

HOLISTIC COMPETITIVE STRATEGY: EMBRACING A HOLISTIC APPROACH TO ESTABLISHING A COMPETITIVE EDGE

Alieu Stephen KAFOE

Marymount University, Arlington, VA, USA

ORCID:<https://orcid.org/0009-0001-8775-4985>

stephenkafoe@yahoo.com

ABSTRACT

This study examines the integration of Porter's Five Forces, the Resource-Based View (RBV), and Dynamic Capabilities frameworks as a comprehensive approach for establishing and maintaining competitive advantage in today's complex business environment. The paper presents real-world examples, including Amazon and Tesla, to demonstrate the practical application and potential challenges of implementing these integrated strategies. These case studies illustrate how successful companies leverage a multifaceted understanding of their competitive landscape, internal strengths, and resource capabilities to outperform rivals and adapt to changing market conditions. By synthesizing these three frameworks, organizations can develop a more nuanced and holistic view of their strategic position. Porter's Five Forces provides insight into industry structure and competitive dynamics, while the RBV focuses on identifying and leveraging unique internal resources. The Dynamic Capabilities perspective adds a crucial temporal dimension, emphasizing the importance of adapting and reconfiguring resources in response to environmental changes. This integrated approach enables companies to establish and sustain their competitive advantage over time, leading to long-term organizational success. The study further explores the implications of this integrated framework for overcoming resistance to strategic changes within organizations. By providing a comprehensive understanding of external and internal factors influencing competitiveness, this approach can facilitate more effective strategic decision-making and implementation, ultimately contributing to long-term organizational success in a dynamic business.

KEYWORDS: Porter's Five Forces, Resource-Based View (RBV), Dynamic Capabilities, VRIN (Valuable, Rare, Inimitable, Non-substitutable) resources, Competitive advantage, Strategic management, Innovation, Change management

1. Introduction

While offering valuable individual frameworks such as Porter's Five Forces, the Resource-Based View (RBV), and Dynamic Capabilities, the current strategic management theory needs a cohesive, integrated approach. This fragmentation in theoretical frameworks potentially limits organizations' ability to effectively navigate external competitive forces while simultaneously leveraging and adapting their internal resources.

The absence of a synthesized strategic framework combining these established theories creates a significant gap in academic understanding and practical application. This gap may hinder firms' capacity to achieve and sustain competitive advantages in dynamic business environments, particularly in the face of global technological advancements and innovation challenges.

Therefore, the need for an integrated strategic approach that amalgamates the

strengths of existing frameworks is more pressing than ever. Such an approach can potentially equip organizations with a more comprehensive and adaptable tool for maintaining a competitive edge, especially in industries characterized by rapid technological change and intense global competition. This research aims to bridge this gap by exploring the potential of an integrated framework that enhances firms' ability to navigate complex external environments while optimizing internal resources and capabilities.

2. Problem Statement

Amidst rapidly evolving global business landscapes and the surge in research and development (R&D) investment, organizations face a critical challenge. The question looms is whether the substantial growth in U.S. R&D expenditure, escalating from \$406.6 billion in 2010 to an estimated \$791.9 billion in 2021 (Anderson et al., 2023), adequately addresses the complexities of modern competitive environments.

3. Research Question

How can organizations effectively integrate Porter's Five Forces model, the Resource-Based View, and the Dynamic Capabilities framework to develop and maintain a sustainable competitive advantage in rapidly changing business environments?

4. Significance of this Research Study

The significance of this research study lies in its synthesis and application of multiple strategic management frameworks to address the challenges of maintaining competitive advantage in dynamic business environments. Specifically:

a) This research study takes a comprehensive approach by bridging theoretical frameworks (Porter's Five Forces, RBV, and Dynamic Capabilities),

providing a deep and comprehensive understanding of strategy formulation.

b) It emphasizes the importance of external industry analysis and internal resource assessment in developing sustainable competitive strategies.

c) The study highlights the critical role of dynamic capabilities in adapting to rapidly changing business environments, which is particularly relevant in today's fast-paced, technology-driven markets.

d) The study provides practical examples of successful and unsuccessful applications of these frameworks, offering tangible lessons for managers and strategists and demonstrating the research's real-world applicability.

e) The research addresses the challenges of implementing these frameworks in practice, offering insights into potential obstacles and strategies to overcome them.

f) By integrating these perspectives, the study contributes to a more nuanced understanding of how firms can achieve and sustain competitive advantage. For example, it delves into the interplay between industry structure and firm resources, shedding light on the conditions under which a competitive advantage can be created and sustained, which is crucial for long-term organizational success and survival.

g) By including real-world examples and personal experiences, this research study enhances the practical relevance of the theoretical discussion, making it directly applicable to the daily challenges faced by business professionals.

Hence, this research is significant as it provides a holistic view of strategic management, combining established theories with contemporary challenges, and offers practical insights for organizations striving to maintain competitiveness in dynamic business landscapes. Its practical relevance makes it a valuable resource for business professionals seeking to enhance their strategic management skills.

5. Methodology

This study employs a qualitative research design, precisely a case study approach combined with a comprehensive literature review. The methodology addresses the research question: “How can organizations effectively integrate Porter’s Five Forces model, the Resource-Based View, and Dynamic Capabilities framework to develop and maintain a sustainable competitive advantage in rapidly changing business environments?”

6. Research Design

The research design incorporates several primary components:

➤ **Literature Review:** A meticulous review of existing literature on Porter’s Five Forces, Resource-Based View (RBV), and Dynamic Capabilities frameworks was conducted. This review synthesizes current theoretical understanding and identifies gaps in existing research, providing a solid foundation for the study.

➤ **Multiple Case Study Analysis:** The study examines a diverse range of cases, including both successful and unsuccessful companies, to illustrate the practical application and challenges of implementing integrated strategic frameworks. This diversity enriches the study with a variety of perspectives.

➤ Data Collection

Data for this study was collected from the following sources:

a) Secondary Data:

- Academic journals and peer-reviewed articles
- Books on strategic management
- Industry reports and business publications
- Company annual reports and public disclosures

b) Case Studies:

- Publicly available information on selected companies (e.g., Amazon, Microsoft, Toyota, Google, Tesla)
- Historical data on companies that failed to adapt (e.g., Nokia, Blockbuster, Kodak, Toys “R” Us, BlackBerry)

c) Personal Experience:

- The researcher’s firsthand experience at a multinational corporation provides an additional data point for analysis.

➤ Data Analysis

The collected data was analyzed using the following methods:

- **Thematic Analysis:** Key themes and patterns were identified across the literature and case studies, focusing on integrating strategic frameworks and their impact on competitive advantage.

- **Comparative Analysis:** Successful and unsuccessful cases were compared to identify critical factors in effectively applying integrated strategic frameworks.

- **Narrative Analysis:** The researcher’s personal experience was analyzed to provide context and depth to the theoretical findings.

➤ Ethical Considerations

Ethical concerns are minimal because this study primarily relies on publicly available information and does not involve human subjects. However, care was taken to accurately represent the information from secondary sources and maintain objectivity in the analysis of case studies by using multiple perspectives and cross-referencing with academic literature.

➤ Validity and Reliability

To ensure the validity and reliability of the study:

- Data sources were triangulated, and findings from academic literature, case studies, and personal experience were compared.

- Multiple case studies were examined to enhance the generalizability of findings.

- The researcher’s potential biases were acknowledged, and efforts were made to maintain objectivity in data analysis and interpretation.

This methodology aims to provide a comprehensive understanding of how organizations can integrate multiple strategic frameworks to achieve and

maintain competitive advantage in dynamic business environments. The study seeks to bridge the gap between academic theory and real-world application in strategic management by combining theoretical analysis with practical examples and personal insights.

7. Literature Review

7.1. Embracing a Holistic Approach to Establishing a Competitive Edge

Porter's Five Forces model provides a structured approach to analyzing an industry's competitive landscape. It underscores the importance of understanding external factors that shape competition, including the threat of new entrants, bargaining power of suppliers and buyers, threat of substitute products, and rivalry among existing competitors (Porter, 2008). This deep understanding of these forces guides firms in developing strategies to improve their market position and long-term profitability. It empowers them with a sense of control and confidence within their industry. Despite its structured approach, the Five Forces model has been criticized for its static nature and failure to consider internal firm resources (Grundy, 2006). However, the Resource-Based View (RBV) and its extension, the Dynamic Capabilities framework, offer a more comprehensive and nuanced approach, opening new possibilities and encouraging a more critical and discerning view.

Lin & Wu (2012) delve into how dynamic capabilities influence firm performance under the Resource-Based View (RBV) framework. The RBV underscores that firms with valuable, rare, inimitable, and non-substitutable (VRIN) resources achieve sustainable competitive advantage. They argue that dynamic capabilities (the firm's ability to integrate, build, and reconfigure internal and external competencies) are crucial for sustaining competitive advantage in rapidly changing environments. Organizations must adopt a proactive and strategic approach to

maintain their competitive advantage. This involves continually replenishing and updating their portfolio of valuable resources in response to evolving external environmental conditions. This proactive stance ensures that firms are not just reacting to changes but actively shaping their competitive position, empowering them in the process.

Complementing this, Talaja (2012) tests the VRIN framework, focusing specifically on resource value and rareness as sources of competitive advantage. Her findings support the RBV, demonstrating that valuable and rare resources contribute significantly to above-average performance.

Synthesizing these frameworks, it can be argued that a comprehensive approach to creating a competitive edge should involve:

- Industry analysis using Porter's Five Forces to understand the external competitive landscape (Porter, 2008).

- Identification and development of VRIN resources per the RBV framework (Lin & Wu, 2012).

One of the critical aspects of the RBV framework is the need to cultivate dynamic capabilities. This is necessary to effectively leverage and reconfigure resources in response to changing environments (Lin & Wu, 2012). It is not enough to identify and develop VRIN resources. Organizations must also be able to adapt and evolve these resources to maintain their competitive advantage. By amalgamating these frameworks, companies can comprehensively understand their competitive landscape, internal strengths, and resource capabilities.

An example of a company that has effectively employed these theories is Amazon. Amazon has consistently demonstrated an understanding of its industry dynamics (Porter's Five Forces), leveraged its unique resources, such as its vast customer data and logistics network (VRIN resources), and continuously developed dynamic capabilities to adapt to changing market conditions, such as its

move into cloud computing with Amazon Web Services (Ritala et al., 2014). Other companies that have effectively employed these strategies include Microsoft, which has leveraged its strong brand and technological innovation to maintain a competitive edge (Patel, 2017), and Toyota, which has continuously developed its dynamic capabilities to adapt to changing market conditions (Cavusgil et al., 2007; Roehl & Mahoney, 1999) via its adoption of the Toyota Production System (TPS), which has not only revolutionized its operations but has also influenced practices in various industries (Wagner, 2024). Similarly, Google has harnessed dynamic capabilities such as innovation and agility to lead in the fast-paced tech sector (Fukawa et al., 2021). Furthermore, companies like Tesla have strategically managed distinctive resources like brand reputation, technological innovation, and patents to achieve sustained competitive advantage, aligning with the principles of the VRIN framework (Gao, 2023; Yang, 2023).

On the other hand, failure to effectively leverage dynamic capabilities can put companies at a significant disadvantage, potentially leading to failure. Notable examples include Nokia, which struggled to adapt to the shift towards smartphones and touchscreens, losing market share to competitors like Apple and Samsung (Cyfert et al., 2021). Once a leader in mobile phones, Nokia needed to adapt to the smartphone era. Despite having significant resources and technological capabilities, the company needed help reconfiguring its competencies to compete effectively in the smartphone market (Vuori & Huy, 2016). Nokia's failure to develop the necessary software capabilities and ecosystem to compete with Apple's iOS and Google's Android platforms led to its decline and eventual sale of its mobile phone business to Microsoft in 2013 (Doz & Kosonen, 2010).

Blockbuster failed to respond to the rise of online streaming services like Netflix, leading to its bankruptcy (Alkaraan, 2024). Blockbuster's demise illustrates a failure to adapt to changing consumer preferences and technological advancements. The company needed to respond to the shift towards online streaming and DVD-by-mail services pioneered by Netflix (Almeida, 2011). Blockbuster's rigid business model and inability to reconfigure its capabilities to embrace digital distribution ultimately led to its bankruptcy in 2010. This case highlights the importance of sensing and seizing new opportunities, which are critical aspects of dynamic capabilities, as described by Teece (2007).

Kodak also needed to improve in transitioning to digital photography, resulting in its decline and bankruptcy (Amaranti, 2024). Kodak's failure is another classic example of a company unable to reconfigure its capabilities in response to technological disruption. Despite inventing the first digital camera in 1975, Kodak needed to transition effectively from film to digital photography (Lucas & Goh, 2009). The company's dynamic capabilities were constrained by its cognitive frames and routines centered around film photography, preventing it from adapting to the digital revolution. This inability to reconfigure its resources and capabilities led to Kodak filing for bankruptcy in 2012.

Toys "R" Us failed to adapt its business model to the rise of e-commerce and changing consumer shopping habits. The company needed to develop a robust online presence faster and struggled to compete with online retailers like Amazon (Kahn et al., 2018). Its inability to reconfigure its capabilities to create a seamless omnichannel experience for customers contributed to its bankruptcy filing in 2017 and subsequent liquidation in 2018.

BlackBerry lost its market position due to its inability to innovate and keep pace with competitors like Apple and Android (Iñigo & Albareda, 2019).

These examples illustrate the critical importance of dynamic capabilities in sustaining competitive advantage, especially in industries characterized by rapid technological change and shifting consumer preferences. The failures of the companies mentioned above underscore several vital points:

- Continuous environmental scanning and opportunity sensing (Teece, 2007).

- Organizational agility and the ability to quickly reconfigure resources and capabilities are needed (Eisenhardt & Martin, 2000).

- The challenges posed by organizational inertia and cognitive barriers to change (Tripsas & Gavetti, 2000).

- The role of leadership in fostering and deploying dynamic capabilities (Helfat & Peteraf, 2015).

These cases provide valuable lessons for managers and scholars alike, emphasizing the need for organizations to continuously develop and refine their dynamic capabilities to remain competitive in rapidly changing business environments.

7.2. Challenges of Implementing Dynamic Capabilities

However, implementing these frameworks is challenging. One major obstacle is identifying VRIN resources and developing dynamic capabilities in practice. Companies may need help to assess their resources objectively or need more organizational flexibility to develop dynamic capabilities (Ambrosini & Bowman, 2009). Another Challenge is that the volatile and dynamic nature of the contemporary business environment (evolving market conditions) necessitates that organizational resources undergo continuous evolution and development to maintain their value. Static resources will

likely become obsolete in the face of ongoing environmental flux. Consequently, firms that fail to engage in perpetual resource reconfiguration and enhancement may find their competitive advantage limited to short-term horizons, potentially compromising their long-term strategic positioning (Ambrosini & Bowman, 2009).

However, overcoming these challenges presents opportunities for growth and innovation, inspiring a sense of optimism about the future among business professionals.

7.3. Ways of Overcoming the Challenges

Organizations have adopted various strategies to overcome these obstacles. One key strategy is continuously investing in and enhancing the resource base to sustain a durable competitive advantage and generate novel strategic growth trajectories. This necessitates cultivating dynamic capabilities within the firm. These capabilities can be conceptualized as organizational processes that facilitate the modification of the resource portfolio through the creation, integration, recombination, and divestment of resources (Ambrosini & Bowman, 2009). For instance, companies like Amazon have embraced a culture of continuous innovation and adaptability to respond to changing market dynamics, which aligns with the principles of dynamic capabilities (Schröder et al., 2020). Similarly, firms like Netflix have focused on cultivating a portfolio of rare and valuable resources, such as original content and subscriber data, to uphold a competitive edge, as the VRIN framework recommends (Nguyen et al., 2021). The urgency and importance of these strategies should be felt by business professionals, strategists, and analysts, inspiring them to act.

Digital technologies have also been shown to play a pivotal role in overcoming some of these challenges.

8. Utilizing Modern Technologies to Reinforce the Integrated Strategic Frameworks for Enhanced Competitive Advantage

In today's dynamic business landscape, integrating modern technologies such as Artificial intelligence (AI), Machine Learning (ML), and digitalization has influenced and transformed the application of traditional strategic frameworks. These modern technologies have played a crucial role in reshaping the consolidated strategy involving Porter's Five Forces, the VRIN framework, and dynamic capabilities, thereby establishing a sustainable competitive edge for firms. Adopting digital technologies has transformed traditional business practices, leading to a paradigm shift in how firms operate and compete (Mariam, 2024). These technologies have broadened opportunities for personalized consumer engagement and revolutionized other essential activities, such as procurement processes through practices like Robotic Process Automation (RPA) (Viale & Zouari, 2020). As firms navigate digital transformation, the strategic implications of these technologies become increasingly crucial for sustainable growth and competitive advantage. Hence, it is imperative to critically analyze the implications of contemporary technological advancements on integrating these strategic frameworks and evaluate how these technologies enhance competitive advantage in the modern business landscape.

8.1. Impact on Porter's Five Forces

AI and ML have transformed how firms analyze their competitive environment using Porter's Five Forces model (Porter, 1979). These technologies enable more sophisticated and real-time analysis of:

- **Threat of New Entrants:** AI-powered market monitoring tools can quickly identify potential new entrants and assess their capabilities (Agrawal et al., 2018).

- **Bargaining Power of Suppliers and Buyers:** ML algorithms can analyze vast amounts of transaction data to predict changes in bargaining power (Brynjolfsson & McAfee, 2017).

- **Threat of Substitute Products:** AI can scan diverse data sources to identify emerging substitutes and predict their market impact (Bughin et al., 2017).

- **Rivalry Among Existing Competitors:** Advanced analytics can provide deeper insights into competitors' strategies and market positioning (Iansiti & Lakhani, 2020).

8.2. Impact on VRIN Framework

The VRIN framework has been significantly enhanced by modern technologies:

- **Valuable:** AI and ML can help firms more accurately identify and quantify the value of their resources (Davenport, 2018).

- **Rare:** Big data analytics can assess the rarity of resources across global markets with unprecedented precision (McAfee & Brynjolfsson, 2012).

- **Inimitable:** Blockchain technology can help protect and verify the uniqueness of specific resources (Tapscott & Tapscott, 2017).

- **Non-substitutable:** AI-driven predictive analytics can forecast potential substitutes for firm resources (Agrawal et al., 2018).

8.3. Impact on Dynamic Capabilities

Modern technologies have revolutionized the concept of dynamic capabilities (Teece et al., 1997) in the following ways:

- **Sensing:** AI and ML enhance a firm's ability to sense environmental opportunities and threats (Teece, 2018).

- **Seizing:** Digital platforms and advanced analytics enable faster decision-making and resource allocation (Yeow et al., 2018).

- **Transforming:** AI-driven process optimization and robotics facilitate more efficient organizational transformation (Davenport & Ronanki, 2018).

9. Successful Companies and Implementation Challenges

Several companies have successfully harnessed this integrated strategy enhanced by modern technologies; notable examples are:

Amazon: The e-commerce giant has leveraged AI and ML to continuously refine its understanding of the competitive landscape (Porter's Five Forces), enhance its VRIN resources (e.g., customer data, and logistics network), and develop dynamic capabilities for rapid market adaptation (Ritala et al., 2014). However, during the initial rollout, Amazon faced initial resistance to AI adoption among employees. They overcame this through comprehensive training programs and the gradual integration of AI tools (Brynjolfsson & McAfee, 2017).

Microsoft: The company has used AI to enhance its VRIN resources, particularly in cloud computing and software development. Its dynamic capabilities have been strengthened through AI-driven market analysis and product development (Nadella et al., 2017). During implementation, Microsoft struggled with data silos, which hindered the effective use of AI across the organization. This challenge was addressed by implementing a company-wide data integration strategy (Ransbotham et al., 2017).

Siemens: The industrial giant has employed AI and ML to analyze its competitive environment, optimize resource allocation, and enhance its dynamic capabilities in product innovation (Iansiti & Lakhani, 2020). Despite the benefits, Siemens faced difficulties scaling AI solutions across its diverse business units. They overcame this by establishing a centralized AI hub to coordinate efforts and share best practices across the organization (Bughin et al., 2017).

Hence, as seen from these examples, integrating AI, ML, and digitalization with traditional strategic frameworks has

significantly enhanced firms' ability to establish and maintain competitive advantage. However, the successful implementation of these technologies is not without its hurdles, which include organizational culture, regulatory compliance, data management, data privacy and security issues, talent acquisition and upskilling, organizational resistance to change, and the need for continuous investment in technology infrastructure and technology integration challenges (Radanliev et al., 2019).

During my tenure at a large multinational Company, we faced significant resistance when rolling out new strategic initiatives to enhance our competitive edge in the face of growing competition in the automation industry. Many employees were skeptical about the changes and were concerned about potential job losses. To address these concerns, we implemented a comprehensive change management strategy that included rigorous and systematic resource audits utilizing advanced analytics and AI to assess value objectively and embarked on organizational restructuring in which we implemented an agile organizational structure to increase our responsiveness and flexibility in decision-making to respond to competitive threats and dynamic customer preferences. We promoted a cultural transformation agenda, promoting continuous learning, collaboration, and adaptation across the organization. Also, we developed a continuous feedback mechanism by establishing relevant KPIs for resource utilization and capability development, linking market performance and internal resource allocation. We also enhanced our environmental scanning to monitor industry trends and disruptive technologies, created early warning systems for potential resource obsolescence, and developed predictive models for anticipating resource value shifts. We also provided training and support to help employees adapt to new

processes. These approaches mitigated resistance and skepticism and fostered a sense of trust, ownership, and engagement among staff, ultimately leading to the successful implementation of the strategy.

In conclusion, by synthesizing the frameworks proposed by Porter (2008), Lin & Wu (2012), and Talaja (2012), companies can develop a holistic approach to formulating strategies, leveraging industry insights, internal capabilities, and resource strengths to attain and sustain a competitive advantage in the market. By strategically applying these frameworks, organizations can navigate challenges, seize opportunities, and drive superior performance in today's dynamic business landscape.

10. Research Limitations and Recommendations for Future Research

10.1. Limitations of the Research Study

- *Reliance on Secondary Data:* The study primarily relies on secondary data sources, including academic literature, industry reports, and publicly available company information. While this approach allows for broad analysis, it may limit the depth and nuance of insights that could be gained from primary data collection methods.

- *Limited Generalizability of Personal Experience:* The inclusion of the researcher's personal experience at a multinational Company, while valuable, is specific to one company and industry. This limits the generalizability of these insights across different sectors and organizational contexts.

- *Potential for Selection Bias:* The case studies selected for analysis may represent a partial spectrum of organizational experiences with integrating strategic frameworks. There is a risk of selection bias towards well-known, high-profile companies, potentially overlooking valuable lessons from less prominent organizations.

- *Lack of Quantitative Analysis:* While the study's qualitative nature provides rich contextual insights, it does not offer quantitative metrics to measure the effectiveness of integrated strategic approaches.

- *Temporal Limitations:* The study provides a snapshot of strategic management practices at a specific point in time. Given the rapidly changing business environment, some insights may have limited long-term applicability.

- *Potential Researcher Bias:* Despite the researcher's efforts to maintain objectivity, their personal experience and perspectives, particularly their time at a particular multinational company, may inadvertently influence the interpretation of data and case studies, potentially introducing bias.

10.2. Recommendations for Future Research

- *Primary Data Collection:* Future studies should prioritize primary data collection methods such as surveys, interviews, or focus groups with business leaders and strategists. These methods can provide more current and nuanced insights into the challenges and successes of integrating strategic frameworks.

- *Longitudinal Studies:* Longitudinal studies are crucial as they can provide insights into the long-term effectiveness and adaptability of integrated strategic approaches, enhancing our understanding of their sustainability over time.

- *Cross-Industry Comparative Analysis:* Expanding the research to include a systematic comparison across various industries could reveal sector-specific challenges and best practices in implementing integrated strategic frameworks.

- *Quantitative Assessment:* Developing and applying quantitative metrics to assess the effectiveness of integrated strategic approaches would complement qualitative insights and provide more robust evidence of their impact on organizational performance.

Focus on Mid-sized and Smaller Enterprises: Future research could explore how smaller and medium-sized enterprises implement and benefit from integrated strategic frameworks, as their experiences differ significantly from those of large corporations.

Cultural and Geographical Variations: Investigating how cultural and geographical factors influence the application and effectiveness of integrated strategic frameworks could provide valuable insights for global organizations.

Technology Integration: Future research must focus on developing more robust methodologies for measuring the impact of these technologies on competitive advantage and exploring the potential ethical implications of their use in strategic decision-making.

Change Management Perspective: Delving deeper into the change management aspects of implementing integrated strategic frameworks could provide valuable insights into overcoming

organizational resistance and fostering adoption.

Stakeholder Impact Analysis: Exploring how the integration of strategic frameworks affects various stakeholders (e.g., employees, customers, suppliers) could offer a more holistic understanding of their organizational impact.

Meta-Analysis of Case Studies: Conducting a comprehensive meta-analysis of a larger pool of case studies could help identify patterns and best practices in implementing integrated strategic frameworks across diverse organizational contexts.

By addressing these limitations and pursuing these research directions, future studies can build upon the current work to provide more comprehensive, nuanced, and actionable insights into the effective integration of strategic management frameworks in dynamic business environments. This emphasizes the urgency and importance of conducting more comprehensive research in this field.

REFERENCES

- Agrawal, A., Gans, J., & Goldfarb, A. (2018). *Prediction machines: the simple economics of artificial intelligence*. Harvard Business Review Press.
- Alkaraan, F., Elmarzouky, M., Hussainey, K., Venkatesh, V.G., Shi, Y., & Gulko, N. (2024). Reinforcing green business strategies with industry 4.0 and governance towards sustainability: natural-resource-based view and dynamic capability. *Business Strategy and the Environment*, Vol. 33, Issue 4, 3588-3606. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1002/bse.3665>.
- Almeida, J.F.C.R. (2011). *Blockbuster: the fall of a giant* (Doctoral dissertation).
- Anderson, G., Jankowski, J., & Boroush, M. (2023). US R&D increased by \$51 billion in 2020 to \$717 billion; estimate for 2021 indicates further increase to \$792 billion. *National Center for Science and Engineering Statistics (NCSES). NSF*, 23-320.
- Brynjolfsson, E., & McAfee, A. (2017). Artificial intelligence, for real. *Harvard business review*, Vol. 1, 1-31.
- Bughin, J., et al. (2017). *Artificial intelligence the next digital frontier*. McKinsey Global Institute.
- Cavusgil, E., Seggie, S.H., & Talay, M.B. (2007). Dynamic capabilities view: Foundations and research agenda. *Journal of marketing theory and practice*, Vol. 15, Issue 2, 159-166.

Cyfert, S., Chwiłkowska-Kubala, A., Szumowski, W., & Miśkiewicz, R. (2021). The process of developing dynamic capabilities: the conceptualization attempt and the results of empirical studies. *Plos One*, Vol. 16, Issue 4, e0249724. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0249724>.

Davenport, T.H. (2018). *The AI advantage: how to put the artificial intelligence revolution to work*. The MIT Press.

Davenport, T.H., & Ronanki, R. (2018). Artificial intelligence for the real world. *Harvard business review*, Vol. 96, Issue 1, 108-116.

Doz, Y.L., & Kosonen, M. (2010). Embedding strategic agility: A leadership agenda for accelerating business model renewal. *Long range planning*, Vol. 43, Issue 2-3, 370-382.

Eisenhardt, K.M., & Martin, J.A. (2000). Dynamic capabilities: what are they?. *Strategic management journal*, Vol. 21, Issue 10-11, 1105-1121.

Fukawa, N., Zhang, Y., & Erevelles, S. (2021). Dynamic capability and open-source strategy in the age of digital transformation. *Journal of Open Innovation: Technology, Market, and Complexity*, Vol. 7, Issue 3, 175. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.3390/joitmc7030175>.

Gao, Y. (2023). A study of Tesla's international marketing strategy based on the Stepps model. *Highlights in Business, Economics and Management*, Vol. 23, 971-979. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.54097/es6rry79>.

Grundy, T. (2006). Rethinking and reinventing Michael Porter's five forces model. *Strategic change*, Vol. 15, Issue 5, 213-229.

Helfat, C.E., & Peteraf, M.A. (2015). Managerial cognitive capabilities and the microfoundations of dynamic capabilities. *Strategic management journal*, Vol. 36, Issue 6, 831-850.

Iansiti, M., & Lakhani, K.R. (2020). *Competing in the age of AI: Strategy and leadership when algorithms and networks run the world*. Harvard Business Press.

Iñigo, E.A., & Albareda, L. (2019). Sustainability oriented innovation dynamics: levels of dynamic capabilities and their path-dependent and self-reinforcing logics. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*, Vol. 139, 334-351. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techfore.2018.11.023>.

Kahn, B., Inman, J., & Verhoef, P. (2018). Introduction to Special Issue: Consumer Response to the Evolving Retailing Landscape. *Journal of the Association for Consumer Research*, Vol. 3, 255-259. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1086/699389>.

Lin, Y., & Wu, L.-Y. (2014). Exploring the role of dynamic capabilities in firm performance under the resource-based view framework. *Journal of Business Research*, Vol. 67, Issue 3, 407-413. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2012.12.019>.

Lucas Jr, H.C., & Goh, J.M. (2009). Disruptive technology: How Kodak missed the digital photography revolution. *The Journal of Strategic Information Systems*, Vol. 18, Issue 1, 46-55.

Mariam, S. (2024). Building competitive advantage through information technology integration in marketing and branding management strategies. *Golden Ratio of Mapping Idea and Literature Format*, Vol. 4, Issue 2, 111-139. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.52970/grmilf.v4i2.356>.

McAfee, A., & Brynjolfsson, E. (2012). Big data: the management revolution. In *Harvard Business Review*, Vol. 90, Issue 10, 60-128.

Nadella, S., Shaw, G., & Nichols, J.T. (2017). *Hit refresh: the quest to rediscover Microsoft's soul and imagine a better future for everyone*. First edition: HarperBusiness, an imprint of HarperCollinsPublishers.

Nguyen, Q., Maritz, A., & Millemann, J.A. (2021). Entrepreneurship imperatives in higher education institutions: the case of Australian universities. *Industry and Higher Education*, Vol. 36, Issue 5, 493-511. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1177/09504222211059744>.

Patel, S.R. (2017). *Microsoft's Paradigm Shift: Strategically Reinventing the Brand, Supporting its Vision for Growth, and Strengthening Its Competitive Position*.

Porter, M. (2008). The five competitive forces that shape strategy. *Harvard Business Review*, Vol. 86, Issue 1, 78-93, 137.

Radanliev, P., Roue, D.D., Nurse, J.R.C., Nicolescu, R., Huth, M., Cannady, S., ... & Montalvo, R.M. (2019). *Cyber risk impact assessment – assessing the risk from the IoT to the digital economy*. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.20944/preprints201903.0109.v2>.

Ransbotham, S., Kiron, D., Gerbert, P., & Reeves, M. (2017). Reshaping Business With Artificial Intelligence: Closing the Gap Between Ambition and Action. *MIT Sloan Management Review*, Vol. 59, Issue 1.

Ritala, P., Golnam, A., & Wegmann, A. (2014). Coopetition-based business models: The case of Amazon.com. *Industrial Marketing Management*, Vol. 43, Issue 2, 236-249. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.indmarman.2013.11.005>.

Ritala, P., Golnam, A., & Wegmann, A. (2014). Coopetition-based business models: The case of Amazon. com. *Industrial marketing management*, Vol. 43, Issue 2, 236-249.

Roehl, T., & Mahoney, J. (1999). *The Evolution of a Manufacturing System at Toyota*. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.2000.3312930>.

Schröder, K., Tiberius, V., Bouncken, R.B., & Kraus, S. (2020). Strategic entrepreneurship: mapping a research field. *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behavior & Research*, Vol. 27, Issue 3, 753-776. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1108/ijeb-11-2020-0798>.

Talaja, A. (2012). Testing VRIN framework: Resource value and rareness as sources of competitive advantage and above average performance. *Management (Split, Croatia)*, Vol. 17, Issue 2, 51-64.

Tapscott, D., & Tapscott, A. (2017). How Blockchain Will Change Organizations. *MIT Sloan Management Review*, Vol. 58, Issue 2, 10.

Teece, D.J. (2007). Explicating dynamic capabilities: the nature and microfoundations of (sustainable) enterprise performance. *Strategic Management Journal*, Vol. 28, Issue 13, 1319-1350.

Teece, D.J. (2018). Business models and dynamic capabilities. *Long Range Planning*, Vol. 51, Issue 1, 40-49. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lrp.2017.06.007>.

Tripsas, M., & Gavetti, G. (2000). Capabilities, cognition, and inertia: evidence from digital imaging. *Strategic Management Journal*, Vol. 21, Issue 10-11, 1147-1161. Available at: [https://doi.org/10.1002/1097-0266\(200010/11\)21:10/11<1147::AID-SMJ128>3.0.CO;2-R](https://doi.org/10.1002/1097-0266(200010/11)21:10/11<1147::AID-SMJ128>3.0.CO;2-R).

Viale, L., & Zouari, D. (2020). Impact of digitalization on procurement: the case of robotic process automation. *Supply Chain Forum: An International Journal*, Vol. 21, Issue 3, 185-195. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1080/16258312.2020.1776089>.

Vuori, T.O., & Huy, Q.N. (2016). Distributed attention and shared emotions in the innovation process: How Nokia lost the smartphone battle. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, Vol. 61, Issue 1, 9-51.

Wagner, S.M., & Kurpjuweit, S. (2024). Microfoundations of dynamic new venture partnering capabilities. *Journal of Business Logistics*, Vol. 45, Issue 2. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1111/jbl.12375>.

Yang, R. (2023). Research on Tesla's business model on obtaining competitive advantages. *Advances in Economics, Management and Political Sciences*, Vol. 25, Issue 1, 159-164. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.54254/2754-1169/25/20230492>.

Yeow, A., Soh, C., & Hansen, R. (2018). Aligning with new digital strategy: A dynamic capabilities approach. *The Journal of Strategic Information Systems*, Vol. 27, Issue 1, 43-58. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsis.2017.09.001>.