International Journal of Academic and Applied Research (IJAAR)
ISSN: 2643-9603
Vol. 7 Issue 5, May - 2023, Pages: 116-126

Dynamic Capabilities and Organizational Competitiveness of Telecommunication Firms in Rivers State

Darlington Chigoziri Unegbu [1] and Adekemi Drusilia Alagah[2]

Department of Management, University of Port Harcourt. Port Harcourt, Nigeria.

Abstract: *This research looked at how the dynamic capability of telecommunications companies in Rivers State relates with their competitiveness. The cross-sectional survey was chosen and 80 managers make up the study's population which were selected from 12 different telecommunications companies. Questionnaire were used to get the data and 71 copies of the questionnaire were retrieved and sued for the study. The Spearman's Rank Order Correlation Coefficient was used to analyse the data. Results showed that dynamic capability and organizational competitiveness had a substantial link. It was concluded that dynamic capacity is important for boosting organizations' competitiveness. In order to adjust to the dynamic nature of the corporate environment, the research advised managers to ensure reconfiguration and seizing of opportunity and be aware of their operational environment and adaptable in their policies and plans.*

Keywords: Dynamic Capabilities, Seizing, Organizational Competitiveness, Reconfiguring, Seizing.

Introduction

Owing to the complexity and dynamic nature of the business world, businesses must be competitive in order to operate effectively. Organizations are forced to operate in situations that are increasingly unpredictable due to rising competition and technological advancements. This is particularly true in the Nigerian setting, where managers of firms face several difficulties as a result of the country's rapidly evolving commercial climate. Organizational competition may be traced back to Adam Smith's Wealth of Nations in (1776). One aspect of Smith's theory was the agricultural sector, where, in his opinion, markets functioned almost flawlessly. On the other hand, he saw more technological advancement in manufacturing throughout his lifetime and theorized that this may be due to the inability of separating all the many agricultural labor specialties. Unfortunately, Smith did not recognize how this variation in the capacity for division of labor would affect organizational and distributional structures. A major contributor to economies of scale, entry obstacles, imperfect competition, and ultimately, disparities in the quality of economic activity, is the basic division of labor. The basic cornerstone of competitiveness in the sense that the word is used today is imperfect competition, which is caused by a high degree of "division of labor" (Reinert, 1994).

Ever since it became the subject of the policy discussion in the late 1980s and early 1990s, the word "competitiveness" has been extensively examined in academic literature (Krugman, 1994; Porter, 1990). The many perspectives that evolved at the time on what competition is and what value it has for policy have never truly been resolved (Sanfey & Zeh, 2012). The discussion begin with Paul Krugman's earlier view of competition as either a risky or unimportant idea (Krugman, 1994). One of the telecom markets in sub-Saharan Africa with the highest growth is the Nigerian market. The regulatory prowess of the telecom industry watchdog, Nigerian Communications Commission (NCC), which has been able to eliminate monopolies by promoting competition and protecting the interests of service providers, investors, and subscribers, respectively, can be assertively credited for the successes so far recorded in the country's telecom sector (Chidiebere, 2017). In a developing economy like Nigeria, competitiveness is crucial to market functioning because it promotes productivity, innovation, and development. As a result, the concept of dynamic capabilities has been extensively studied in organization theory and strategic management literature. In terms of the degree of instability/turbulence of such fundamental operational issues as market and industry circumstances as well as broader variables like technical, economic, social, and political forces and how they affect enterprises, it is becoming more important. Thus, a company's competitiveness depends on its capacity to adjust to shifting environmental conditions.

Additionally, the organization's dynamic capabilities are a crucial component of strategy creation and a source of profitability. Today's strategic management and organization theory researchers understand how crucial dynamic capabilities are to advancing strategy (Luo & Park, 2001). According to one line of study, managers' views of the external business environment affect company strategy, which in turn affects firm performance (Verdu-Jover, Llorens-Montes, & Garcia-Morales, 2006). Dynamic capabilities, therefore, are a company's capacity to use its resources wisely in order to achieve alignment with the changing business environment. The notion was described as "the ability of an organization to actively develop, expand, or adjust its resource base" by Helfat et al. in 2007. According to Verdu-Jover et al. (2006), the resource and capacity theory and competitiveness literatures emphasize that how an organization perceives opportunities in the external business environment affects its strategy, which in turn affects how well it performs. Suppliers, customers, rivals, and the nature of competition may all change as a result of changes in the organization's environment, which can be challenging for the business. Government regulations, supply and demand shifts domestically and internationally, as well as competitive pressure, might compel businesses to engage in adaptive behavior if they want to survive over the long run. However, unlike unprepared firms, those who are used to a more complex and dynamic environment may not have trouble adjusting and responding to the environment (Azadegan, 2013). As a result, businesses functioning in highly dynamic environments may encounter major changes in the level of competition, competitive behavior, consumer demand, and technological advancements (Wilhelm, Schlömer, & Maurer, 2015). According to this perspective, organizations operating in the same sector often confront comparable obstacles, as well as technical factors that define the environment in which they operate (Karna & Richter, 2016). Organizations are more competitive as a result when the economic climate promotes the rapid accumulation of capital and specialized skills, the effective transfer of information, and a stronger grasp of customer wants and manufacturing processes. This kind of climate helps businesses to make long-term investments, develop and maintain competitiveness. A highly competitive environment is necessary to protect economic growth and the establishment of international markets (Todorut & Vasilescu, 2009). Therefore, competition benefits businesses and the economy as a whole, promoting consumer sovereignty and market stability. Maintaining and monitoring industrial competition inevitably raises the quality of services provided by businesses.

The Nigerian telecom business grew astronomically from 400,000 active lines in 2001 to over 100 million functional lines in 2016, thanks to the affordability of GSM lines in comparison to the widespread deployment of telecommunication network infrastructure throughout Nigeria. These significant developments in the telecom sector had a significant role in the expansion of the national economy. It turned Nigeria into a refuge for investments for international telecommunications companies. This would not have been conceivable if the market had been allowed to become normalized into complacency, eliminating the spirit of competition at its best (Chidiebere, 2017) There are several methods to gauge how competitive a company is. Traditionally, financial or marketing metrics have been used as the primary indicators of competitiveness. Riley (2012), for instance, claims that a competitive firm may seek to accomplish one or more of the following in comparison to rivals. A greater growth rate, a bigger profit margin, and a better return on investment are indicators of competitiveness.

Further indicators include; improved product quality and client services, above-average levels of consumer loyalty, above-average effectiveness, a more motivated and devoted staff as well as quicker and more efficient decision-making and communication, improve productivity, efficiency, quality, customer service, and other factors. High uncertainty forces the organization to react more quickly to unanticipated change in order to survive (Barr, Stimpert & Huff, 1992). According to Eisenhardt (1989), businesses that operate in high-velocity settings use more information and generate more options than those that do not. Operating in an environment that is more highly dynamic has been proven to influence managers' views of the risk of organizational failure (Hambrick & Finkelstein, 1987). Studies have shown the link between dynamism and organizational success (Waldman, Ramirez, House & Puranam, 2001). On the other hand, industry-level academic discussions on competitiveness show that it may be defined as a firm's capacity to compete against overseas rivals while operating without financial support (Merriam Webster Online, 2011). The cost and quality of a sector's goods, the overall profitability of its businesses, its trade balance, and the balance of incoming and outbound foreign direct investment may all be used to gauge how competitive a sector is (Ahonen, 2010). Competition has been noted as a significant motivator driving change in many businesses (Obasan & Soyebo, 2012). Numerous research have been conducted on the topic since Teece, Pisano, and Shuen (1997) developed the idea of dynamic capabilities to assist clarify the problems of sustainable advantage in a volatile and highly dynamic corporate environment. Gremme and Wohlgemuth (2017), for example, note that since 2011, the dynamic capabilities construct has received over 2000 articles which is making it one of the most investigated and debated subjects in the area of strategic management. Breznik, Lahovnik, and Dimovski (2017) pointed out that a recent evaluation of research on dynamic capabilities and how it relates to competitiveness shows that the majority of contributions on the topic are still mostly conceptual. Thus, relatively little empirical research has been done. The majority of research on dynamic capabilities are either Eurocentric or Americanicentric, which is also important to note Regarding the relationship between enterprises' dynamic capabilities and competitiveness, little emphasis has been paid to the African business environment. This research's aim is to perform an empirical investigation on the link between dynamic capabilities and organizational competitiveness in telecommunication enterprises in Rivers State, Nigeria, in light of the observed vacuum in the literature.

Statement of the Problem

Low level of competitiveness has become a critical problem of organization over the years. Due to the unstable and uncertain business climate, companies can no longer maintain their competitive edge for very long owing to changes in consumer taste and technical advancement, products and services are rapidly rendered outdated. Because of this, businesses are always under pressure to look for new methods to raise the quality of their services in order to stay competitive.

The delivery of data at a substantially lower cost is a current point of contention between telecom carriers and service providers. Over time, the sector's income has decreased because of the intense rivalry among telecom carriers for customers who want phone and internet data services. As a result, it becomes important to think about how businesses can compete both successfully and efficiently. Because of this, it is important for enterprises to be aware of changes to their operating environment. This calls for the capacity to identify hazards and opportunities, act on them by putting suitable strategies in place to deal with threats, and adjust an organization's asset structure to keep up with environmental changes. Despite the fact that many research have been conducted to study the relationship between dynamic capabilities and organizational competitiveness, the majority of them are theoretical and there are very few empirical studies available. Additionally, little empirical research has been done in the Nigerian context on the relationship between the two variables (dynamic capabilities and organizational competitiveness), particularly as they relate to the telecom industry. On this point, the empirical analysis of the relationship between dynamic capabilities and organizational competitiveness of telecommunication enterprises in Rivers State is shown in this paper.

Objectives of the Study

The specific objectives are to:

i. Examine the relationship between seizing and service quality.
ii. Establish the relationship between seizing and market share.
iii. Examine the interface between reconfiguring and service quality.
iv. Investigate the nexus between reconfiguring and market share.

Research Questions

The following research questions will serve as a guide to this study;

i. What is the relationship between seizing and service quality?
ii. What is the relationship between seizing and market share?
iii. What is the relationship between reconfiguring and service quality?
iv. What is the relationship between reconfiguring and market share?

Research Hypotheses

The Null hypotheses below were formulated to guide answers to the research questions.

$H0_1$: There is no significant relationship between seizing and service quality.
$H0_2$: There is no significant relationship between seizing and market share.
$H0_3$: There is no significant relationship between reconfiguring and service quality.
$H0_4$: There is no significant relationship between reconfiguring and market share.

Review of Related Literature

Resource-based View

The resource-based perspective is the key to this study. The theory is based on the idea that a corporate company may acquire a competitive edge via the correct use of a variety of resources, both physical and intangible resources that are precious, uncommon, unique, and non-substitutable. Here, competitive advantage refers to value-creation methods that are challenging for prospective rivals or newcomers to immediately copy or apply. Procedures, knowledge, assets, traits, and capabilities are the categories into which Barney (1991) categorized a firm's resources. According to Daft (2010), the smart use of organizational resources may lead to a persistent competitive advantage. The Resource Based View (RBV) examines companies' resources to comprehend how businesses develop long-lasting competitive advantage. The notion of difficult-to-imitate characteristics of the company as sources of better performance and competitive advantage is the RBV's main point of emphasis (Barney, 1986; Hamel and Prahalad, 1996). Resources that are difficult to transfer or buy, that need a long learning curve or a significant shift in the organizational atmosphere and culture are more likely to be exclusive to the business and, hence, more challenging for rivals to copy. Connerb (1991) asserts that a firm's ability to act differently from its competitors relies on the presence of distinctive capabilities and competencies.

Concept of Dynamic Capabilities

The concept of dynamic capabilities has been extensively studied in the literature on organization theory and strategic management. As important operational issues including market/industry conditions and more general technical, economic, social, and political factors and their interactions with enterprises become increasingly unstable or turbulent, it becomes of increasing relevance. The secret to an organization's existence is its capacity to adjust to changing external conditions. There are many different interpretations of dynamic capabilities in the scientific literature, thus it makes sense to present a few. In addition, it is possible to learn about the definitions of dynamic capabilities and how this construct is used in research. As a relatively recent topic of academic study, dynamic capabilities have attracted considerable interest from academics working in both strategic management and other fields. It has emerged as a recurrent issue in works published in eminent academic journals and has been the subject of many conversations and scientific conferences all over the globe. The lack of a commonly accepted definition of the notion, according to Wojcit (2017), has led to variations in the areas of methodology, nature, and operationalization. Dynamic capabilities is a recent and developing research tradition, hence it is not yet lucky to have a well-established and undisputed theoretical foundation. There are several definitions and sometimes opposing viewpoints, as is seen from numerous assessments of various studies and investigations linked to dynamic capacity. Dynamic capabilities were described as the "capacity to integrate, create, and reconfigure both internal and external competences to handle dynamically changing environments" by Teece, Pisano, and Shuen (1997). More definitions have subsequently been offered by other scholars. According to Eisenhardt and Martin (2000: 1107), dynamic capabilities are "the firm's process that utilizes resources, especially the process to integrate, restructure, gain, and release resources to meet or even cause market change.

Seizing

Every company organization looks for market possibilities to take advantage of and works to remove any barriers or dangers in the way of this goal. As soon as market opportunities are recognized or felt, a response is required by putting in place the systems and procedures that may assist the company in developing or producing goods and services and seizing the market possibilities. To put it another way, resources must be mobilized if the perceived chances are to be taken advantage of (Alonso, Kok, & O'shea, 2018). Therefore, seizing refers to the act of taking advantage of potential market opportunities while avoiding risks. Kessler and Kump (2019). Seizing links between external and internal knowledge and information. Strategic decision-making and seizing are intimately related, particularly in the context of investment choices. It focuses on creating and selecting company strategies that are suitable with the business environment, as well as its advantages and disadvantages (Teece, 2007). Seizing capacity starts with a method for identifying priceless information. It requires figuring out the organization's business strategy and comprehending the kinds of resources that may help it seize and profit from business possibilities. As a part of dynamic capabilities, seizing, according to Teece, defines how rapidly an organization as a system can respond to opportunities and react to dangers after they have been detected and considered relevant (Teece, 2018). It includes actions like making investments in newly developed, commercially viable technology and creating or upgrading them.

Reconfiguring

Reconfiguring is the "capacity to recombine and reconfigure assets and organizational structures" to fit a firm's or organization's internal processes with opportunities that have been taken (Teece, 2011; Wagner, Wenzel, Wagner & Koch, 2017). The process of reconfiguring includes actions taken by organizations when they add, redeploy, recombine, or divest resources (Karim & Capron, 2016). Reconfiguring has the advantage of facilitating ongoing development and giving enterprises a way to acquire new resources and gain from innovation. The secret to achieving and reconfiguring competitive advantages is to combine and reconfigure organizational resources and structures to confront the market and adjust to technology developments. According to Teece (2011), the requirement for transforming capabilities is most apparent when fresh possibilities need to be handled as well as periodically easing rigidities that develop over time as a result of asset accumulation, standard operating procedures, and insider misapplication of rent streams. Teece also emphasized the need to maintain a business's assets in harmony in order to create the optimum strategic "fit" inside the ecology of the organization. Maintaining the organization's components' alignment with one another and with the plan is a duty that goes along with reconfiguring capabilities, according to Teece (2018).

Concept of Organizational Competitiveness

A mix of economic, social, and political factors form the foundation of competitiveness. The economic factors primarily concentrate on the relative benefits and drawbacks of various places, along with their labor forces, skill levels, and other advantages. The social components of competitiveness are clearly distinct from the economic ones in that they are more focused on ways to eliminate disparities between various population segments and distributional issues (Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, 1999). The term "competitiveness" has different connotations at the national, industry, and company levels. The capacity of a company to make goods and services accessible to both current and potential consumers in a more effective and efficient manner than the related firm competitor may be used to explain competitiveness at the firm level (OECD, 1999). Organizational competitiveness is the capacity of an organization to generate more economic value than other rival companies, according to this definition (Wilfred, Matoke, Tagon & Egessa, 2014). Organizational competitiveness is the capacity of an organization to react to any changes with adaptability, flexibility, and innovation while outperforming rivals in terms of ability to produce economic value (Honshang & Babakhniasnb, 2015). The consistency of a company's success in the domestic and worldwide markets without government assistance is another indicator of its degree of competitiveness. The degree of a company's regional and worldwide market share as well as its earnings, cost and quality, export and international sales may all be used to gauge how fiercely competitive a company is. Additionally, a firm's performance in the global market may be used to gauge its degree of competitiveness (Gartner, 2010).

Service Quality

Numerous economic issues, such as growing consumer and societal expectations, escalating rivalry, and rising product complexity, all influenced how important quality was to businesses. A crucial strategic component is service quality, and any competitive strategy must address the product-market-technology triangle as well as the environment variable. In these conditions, only businesses that can swiftly adapt to changing demands and provide high-quality goods and services at reasonable rates are able to thrive. Therefore, in order to choose the best strategy for dominating the market from the viewpoint of goods or services, it is important to analyze the competitive environment to allow identification of the vulnerabilities and strengths of the rival enterprises. The consumer serves as the foundation for creating quality plans. In actuality, maintaining client pleasure depends on quality. A goal of every company nowadays is to provide quality and services to customers (Faure, 1997).

Quality, according to Sachitra (2017), refers to an organization's capacity to provide clients or consumers with high-quality goods or services that increase their worth. Product/service quality is a positioning factor, according to Hanaysha, Haliman, and Abdul Ghani (2014), where consumers' intentions to buy or rebuy a product show the product's degree of performance quality.

Market Share

Market share is the proportion of a market's overall volume that a company sells its goods in. In other terms, market share is the proportion of a company's sales to the entire monetary or numerical value of a certain market. The market share has been utilized as an indicator of a specific organization's competitiveness in the relevant industry in a number of empirical investigations (Hidetaka, 2014). For instance, Hidetaka identified market share as a variable representing strategic advantage in a research because he thought it was crucial for determining a company's competitive position. What portion of a customer's overall purchases of a product or service goes to a firm determines its market share. In other words, if 100 sim cards are purchased by customers as a whole, and 40 of those cards come from a single vendor, that vendor has a 40% market share. Market share comes in a variety of forms. Value or volume market shares are also possible. Value market share is calculated using a company's overall share of all segment sales. In terms of the overall number of units sold in the market, volumes relate to the actual number of units that a firm sells. The relationship between value and volume market share is often nonlinear since a unit's value and number may be high yet its volume market share may be low.

Empirical Review

A research was conducted by Garrido, Kretshmer, Vasconcellos, and Goncalo in 2020 to look at how dynamic capabilities are measured and how it affects performance. Through a survey conducted in what they referred to as "a highly dynamic industry and market," they proposed and validated a scale for the measurement of dynamic capabilities based on David Teece's conceptual dimensions: sensing, seizing, and reconfiguring, and they examined how performance is impacted by those dimensions. According to the research, Teece's three conceptual dimensions behave differently in respect to one another. In other words, detecting and reconfiguring suggested that performance had a bad connection. Tempalmayr, Ehrlnger, Stadlmann, Uberwinner, Mang, and Biedergber (2019) examined the effects of dynamic capabilities on businesses' performance in the servitization context, building on the current research on dynamic capabilities in servitization context. They also looked at how environmental turbulence affected behavior. Based on the analysis of 206 manufacturing organizations, the research found that dynamic capabilities are crucial for a firm's success in the servitization setting. The research indicated that whereas sensing and reconfiguring had a considerable influence on company performance, seizing had no meaningful effect. Additionally, it discovered that environmental turbulence had no discernible moderating influence, demonstrating that dynamic capabilities are crucial in a servitization setting regardless of environmental turbulence. However, the results show that Sensing is more crucial in tumultuous surroundings, while reconfiguring is more crucial in more stable contexts. Ofoegbu and Onuoha (2018) investigated the relationship between fast food businesses' competitive advantage and their dynamic capabilities in Rivers state, Nigeria. The study used a cross-sectional survey research approach to explore how dynamic capabilities and competitive advantage interact. The results showed that dynamic capabilities and competitive advantage had a strong link.

Kimemia, Gakure, and Waititu (2014) conducted research on the impact of organizational competitiveness on Kenyan manufacturing micro- and small-business performance. They used an exploratory study strategy using 2450 MSEs from the Kamukunji 'JuaKali' Association in Nairobi, Kenya, as their target group. 175 (97.2%) valid replies were received from a random sample of 180 companies. Through in-person interviews and a semi-structured questionnaire, survey data was gathered. The instrument was also improved by a pilot test on 20 businesses, and the components were retrieved using the Principal Component Analysis (PCA) approach with a reliability cut-off value of 0.70. Less than 0.40 factor loadings were disregarded. Means and standard deviations were used in descriptive statistics to display the replies. Ordinal regression analysis was carried out utilizing the Polychromous Universal Model (PLUM) of the SPSS for Windows 19 location-scale model to clarify findings. Positive skewing of the response frequencies for company performance, sorted into 5-part Likert-type categories, required the employment of the negative log-log link function. Log likelihood ratio tests for the null hypothesis that the independent variable was statistically equal to zero were supplied by model fitting data. According to the research, organizational competition has a favorable and substantial impact on business performance.

In their 2013 study, Tolulope and Cornelius looked at Nigeria's telecom sector's level of competition. Customers often had to choose which service provider was more convenient and affordable for them due to the dramatically increased rivalry amongst mobile telecommunications firms. The research looked at how marketing tactics affected client happiness, loyalty, and retention. For the study, a cross-sectional survey research methodology was used, and 280 employees from five mobile telecommunications businesses in the Ibadan metropolitan were chosen at random. Multiple regression (R2) was used to examine the data at the 0.05 alpha level. According to the survey, mobile telecom firms' advertising techniques have a big impact on customer happiness, loyalty, and retention. Additionally, it was shown that promotional methods have a beneficial influence on Nigerian telecommunication development whereas competition has a negative impact ($t=-1.98$, $p>.05$). Based on the results, it was suggested that the Nigerian telecommunications sector hire more specialists, since this would help the sector develop. Professionals must consider the advantages of implementing successful marketing plans in order to survive the fierce competition seen in the domestic and worldwide telecommunications markets. To help improve the quality of services provided by telecom businesses, market monitoring initiatives should be undertaken by Nigeria's telecom authorities.

Through a case study of medium- and large-scale manufacturing businesses in Rwanda, Claude (2018) investigated organizational determinants and competitiveness. The research continued by stating that there are more chances for long-term development, job creation, and poverty alleviation in manufacturing groups or firms. They are essential in generating stable economic development and employment opportunities. The researcher did find a study that sought to investigate the direct association between organizational variables, such as leadership, market orientation, and organizational resources, and manufacturing company competitiveness in Rwanda, however. The most significant internal organizational elements affecting organizational competitiveness are not generally agreed upon. The organizational elements that are connected to the competitiveness of medium and large manufacturing businesses in Rwanda have not been specifically investigated by academics. In order to fill the aforementioned gap, the researcher evaluated the link between organizational resource variables, competitiveness, market orientation, and leadership. The study's goal was to determine the relationship between organizational elements and the competitiveness of medium- and large-scale manufacturing businesses. Both correlation analysis and regression analysis were employed in the study. Survey research methodology was used. There were 123 middle managers of medium and large industrial companies that made up the target demographic. In manufacturing businesses, 91 respondents were chosen using the Solvinformula. The test and pre-test of the questionnaire were carried out to guarantee the validity and reliability of the research tools. Using SPSS, the gathered data were examined. The results showed that organizational characteristics had a relatively beneficial influence on organizational competitiveness and that 65.9% of the evaluated manufacturing businesses were not competitive. The results of the regression analysis showed that market orientation (=0.425, P=0.002), leadership (=0.51, P=0.860), human resource (=0.199, P=0.851), asset tangibleness (=0.0252, P=0.970), and financial resource capability (=0.196, P=0.995) have a significant positive impact on organizational competitiveness. In order to increase competitiveness, the study advised policymakers, businesses, and future studies to reevaluate the capability gaps of company leaders and business managers.

In 2012, Roman, De Mello, and Erdmann investigated the elements of organizational competitiveness. Based on a content analysis of academic publications on topics including competitiveness, productivity, efficiency, and performance, the study's goal was to determine in the business administration literature the factors thought to be most crucial to improving corporate performance. The information was gathered from magazines made accessible between 2000 and 2009 from sources listed on the CAPES site. Strategic alliances, human capital, dependability, knowledge, cost, cultural considerations, flexibility, innovation, quality, speed, customer relations, social responsibility, control systems, production techniques, and information and communication technologies were the 15 organizational competitiveness factors that they identified from the analysis of 486 articles. These elements have the ability to influence how organizational priorities are set and may serve as a roadmap for creating management tools and putting competitiveness-enhancing strategies into action.

A study on competitiveness-affecting variables was conducted by Akben-Selcuk in 2016 using data from a developing market. This study's goal was to look at the elements that influence a company's ability to compete in Turkey, a rising market. In the study, a firm's financial performance is used as a proxy for competitiveness. The empirical investigation, which spans the years 2005 to 2014, was based on companies listed on the Borsa Istanbul exchange. The lowest number of enterprises (273) was reached in 2005, while the highest number (408) was noted in 2013. The final sample included 35 firm-years of observations, or an average of 359 businesses each year. According to findings from a company-level panel data model, return on assets is correlated favorably with firm size, foreign sales, liquidity, and growth and adversely with leverage and R & D spending. On the other side, gross profit margin is inversely correlated with leverage and R & D spending, and positively correlated with scale and foreign sales. The results demonstrated that greater debt and liquidity levels for enterprises result in higher Tobin's Q ratios.

3.0 Methodology

In this research, a quasi experimental approach known as a cross sectional survey was utilized. The five (5) telecommunication companies in Rivers State were the accessible population. Since there were only 80 people in the study's population, the census technique was used. Thus, workers at the five chosen companies received a total of 80 questionnaires. Dynamic capabilities, an independent variable, were evaluated in terms of seizing and reconfiguring. Six items were used to measure reconfiguring, whereas four were used to measure seizing (e.g., our organization can swiftly react to new knowledge from the outside; we identify what new information can be exploited in our company) (e. g. Decisions on planned changes are pursued consistently in our company). The dependent variable (organizational competitiveness), on the other hand, was assessed using market share and service quality. The five criteria used to evaluate service quality were (e.g. the service quality plays an important role for selling a product; our services are better than the others available in the market). And five things were utilized to calculate market share (e.g Expanding the market share will be beneficial for the reputation of the company; the current market share of the sales of the company is satisfactory). The ratings for each item ranged from 1-strongly disagreed to 4-strongly agreed on a 4-point Likert scale. Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) version 21 was used to analyze the bivariate hypotheses using the spearman rank order correlation coefficient statistical analysis.

4.0 Result

International Journal of Academic and Applied Research (IJAAR)
ISSN: 2643-9603
Vol. 7 Issue 5, May - 2023, Pages: 116-126

Only 71 (88.7%) of the 80 questionnaires that were sent out to respondents were actually returned and utilized in the research. The hypothesis test was conducted using a 95% confidence level, which suggests a 0.05 level of significance. The crucial area for the decision rule is set at $p > 0.05$ for accepting the null hypothesis and $p < 0.05$ for rejecting it.

Table 1 Seizing and Service Quality

Correlations

			Seizing	Service Quality
Spearman's rho	Seizing	Correlation Coefficient	1.000	.538**
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.	.000
		N	71	71
	Service Quality	Correlation Coefficient	.538**	1.000
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.
		N	71	71

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

H0₁: There is no relationship between seizing and service quality in telecommunication firms in Rivers State.
According to the study in table 1, there is a strong positive association between seizing and service quality, with rho =.538 and P = 0.000 being significant at a significance level of 0.05. Therefore, in this case, the null hypothesis is rejected.

Table 2 Seizing and Market Share

Correlations

			Seizing	Market Share
Spearman's rho	Seizing	Correlation Coefficient	1.000	.658**
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.	.000
		N	71	71
	Market Share	Correlation Coefficient	.658**	1.000
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.
		N	71	71

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

$H0_2$: There is no relationship between seizing and market share in telecommunication firms in Rivers State.
The study of table 2 results demonstrates a strong positive link between market share and seizing, with rho =.658 and P = 0.000 being significant at 0.05. Therefore, in this case, the null hypothesis is rejected.

Table 3. Reconfiguring and Service Quality

Correlations

			Reconfiguring	Service Quality
Spearman's rho	Reconfiguring	Correlation Coefficient	1.000	.701**
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.	.000
		N	71	71
	Service Quality	Correlation Coefficient	.701**	1.000
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.
		N	71	71

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

$H0_3$: There is no relationship between reconfiguring and service quality in telecommunication firms in Rivers State.
The examination of table 3 data shows a substantial positive link between reconfiguring and service quality, with rho =.701 and P = 0.000, which is significant at a significance level of 0.05. Therefore, in this case, the null hypothesis is rejected.

International Journal of Academic and Applied Research (IJAAR)
ISSN: 2643-9603
Vol. 7 Issue 5, May - 2023, Pages: 116-126

Table 4 Reconfiguring and Market Share

Correlations

			Reconfiguring	Market Share
Spearman's rho	Reconfiguring	Correlation Coefficient	1.000	.821**
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.	.000
		N	71	71
	Market Share	Correlation Coefficient	.821**	1.000
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.
		N	71	71

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

H0$_4$: There is no relationship between reconfiguring and market share in telecommunication firms in Rivers State.
In accordance with the study of hypothesis 4, there is a substantial positive link between reconfiguring and market share, with rho =.821 and P = 0.000 being significant at 0.05.

5.0. Discussion of Findings

Hypothesis one: There is no significant relationship between seizing and service quality. The presence of a substantial association between seizing and service quality was discovered using the spearman's rank order correlation coefficient. As a result, the null hypotheses were disproved, and the research concludes that there is a meaningful connection between seizing and service quality. The organization's service quality will improve when seizing occurs more often in the workplace. This suggests that seizing has a favorable effect on the organization's service quality. This result is consistent with Veron and Ravsi's (2013) observation that seizing capacity is important for maintaining competitiveness in terms of fostering innovation.

Hypothesis Two: There is no significant relationship between seizing and market share. It was discovered that there is a substantial association between market share and seizing capabilities using spearman's rank order correlation coefficient. As a result, the null hypotheses were disproved, and the research concludes that growing a firm's market share requires seizing capabilities. This suggests that seizing over will lead to an increase in the market share of such organizations since seizing over allows businesses to be better positioned to expand their market share in a highly dynamic environment (Derus, 2019).

Hypothesis Three: There is no significant relationship between reconfiguring and service quality. Inferring from the conclusion of hypothesis three, it was found that service quality and reconfiguring, a dynamic capability, have a substantial and favorable link. As a result, the null hypotheses were disproved, and the research concludes that there is a meaningful connection between reconfiguring and service quality. The frequency of reconfiguring raises the level of service provided by such an organization. Empirically, it has been noted that reconfiguring assets and resources helps businesses to examine their operating model, organizational structure, and strategy, which may improve service quality (Teece, 2018).

Hypothesis Four: There is no significant relationship between reconfiguring and market share. With a P-value of 0.000 and a rho value of 0.821, it was shown that reconfiguration had a strong association with market share, supporting the finding of hypothesis four. This suggests that market share and reconfiguring have a very strong, positive, and substantial connection. This suggests that market share grows when workplace reconfiguration is possible. Reconfiguring an organization's capacity to grow its market share requires more reconfiguration capabilities. As a result, the null hypotheses were disproved, and the research concludes that there is a meaningful connection between reconfiguring and market share. In their 2013 study, Tolulope and Cornelius looked at Nigeria's telecom sector's level of competition. Customers often had to choose which service provider was more convenient and affordable for them due to the dramatically increased rivalry amongst mobile telecommunications firms. The research looked at how marketing tactics affected client happiness, loyalty, and retention.

6.0. Conclusion and Recommendation

The study identified relationships between dynamic capabilities and organizational competitiveness of telecommunication firms in Rivers State with the identified dimensions of the predictor variables and the measures of the criterion variable based on the finding s after critically analyzing the data that was made available. The investigation came to the conclusion that;

i. There is a significant relationship between seizing and service quality.
ii. There is a significant relationship between seizing and market share.
iii. There is a significant relationship between reconfiguring and service quality.
iv. There is a significant relationship between reconfiguring and market share.

The following suggestions are made in light of the study's results and conclusion.;

i. Managers should always have business policies and strategies that are adaptable enough to allow them to deal with the dynamic nature of the business environment.
ii. To allow continuous monitoring of the business environment, investment in research and information technology should be prioritized in their business policies.
iii. To ensure that every employee can keep up with deployments in the business environment, training and development should be strongly encouraged.

REFERENCES

Adam, S. (1776). *Wealth of Nations*, Chicago, University of Chicago Press.

Ahonen B(2010). The role and measurement of quality in competition analysis

Akben-Selcuk, E. (2016). Factors affecting firm competitiveness: Evidence from an emerging market. *International Journal of Financial Studies, 4*(9), 52-560.

Alonso, A., Kok, S. & O'Shea, M. (2018). Family business and Adaptation: A dynamic capabilities a approach. *Family Economy Issues*, 39(4), 683-698.

Azadegan, A., Patel, P. C., Zangoueinezhad, A., & Linderman, K. (2013). The effect of environmental complexity and environmental dynamism on lean practices, *Journal of Operations Management, 31*, 193-212.

Bar J.T., Stimpert J.L& Huff, A.S (1992). Cognitive change, strategic action and international renewal. *Strategic Management Journal*, *13*(1); 15-36

Barney . B, (1986). Strategic factor markets excepttaion and business strategy. *Management Science Journal. 3*(10), 1231-1242

Barney, J.B. (1991). Firm resources and sustained competitive advantage. *Journal of Management*, 17(1), 99-120

Breznik L., Lohavnik M., &Dimovski (2019). Explicating firm capabilities by sending, seizing and reconfiguring capabilities: An empirical investigation. *Economic and Business Review, 21(1) 5-36*

Chidiebere., E.A (2017). Monetary policy and Nigeria economy: an impact investigation. *International Journal of Economics And Finance 9*(11)

Claude, R. (2018). Organizational Factors and Competitiveness: A Case Study of Medium and Large Manufacturing Enterprises in Rwanda. *Journal of Business Finance, 20(7)*, 354-520.

Conner.,B (1991). Resource based view of competitive advantage: An overview. *Strategic Management Journal. 14*,601-618

Daft. R.L (2010). Organization theory and design (9th ed). New York

Eisendhardth, K.M., &Martin, J.A. (2000). Dynamic capabilities: what are they? *Strategic Management Journal*, 21(1), 1105-1121.

Eisenhardt, K. M., & Tabrizi, B. N. (1995), Accelerating adaptive processes: product innovation in the global computer industry. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 84-110.

Faure J., (1997). Economic criteria for compulsory insurance. The geneva papas. 31, 149-168

Garrido, I.J., Kretshmer C, Vasconcellos, S.L & Goncalo (2020). Dynamic capabilities: a measurement proposal and its relationship with performance. *Brazilian Business Review*, 17(1): 46-65

Gremme, C & Wohigemutin, J.L (2017). Dynamic capabilities: a systematic literature review of theory and practice. *European Journal of Management 25*(1)

Hambrick, D., & Finkelstein, S. (1987). *Managerial Discretion: A Bridge between Polar Views of Organizations*. Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

Hamel, G & Prahalad, C.L (1996). Competing for the future, Harvard business school press, paper back edition, Boston

Hanaysha J, Haliman L.D, Abdul, R (2014). The disciplinary status consumer behavior. *International Journal of Asian Social Science, 7*(12)949-962

Helfat, C. E, &Peteraf, M.A. (2009). Understanding dynamic capabilities: Progress along a developmental path. *Strategic Management Journal, 7(1)*91-102.

Hidetaka, M. (2014). Capital structure and competitive position in product market. *International Review of Economics and Finance,* 29, 358-371.

Honshan J., & Babakhnaia K.P (2015). The disciplinary status of Islamic consumer behavior. International Journal of Asian Social Science, 7(12)

Karim ,S & Capron L. (2016). Reconfigure: Adding, redeploying, recombining& divesting resource and business units. *Strategic Management Journal, 37* (13), 54-62

Karna, A., Richter, A., &Riesenkampff, E. (2016). Revisiting the role of the environment in the capabilities-financial performance relationship: a meta-analysis. *Strategic Management Journal,* 1154-1173.

Kimemia, P. N., Gakure, R. W., andWaititu, G. A. (2014). Influence of organizational competitiveness on the performance of manufacturing micro and small enterprises in Kenya. *Journal of Humanities and Social Science, 19*(1), 77-86.

Kruggman, P (1994). Competitveness , a dangerous obsession. *Journal of International Business Research and Marketing73(2) 28-44*

Kump, B., Engelmann, A., Kessler, A. and Schweiger, C. (2019). Toward a dynamic capabilities scale: measuring organizational sensing, seizing, and transforming capacities. *Industrial and Corporate Change*, 28(5),1149-1172.

Luo, Y., and Park, S. H. (2001). Strategic alignment and performance of market-seeking MNCs in China. *Strategic Management Journal, 22,* 141-155.

Obasan, K. A., &Soyebo, Y.A., (2012) Assessing the effectiveness of promotion as a marketing management tool in the Nigerian telecommunication industry. *Journal of Emerging Trends In Economics And Management Sciences*, *3*(1), 1-6.

Ofoegbu & Onuoha (2018). Dynamic capabilities and competitive advantage of fast food restaurant. *International Journal of Management Science And Business Administrative, 4(*3): 7-14

O'Reilly, C. &Tushman, M. (2007). Ambidexterity as a dynamic capability: Resolving the Innovator's Dilemma, in B.Staw and A. Brief (eds), *Research in Organizational Behaviour*,29.

Organization for economic co-operation development (199). Effort and polras of the member of the development assistant committee, international encyclopedia of the social science

Porter, M. E. (1990). *The Competitive Advantage.* McGraw-Hill Havard Business Review.

Reinert, H.T (1994). Competitiveness and its predecessor. A 500 year cross national perspective (3rd ed), williamburg, virgina

Riley ., T(2012). Dynamic of cogntion. *Journal of psychology.* 593-606

Roman, D., De Mello, N., Piana, J., & Erdmann, R. H. (2012). Organizational competitiveness factors. *Brazilian Business Review, 9*(1), 25-42.

Sanfey D., & Zeh. S (2012). Making sense of competitive indicators in south –eastern Europe. *Journal of Management Science And Social Science, 146*-157

Teece, D. J. (2014). The Foundations of Enterprise: Dynamic and Ordinary Capabilities in an (Economic) Theory of Firms. *The Academic of Management Perspectives*, 28(4), 328-352.

Teece, D.J. (2007). Dynamic capabilities: Routine versus Entrepreneurial Action. *Journal of Management Studies*, 49(8), 1395-1401.

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

Teece, D.J. (2011). Achieving integration of the business school curriculum using the dynamic capabilities framework. *Journal of Management Development,* 30(5), 499-518.

Teece, D.J. (2018). Business models and dynamic capabilities. *Long Range Planning*, 51(1), 40-49.

Teece, D.J. (2018). Dynamic capabilities as (workable) management systems theory. *Journal of Management* and *Organization*, 24(3), 359-368.

Teece, J.D., Pisuno ,G, Shuen A (1997). Dynamic capabilities and strategic management: *Strategic Management Journal, 18*(7) 509-533

Tempalmayr D., Ehrlnger D, Stadlmann C., Uberwinner F, Mang S, And Biedergber, A(2019). The performance effect of dynamic capabilities in servitizing companies. *Journal of International Business Research and Marketing, 4*(6): 42-48

Todorut, A. V., &Vasilescu, I. (2009). The quality – competitiveness factor of the organizations . *Strategic Management Journal* 30(4)2 – 23.

Tolulope, F., & Cornelius, P. F. (2013). *Competitiveness in Nigerian Telecommunication Industry: marketing strategy. International Journal of Research in commerce, IT & Management, 3(7),850-920.*

Verdu-Jover, A. J., Llorens-Montes, F. J., & Garcia-Morales, V. J. (2006). Environment-flexibility co alignment and performance: An analysis in large versus small firms. *Journal of Small Business Management*, *44*(3), 334-349.

Wagnwe D., Wenzel M, Wagner, H.T, Kach J (2017). Sense, seize, reconfigure; online communities as strategic assets. *Journal of Business Strategy, 38*(5): 27-3

Waldman, D. A., Ramirez, G. A., House, R. J., & Puranam, P. (2001). Does Leadership Matter? CEO Leadership Attributes and Profitability under Conditions of Perceived Environmental Uncertainty. *Academy of Management Journal 44,* 134–143.

Wilhelm, H., Schl&mer, M., & Maurer, I. (2015). How dynamic capabilities affect the effectiveness and efficiency of operating routines under high and low levels of environmental dynamism, *British* Journal *of Management, 26,(1), 650-751*.