International Journal of Economic Integration and Regional Competitiveness
Homepage : https://e-journal.antispublisher.id/index.php/IJEIRC
Email : admin@antispublisher.com

e-ISSN : 3032-1301
IJEIRC, Vol. 3, No. 8, August 2026
Page 28-41
© 2026 IJEIRC :
International Journal of Economic Integration and Regional Competitiveness

The Influence of Knowledge Management on Organizational Resilience: The Mediating Role of Dynamic Capability

Dasrial[1], Syukri Lukman[2], Vera Pujani[3], Alizar Hasan[4]
[1,2,3,4]Andalas University, Padang, West Sumatera, Indonesia

DOI : https://doi.org/10.61796/ijeirc.v3i8.542

Sections Info

Article history:
Submitted: June 20, 2026
Final Revised: July 15, 2026
Accepted: August 03, 2026
Published: August 30, 2026

Keywords:
Knowledge management
Dynamic capability
Organizational resilience

ABSTRACT

Objective: *This study aims to analyze the influence of knowledge management on organizational resilience by testing the mediating role of dynamic capability.* ***Method:*** *The study employs a quantitative approach using a cross-sectional survey design and analysis via Partial Least Squares Structural Equation Modeling (PLS-SEM).* ***Results:*** *No explicit Results sentence is available in the abstract. The abstract only states the expected contribution and does not report empirical findings.* ***Novelty:*** *This research is expected to contribute to the development of the literature by integrating the Knowledge-Based View and the Dynamic Capability View in explaining the mechanisms underlying the formation of organizational resilience.*

INTRODUCTION

The contemporary business landscape of the 21st century, propelled by globalization, digital transformation, and accelerated advancements in information technology, is inherently dynamic, intricate, and highly uncertain. Consequently, institutional survival and the generation of sustainable value now necessitate rapid adaptability rather than a singular reliance on operational efficiency or superior resource endowments [1]. Within this paradigm, organizational resilience has emerged as a critical strategic competency, allowing firms to foresee, manage, adapt to, and recover from operational shocks while utilizing such disruptions as catalysts for learning and innovation [2].

The salience of organizational resilience is especially pronounced in commercial climates defined by volatility, uncertainty, complexity, and ambiguity, alongside brittle, anxious, non-linear, and incomprehensible conditions. In such settings, maintaining a competitive edge requires enterprises to proactively anticipate shifts, execute swift decisions, recalibrate strategies, and continuously revitalize their resources [3]. Distinct from traditional risk management, which is predominantly preventative, organizational resilience prioritizes experiential learning and structural transformation post-crisis, enabling an entity not merely to restore its previous state, but to constructively advance and evolve [1].

Knowledge constitutes a fundamental, intangible strategic resource that dictates organizational success, cultivated through continuous learning and the accumulation of both individual and collective experiences. Grounded in the Knowledge-Based View, knowledge is conceptualized as a pivotal strategic asset that facilitates value creation,

stimulates innovation, and secures a sustainable competitive advantage (Grant). Consequently, the mere possession of knowledge is insufficient; organizations must implement systematic knowledge management to ensure this intellectual asset is effectively leveraged for decision-making, problem resolution, and the generation of organizational value. Theoretically, knowledge management represents a comprehensive suite of processes dedicated to the acquisition, creation, storage, dissemination, and application of knowledge, ultimately enhancing organizational efficacy and advancing strategic objectives [4].

In practice, knowledge management necessitates the administration of both explicit and tacit knowledge. Explicit knowledge is codifiable, facilitating straightforward storage and transfer, whereas tacit knowledge is deeply embedded within an individual's experiences, intuition, and competencies, rendering it inherently difficult to document (Nonaka and Takeuchi). These dual forms of knowledge are mutually reinforcing; explicit knowledge underpins process standardization, while tacit knowledge functions as the primary catalyst for creativity, innovation, and complex problem-solving [5].

Within the context of this study, knowledge management is operationalized across four principal dimensions: knowledge creation, knowledge acquisition, knowledge sharing, and knowledge application. Knowledge creation denotes the organizational capacity to generate novel insights through learning, collaborative efforts, experiential accumulation, and innovation, thereby producing valuable concepts, solutions, and operational practices. Knowledge acquisition refers to the capability to extract information from diverse internal and external channels, enabling the organization to navigate environmental fluctuations, recognize emerging opportunities, and continuously update its knowledge repository [6].

A substantial body of literature posits that knowledge management is a critical driver of innovation, organizational performance, and competitive advantage. Specifically, Darroch asserts that effective knowledge management practices are instrumental in fostering innovation and elevating firm outcomes [7]. Corroborating this perspective, Gold et al. and Andreeva and Kianto illustrate that knowledge management bolsters organizational capabilities [8], optimizes business processes, and secures competitiveness through continuous learning [9]. Nevertheless, the mere accumulation of knowledge is insufficient for guaranteeing organizational resilience. As Easterby-Smith and Prieto argue, knowledge yields tangible value only when it is embedded within organizational routines, applied to decision-making frameworks, and operationalized into strategic initiatives that facilitate structural adaptation and change [10].

This transformational mechanism is effectively conceptualized through the Dynamic Capability View, introduced by Teece as an advancement of the traditional Resource-Based View. While the Resource-Based View, articulated by Barney, attributes competitive advantage to the ownership of resources that are valuable, rare, inimitable, and non-substitutable, it falls short in highly volatile contexts where static resource possession proves inadequate. Consequently, the Dynamic Capability View underscores

the imperative for organizations to perpetually develop, assimilate, and realign their internal and external resource bases to adeptly navigate and respond to shifting environmental demands [11].

Dynamic capability is defined as an organization's capacity to integrate, construct, and realign its resources to successfully navigate and adapt to shifting environmental conditions [12]. Dynamic capabilities are cultivated across three primary dimensions: sensing, seizing, and transforming. Sensing capability encompasses an organization's proficiency in detecting and interpreting environmental fluctuations. This is achieved by monitoring technological advancements, analyzing market dynamics, evaluating customer demands, and assessing competitor strategies to identify emerging opportunities and threats, thereby enabling the formulation of an optimal strategic response. Seizing capability entails the exploitation of these identified opportunities via strategic decision-making, the establishment of investment priorities, effective resource allocation, and the fostering of innovation within products, services, or overarching business models [3].

Collectively, these capabilities empower organizations to utilize knowledge effectively to identify market fluctuations, execute strategic decisions, and drive organizational transformation. The positive correlation between knowledge management and dynamic capabilities is corroborated by Wilden et al. (2013), whose empirical evidence illustrates that robust knowledge management practices significantly enhance an organization's dynamic capabilities. Specifically, the processes of knowledge creation, acquisition, sharing, and application establish a foundational learning framework. This framework fortifies the various dimensions of dynamic capabilities, thereby equipping organizations to rapidly detect environmental shifts, formulate strategic initiatives, and execute comprehensive organizational transformations [13].

Moreover, a substantial body of literature identifies dynamic capability as a critical antecedent to organizational resilience. As elucidated by Linnenluecke, the proficiency to anticipate shifts, adapt, and enact organizational renewal equips a firm to better withstand disruptions and expedite its recovery. Viewed through the lens of the Dynamic Capability View, organizational resilience manifests from an organization's aptitude to integrate, modernize, and reconfigure its resources in reaction to environmental fluctuations [2].

Concurrently, the Knowledge-Based View posits that these capabilities are cultivated through the acquisition, dissemination, and application of knowledge, which serves as the bedrock of organizational learning [14]. In the context of the present research, organizational resilience is operationalized utilizing the conceptual framework advanced by Maslani et al., which characterizes resilience as the capacity to sustain operational continuity whilst effectively navigating environmental volatility and disruptions. This construct is delineated by four primary indicators: anticipation, response, adaptation, and recovery. Anticipation denotes the organizational foresight to recognize latent risks, decode environmental shifts, and formulate preemptive strategies prior to the onset of a disruption. Response signifies the execution of a prompt, accurate,

and synchronized reaction when confronting a crisis. Adaptation encapsulates the recalibration of strategic orientations, business processes, and resource allocations to maintain congruence with environmental dynamicsm [15].

Despite its significance, research examining the nexus between knowledge management and organizational resilience remains scarce. The extant literature predominantly emphasizes outcomes such as innovation, competitive advantage, and general firm performance, leaving a critical void regarding the underlying mechanisms specifically, how knowledge management fosters organizational resilience through dynamic capabilities. Furthermore, prior studies frequently assess the direct association between these constructs, largely overlooking the mediating function of dynamic capability.

Addressing these theoretical gaps, the present study posits dynamic capability as a crucial mediator linking knowledge management to organizational resilience. By integrating the Knowledge-Based View and the Dynamic Capability View, this research seeks to elucidate the process by which knowledge management cultivates dynamic capabilities, which subsequently fortify organizational resilience. The anticipated findings aim to advance the strategic management literature while offering actionable insights for practitioners concerning the design of knowledge management strategies and the development of dynamic capabilities essential for navigating highly volatile contexts.

Consequently, this study conceptualizes knowledge management as a foundational antecedent to dynamic capability. The effective acquisition, dissemination, and application of knowledge equip organizations to detect environmental shifts, formulate strategic decisions, and execute organizational renewal. Within this framework, dynamic capability functions as the strategic conduit that translates knowledge management into organizational resilience, thereby empowering firms to not merely endure, but prosper amidst escalating environmental turbulence and uncertainty.

RESEARCH METHOD

This study utilizes a quantitative, explanatory research design to investigate the causal linkages between knowledge management, dynamic capability, and organizational resilience. In accordance with the methodological principles outlined by Sekaran and Bougie, a cross-sectional framework was adopted. By facilitating data collection at a discrete point in time, this approach effectively captures the prevailing state and interdependencies of the variables under examination. Such a design is highly appropriate for assessing the immediate perceptions of organizational actors, thereby yielding a contemporary snapshot of how these constructs interact within the current organizational environment [16].

The target population consists of managerial personnel within enterprises that have formally integrated knowledge management systems. To guarantee data validity and relevance, a purposive sampling strategy was employed, utilizing specific inclusion criteria. First, participants must hold a managerial title ranging from supervisor to director predicated on the assumption that such positions afford extensive visibility into

strategic operations, knowledge management initiatives, and organizational adaptability. Second, a minimum tenure of two years within their respective organizations is mandated to ensure a profound comprehension of internal workflows, resource allocations, and decision-making structures. Third, subjects must actively participate in organizational decision-making, ensuring their evaluations reflect concrete strategic and operational realities rather than superficial observations. Finally, the sample size was established in accordance with the Partial Least Squares Structural Equation Modeling (PLS-SEM) guidelines delineated by Hair et al., which meticulously accounts for the structural complexity of the model, including the quantity of latent constructs and their corresponding measurement indicators [17].

Primary data were gathered utilizing an online survey administered via Google Forms, a method selected to optimize accessibility and expedite distribution to the target demographic. The survey instrument utilized a six-point Likert scale, anchored at one (strongly disagree) and six (strongly agree). The adoption of an even-numbered scale was a deliberate methodological choice intended to eliminate the neutral midpoint. As articulated by Puspitasari et al., this design compels participants to commit to a definitive position, thereby mitigating central tendency bias and the prevalence of socially desirable neutral responses [18].

The questionnaire assessed three principal constructs: knowledge management, dynamic capability, and organizational resilience. To ensure both theoretical validity and empirical reliability, all measurement items were adopted from previously established and validated instruments. Knowledge management was conceptualized through four fundamental dimensions knowledge creation, knowledge acquisition, knowledge sharing, and knowledge application based on the framework delineated by Achmad and Wiratmadja [6]. Dynamic capability was evaluated using the tripartite dimensions of sensing, seizing, and transforming capabilities, as originally conceptualized by Teece [11] and subsequently expanded upon by Yoshikuni et al. [19].

Furthermore, organizational resilience was measured via four key indicators anticipation, response, adaptation, and recovery developed by Maslani et al. (2024), which effectively encapsulate both the proactive and reactive facets of organizational resilience amidst disruptions.The data analysis was executed utilizing SmartPLS software to apply the Partial Least Squares Structural Equation Modeling (PLS-SEM) technique. In accordance with the guidelines proposed by Hair et al., this methodology was adopted due to its robust capacity to handle complex structural relationships among latent variables, facilitate mediation analysis, and support research objectives centered on theoretical advancement and predictive accuracy. The analytical framework was bifurcated into two primary stages: the assessment of the measurement (outer) model and the evaluation of the structural (inner) model [17].

During the evaluation of the measurement model, rigorous criteria were implemented to establish the reliability and validity of the research instruments. Indicator reliability was verified using outer loadings, which were required to surpass the 0.70 threshold to ensure that each indicator adequately reflected its underlying

construct. Internal consistency reliability was substantiated by both Cronbach's Alpha and Composite Reliability metrics, with coefficients exceeding 0.70 deemed satisfactory. Convergent validity was ascertained via the Average Variance Extracted (AVE), where values greater than 0.50 confirmed that the construct accounted for a majority of the variance in its associated indicators. Furthermore, discriminant validity was rigorously tested utilizing the Heterotrait–Monotrait (HTMT) ratio and the Fornell-Larcker criterion to confirm the empirical distinctiveness of each construct within the model.

Subsequent to the measurement model validation, the structural model was evaluated to determine its explanatory power and predictive relevance. The coefficient of determination (R^2) was analyzed to quantify the proportion of variance in the endogenous constructs elucidated by the exogenous variables, while the effect size (f^2) was examined to gauge the substantive impact of individual predictors. Hypothesis testing was executed via a bootstrapping procedure within SmartPLS, facilitating the precise estimation of path coefficients and their corresponding statistical significance. Concurrently, the mediating effect of dynamic capability on the relationship between knowledge management and organizational resilience was scrutinized by assessing the significance of indirect effects, thereby illuminating the complex causal mechanisms inherent in the theoretical framework.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Results

Respondent Characteristics

This study involved a predominantly male respondent base (70%), with female respondents comprising the remaining 30%. In terms of the industrial sector, 73% of the respondents were affiliated with the non-banking sector, while 27% belonged to the banking sector. Regarding organizational ownership, 65% of the respondents were employed in non-state-owned enterprises (non-SOEs), and 35% worked in state-owned enterprises (SOEs). The age distribution reveals that the majority of the respondents were between 25 and 35 years old (55%), whereas 45% were above the age of 35. This demographic indicates that most respondents are within their productive years and possess substantial experience in managerial activities. Based on occupational positions, 58% of the respondents served as managers, 40% as senior managers, and 2% as directors. This compositional profile demonstrates that the majority of the participants hold managerial roles integral to organizational decision-making. Consequently, they are considered to possess an adequate understanding of knowledge management practices, dynamic capability development, and organizational resilience within their respective professional environments.

Measurement Model Evaluation

The evaluation of the measurement model was conducted by assessing indicator reliability, internal consistency reliability, convergent validity, and discriminant validity to ensure that each construct satisfied the requisite validity and reliability criteria. Based on the preliminary evaluation results, several indicators failed to meet the criteria

recommended by Hair et al. and, consequently, required elimination from the model. The excluded indicators comprised KA1, KA3, KA5, KAP1, KAP2, KAP4, KS1, KS3, KS5, KC4, KC5, SS1, SS2, SS3, SZ1, and SZ4. These specific indicators were removed because their outer loading values fell below the mandated minimum threshold (> 0.70).

Additionally, their inclusion caused the Heterotrait-Monotrait (HTMT) ratio to exceed the recommended maximum threshold (< 0.90), which inherently threatened to compromise the overall quality and robustness of the measurement model.Following the elimination process, the measurement model was reassessed to ensure that all constructs fulfilled the requisite measurement quality criteria. The analytical results demonstrated that all retained indicators exhibited outer loadings exceeding 0.70, while the Composite Reliability and Cronbach's Alpha values similarly surpassed the minimum threshold of 0.70. Furthermore, all constructs yielded an Average Variance Extracted (AVE) greater than 0.50, indicating that the constructs account for more than 50 percent of the variance in their respective indicators.

Subsequently, the discriminant validity assessment revealed that the model satisfied the recommended criteria following the indicator elimination process. The Heterotrait-Monotrait ratio (HTMT) values for all construct pairs fell below the maximum threshold of 0.90, while the evaluation utilizing the Fornell-Larcker criterion demonstrated that the square root of the AVE for each construct was strictly greater than its correlation with any other constructs. These findings indicate that each construct possesses an adequate level of discriminant validity, thereby measuring empirically distinct concepts. Consequently, it can be concluded that the measurement model successfully meets all recommended validity and reliability prerequisites.

Structural Model Evaluation

The structural model was evaluated to examine the causal relationships among the latent variables and to test the hypotheses proposed in this study. The analysis was conducted using the bootstrapping procedure in PLS-SEM, wherein path coefficients, t-statistics, and p-values were assessed to determine the statistical significance of each relationship between the variables.Furthermore, the explanatory power of the structural model was assessed through the analysis of the coefficient of determination and effect size to evaluate the model's capacity to elucidate the relationships among the variables. The analytical results indicate that dynamic capabilities exhibit an R-squared value of 0.650, signifying that knowledge management accounts for 65.0 percent of the variance in dynamic capabilities. Meanwhile, organizational resilience presents an R-squared value of 0.581, indicating that 58.1 percent of the variance in organizational resilience can be explained by dynamic capabilities. According to the criteria established by Hair et al., these values demonstrate that the model possesses an explanatory power ranging from moderate to substantial.

Subsequently, the effect size results reveal that the impact of knowledge management on dynamic capabilities is 1.854, whereas the effect of dynamic capabilities on organizational resilience is 1.386. Based on the criteria postulated by Hair et al., both values are classified within the category of a very large effect. Consequently, it can be

deduced that knowledge management is a highly potent factor in cultivating dynamic capabilities, and dynamic capabilities contribute significantly to the enhancement of organizational resilience.

Based on the testing results, all hypothesized relationships display coefficient directions that are consistent with the conceptual model and are statistically significant at the 5 percent significance level (p-value < 0.05). These findings indicate that all research hypotheses are supported by empirical data, signifying that the developed model effectively explains the relationships among knowledge management, dynamic capabilities, and organizational resilience in alignment with the utilized theoretical framework. Furthermore, these results provide empirical evidence that knowledge management contributes to the development of dynamic capabilities, which in turn reinforces the organization's capacity to establish organizational resilience.

Discussion

The Impact of Knowledge Management on Dynamic Capabilities

The empirical results from the first hypothesis test demonstrate that knowledge management exerts a positive and statistically significant impact on dynamic capabilities ($\beta = 0.806$; $t = 12.222$; $p < 0.001$), thereby supporting H1. This finding suggests that the more proficiently an organization orchestrates its knowledge specifically through the processes of knowledge creation, acquisition, sharing, and application the more robust its capacity to cultivate dynamic capabilities becomes.

These results align with the Knowledge-Based View (KBV) articulated by Grant, which conceptualizes knowledge as a paramount strategic resource. Because knowledge is idiosyncratic and cultivated through continuous learning and experiential processes, it fundamentally shapes organizational capabilities. By employing effective knowledge management, organizations can successfully acquire, disseminate, and implement knowledge to elevate decision-making quality, expedite organizational learning, and fortify their adaptability in the face of environmental volatility [4].

Furthermore, this relationship is corroborated by the Dynamic Capability View (DCV) postulated by Teece. The DCV defines dynamic capabilities as an organization's proficiency in integrating, building, and reconfiguring resources to optimally address environmental shifts. The maturation of such capabilities relies heavily on the availability of knowledge and ongoing organizational learning processes. Consequently, knowledge management acts as an essential bedrock for augmenting an organization's aptitude to detect opportunities and threats (sensing), execute strategic decisions (seizing), and facilitate structural shifts (transforming) [19].

Congruent with these assertions, Pascucci et al. emphasize that synergizing knowledge with dynamic capabilities empowers organizations to amplify their innovative capacity and navigate environmental turbulence with greater efficacy. Empirically, these findings are consistent with the research of Gold, Malhotra, and Segars, which demonstrates that knowledge management enhances organizational capabilities through learning and knowledge integration [9]. Easterby-Smith and Prieto assert that knowledge management serves as a critical antecedent for the formation of

dynamic capabilities [10], whereas Wilden et al. observed that organizations employing effective knowledge management practices tend to exhibit superior dynamic capabilities [13].

More recent evidence is provided by Kowshik, Chew, and Lee, whose meta-analysis reveals that knowledge management processes particularly knowledge transfer act as a precondition capability that bolsters the development of dynamic capabilities and various organizational outcomes [20]. Furthermore, Li et al. elucidate that integrating knowledge management with dynamic capabilities via a dynamic knowledge management approach allows organizations to align their knowledge processes with sensing, seizing, and transforming activities [21]. This alignment consequently elevates adaptability and competitive advantage within dynamic environments.

The effect size (f^2) of 1.854, which is categorized as extremely large, further substantiates the highly significant contribution of knowledge management to the cultivation of dynamic capabilities. Theoretically, this study reinforces the integration of the Knowledge-Based View and the Dynamic Capability View by supplying empirical evidence that knowledge management is an essential mechanism for constructing organizational dynamic capabilities. From a practical perspective, these findings suggest that organizations must fortify their knowledge management practices by fostering a knowledge-sharing culture, promoting organizational learning, and leveraging information technology to enhance adaptability and respond more efficaciously to environmental shifts. In the absence of robust knowledge management, organizations will encounter substantial difficulties in developing the dynamic capabilities requisite for survival and growth amidst the uncertainties of the business environment.

The Effect of Dynamic Capabilities on Organizational Resilience

The results of the second hypothesis test demonstrate that dynamic capabilities have a positive and significant effect on organizational resilience ($\beta = 0.762$; $t = 10.640$; $p < 0.001$), thereby supporting H2. These findings indicate that the higher an organization's proficiency in sensing, seizing, and transforming, the greater its capacity to anticipate, respond to, adapt to, and recover from various disruptions.

Organizations operating within dynamic environments require dynamic capabilities, defined as the ability to integrate, build, and reconfigure resources to effectively respond to changes [11]. From the perspective of the Dynamic Capability View (DCV), the ability to recognize environmental shifts, formulate strategic decisions, and execute organizational transformation serves as a fundamental prerequisite for building organizational resilience. Consequently, organizations are not merely able to withstand disruptions but also to learn and grow in the aftermath of a crisis.

Duchek posits that organizational resilience is constructed through the processes of anticipation, coping, and adaptation, which rely heavily on an organization's capacity to adapt dynamically. Furthermore, Linnenluecke emphasizes that resilience is established through a combination of the ability to anticipate change, sustain operations during a crisis, and undergo transformation once the crisis subsides. In alignment with this [2], Linnenluecke, as well as Teece, Peteraf, and Leih, assert that dynamic capabilities

function as the foundation of organizational resilience through the continuous ability to learn, adapt, and renew resources [3].

Empirical findings suggest that organizations possessing high dynamic capabilities are more adept at integrating resources, adjusting strategies, and maintaining operational continuity when confronted with change, compared to their less adaptive counterparts [1]. The f^2 value of 1.386, which falls into the category of a very large effect size, indicates that dynamic capabilities contribute highly significantly to organizational resilience. In other words, the more robust an organization's dynamic capabilities, the greater its ability to endure and recover from various disruptions.

From a theoretical standpoint, this research reinforces the Dynamic Capability View by offering empirical evidence that dynamic capabilities serve as critical antecedents in the development of organizational resilience. From a practical perspective, these findings suggest that organizations must cultivate sensing, seizing, and transforming capabilities through continuous learning, adaptive decision-making, and resource reconfiguration. Such measures ensure that organizations are better equipped to navigate changes, mitigate the impact of disruptions, and guarantee long-term sustainability. Furthermore, dynamic capabilities empower organizations to transcend merely recovering (bounce back) by enabling them to advance (bounce forward), thereby leveraging crises as critical opportunities for learning and innovation.

The Mediating Role of Dynamic Capabilities in the Relationship Between Knowledge Management and Organizational Resilience

The empirical evaluation of the third hypothesis demonstrates that dynamic capabilities positively and significantly mediate the relationship between knowledge management and organizational resilience ($\beta = 0.614$; $t = 6.011$; $p < 0.001$), thereby supporting H3. This finding implies that the impact of knowledge management on organizational resilience is predominantly channeled through the organization's proficiency in cultivating dynamic capabilities. Consequently, effective knowledge management amplifies an organization's aptitude for sensing, seizing, and transforming, which subsequently fortifies its capacity to anticipate, respond to, adapt to, and recover from multifaceted disruptions.

The Knowledge-Based View (KBV) articulated by Grant postulates that although knowledge constitutes a strategic resource, its value is actualized only when translated into organizational capabilities that facilitate decision-making, resource allocation, and adaptation to change. Within this framework, dynamic capabilities operate as the foundational mechanism bridging knowledge management and organizational resilience [14].

Easterby-Smith and Prieto elucidate that knowledge management fosters dynamic capabilities through the continuous processes of knowledge creation, integration, and utilization [10]. Concurrently, dynamic capabilities empower organizations to anticipate, respond to, and perpetually adapt to fluctuating environmental conditions [11]. Moreover, the findings of Wilden et al. suggest that knowledge management practices

substantially bolster dynamic capabilities [13], whereas Duchek reaffirm that dynamic capabilities constitute the fundamental bedrock of organizational resilience [1].

These findings are consistent with the integration of the Knowledge-Based View and the Dynamic Capability View. From this perspective, knowledge constitutes a strategic resource; however, it will only yield organizational resilience if it is transformed into dynamic capabilities. The results of this study also align with Easterby-Smith and Prieto, who conceptualize knowledge management as an antecedent to dynamic capabilities [10]. Furthermore, they corroborate the work of Yoshikuni et al., which demonstrates that an organization's proficiency in managing and leveraging knowledge is pivotal in the cultivation of dynamic capabilities [19], as well as the assertions of Linnenluecke, who emphasize that dynamic capabilities serve as the fundamental bedrock for establishing organizational resilience [2].

Theoretically, this research substantiates the role of dynamic capabilities as a mediating mechanism that bridges the relationship between knowledge management and organizational resilience, thereby enriching the theoretical integration of the Knowledge-Based View and the Dynamic Capability View. The findings delineate that the nexus between knowledge management and organizational resilience is not direct, but rather operates through the preliminary formulation of dynamic capabilities. This elucidates why preceding literature examining the direct correlation between knowledge management and organizational resilience has frequently yielded mixed results, as dynamic capabilities inherently function as the vital intermediary mechanism linking the two constructs.

From a practical standpoint, these findings imply that it is insufficient for organizations to merely implement knowledge management systems. Instead, they must ensure that the knowledge acquired, generated, disseminated, and applied is effectively transmuted into the organizational capacity to adapt and transform, thereby augmenting organizational resilience amidst dynamic business environments. Organizations that successfully integrate knowledge management with the development of dynamic capabilities will be more advantageously positioned to navigate various disruptions, sustain operational continuity, and secure long-term viability within an increasingly competitive and unpredictable business landscape.

Theoretical and Practical Implications

Overall, the findings of this study offer a substantial theoretical contribution to the strategic management literature, particularly by integrating the Knowledge-Based View (KBV) and the Dynamic Capabilities View (DCV) to elucidate the mechanisms underlying the formation of organizational resilience. This research successfully demonstrates that dynamic capabilities serve as a mediating variable, explaining how knowledge management enhances organizational resilience. This enriches the prevailing understanding by asserting that knowledge, as a strategic resource, must first be converted into organizational capabilities before it can engender organizational resilience. Consequently, this study clarifies the relational mechanism between

knowledge management and organizational resilience through the mediating role of dynamic capabilities, thereby addressing a notable gap in the existing literature.

From a practical perspective, this study provides actionable guidance for organizations in formulating strategies to foster organizational resilience amidst an increasingly dynamic and uncertain business environment. Organizations must allocate resources not merely toward the development of comprehensive knowledge management systems encompassing knowledge creation, acquisition, sharing, and application but also toward the cultivation of dynamic capabilities. These capabilities include the capacity to detect environmental changes (sensing), respond to emerging opportunities and threats (seizing), and reconfigure the organization (transforming). Both endeavors must be executed in an integrated manner, as knowledge management attains its optimal efficacy in building organizational resilience only when underpinned by robust dynamic capabilities. Organizations that successfully integrate knowledge management with the development of dynamic capabilities will be better positioned to withstand various disruptions, maintain operational continuity, and ensure long-term sustainability within an increasingly competitive and unpredictable business landscape.

CONCLUSION

Fundamental Finding: This study demonstrates that knowledge management exerts a positive influence on dynamic capabilities, which in turn positively affect organizational resilience, with dynamic capabilities serving as a crucial mediator in this relationship. **Implication:** Consequently, knowledge management alone is insufficient for establishing organizational resilience; rather, knowledge must be translated into dynamic capabilities to enable organizations to effectively sense environmental shifts, execute precise decision-making, and undergo sustainable transformation. From a theoretical perspective, this research reinforces the integration of the Knowledge-Based View (KBV) and the Dynamic Capabilities View (DCV) by illustrating that dynamic capabilities act as a vital bridge between knowledge management and organizational resilience. On a practical level, it is recommended that organizations construct robust knowledge management systems while simultaneously cultivating their sensing, seizing, and transforming capabilities to enhance their fortitude in the face of environmental turbulence. **Limitation:** This study is subject to several limitations: (1) the cross-sectional research design precludes the ability to capture the long-term temporal dynamics of the relationships among the variables; (2) there is a potential for common method bias, as the empirical data relies on the self-reported perceptions of the respondents; and (3) the proposed model exclusively focuses on dynamic capabilities as a mediator, thereby omitting other potentially significant factors such as organizational agility, digital capabilities, or organizational culture. **Future Research:** Future research endeavors should consider employing a longitudinal design to better infer causality. Furthermore, scholars are encouraged to incorporate alternative mediating or moderating variables such as organizational agility, strategic leadership, or organizational culture and to

empirically test the model across various sectors and national contexts to enhance the generalizability of the findings.

REFERENCES

[1] S. Duchek, "Organizational resilience: A capability-based conceptualization," *Bus. Res.*, vol. 13, no. 1, pp. 215–246, 2020, doi: 10.1007/s40685-019-0085-7.

[2] M. K. Linnenluecke, "Resilience in business and management research: A review of influential publications and a research agenda," *Int. J. Manag. Rev.*, vol. 19, no. 1, pp. 4–30, 2017, doi: 10.1111/ijmr.12076.

[3] D. J. Teece, M. A. Peteraf, and S. Leih, "Dynamic capabilities and organizational agility: Risk, uncertainty, and strategy in the innovation economy," *Calif. Manage. Rev.*, vol. 58, no. 4, pp. 13–35, 2016, doi: 10.1525/cmr.2016.58.4.13.

[4] M. Alavi and D. E. Leidner, "Knowledge management and knowledge management systems: Conceptual foundations and research issues," *MIS Q.*, vol. 25, no. 1, pp. 107–136, 2001, doi: 10.2307/3250961.

[5] I. Nonaka and H. Takeuchi, *The knowledge-creating company: How Japanese companies create the dynamics of innovation*. Oxford University Press, 1995.

[6] F. Achmad and I. Wiratmadja, "Organizational performance and competitive advantage in SMEs: The role of green innovation and knowledge management," *J. Open Innov. Technol. Mark. Complex.*, 2025, doi: 10.1016/j.joimtc.2025.100532.

[7] J. Darroch, "Knowledge management, innovation and firm performance," *J. Knowl. Manag.*, vol. 9, no. 3, pp. 101–115, 2005, doi: 10.1108/13673270510602809.

[8] T. Andreeva and A. Kianto, "Does knowledge management really matter? Linking knowledge management practices, competitiveness and economic performance," *J. Knowl. Manag.*, vol. 16, no. 4, pp. 617–636, 2012, doi: 10.1108/13673271211246185.

[9] A. H. Gold, A. Malhotra, and A. H. Segars, "Knowledge management: An organizational capabilities perspective," *J. Manag. Inf. Syst.*, vol. 18, no. 1, pp. 185–214, 2001, doi: 10.1080/07421222.2001.11045669.

[10] M. Easterby-Smith and I. M. Prieto, "Dynamic capabilities and knowledge management: An integrative role for learning?," *Br. J. Manag.*, vol. 19, no. 3, pp. 235–249, 2008, doi: 10.1111/j.1467-8551.2007.00543.x.

[11] D. J. Teece, "Explicating dynamic capabilities: The nature and microfoundations of (sustainable) enterprise performance," *Strateg. Manag. J.*, vol. 28, no. 13, pp. 1319–1350, 2007, doi: 10.1002/smj.640.

[12] D. J. Teece, G. Pisano, and A. Shuen, "Dynamic capabilities and strategic management," *Strateg. Manag. J.*, vol. 18, no. 7, pp. 509–533, 1997, doi: 10.1002/(SICI)1097-0266(199708)18:7<509::AID-SMJ882>3.0.CO;2-Z.

[13] R. Wilden, S. P. Gudergan, B. B. Nielsen, and I. Lings, "Dynamic capabilities and performance: Strategy, structure and environment," *Long Range Plann.*, vol. 46, no. 1–2, pp. 72–96, 2013, doi: 10.1016/j.lrp.2012.12.001.

[14] R. M. Grant, "Toward a knowledge-based theory of the firm," *Strateg. Manag. J.*, vol. 17, no. Winter Special Issue, pp. 109–122, 1996, doi: 10.1002/smj.4250171110.

[15] Maslani, Hartoyo, R. Syarief, and Harianto, "Strengthening the competitiveness of state-owned enterprises," *J. Open Innov. Technol. Mark. Complex.*, vol. 10, no. 1, p. 100199, 2024, doi: 10.1016/j.joitmc.2023.100199.

[16] U. Sekaran and R. Bougie, *Research Methods for Business: A Skill-Building Approach*, 7th ed. John Wiley \& Sons, 2016.

[17] J. F. Hair, G. T. M. Hult, C. M. Ringle, and M. Sarstedt, *A Primer on Partial Least Squares Structural Equation Modeling (PLS-SEM)*, 3rd ed. Sage, 2022.

[18] I. Puspitasari, F. Rusydi, N. Nuzulita, and C.-S. Hsiao, "Investigating the role of utilitarian and hedonic goals in characterizing customer loyalty in E-marketplaces," *Heliyon*, vol. 9, no. 8, p. e19193, 2023, doi: 10.1016/j.heliyon.2023.e19193.

[19] A. C. Yoshikuni, Y. K. Dwivedi, D. Zhou, and S. F. Wamba, "Big data and business analytics enabled innovation and dynamic capabilities in organizations: Developing and validating scale," *Int. J. Inf. Manag. Data Insights*, vol. 3, no. 2, p. 100206, 2023, doi: 10.1016/j.ijimei.2023.100206.
[20] S. K. T. H. Kowshik, E. Y. T. Chew, and S. W. H. Lee, "Knowledge transfer as a dynamic capability: A meta-analysis of its impact on organizational outcomes in international contexts," *Knowl. Manag. Res. \& Pract.*, 2025, doi: 10.1080/14778238.2025.2519291.
[21] B. Li, D. J. Teece, A. Baskaran, and V. G. R. Chandran, "Dynamic Knowledge Management: A dynamic capabilities approach to knowledge management," *Technovation*, vol. 147, p. 103316, 2025, doi: 10.1016/j.technovation.2025.103316.

***Dasrial (Corresponding Author)**
Andalas University, Indonesia
Email: dasrial_21305220r4@student.unand.ac.id

Syukri Lukman
Andalas University, Indonesia

Vera Pujani
Andalas University, Indonesia

Alizar Hasan
Andalas University, Indonesia