

DYNAMIC IT CAPABILITIES AND THEIR INFLUENCE ON JOB PERFORMANCE THROUGH TEAMWORK

GUANGYAN LUO, KACPER BUDNIK, DAGMARA BOGDZIUN,
KATARZYNA TWOREK

ABSTRACT

The paper is devoted to the analysis of the role played by the dynamic capabilities of IT in shaping the job performance of contemporary employees. It also discusses teamwork as a factor playing a key role in such a relationship, showing that dynamic IT capabilities have the potential to support teamwork in an organisation. Empirical research was conducted in order to verify the existence of such a relationship. The research was done based on a questionnaire as a tool for data collection, and the sample contained 246 organisations operating in Poland. Statistical analysis of data was performed using linear regression analysis with mediators and moderators. The results show that teamwork is a mediator of the relationship between dynamic IT capabilities and job performance. Moreover, the level of organisational dynamics was verified as a moderator of said relationship.

KEY WORDS

Teamwork, dynamic IT capabilities, job performance, dynamic environment.

DOI: 10.23762/FSO_VOL9_NO1_4

GUANGYAN LUO

e-mail: panny.luo@nokia.com

KACPER BUDNIK

e-mail: kacper.budnik@pwr.edu.pl

DAGMARA BOGDZIUN

e-mail: 238160@student.pwr.edu.pl

KATARZYNA TWOREK¹

e-mail: katarzyna.tworek@pwr.edu.pl

Wrocław University of Science
and Technology, Poland

¹ Corresponding author

Introduction

The role of teamwork in shaping job performance has been known and recognised in the literature for decades now, together with various dimensions which influence such relations (Cohen and Ledford, 1994; Stevens and Campion, 1994; Dickinson and McIntyre, 1997; Salas et al., 2000; Salas et al., 2005; Salas et al., 2008; DeChurch and Mesmer-Magnus, 2010). Nowadays, it seems that every contemporary organisation relies on teamwork to some extent. To effectively respond to the unexpected, organisations have been pushed to restructure work around teams, to enable more rapid, flexible responses (Kozłowski and Ilgen, 2006). Saafin and

Shaykhian (2013) perceived that reliable IT was an important factor affecting organisational performance in such a context. The main aim of information technology (IT) is to support the operations of an organisation. In contemporary organisations, which operate in a highly dynamic environment, its role is even greater due to its ability to support the rapid adaptation of the organisation to changing conditions. Such support is conditioned by the existence of the dynamic capabilities of IT, which should also be treated as those which support the dynamic capabilities of the organisation as a whole (e.g. Drnevich and Kriauciunas, 2011; Mikalef et al., 2016). Hence, it seems

logical that such capabilities will allow an organisation to gain an advantage due to their ability to influence employees' job performance, especially when they tend to implement teamwork. However, there is a research gap in this regard, as to the best of our knowledge there is nothing in the literature confirming such a relationship.

As such, the aim of the article is to examine whether the role of IT is so important to contemporary organisations that the dynamic capabilities of IT will influence teamwork and, as a result, job performance. Moreover, another issue to be examined is whether such mediated influence of the dynamic capabilities of IT on job performance is stronger in a more dynamic environment, which naturally calls for solutions which allow teams to quickly adapt to the changing conditions in which they operate. Such an aim will be fulfilled based on a literature review, which will be the basis for the development of a conceptual model, and empirical research, which will be the basis for the verification of such a model. The theoretical model will be presented at first; subsequently, the research methodology will be described together with the empirical research results.

1. Theoretical background and development of hypotheses

1.1. Conceptualisation

1.1.1. Job performance

Either as a standalone construct or as a component of a more encompassing construct such as organisational performance, job performance has been studied in detail over recent decades. This is largely attributed to its importance to the success of organisations in industry and business. Fiske (1951) defines job performance as the behaviour of an individual enabling him or her to perform a job which

can be judged in the context of organisational goals. Despite the fact that it is connected to directly observable actions or intellectual products such as decisions, it has to be within the control of an individual (McCloy et al., 1994). Although Campbell (1990) emphasises that job performance is not the outcome of an action but the action itself, later studies relaxed this constraint and examined job performance in terms of both the behavioural aspect and the outcome aspect (Roe, 1999; Jex, 1998). While the behavioural aspect examines actions that are judged against organisational goals in terms of their effectiveness and efficiency, the outcome aspect focuses on the outcomes and consequences (Sonnentag and Frese, 2002). In this paper, job performance will be understood based on four aspects: task proficiency, task meticulousness, work discipline, and work improvement and readiness for innovation (Ali-Hassan et al., 2015; Kwahk and Park, 2018; Yuen et al., 2018; Biełkowska and Brol, 2011). These aspects serve as the theoretical background in the empirical part of this study when designing questionnaires to collect data and measure the construct of job performance.

1.1.2. Teamwork

Teamwork has been studied by scholars for decades from various dimensions, including as a factor potentially influencing job performance (Cohen and Levesque, 1991; Stevens and Campion, 1994; Dickinson and McIntyre, 1997; Salas et al., 2000; Salas et al., 2005; Salas et al., 2008; DeChurch and Mesmer-Magnus, 2010). In terms of its definition, Salas et al. (2008) define it as a collective effort by multiple people to achieve a shared goal or to complete a task in a more efficient and effective way. Teamwork cannot be discussed outside the context of a team in the first place (Salas et al., 2000). Neither is it an intrinsic

substance, but a construct of certain basic components and principles (LePine et al., 2008) which exist based on prerequisites, the first of which is that there must be at least two people involved. A task that can be completed by one person falls into the category of individual work, not teamwork, though the exact number of people involved depends on the complexity of the task. Secondly, the effort of the people should be interdependent. Interdependence here is a necessary condition to substantiate teamwork. If two artists created two paintings independently but are labelled a team simply because the two paintings should be sold at one auction, obviously there is no interdependence, and thus no teamwork. After acknowledging the presence of teamwork, a subsequent concern is the degree thereof in different types of teams. Such a degree varies depending on the level of interdependence of tasks carried out by members. For example, a football team is usually expected to have a higher level of interdependence than a baseball team, and thus requires a greater degree of teamwork.

The essence of teamwork is the collective product of the efforts of multiple individuals. It exists when the conditions previously mentioned have been met. The reasons for favouring teamwork can be generalised as follows. First of all, with the presence of teamwork, the team outcome is greater than the sum of individual outcomes. One example is a family cheese workshop where, although each family member can produce cheese independently, they are able to produce more cheese when they divide the responsibilities and become more efficient due to task specialisation. Secondly, teamwork makes it possible to achieve a goal which is deemed impossible for an individual to accomplish (Salas et al., 2008). For instance, one may argue that cheese produced by a family work-

shop can nevertheless still be made by a single family member given no constraints on time or cost, but one can hardly imagine a rocket designed and built by a single person. Therefore, the motive for favouring teamwork can be summarised either as to enable a team to accomplish complex tasks that cannot be done by one individual (Cannon-Bowers and Salas, 1998), or to make the result quantitatively and qualitatively greater than the sum of individual outcomes (Salas et al., 2008).

1.1.3. Dynamic IT capabilities

Dynamic capabilities are a strategic theory concerning many fields of research (Talafidaryani, 2020). Dynamic capabilities are defined as “the ability to integrate, build, and reconfigure internal and external competencies to address rapidly-changing environments” (Teece et al., 1997). This does not change the fact that dynamic capabilities have recently attracted attention in various areas, e.g. information technology, information management, marketing, human resources management, technology and innovation management, international management, and entrepreneurship (Barreto, 2010; Eriksson, 2014; Schilke et al., 2018). Since IT, among others, is often treated as a set of tools, methods and techniques that support an organisation in labour efficiency and productivity (Odintsova et al., 2013), its dynamic capabilities seem to be an important feature. Bhatt and Grover (2005) define dynamic IT capabilities as the ability to search, explore, acquire, assimilate and apply knowledge about resources, opportunities, and how resources can be configured to exploit opportunities. Teece et al. (1997) argue that organisations with a superior competitive position on the market can respond to technological changes and market changes rapidly and coordinate and redeploy internal and external resources effectively.

Based on such definitions, in this paper, dynamic IT capabilities will be treated as support for building a flexible organisation with the ability to meet the challenges of a changing or unknown environment (Qureshi, 2000), and they will concern the following capabilities (Bieńkowska and Tworek, 2021):

(Dynamic IT capability) Searching: IT used in the organisation supports the collection of information concerning the environment (together with changes which occurred earlier) and predicting changes which may occur in the future.

(Dynamic IT Capability) Seizing: IT used in the organisation supports the recognition of the information which may potentially be useful for the identification of environment-born opportunities and allows organisations to defend information and intellectual property from environment-born threats.

(Dynamic IT Capability) Transforming: IT used in the organisation supports designing or reshaping existing business processes or even the reconfiguration of resources, underlining the role of the realignment of IT to the constantly changing needs of employees.

1.2. Hypothesis development

1.2.1. Dynamic IT capabilities as a source of effective teamwork

There is over 50 years of psychological research focused on demonstrating that teams collectively possess high levels of expertise, resources, and commitment to success, which can still fail without strong teamwork skills (Hackman, 1998). Some examples in the literature go a step further, stating that a team's processes are critical to its effectiveness (Hackman, 1987). McAdam et al. (2017) emphasised that project deadlines, synchronisation of schedules, alignment of coordination efforts, and so forth dictate many aspects of team func-

tioning, including the strategies that are employed, the pace of activities, and the role assignments which are developed in order for teams to perform successfully. This is especially true for interdisciplinary teams such as R&D teams, IT teams and management teams, where each of the team members is a specialised expert in one specific area, with the requisite specific skills and knowledge. It seems that IT may play a significant role in building the success of such teams, supporting their proper operations.

Marks et al. (2001) state that teamwork processes focus on three intermediate levels. The first of these is based on mission analysis, goal specification and strategy formulation with planning. The second level depends on monitoring progress toward goals and backup behaviour, referring to coordination. The last one is interpersonal processes, which focus on the management of interpersonal relationships.

It seems that IT support is becoming a main resource in contemporary organisations (Au-Yong-Oliveira et al., 2018). The continuing development of IT has led to new organisational forms that are flexible and responsive (Salas, 2005). Among other things, this is due to the fact that IT supports teamwork, especially when employees are geographically and organisationally dispersed. It allows them to come together across time and space in response to specific customer needs or to complete unique projects (DeSanctis and Poole, 1997; Jarvenpaa and Leidner, 1998; Lipnack and Stamps, 1997).

Therefore, organisations which wish to respond to change rapidly and coordinate and redeploy internal and external resources effectively must be supported by adaptable IT, which has the ability to rapidly mesh the individual skills of employers into interdependent teamwork (Iacono and Weisband, 1997; Teece et al., 1997).

Hence, it seems logical that IT dynamic capabilities will be needed to give the ability to search, explore, acquire, assimilate and apply knowledge about resources, opportunities, and also support their configuration to exploit opportunities (Bhatt and Grover, 2005).

Hence, dynamic capabilities of IT enable support for teamwork through swift cognition of incoming problems, the analysis thereof, and detecting needs or possibilities of reorganisation among team members to give maximum value for the organisation and monitor progress.

Therefore, the following hypothesis can be formulated:

H1a. There is a relationship between dynamic IT capabilities and teamwork

With a decent grip of the definition, prerequisites and effect of teamwork, the issue of how to maximise the positive effect of teamwork upon the job performance of individual employees should reasonably be studied. This leads to a rich body of studies on defining and testing the mediators and moderators in the relation between teamwork and job performance (Salas et al., 2000; Salas et al., 2005; Salas et al., 2008; DeChurch and Mesmer-Magnus, 2010), all underlining the existence of a relationship between teamwork and job performance. As is explained, teamwork is not an intrinsic element but a complex construct depending on context and comprising many components. Several models have been proposed by different researchers to shortlist and prioritise components which are why that relationship exists (Cannon-Bowers et al., 1995; Cannon-Bowers and Salas, 1998; Tesluk and Mathieu, 1999). So far, the most commonly acknowledged components that form effective teamwork (which translate into better job performance) include shared goals, accountability (definition of roles and responsibilities),

communication, coordination, conflict resolution and leadership (Cannon-Bowers and Salas, 1998; Marks et al., 2001; Marks and Panzer, 2004; LePine et al., 2008). In addition, Griffin et al. (2001) suggest that teamwork positively impacts job satisfaction, which is a determinant of job performance. This is supported by several other studies which affirm the positive relationship between teamwork, job satisfaction and performance (Dickinson and McIntyre, 1997; Salas et al., 2008). Another study conducted by Farh et al. (2012) proposes that emotional intelligence is a moderator between teamwork and job performance, also underlining the existence of the relationship between them.

Therefore, the following hypothesis can be legitimately formulated:

H1b. There is a relationship between teamwork and job performance

Dynamic IT capabilities, as an important characteristic of contemporary IT, aim "to mobilise and deploy IT-based resources in support of and for the enhancement of business strategies" (Bharadwaj, 2000) in a changing and unknown environment. This is in accordance with the behavioural definition of job performance in the sense that employee behaviour must contribute to the realisation of business strategies for the purpose of maximising shared organisational goals. Such correspondence sets the same expectation for IT and employees – staying flexible, agile and resourceful in the face of environmental dynamics in order to diversify methods to achieve business strategy and organisational goals.

As mentioned in the previous section, job performance is defined in this research paper as being constructed by task proficiency, task meticulousness, work discipline, work improvement and readiness for innovation (Ali-Hassan et al., 2015; Kwahk and Park, 2018; Yuen et al., 2018). At first

glance, only work improvement and readiness for innovation seem to be related to the ability to deal with changes. However, further analysis shows that task proficiency, task meticulousness and work discipline all involve a certain degree of agility and flexibility in the dynamic environment. In the modern environment, when IT is implemented to underpin the work processes, such a need for agility and flexibility is largely determined by its dynamic capabilities for any work that requires efficient information acquisition and transmission, data storage and indexing, communication across geographical dispersion and time separation as well as easy access to knowledge so as to develop new skills for new task requirements. Considering this, it is reasonable to hypothesise that:

H1c. There is a relationship between dynamic IT capabilities and job performance.

Based on the abovementioned literature analysis, the pairwise relations among these three variables: teamwork vs. job performance, dynamic IT capabilities vs. job performance, and dynamic IT capabilities vs. teamwork, are established. This lays the foundation for the formulation of a more sophisticated mediation model that can encompass all three variables and study their combined relations. In another research paper conducted by Tworek et al. (2020), it is theoretically elaborated and empirically verified that dynamic IT capabilities do not have a direct influence upon organisational performance, but can exert such influence through the mediation of employees who are the direct users and beneficiaries of the dynamic capabilities of IT. Although the issue in this study is not straightforward organisational performance but individual job performance, these two constructs of performance share the same characteristic in that they are forms of appraisal for both actions and out-

comes that need to be influenced through mediation by direct users and beneficiaries (Viswesvaran and Ones, 2000). Such views are also confirmed by various other authors (e.g. Bieńkowska and Ignacek-Kuźnicka (2019) considering knowledge workers). This provides sound support for the theory that job performance can be influenced by dynamic IT capabilities through teamwork, which is the collective effort of employees. The role of dynamic capabilities in shaping job and organisational performance was also discussed by Bieńkowska et al. (2020), who underlined the role of IT in the existence of such relations. Therefore, the following hypothesis is formulated:

H2: Dynamic IT capabilities influence job performance through teamwork

The first known definition of environment was given in 1827, according to which environment means *“the circumstances, objects, or conditions by which one is surrounded”* (Merriam-Webster, 2020). Cellier et al. (1997) emphasised that, in a dynamic environment, all states of process can change independently of operator action. The existing literature presents few criteria for the dynamic environment. An initial criterion concerns the possibility of obtaining understandable data or information (Hoc, 1989a, b; Roth and Woods, 1988; Brehmer, 1990). As stated by Woods (1988), a second criterion is related to the changing character of parameter value. As Hoc (1989a, b) and Woods (1988) noted, assessing the state or effects of an action requires anticipation and representation of the probable states to come. Knowledge of causal chains, allowing for quality of comprehension, prognosis and choice of action, generates the third criterion – the number of variables interacting in a process (Brehmer and Allard, 1991; Woods, 1988). The final criterion is connected with

timeframes. The different variables may depend on different time scales (Brehmer and Allard, 1991). Leplat (1988) states that feedback times may vary according to the parameters. As mentioned by Cellier et al. (1997), all criteria describing dynamic environments mean that employees do not differ so much in their performance, but rather in the way they come to a reasonable decision that allows them to control the implementation of their decision more efficiently.

In recent years the environment in which organisations are operating has been more dynamic than before. Stock market crashes, changes to the law, economic crises, the pandemic, climate change, massive job rotation, and changing technology are the most often cited sources of such dynamics (Shreve, 2020; Savage et al., 2019; Thomas, 2018). If an organisation wishes to maintain its position and grow, it needs to quickly adapt to the changes occurring within (Aulet, 2013; Moore, 2014).

To exploit opportunities, organisations need stronger abilities to search, explore, acquire, assimilate and apply knowledge about resources and opportunities, which occurs by supporting employees working based on teamwork (Bhatt and Grover, 2005). Bharadwaj (2000) states that dynamic IT capabilities support business strategies and work processes in teamwork and their importance is growing with the growing dynamics of the environment in which organisations operate. As the most commonly acknowledged components that form effective teamwork (which translates into higher job performance) include shared goals, accountability (definition of roles and responsibilities), communication, coordination, conflict resolution and leadership (Cannon-Bowers and Salas, 1998; Marks et al., 2001; Marks and Panzer, 2004; LePine et al., 2008), it seems that the role of dynamic capabilities in sup-

porting almost all of them will grow when the team is exposed to the higher level of environment dynamics. Hence, the following hypothesis can be formulated:

H3: The higher the level of environment dynamics, the stronger the influence of dynamic IT capabilities on job performance (in the mediation model)

2. Research methodology

The hypotheses were verified using empirical research conducted using the survey method. A questionnaire survey was developed based on Likert scale questions concerning each analysed variable and used as a research tool. The pilot survey was conducted as the first step in the middle of 2019. A group of 25 managers acted as competent judges and analysed the content. According to their suggestions, the questionnaire was supplemented and reshaped in order to better match the intent of the authors in the case of several questions. The pilot survey was a prerequisite for establishing a questionnaire as a valid measurement method (Czakov, 2019). The main survey was conducted among 246 organisations located in Poland in October 2019. The location of the organisation was the only condition limiting the sample (they were chosen regardless of size, industry, type of business etc.). The survey was done using the Computer Assisted Web Interview (CAWI) method. The sample (in case of the diversity of organisational characteristics) was sufficiently diversified and can be a basis for overall conclusions concerning the given topic. Sample characteristics are presented in Table 1, showing that the sample covered a diverse group of organisations. The results were analysed using Process Macro (v.3.5) for IBM SPSS Statistics (v. 25).

Table 1. Research sample characteristics

Organisation size	local organisation	branch of a global organisation	Total
Micro (fewer than 10 people)	21	1	22
Small (11-50 people)	76	10	86
Medium (51-250 people)	62	44	106
Large (more than 250 people)	17	15	32
Total	176	70	246

Source: Bieńkowska and Tworek, 2021.

2.1. Overview of variables

The verification of the hypotheses was based on four key variables: *IT DC*, *Teamwork*, *Job Performance*, and *Environment dynamics*.

IT DC was measured based on seven items covering activities connected to gathering information about the environment, predicting the changes occurring therein, recognising the inherent opportunities, defending against threats, designing or reshaping business processes, reconfiguring resources and realigning according to changing needs. The scale was based on a five-point Likert scale from 'I strongly disagree' to 'I strongly agree' with the mid-point being 'I have no opinion') (Bieńkowska and Tworek, 2021).

Teamwork was measured based on a single item connected to the assessment of its occurrence in the organisation (on the five-point Likert scale).

Job performance was measured based on four items according to the definitions by Campbell (1990) and Borman and Brush (1993). The scale contains four items referring to the quality, timeliness, efficiency and effectiveness of employees' tasks at the workplace and was based on the five-point Likert scale.

Environment dynamics were measured based on a single item connected to the assessment of the level of such dynamics (on the five-point Likert scale).

2.2. Descriptive statistics and reliability analysis of scales

The reliability of scales of each variable was verified as the first step of the research and the results are presented in Table 2. The results obtained show that Cronbach's α was high for every variable, which indicates high internal reliability of the scales and measurements.

Table 2. Defined variables along with the results of the reliability analysis of scales

No.	Variable	No. of scales	Cronbach's α	Factor analysis	M	SD
1	IT DC	7	0.896	61.56%	3.43	0.76
2	Teamwork	1	--	--	3.40	0.82
3	Environment dynamics	1	--	--	3.44	0.99
4	Job performance	4	0.816	64.72%	3.69	0.75

Source: Own elaboration.

2.3. Mediation model

There are at least three conditions which must be met to establish a mediation model (Saks, 2006):

- a relationship between the independent variables and the mediator,

– a relationship between the dependent variables and the mediator,

– significant relationships between the independent variables and dependent variables should be reduced (par-

tial mediation) or no longer be significant (full mediation) when introducing the mediator.

Therefore, in order to verify those conditions, the r-Pearson correlation analysis was performed. It was also a basis for the verification of hypotheses H1a-H1c.

Table 3. Analysis of correlation between the analysed variables

		IT DC	Job performance
Teamwork	r	0.585	0.514
	Sig.	<0.001	<0.001
	N	240	240
Job Performance	r	0.605	1
	Sig.	<0.001	
	N	240	240

Source: Own elaboration.

The results obtained, which are presented in Table 3, clearly show that there is a statistically significant and high correlation between all analysed variables. The correlation is definitely the highest in case of the relationship between leadership and job performance. It allows for the initial acceptance of hypotheses H1a, H1b and H1c.

The results obtained allow the researchers to go further with the statistical analy-

sis of obtained data – to verify the mediation model of job performance. Linear regression analysis with a mediator was performed for *IT DC* as the independent variable, and *job performance* as the dependent variable. The variable *teamwork* was tested to verify whether it is a mediator in the model. Table 4 shows the results of the analysis.

Table 4. Results of the regression analysis with a mediator

Mediator	Direct effect value	Indirect effect value	BootLLCI	BootULCI	R2
Teamwork	0.469	0.127	0.042	0.217	0.629

Source: Own elaboration.

The regression model with a mediator is statistically significant ($F(2.230)=75.332$ and corrected $R^2=0.629$). Moreover, teamwork is a statistically significant mediator of the model ($p<0.001$, coeff. = 0.188, se = 0.056). The mediating effect is also statistically significant, as can be observed in Table 4 (BootLLCI and ULCI are both above the value of 0). The model obtained shows that teamwork is a weak, yet statistically significant, mediator of the relationship between *IT DC* and *job performance*. Therefore, it allows for the acceptance of hypothesis H2.

2.4. Moderator analysis for environment dynamics – research results

In order to verify the statistical significance of *environment dynamics* as a moderator of the relationship in a given model, the mediation model obtained (hypothesis H2) was supplemented with a moderator. The hypotheses concerning *environment dynamics* were tested using linear regression analysis with a moderator. The moderator was introduced into the model and its statistical significance was tested using Model 7 and 14 of Process Macro (v.3.5) for IBM SPSS Statistics (v. 25). The results of the analysis are presented in Table 5.

Table 5. Regression model statistics

Model description	R ²	Delta R ²	Moderator coeff.	Standard error	t Stat	P Value
IT DC, Environment dynamics, Moderator dependent v.: teamwork	0.668	0.013	0.123	0.052	2.358	0.019
Teamwork, Environment dynamics, Moderator dependent v.: job performance	0.644	0.001	0.001	0.042	0.036	0.971

*accepted level of significance 0.001

Source: Own elaboration.

The linear regression model with a moderator allows the researchers to draw conclusions about a cause-effect relationship between the variables *IT DC*, *teamwork* and *job performance*, which is another way to verify the proposed model (H2). Moreover, the results obtained clearly show that the variable *environment dynamics* is a statistically significant moderator in case of the first relationship, between *IT DC* and *Teamwork* ($F(3.222)=59.650, p < 0.001$). Therefore, as shown in Table 5, the results obtained are the basis for the acceptance of hypothesis H3. The hypotheses can be accepted stating that the variable *environment dynamics* is a moderator in a given mediation model.

3. Discussion

The results of the empirical study confirmed that there is a relationship between teamwork and job performance, which is in line with the postulates of several other studies (Griffin et al., 2001; Salas et al., 2008). However, more importantly from the point of view of the research gap addressed in the article, the results clearly show that dynamic IT capabilities, as a comparatively new construct (which is gaining traction along with the deepening of industry digitalisation), are also significantly related to teamwork and job performance. These results allow for the confirmation of statements which can be found in corresponding research by Bhatt and Grover (2005)

and Bieńkowska and Tworek (2020), and this research contributes to the empirical verification of those statements.

However, the research not only allowed for the confirmation of the existence of direct relationships, but more importantly the existence of the mediation model in which the dynamic capabilities of IT influence job performance through teamwork. The formulated hypotheses have been statistically verified, showing the weak but statistically significant mediating role of teamwork in the relationship between dynamic IT capabilities and job performance. This was confirmed when carrying out the linear regression analysis with a mediator which proves the cause-effect relationship among the three variables and the specific role played by teamwork. Such results allow the researchers to confirm the views of e.g. Viswesvaran and Ones (2000) proving that teamwork is an important link which enables the influence of dynamic IT capabilities on job performance.

Furthermore, the research reveals that the relationship between dynamic IT capabilities and job performance is subject to the influence of organisational dynamics. Environment dynamics were verified as a moderator of a given mediated relationship, which enhances the strength of relations within the mediation model.

Conclusions

The aim of the paper was to examine whether the dynamic capabilities of IT influence teamwork – and through that, job performance – and whether the level of environment dynamics moderates the strength of such a relationship. The aim was fulfilled using empirical research, which verified the assumed hypotheses. The results obtained allowed the researchers to confirm that the dynamic capabilities of IT influence job performance through teamwork. Such conclusions allow the researchers to fulfil the existing research gap concerning the lack of a comprehensive view on the role of dynamic IT capabilities in shaping the job performance of contemporary employees. Moreover, it was also confirmed that such an influence is stronger under the conditions of a more dynamic environment.

The results obtained allow the researchers to contribute not only to the development of theory in the context of the role of IT in shaping the job performance of contemporary employees, but also to the practice thereof.

The findings offer an important implication for industrial practices showing the mechanism for improving job performance, and through it, organisational performance. It is worth noting that such an implication may be applicable to a broader scope of organisational configurations since the empirical study was conducted among organisations varying in size, industry, business type and characteristics, which nonetheless yielded consistent results.

The research has some limitations, as the verification of hypotheses was performed on a sample from one country in a specific period of time (before the COVID-19 pandemic) and should most definitely be replicated based on a different sample. However, the results obtained show future directions of research, as the current situ-

ation might significantly strengthen the relations discussed in the article and show them from a different perspective (where it is almost impossible to keep organisations operating without dynamic IT capabilities).

References

- Ali-Hassan, H., Nevo, D., Wade, M. (2015), Linking dimensions of social media use to job performance: The role of social capital, *The Journal of Strategic Information Systems*, 24(2), 65-89. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsis.2015.03.001>
- Aulet, B. (2013), *Disciplined entrepreneurship*, New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Au-Yong-Oliveira, M., Gonçalves, R., Martins, J., Branco, F.M. (2018), The social impact of technology on millennials and consequences for higher education and leadership, *Telematics and Informatics*, 35(4), 954-963. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tele.2017.10.007>.
- Barreto, I. (2010), Dynamic capabilities: a review of past research and an agenda for the future, *Journal of Management*, 36(1), pp. 256-280. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206309350776>
- Bharadwaj, A. (2000), A resource-based perspective on information technology capability and firm performance: An empirical investigation, *MIS Quarterly*, 24(1), 169-196. doi: 10.2307/3250983
- Bhatt, G.D., Grover, V. (2005), Types of information technology capabilities and their role in competitive advantage: An empirical study, *Journal of Management Information Systems*, 22(2), 253-277, <https://doi.org/10.1080/07421222.2005.11045844>
- Bieńkowska, A., Brol, M.W. (2011), Zarządzanie przez kompetencje, in M. Hopej, Z. Kral (Eds.) *Współczesne metody zarządzania w teorii i praktyce*, Oficyna Wydawnicza Politechniki Wrocławskiej. (Original work written in Polish).
- Bieńkowska, A., Ignacek-Kuźnicka, B. (2019), Influence of knowledge workers work motivation on their job performance--results of empirical research, *Cen-*

- tral European Business Review, 8(5), 54-68. <https://doi.org/10.18267/j.cebr.224>
- Bieńkowska, A., Tworek K., Sałamacha A. (2020). The role of UX in shaping EDC based model of job performance, *European Journal of International Management* (in press). <https://doi.org/10.1504/ejim.2020.10029428>
- Bieńkowska, A., Tworek, K. (2020), Job performance model based on employees' dynamic capabilities (EDC), *Sustainability*, 12(6):2250. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su12062250>
- Bieńkowska A., Tworek K. (2021), The moderating role of IT in process of shaping organizational performance by dynamic capabilities of controlling, *Applied Sciences*, 11(2):889. <https://doi.org/10.3390/app11020889>
- Borman, W.C. Brush, D.H. (1993), More progress toward a taxonomy of managerial performance requirements, *Human Performance*, 6(1), 1-21. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327043hup0601_1
- Brehmer, B. (1990), Towards a taxonomy of microworlds, in: J. Rasmussen, B. Brehmer, M. de Montmollin and J. Leplat (Eds), *Taxonomy for analysis of work domains*, *Proceedings of the First MOHAWC Workshop* (pp. 1-21), Liege, Belgique.
- Brehmer, B., Allard, R. (1991), Dynamic decision making: The effects of task complexity and feedback delays, in: J. Rasmussen, B. Brehmer and J. Leplat (Eds), *Distributed decision making: Cognitive models for cooperative work* (pp. 319-334), Chichester: Wiley.
- Campbell, J.P. (1990), Modeling the performance prediction problem in industrial and organizational psychology, in: M.D. Dunnette and L.M. Hough (Eds.), *Handbook of industrial and organizational psychology* (pp. 687-732), Consulting Psychologists Press.
- Cannon-Bowers, J.A., Salas E. (1998), Team performance and training in complex environments: Recent findings from applied research, *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 7(3), 83-87. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-8721.ep10773005>
- Cannon-Bowers, J.A., Tannenbaum, S.I., Salas, E., Volpe, C.E. (1995), Defining competencies and establishing team training requirements, in: R.A., Guzzo and E. Salas (Eds), *Team effectiveness and decision making in organizations* (pp. 333-380), San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Cellier, J.-M., Eyrolle, H., Marine, C. (1997), Expertise in dynamic environments, *Ergonomics*, 40(1), 28-50, DOI: 10.1080/001401397188350
- Cohen, P.R., Levesque, H.J. (1991), Teamwork, *Nous*, 25(4), 487-512. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2216075>
- Czakon, W. (2019), Walidacja narzędzia pomiarowego w naukach o zarządzaniu, *Przegląd Organizacji*, 4(951), 3-10. <https://doi.org/10.33141/po.2019.04.01> (Original work written in Polish).
- DeChurch, L.A., Mesmer-Magnus, J.R. (2010), The cognitive underpinnings of effective teamwork: A meta-analysis, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 95(1), 32-53. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0017328>
- DeSanctis, G., Poole, M.S. (1997), Transitions in teamwork in new organizational forms, *Advances in Group Processes*, 14, 157-176.
- Dickinson, T.L., McIntyre, R.M. (1997), A conceptual framework for teamwork measurement. Team performance assessment and measurement, in: M.T. Brannick, E. Salas and C. Prince (Eds.), *Series in applied psychology. Team performance assessment and measurement: Theory, methods, and applications* (pp. 19-43), Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers.
- Drnevich, P.L., Kriauciunas, A.P. (2011), Clarifying the conditions and limits of the contributions of ordinary and dynamic capabilities to relative firm performance, *Strategic Management Journal*, 32, 254-279. <https://doi.org/10.1002/smj.882>
- Eriksson, T. (2014), Processes, antecedents and outcomes of dynamic capabilities, *Scandinavian Journal of Management*, 30(1), 65-82. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scaman.2013.05.001>

- Farh, C.I.C.C., Seo, M.-G., Tesluk, P.E. (2012), Emotional intelligence, teamwork effectiveness, and job performance: The moderating role of job context, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 97(4), 890-900. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0027377>
- Fiske, D.W. (1951), Values, theory, and the criterion problem. *Personnel Psychology*, 4, 93-98. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6570.1951.tb01462.x>
- Griffin, M.A., Patterson, M.G., West, M.A. (2001), Job satisfaction and teamwork: The role of supervisor support, *Journal of Organizational Behavior: The International Journal of Industrial, Occupational and Organizational Psychology and Behavior*, 22(5), 537-550. <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.101>
- Hackman, J.R. (1987), The design of work teams, in: J.W. Lorsch (Ed.), *Handbook of Organizational Behavior* (pp. 315-342), Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall.
- Hackman, J.R. (1998), Why teams don't work, in: R.S. Tindale, L. Heath, J. Edwards (Eds.), *Theory and research on small groups* (pp. 245-267), New York: Plenum. <https://doi.org/10.1002/Itl.40619980709>
- Hoc, J.-M. (1989a), La conduite d'un processus continu á longs delais de reponse. Une activite de diagnostic, *Le Travail Humain*, 54(4), 289-316.
- Hoc, J.-M. (1989b), Strategies in controlling a continuous process with long response latencies: need for computer support to diagnosis, *International Journal of Man-Machine Studies*, 30, 47-67. [https://doi.org/10.1016/s0020-7373\(89\)80020-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/s0020-7373(89)80020-3)
- Iacono, C.S., Weisband, S.P. (1997), Developing trust in virtual teams, *Proceedings of the Thirtieth Hawaii International Conference on System Sciences*, Los Alamitos, CA: IEEE Computer Society Press. <https://doi.org/10.1109/hicss.1997.665615>
- Jarvenpaa, S., Leidner, D. (1998), Communication and trust in global virtual teams, *Journal of Computer Mediated Communication*, 3(4). <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1083-6101.1998.tb00080.x>
- Jex, S.M. (1998), Stress and job performance: theory, research, and implications for managerial practice – advanced topics in organizational behavior, Newbury Park: Sage. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0258042x9902400409>
- Kozlowski, S.W.J., Ilgen D.R., (2006), Enhancing the effectiveness of work groups and teams, Michigan State University, Association for Psychological Science. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1529-1006.2006.00030.x>
- Kwahk, K., Park, D. (2018), Leveraging your knowledge to my performance: The impact of transactive memory capability on job performance in a social media environment, *Computers in Human Behavior*, 80, 314-330. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2017.10.047>
- LePine, J.A., Piccolo, R.F., Jackson, C. L., Mathieu, J.E., Saul, J.R. (2008), A meta-analysis of teamwork processes: Tests of a multidimensional model and relationships with team effectiveness criteria, *Personnel Psychology*, 61(2), 273-307. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6570.2008.00114.x>
- Leplat, J., (1988), Task complexity in work situations, in: L.P. Goodstein, H.B. Andersen and S.E. Olsen (Eds.), *Tasks, errors and mental models* (pp. 105-115), London: Taylor & Francis.
- Lipnack, J., Stamps, J. (1997), *Virtual teams: Reaching across space, time, and organizations with technology*, New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Marks, M.A., Panzer, F.J. (2004), The influence of team monitoring on team processes and performance, *Human Performance*, 17(1), 25-41. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327043hup1701_2
- Marks, M.A., Mathieu, J.E., Zaccaro, S.J. (2001), A temporally based framework and taxonomy of team processes, *Academy of Management Review*, 26, 356-376. <https://doi.org/10.2307/259182>
- McAdam, R., Humphreys, P., Galbraith, B., Miller, K. (2017), Developing management capability within a horizontal supply chain in performance measurement

- deployment and evolution: A dynamic capabilities and goal theory perspective, *Production Planning & Control*, 28(6-8), 610-628, DOI: 10.1080/09537287.2017.1309706
- McCloy, R.A., Campbell, J.P., Cudeck, R. (1994), A confirmatory test of a model of performance determinants, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 79(4), 493-505. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.79.4.493>
- Merriam-Webster.com, "Environment", dictionary, Merriam-Webster, retrieved from: <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/environment> (accessed 18 December 2020).
- Mikalef, P., Pateli, A. van de Wetering, R. (2016), IT flexibility and competitive performance: the mediating role of it-enabled dynamic capabilities, *Research Papers* no. 176. https://aisel.aisnet.org/ecis2016_rp/176.
- Moore A.G. (2014), *Crossing the chasm: Marketing and selling high-tech products to mainstream customers*, New York: Harper Collins.
- Odintsova, S.A., Kenesova, N.T., Sarsekeyeva, Z.E. (2013), Information Technology: Definition, essence and content of the concept, *Education and Science Without Borders*, 4(7), 107-109. <https://doi.org/10.15587/2312-8372.2014.28091>
- Qureshi, S., (2000), Organisational change through collaborative learning in a network form, *Group Decision and Negotiation*, 9, 129-147.
- Roe, R.A. (1999). Work performance: A multiple regulation perspective, in C.L. Cooper and I. T. Robertson (Eds.), *International review of industrial and organizational psychology* (pp. 231-335). New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Roth, E.M., Woods, D.D. (1988), Aiding human performance. I: Cognitive analysis, *Le Travail Humain*, 51(1), 39-64. <https://doi.org/10.1016/b978-0-444-70536-5.50006-3>
- Saafein, O., Shaykhian, G.A., (2013), Factors affecting virtual team performance in telecommunications support environment, *Telematics and Informatics*, 31(3), 459-462. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tele.2013.10.004>
- Saks, A.M. (2006), Antecedents and consequences of employee engagement, *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 21(7), 600-619. <https://doi.org/10.1108/02683940610690169>
- Salas, E., Burke, C.S., Cannon-Bowers, J.A. (2000), Teamwork: Emerging principles, *International Journal of Management Reviews*, 2(4), 339-356. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-2370.00046>
- Salas, E., Cooke, N.J., Rosen, M.A. (2008), On teams, teamwork, and team performance: Discoveries and developments. *Human Factors*, 50(3), 540-547. <https://doi.org/10.1518/001872008x288457>
- Salas, E., Sims, D.E., Burke, C.S. (2005), Is there a "big five" in teamwork?, *Small Group Research*, 36(5), 555-599. <https://doi.org/10.1037/e518632013-346>
- Savage J., Brown M.G., Murphy M.J. et al. (2019), Report of the Environmental Regulation Committee, The Energy Bar Association.
- Schilke, O., Hu, S., Helfat, C.E. (2018), Quo vadis, dynamic capabilities? A content-analytic review of the current state of knowledge and recommendations for future research, *Academy of Management Annals*, 12(1), 390-439. <https://doi.org/10.5465/annals.2016.0014>
- Shreve, K. (2020). Coronavirus stock market crash: New stock market leaders will share this common trait, Los Angeles: Investor's Business Daily.
- Sonnentag, S., Frese, M. (2002), Performance concepts and performance theory, *Psychological management of individual performance*, 23(1), 3-25. DOI: 10.1002/0470013419.ch1
- Stevens, M.J., Campion, M.A. (1994), The knowledge, skill, and ability requirements for teamwork: Implications for human resource management, *Journal of Management*, 20(2), 503-530. <https://doi.org/10.1177/014920639402000210>
- Talafidaryani, M. (2020), A text mining-based review of the literature on dy-

- dynamic capabilities perspective in information systems research, *Management Research Review* (in press). <https://doi.org/10.1108/MRR-03-2020-0139>.
- Teece, D.J., Pisano, G., Shuen, A. (1997), Dynamic capabilities and strategic management, *Strategic Management Journal*, 18(7), 509-533. [https://doi.org/10.1002/\(sici\)1097-0266\(199708\)18:7](https://doi.org/10.1002/(sici)1097-0266(199708)18:7)
- Tesluk, P.E., Mathieu, J. (1999), Overcoming roadblock to effectiveness: incorporating management of performance barriers into models of work group effectiveness, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 84(2), 200-217. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.84.2.200>
- Thomas, C.A. (2018), The Modern Law Review, 81(3), 551-554. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-2230.12348>.
- Viswesvaran, C., Ones, D.S. (2000), Perspectives on models of job performance, *International Journal of selection and assessment*, 8(4), 216-226. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-2389.00151>
- Woods, D.D. (1988), Coping with complexity: the psychology of human behaviour in complex systems, in: L.P. Goodstein, H.B. Andersen and S.E. Olsen (Eds.), *Tasks, errors and mental models*(pp. 128-148), London: Taylor & Francis.
- Yuen, K.F., Loh, H.S., Zhou, Q. Wong, Y.D. (2018), Determinants of job satisfaction and performance of seafarers, *Transportation Research Part A: Policy and Practice*, 110, 1-12. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tra.2018.02.006>
- acterised by high job rotation. <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7847-0526>

Dagmara Bogdziun is currently a student at the Faculty of Computer Science and Management, Wrocław University of Science and Technology, in the field of management sciences. <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8020-3710>

Katarzyna Tworek, PhD, associate professor, is currently working as Dean of the Faculty of Computer Science and Management, Wrocław University of Science and Technology. Her research interests are connected to IT reliability, organisational reliability and the use of IT in contemporary organisations. <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6276-2436>

Guangyan Luo is currently a PhD student at the Doctoral School of Wrocław University of Science and Technology in the field of management sciences. Her PhD concerns the management of multicultural teams. <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7647-8228>

Kacper Budnik is currently a PhD Student at the Doctoral School of Wrocław University of Science and Technology in the field of management sciences. His PhD concerns IT support for the management of teams char-