



---

EDITORIAL

## Strategic Reconfiguration in the Generative Era

**Lina Marlina**  
Editor-in-Chief

Contemporary organizations are entering a period of strategic transition shaped by rapid changes in how ideas are produced, communicated, and interpreted within markets. Earlier discussions on digital transformation largely emphasized efficiency, analytics, and process optimization. Recent developments, however, point toward a deeper transformation that affects managerial cognition, capability formation, and symbolic value creation. Rather than simply accelerating existing practices, emerging technological infrastructures reshape how strategic alternatives are imagined and evaluated, challenging long-standing assumptions about organizational learning and differentiation (Verhoef et al., 2021; Kumar et al., 2024).

These changes invite renewed reflection on how management scholarship conceptualizes competitive advantage. Classical perspectives emphasize the orchestration of resources, organizational routines, and interpretive processes that enable firms to adapt under uncertainty (Teece, 2007; Eisenhardt & Martin, 2000). Yet the increasing mediation of decision-making and communication processes suggests that strategic outcomes are influenced not only by managerial intention but also by the broader socio-technical context in which organizations operate. Understanding this shift requires moving beyond linear narratives of technological progress toward a more structural perspective on strategy and capability development.

### Reframing Capability Architecture

Dynamic capabilities theory has long provided a foundation for understanding how organizations respond to environmental turbulence by sensing opportunities, seizing them through strategic commitment, and transforming internal resources (Teece, 2007). In contemporary contexts, capability development appears increasingly intertwined with systems that shape how information is generated and interpreted. The emphasis therefore shifts from individual tools toward the architecture of capabilities themselves—how organizations design learning routines, coordinate symbolic resources, and maintain interpretive flexibility.

This reframing highlights that strategic renewal depends not only on adoption of new technologies but on governance and orchestration. Excessive reliance on standardized processes may compress variance and reduce exploratory potential, echoing long-standing concerns regarding competence traps and exploitative learning cycles (Levinthal & March, 1993). Conversely, carefully calibrated integration can enhance experimentation and support adaptive responses to uncertainty. Capability architecture thus becomes a central locus of managerial attention, linking organizational design with strategic resilience.

## **Agency, Interpretation, and Strategic Judgment**

Another emerging theme concerns the evolving nature of agency within managerial and communicative processes. Behavioral strategy research emphasizes that strategic outcomes are shaped by how decision makers allocate attention and construct meaning from available information (Ocasio, 1997; Gavetti, 2012). As organizational environments become increasingly mediated by complex systems, the boundary between human judgment and mediated interpretation becomes less distinct. Strategic decisions are influenced not only by hierarchical authority but also by how alternatives are framed, communicated, and perceived within organizational contexts.

Similar dynamics appear in engagement research, where relationships between organizations and stakeholders depend on perceptions of authenticity, intentionality, and relational alignment (Brodie et al., 2011; Hollebeek et al., 2014). When communication becomes increasingly mediated, audiences may reinterpret agency in new ways, reshaping trust and legitimacy. From a management perspective, these developments underscore the importance of interpretive governance—how organizations maintain clarity of purpose and relational coherence despite shifts in communicative infrastructure.

## **Authenticity and Symbolic Value**

Branding and creative economy scholarship have traditionally linked authenticity to origin, narrative continuity, and experiential grounding (Beverland, 2005; Napoli et al., 2014). In environments characterized by abundant symbolic production, however, authenticity increasingly emerges as a relational and governance-driven outcome. Organizations must balance scalability with distinctiveness, ensuring that symbolic outputs remain coherent with strategic identity and organizational values.

This shift reframes brand value as a function of symbolic governance rather than mere creative output. Competitive advantage depends on the capacity to orchestrate meaning systems in ways that sustain differentiation while adapting to rapidly evolving market expectations. Such challenges highlight the relevance of signaling and legitimacy theory, which emphasize how stakeholders interpret organizational actions through broader cultural and institutional lenses (Suchman, 1995; Connelly et al., 2011). Managing symbolic complexity therefore becomes a core strategic capability, bridging marketing, organizational design, and leadership.

## **Toward New Strategic Pathways**

Taken together, these developments suggest that management scholarship is moving toward a new understanding of strategy—one that emphasizes orchestration, governance, and interpretive diversity rather than technological determinism. Strategic advantage in contemporary environments depends on how organizations integrate new forms of mediation into existing capability structures while preserving flexibility and meaning coherence. This perspective invites further exploration of how dynamic capabilities evolve under changing conditions and how managerial cognition adapts to increasingly mediated decision environments (Helfat & Peteraf, 2015).

Future research may benefit from integrating insights from behavioral strategy, engagement theory, and branding scholarship to examine how organizations sustain differentiation amid structural transformation. By focusing on governance, agency, and symbolic value, management studies can develop a more nuanced understanding of strategic adaptation—one that recognizes both the opportunities and tensions inherent in contemporary organizational change.

## References

- Beverland, M. B. (2005). Crafting brand authenticity. *Journal of Management Studies*, 42(5), 1003–1029.
- Brodie, R. J., Hollebeek, L. D., Juric, B., & Ilic, A. (2011). Customer engagement. *Journal of Service Research*, 14(3), 252–271.
- Connelly, B. L., Certo, S. T., Ireland, R. D., & Reutzel, C. R. (2011). Signaling theory. *Journal of Management*, 37(1), 39–67.
- Eisenhardt, K. M., & Martin, J. A. (2000). Dynamic capabilities. *Strategic Management Journal*, 21(10–11), 1105–1121.
- Gavetti, G. (2012). Behavioral strategy. *Organization Science*, 23(1), 267–285.
- Helfat, C. E., & Peteraf, M. A. (2015). Managerial cognitive capabilities. *Strategic Management Journal*, 36(6), 831–850.
- Hollebeek, L. D., Glynn, M. S., & Brodie, R. J. (2014). Consumer brand engagement. *Journal of Interactive Marketing*, 28(2), 149–165.
- Kumar, V., Ramachandran, D., & Kumar, B. (2024). AI in marketing strategy. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*.
- Levinthal, D. A., & March, J. G. (1993). The myopia of learning. *Strategic Management Journal*, 14(S2), 95–112.
- Napoli, J., Dickinson, S., Beverland, M., & Farrelly, F. (2014). Measuring brand authenticity. *Journal of Business Research*, 67(6), 1090–1098.
- Ocasio, W. (1997). Towards an attention-based view of the firm. *Strategic Management Journal*, 18(S1), 187–206.
- Suchman, M. C. (1995). Managing legitimacy. *Academy of Management Review*, 20(3), 571–610.
- Teece, D. J. (2007). Dynamic capabilities. *Strategic Management Journal*, 28(13), 1319–1350.
- Verhoef, P. C., Broekhuizen, T., Bart, Y., et al. (2021). Digital transformation. *Journal of Business Research*, 122, 889–901.