Integration of Technological Development: An Evolutionary Model

Teknolojik Gelişimin Entegrasyonu : Evrimsel Bir Model

Aras YOLUSEVER[1]

Araştırma Makalesi
Makale Geçmişi
Başvuru Tarihi: 30.09.2024
Kabul Tarihi: 24.08.2025

Research Article
Article History
Date of Application: 30.09.2024
Acceptance Date: 24.08.2025

Abstract

In today's fast-paced tech world, understanding investment strategies is crucial for driving innovation and gaining a competitive edge. This article explores how organizations integrate technological advancements using evolutionary game theory, which analyzes strategies in competitive environments. Key concepts include the evolutionarily stable strategy (ESS) and replicator dynamics, emphasizing the importance of adopting new investment strategies and staying updated on technology. The article provides a summary of the existing literature on this topic and focuses on establishing the fundamental model and acknowledging the presence of two core strategies. The study also attempts to identify the existence of an evolutionary stationary strategy. The results of the study reveal that trust in technological development, conformity, and the social and legal order are the primary driving forces behind comprehensive integration.

Keywords: Evolutionary Game Theory, Replicator Dynamics, Technological Development, Innovation, Evolutionary Stability

JEL Codes: C02, C70, D00, D21

Özet

Günümüzün hızlı tempolu teknoloji dünyasında, yatırım stratejilerini anlamak yeniliği teşvik etmek ve rekabet avantajı elde etmek açısından son derece önemlidir. Bu makale, rekabetçi ortamlardaki stratejileri analiz eden evrimsel oyun teorisini kullanarak, organizasyonların teknolojik gelişmeleri süreçlere nasıl entegre ettiklerini incelemektedir. Çalışmanın temel kavramları olan evrimsel kararlı strateji (ESS) ve çoğaltıcı dinamik, yeni yatırım stratejilerinin benimsenmesinin ve teknolojiye ayak uydurmanın önemine vurgu yapmaktadır. Makale, bu konudaki literatürün bir özetini sunmakta ve temel modeli ortaya koymaya, ayrıca iki temel stratejinin varlığını ele almaya odaklanmaktadır. Çalışma ayrıca, evrimsel bir durağan stratejinin varlığını belirlemeye de çalışmaktadır. Çalışmanın sonuçları teknolojik gelişime duyulan güvenin, konformizmin ve sosyal ve hukuki düzenin kapsamlı bir entegrasyonun birincil itici gücü olduğunu ortaya koymaktadır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Evrimsel Oyun Teorisi, Replikatör Dinamikleri, Teknolojik Gelişim, İnovasyon, Evrimsel Durağan Denge

JEL Kodları: C02, C70, D00,

[1] PhD, Istanbul Kültür University, Faculty of Economics and Administrative Sciences, Department of Economics, Istanbul, Türkiye. a.yolusever@iku.edu.tr , https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9810-2571

1.Introduction

Investors operating in highly volatile financial markets need to adopt new investment strategies to deal with the complexity of the markets. New strategies have been increasingly used recently. Developments in behavioral finance increase the diversity of these strategies. These new strategies differ from traditional investment methods. Adaptive strategies that integrate quantitative and qualitative analysis more comprehensively stand out. These new strategies are becoming more applicable with the advancement of technology.

The impact of technology on daily life continues to increase. Therefore, it is important to examine its effects on investment strategies because investments are made not only at the individual level but also at the corporate level. In this respect, as an important actor of economic development, enterprises can integrate technological innovations into their investment strategies to produce high-value-added products and gain a competitive advantage. This integration may involve the exogenous inclusion of technological developments or the direct endogenous acceptance of technological developments and separate investment for technological development.

Technological development offers enterprises varied advantages. These include reduced transaction costs, improved product quality, production of higher-quality products at lower costs, efficiency in resource allocation, reduced inventory costs, improved operational decision-making efficiency, and enhanced corporate reputation.

On the other hand, there is a need to investigate the barriers that prevent enterprises from integrating technological developments. These barriers may stem not only from internal factors but also from legal regulations, economic conjuncture and political developments. In this respect, patent rights, industrial property, insufficient government incentives, or global tension stand out as important obstacles. All these problems reduce the potential of enterprises to make new investments.

The main research question of this study can be stated as

“How do firms integrate technological developments and what conditions lead to the emergence of evolutionarily stable equilibria?”.

Based on the literature and the proposed evolutionary model, the following hypotheses are examined:

- Firms that integrate technological advancements into their investment strategies will achieve higher evolutionary stability in the long run compared to firms that do not.
- If a society holds the belief that technological investment yields long-term benefits, then technological investment will not diminish even when there is a return advantage for enterprises that do not invest in technology.
- A positive segmentation that encourages investments in technological exploration can lead to increased interaction among these firms, thus diminishing the positive external effects on imitating firms and impacting their frequency.
- The presence of imitation strategies within a population reduces the overall equilibrium level of innovation investment unless segmentation (e.g., IP protection, R&D incentives) is sufficiently strong.

- As conformity within an industry increases, the influence of payoff differences on strategy selection diminishes, leading to a more stable but potentially less efficient technological equilibrium.

The study utilizes evolutionary game theory to answer the question. Evolutionary game theory, which emerged in the 1970s with the pioneering work of John Maynard Smith and George R. Price (Smith & Price, 1973), is now widely used in the social sciences, mathematics, and medicine. The evolutionary stationary equilibrium concept means that the equilibrium achieved is robust to small deviations. In other words, the equilibrium strategy cannot be eliminated by other strategies.

This period also stands out as a period when the basic principles of behavioral economics were integrated into evolutionary game theory. In particular, Camerer and Fehr (2002) made important studies on human altruism and analyzed social preferences (Camerer & Fehr, 2002). Alger and Weibull (2016), on the other hand, found that human behavior, which is called Homo-moralis (moral human) and acts with moral norms, is evolutionarily stable.

Technological advances in the 2010s have made the use of evolutionary game theory even broader. The theory is now used in modeling cancer treatment, developing post-pandemic teaching systems and network models (Han et al., 2020; Muñiz, et al., 2023; Bayer et al., 2021; Bauch & Bhattacharyya, 2012).

The choice of evolutionary game theory as the modeling framework for technological integration is grounded in both the nature of the problem and the limitations of alternative approaches. Traditional static models often assume fully rational agents and equilibrium conditions that remain fixed over time. However, the diffusion of technological investment is inherently dynamic: firms continually adjust their strategies in response to shifting market signals, competitors' actions, and institutional environments. Evolutionary game theory offers a natural and well-established approach for capturing such dynamics, as it enables strategies to evolve through processes of adaptation, imitation, and selection, rather than relying solely on the assumption of instantaneous optimization.

Moreover, technological integration decisions are rarely made in isolation. Firms are embedded in networks where social learning, conformity, and local interactions significantly influence behavior. Evolutionary models explicitly incorporate these features through mechanisms such as replicator dynamics, which describe how the prevalence of strategies changes over time based on their relative success. This framework enables the analysis of how certain behaviors—such as persistent investment despite uncertainty—can become evolutionarily stable strategies (ESS) and how market segmentation or conformity can influence the path toward or away from innovation. In summary, evolutionary game theory is particularly well-suited for modeling technological integration because it captures the adaptive, path-dependent, and socially embedded nature of firm decision-making.

The paper will emphasize the importance of adopting innovative investment strategies and following technological developments, present a systematic literature review, develop an evolutionary game theoretical model with two basic strategies and search for the existence of evolutionary stationary equilibrium.

2. The Importance of Adopting the Technological Progress

The pace of technological advancement in the corporate environment has increased dramatically. As a result, enterprises design new processes that will increase their operational efficiency. It is essential for enterprises to keep up with technological developments to stay ahead of the curve and gain competitive advantage. Here, the importance of keeping up with the technological revolution will be discussed.

As enterprises strive to remain competitive in the corporate competitive environment, they integrate complex systems, streamline operational decisions, increase efficiency and achieve cost savings. For instance, enterprises that adopt automation technologies can reduce the completion time of routine transactions and thus provide a faster service for their customers.

Performing routine tasks with automation systems has led to significant increases in productivity. Employees can engage in creative and high-value-added activities by automating repetitive processes. Technologies such as cloud computing, big data analytics, and artificial intelligence are the main factors influencing this transformation. These technologies help employees with instant access to large databases, strategic planning, and analysis. Making strategic decisions quickly ensures that opportunities are not missed.

Moreover, today's consumption behavior is emerging through the technology channel. E-commerce platforms, interactive chatbots and mobile applications stand out as attractive for consumers. These tools provide instant support, increase customer satisfaction and facilitate access to products and services. In addition, the feedback obtained through these technologies helps enterprises to improve their services. Acting in line with customer expectations is no longer an extra advantage; it has become a corporate imperative. Enterprises that fail to adapt to these changing demands risk losing market share to competitors that use technology more effectively.

In this era of dizzying technological advancement, adaptability and agility have become essential qualities for organizations. Enterprises need to invest in innovative solutions that not only meet today's challenges but also ensure their future success. Continuous investment in new technologies prevents becoming obsolete and enables companies to proactively adapt to market changes. The competitiveness of enterprises that cannot keep up with technological developments is decreasing. For this reason, being open to change encourages innovation culture for the long-term sustainable success of the enterprises.

In summary, it is essential to integrate technological developments into corporate operations. This integration provides many benefits such as competitive advantage, increased efficiency and enrichment of customer experience. Enterprises need to ensure this integration to survive in the digitalizing ecosystem. Therefore, digital transformation should be at the center of their operational processes. Moreover, innovative thinking should transform the corporate structure as a culture.

The market leaders of the future will be those who succeed in internalizing this technological transformation. Enterprises that complete their investments by considering the changing corporate structure will strengthen their market position with the competitive advantage they gain, establish deeper relationships with their customers, changing corporate structure will strengthen their market position with the competitive advantage they gain, establish deeper relationships with their customers, and ensure their long-term growth in an economic environment full of uncertainties. (Baden-Fuller & Haefliger, 2013).

2.1 Literature Review

Recent research have extensively analyzed the influence of technological advancements on enterprises. Huff and Munro (1985) provide a comprehensive definition of information technology, encompassing a range of technologies involved in processing and managing information, such as computer hardware, software, telecommunications, and office information systems. As stated by Keen (1991), IT has transitioned from its traditional supportive role to become a key component of enterprise strategies. The fundamental concept of IT now revolves around using technology to attain sustainable competitive advantages and to support an organization's competitive strategy.

Windrum and Berranger's (2002) study focused on the primary factors influencing firms' adoption of Internet and e-trade technology. These factors were identified as network externalities and endogenous factors. The timing of technological investments is critical for enhancing productivity and should be approached strategically. Early investments enable enterprises to gain a competitive advantage by leveraging network externalities. This is consistent with Rogers' (2003) diffusion of innovation theory, which underscores the critical influence of early adopters in shaping the dynamics of technology adoption and market behavior.

Drew (2003) conducted a study on the impact of technological developments and advances on various enterprises in the United Kingdom. The study found that high-tech and knowledge-oriented firms are more willing to integrate technological developments. The study also found that enterprises of all sizes and structures have incorporated the transformative impact of e-commerce into their strategic planning and that Internet technology plays a central role in their growth strategies (Drew, 2003).

In a study conducted in Nigeria - a developing country - in 2004, Aruwa examined the contribution of enterprises to regional development and sustainable economic growth. The research emphasized that the development and adoption of indigenous technologies is of great importance in achieving long-term development. Aruwa argued that the effective utilization of indigenous knowledge and innovations is a critical element for economic development and the sustainable future of the country (Aruwa, 2004).

The study conducted in Finland by Jalava et al., in 2005 analyzed the effects of Information and Communication Technologies (ICT) on the volume of production and labor productivity. The study showed that ICT advances, especially since the 1990s, have significantly increased labor productivity and economic growth and that these developments have strengthened the competitive advantage of enterprises in the international arena (Jalava et al., 2015).

Another study conducted by Chen (2006) in China evaluated the historical development and current situation of enterprises in the country in detail. Chen argued that firms need to be supported to establish and maintain the industrial structure and emphasized the importance of the state taking an active role in this process. He also emphasized the need to integrate state support into policy instruments to encourage the internalization of technological progress.

Finally, Liu (2008) stated that the decisive factor in the success of enterprises in the global competitive environment is their capacity to create innovation and their ability to implement technological developments. It is recommended that local governments establish a financing and innovation framework to facilitate the integration of technological advancements into the structure of small and medium-sized enterprises. Suggestions include allocating a dedicated state budget for firms, tax incentives, establishing SME development funds, and providing special innovation funds for technology-based enterprises.

Pipitone's (2009) study thoroughly analyzed the relationship between technological development, enterprise performance, and economic growth using the total factor productivity method. Research findings reveal that the impact of physical capital and technological advances on the performance of enterprises and economic growth is more decisive than that of human capital. In particular, total factor productivity, which is driven by technological advances, stands out as a key factor in achieving high growth rates. This conclusion is in line with Arrow's (1962) view that learning by experience and accumulation of knowledge play a key role in increasing productivity over time.

De Vrande and De Jong (2009) conducted an analysis of a database comprising 605 innovative companies in the Netherlands. They focused on two key technological innovation components: technology utilization (exploitation) and technology discovery. Technology utilization refers to the ability of firms to leverage the initiatives and knowledge of their non-R&D employees to derive benefits, thereby enhancing their existing technological capacity. On the other hand, technology discovery involves engaging customers in the innovation process to gain insights into product modifications and acquire knowledge related to technological advancements, ultimately leading to improvements in product quality and design. This process encourages companies to pursue product technology research, leading to the acquisition of valuable technological discoveries that can confer a competitive advantage and support sustainable growth.

Daude and Fernandez-Arias (2010) highlighted the significance of technological advancements. They attributed the failure of firms in developing countries, as opposed to those in developed countries, to inadequate human capital, limited technological progress, and financial constraints. These challenges hinder the possibility of achieving uniform enterprises success across different countries.

Teece (2010) emphasized the pivotal role of firms in driving innovation and technological advancement. The traditional large industrial research facilities have been replaced by more dispersed sources of technology, placing greater emphasis on managers' coordination skills. Dynamic capabilities encompass the skills, processes, organizational structures, and decision-making frameworks that firms employ to generate and exploit value. Managers must possess the ability to identify opportunities, develop suitable enterprise models, and adapt their organizations and industries to evolving enterprise environments and technological landscapes. The key players in this context are experts (both literary and numerate) whose effective management necessitates minimal hierarchical constraints, flexible teams, and performance-driven incentives. The dynamic capabilities articulated in Nelson and Winter's (1985) framework are fundamental to understanding firm behavior, which they conceptualize as evolving routines influenced by processes of innovation and natural selection.

To adequately address these dynamics, the theory of the firm should be expanded to encompass both opportunity and opportunism, coordination within and outside the firm, variations in capabilities among firms, and the frequent advantage of firms over markets in creating, transferring, and safeguarding intangible assets. Furthermore, the concepts of complementarities and specialization are proposed as significant elements in a theory of innovative enterprises that realize superior returns.

Baden-Fuller and Haefliger (2013) developed a model that includes knowing customers, interacting with customers, ensuring customer satisfaction and turning positive opinions into revenue. This model reveals the causal relationship between interconnected parts. The authors also noted the bidirectional relationship between technology and the enterprise model. The first aspect of this relationship is that enterprise models act as a bridge between technology and enterprise performance. The second aspect is that the selection and implementation of technology is a strategic decision for the enterprise model, especially in the context of openness and user involvement. The study raises new research questions in technology management, innovation, and strategy.

Herliana (2015), Bayarçelik et al. (2016), and Bonito and Pais (2018) show that participating in technological innovation processes facilitates enterprises to gain a lasting competitive advantage and can increase market stability by adapting to rapid technological changes with shorter production cycles. Technological innovation is an important tool for increasing productivity, using resources (primarily labor and capital) more efficiently, mitigating growth-limiting effects such as diminishing marginal returns, and raising economic output. In this context, technological progress is made effectively in realizing innovation through social networks, unlimited access to information (e.g., the internet), and integrating industrial machinery into production processes.

In the study conducted by Hau (2016) in South Korea, an innovation-oriented model was developed in the light of data obtained from 2000 firms. The model results show that the technological network diversity of firms has a strong and positive effect on the commercialization of technological developments. The research emphasizes that the diversity of enterprises external knowledge networks plays a decisive role in increasing their technological impact and adapting and utilizing these technologies to the domestic market.

Almeida and Terra (2018) analyzed the technological strategies and sustainable management practices followed by small enterprises operating in Brazil's biotechnology, pharmaceutical, petroleum, and shipbuilding sectors. The study aims to show these enterprises structures, their preferred investment instruments, their partnerships, and the importance they attach to sustainable economies as important actors in their decision-making processes. The findings show that innovation has a substantial impact on enterprises development and that this impact is influenced by many factors, such as the institutional environment, the structural characteristics of the sector, sustainability management, and the enterprises network created.

Drejeris and Oželienė (2019) sought to gain a deeper understanding of the structure of this concept by focusing on the relationship between different dimensions of sustainability. By comparing various academic views, their research aimed to identify the most critical knowledge related to sustainable technology, explain the relationships between the technological dimension and other sustainability elements, evaluate the technological processes of enterprise products in terms of sustainability, and draw attention to the importance of technology in sustainable practices. The article concluded that sustainable development comprises a technological dimension alongside the four traditional dimensions, and it plays a pivotal role in shaping the content of other sustainability components.

In a study by Haseeb et al. (2019), the social and technological barriers faced by small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs) in Malaysia in achieving sustainable competitiveness and enterprises performance were addressed. Five hundred managers were contacted via e-mail, and data were collected using simple random sampling. The results reveal that strategic adaptive behavior plays a decisive role in integrating technological developments.

Prasanna et al. (2019) examined the relationship between technology and sustainable growth in small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs). Based on the predictions of Romer (1986), they emphasized that technological innovations are one of the main factors that enable these enterprises to grow. It was revealed that financing allocated to R&D is of great importance in determining the growth direction of enterprises. The study also emphasized the innovative contributions of SMEs to the economy. It stated that technological advances are essential for these enterprises to compete in the global market and survive in the long run.

Khuan et al. (2023) conducted a bibliometric analysis to assess the effects of technology on innovation and growth in startups. A systematic review of academic publications identified the main trends, important research topics, and influential studies in this field. The analysis used co-citation relationships, author and institution maps, journal analysis, and keyword clusters. The study highlights the importance of open innovation, digital transformation, and disruptive innovation and reveals the multifaceted relationship between technology and startup success.

Shahadat et al. (2023) investigated the effects of environmental and organizational factors on the digital technology adoption process of SMEs in developing countries. In the study, a new theoretical framework was developed under the title of "technology-organization-environment", with particular emphasis on the internalization of digital technologies and the diffusion process of innovations. Data was gathered through a structured questionnaire administered to a purposive sample of 535 top and middle managers from SME firms and subsequently analyzed. The findings indicate that factors such as relative competitive advantage, institutionalization, observability, accurate cost analysis, top management support, top management innovation, competitive pressure, and government support are critical determinants of ICT adoption in SMEs.

In addition to these applied studies, theoretical research in evolutionary economics and game theory offers a solid foundation for modeling strategic behavior in innovation. Nelson and Winter (1985) highlight the importance of firm heterogeneity and the evolution of capabilities, while Young (1998) examines how institutional norms and social learning influence strategy selection. These insights support the application of replicator dynamics and conformist behavior modeling in making decisions related to enterprise innovation.

The research cited demonstrates that companies can gain a competitive edge and achieve sustainable growth by embracing technological advancements. Developed countries possess a human capital advantage that increases the likelihood of technological innovations. In contrast, developing nations primarily receive technological advancements externally. However, challenges such as insufficient government support, legal frameworks, organizational issues, lack of institutionalization, and environmental factors can escalate the costs associated with the technology transfer process. Consequently, firms may struggle to keep up with technological progress.

In conclusion, while the majority of the literature emphasizes the positive relationship between technological integration and firm performance, opposing views highlight that such integration is not universally beneficial. Some studies argue that over-investment in technology without complementary capabilities can lead to resource misallocation or technological lock-in (Windrum & Berranger, 2002). Furthermore, the effectiveness of integration strategies varies across economic contexts. In developed economies, strong institutional frameworks, advanced R&D ecosystems, and mature markets facilitate the translation of technological investments into competitive advantage (Teece, 2010; Almeida & Terra, 2018). In contrast, firms in developing countries often encounter structural barriers, such as limited human capital, weak intellectual property protections, and volatile policy environments, which can constrain the expected gains from innovation (Aruwa, 2004; Haseeb et al., 2019). A critical assessment of these differing contexts highlights that the dynamics of replicators and the emergence of evolutionary equilibria are highly sensitive to the institutional and economic environment.

3. Main Model

Assuming that the ρ is the fraction that invests for technological development (strategy i) and and that the enterprises are return-oriented, the stationary condition can be written as $\pi_{i(\rho)} = \pi_{y(z)}$. When the fraction ρ chooses strategy i, the expected returns of strategies a and b will be $\pi_{i(\rho)}$ and $\pi_{y(z)}$respectively. Here strategy y shows insensitivity to technological development for political, economic or other important reasons. This fraction denotes as $z, (\rho + z = 1)$.

The decisions made by enterprises can be influenced by various factors, including the current political and legal landscape, the long-term goals of senior management, and the responsiveness to technological advancements. In such instances, companies might choose not to pursue investments, even if those investments are projected to yield positive returns. The behavior described above in the model will be represented by conformism $(\mathrm{K}, \mathrm{K} \in [0,1))$. As the level of conformism increases, firms will increasingly take into account other firms' strategies and general market conditions rather than focusing solely on returns.

Investing in any opportunity carries inherent risks, and this is especially true in the realm of technological investments. When considering the right timing and investment platform, firms must weigh potential risks against the anticipated benefits. Enterprises must make rational and informed decisions on how to use their resources when investing, as these decisions can have decisive effects on aggregate productivity. In a model explaining investment behavior, the symbol χ represents the proportion of firms that continue to invest even in the face of high risks and possible financial losses. Such stable firms do not stop investing despite uncertainty in returns. In this scenario, evolutionary multiplicative dynamics can be formulated.

To make the theoretical framework more accessible to readers outside the field of economics, it is essential to connect the model's parameters to practical, real-world phenomena. Each symbol in the model represents a tangible aspect of enterprise decision-making and industry dynamics.

- $\rho =$ This variable (the fraction that invests for technological development) captures the overall level of commitment to technological advancement within a given market or industry. For example, if $\rho = 0{,}7$, this indicates that 70% of firms have adopted a strategy of allocating resources to technological innovation, while the remaining 30% rely on existing methods or avoid investment due to risk considerations or regulatory constraints. A rising ρ over time reflects increasing market confidence in technological development.
- $\pi_{i(\rho)}$ and $\pi_{y(z)} =$ These payoffs measure the average financial or operational outcomes associated with each strategic choice. Strategy i represents active technological investment, while strategy y represents non-investment or a more conservative approach. If $\pi_{i(\rho)} > \pi_{y(z)}$, then firms investing in technology are expected to enjoy higher profits, lower production costs, or enhanced market share. Conversely, if $\pi_{i(\rho)} < \pi_{y(z)}$ firms may perceive technology adoption as too costly or risky in the short run.
- $\mathrm{K} =$ Not all firms base their decisions solely on financial calculus. The parameter K represents the weight of conformity, meaning the extent to which firms

imitate others in their industry. A high K (high conformism) implies that firms are highly sensitive to prevailing norms—adopting technology because "everyone else is doing it," or refraining from adoption because their peers have not yet taken that step. For example, in tightly networked sectors such as automotive supply chains, conformity can significantly delay or accelerate the diffusion of innovations. In empirical terms, **conformism** refers to the tendency of firms to align their strategic decisions—such as investment in technological development—not solely with their own expected payoffs but with the observed behavior of other firms in the same environment. It is measured by the degree to which a firm's actions are explained by prevailing industry norms or peer behavior rather than by independent cost–benefit analysis. In practice, conformism can be identified when a statistically significant portion of firms adopt or abandon an innovation after observing similar moves by competitors, even when controlling for their own financial indicators. For example, empirical studies detect conformism when regression analyses show that a firm's probability of investing in R&D is strongly and positively associated with the proportion of peer firms that have already done so, independent of that firm's internal profitability metrics (Bikhchandani et al., 1992). Thus, conformism operationalizes the idea that firms are socially embedded decision-makers: their strategies are not shaped in isolation but are influenced by the collective behavior within their network or industry. This behavioral parameter is critical in evolutionary models because it can amplify or dampen the diffusion of technological investments regardless of direct economic incentives.

- $\chi =$ In the model, χ captures the proportion of firms that maintain their technological investment strategies even under difficult circumstances. These firms continue to allocate resources to innovation despite facing high risks, periods of low profitability, or uncertainty about future returns. Rather than reacting immediately to short-term market signals, they exhibit a form of strategic persistence, trusting that their investments will generate long-term advantages such as stronger market positions, unique capabilities, or barriers to entry for competitors. From a behavioral standpoint, firms represented by χ tend to be long-term oriented and resilient. They are not driven solely by immediate payoffs; instead, they invest based on a vision of future growth and technological leadership. This persistence often stems from factors such as established R&D infrastructures, organizational cultures that value innovation, or expectations of future regulatory and market changes that will reward early adopters. Even when returns fluctuate, these firms sustain their commitment, serving as stabilizers in the broader population of enterprises. In practical terms, a high χ reflects industries or regions where firms are willing to absorb temporary setbacks to sustain innovation. It indicates environments in which trust in technological development and institutional support is strong enough to maintain investment even during downturns. Conversely, a low χ suggests a fragile system where most firms quickly abandon innovation when conditions worsen, making technological progress more vulnerable to economic cycles or shocks.

3.1 Replicator Dynamics

Replicator dynamics is one of the basic building blocks of evolutionary game theory, which mathematically expresses how the distribution of strategies in a population changes over time and how this change is shaped by the relative success of the strategies. This approach helps to understand how strategies evolve in competitive systems and how this evolution affects population structure.

In this theoretical framework, individuals adopt a variety of strategies, and interactions with other individuals determine the success of these strategies. Replicator dynamics shows which direction individuals prefer will evolve and which strategies will spread or decline based on their payoffs.

This dynamic structure is a powerful model that allows us to study evolutionary processes based on the success of strategies. Thanks to its wide range of applications, it provides a theoretical basis for research in many disciplines and explains the mechanisms behind strategy change.

Replicators can be written as follows

$$r_{(\rho)} = [K(\chi) + (1-K)(\pi_{i(\rho)} - \pi_{y(z)})] \quad (1)$$

$$r_{(z)} = \left[(1-K)(\pi_{y(z)} - \pi_{i(\rho)})\right] \quad (2)$$

The technological investment rate of the population is determined by the frequency of replicators 1 and 2. The first faction must possess significant dominance over the other to adopt a new technology. This dominant faction will influence the acceptance and integration of the technology within the relevant industry or community. So, we must write a new equation as below

$$r_{(\rho)}{}' = K(\chi) + (1-K)\big(\pi_{i(\rho)} - \pi_{y(z)}\big) \; (3)$$

Under these conditions the replicator can be dynamically generated.

$$\rho^{t+1} = p^t + \delta p(1-p) r'_{(\rho)} \; (4)$$

$$\rho^{t+1} - p^t = \Delta\rho = \delta p(1-p) r'_{(\rho)} \; (4.1)$$

The replicator dynamics 4.1 can be read as follows. An organization that invests in technology during period t will continue to do so in period t + 1 if the $r'_{(\rho)} \geq 0$. Note that if $r'_{(\rho)} = 0$ than $\rho^{t+1} = p^t \in [0,1]$. Conversely, an organization that decides not to invest in period t will change its strategy with a probability of $\delta p(1-p)$ and commence investing in technology in period $t+1$ if the $r'_{(\rho)} > 0$. Here, the fraction $\delta \in [0,1]$ indicates enterprises that are ready to change strategy.

Enterprises financial performance is commonly assessed through their balance sheets and income statements. Peer evaluation is instrumental in gauging company performance, while independent research organizations produce sector-specific performance reports. The impact of technological investments on financial success is widely documented and easily accessible. As can be easily seen, when conformism is in full effect and with this effect, enterprises that continue to invest in technology under all circumstances dominate the population $\rho = \chi = 1$. In this scenario, a stable equilibrium state is reached, causing the replicator dynamics to cease ($\rho^{t+1} - p^t = 0$).

Other points that prevent the replicator dynamics from working, in other words, which can be characterized as equilibrium, are as follows.

- $\delta = 0$
- $p = 1,0$

- $r'_{(\rho)} = 0$

The first of these scenarios involves situations in which enterprises are not willing to alter their strategies. In such cases, the significance of payoff differentials or the power of conformism diminishes, leading to the termination of the game without any impact from the replicator dynamic. In one another scenario, every single enterprise in the population made the choice to either invest in technology or not invest at all. In both situations, all the enterprises were captured, and the replicator didn't function dynamically. The final enterprises state, denoted as $r'_{(\rho)} = 0$, occurs for several reasons. One example is complete conformism, in which no institution invests in all circumstances. When there is no conformism and the focus is on returns, equilibrium is reached by equalizing the financial returns of both strategies.

The most general condition for equilibrium can be expressed as follows.

$$\frac{K(\chi)}{1-K} = \left(\pi_{y(z)-}\pi_{i(\rho)}\right) \quad (5)$$

The equilibrium χ mentioned in the text represents an evolutionary stationary equilibrium. This evolutionary stationary χ is a balance between the influences of conformism and the effect of the return differential. For instance, if a society holds the belief that technological investment yields long-term benefits, then technological investment will not diminish even when there is a return advantage for enterprises that do not invest in technology. This equilibrium reflects the interplay between societal attitudes towards technological investment and the economic incentives associated with it. This will be discussed in more detail in the last section.

3.2 R&D and Imitation

In the preceding section, the analysis operated under the assumption that enterprise relationships between enterprises were random. Nonetheless, it is conceivable that enterprises have more frequent relationships, possibly due to similarities in their respective sectors or enterprise approaches. Consequently, there may be a need to modify the matching mechanism within the model to account for these non-random relationships.

In our study, we emphasize the critical role of technological initiatives and investments in driving competitive advantages and higher returns on investment for companies. Firms that in developed countries prioritize the discovery and development of new technologies over simply keeping up with advancements. This strategic focus has revealed that countries excelling in technology discovery gain a substantial competitive edge in the global market.

Technological development typically demands substantial upfront investments before any tangible returns can be realized. These investments encompass a wide spectrum of expenditures, including the recruitment and retention of specialized research teams, the establishment and maintenance of advanced laboratories, the acquisition of cutting-edge equipment, and the iterative processes of prototyping and product testing. Such commitments are not merely financial; they also involve allocating time, managerial attention, and organizational resources toward uncertain innovation pathways. Firms pursuing this route often operate with a long-term perspective, recognizing that the costs incurred in the early stages are essential for securing future competitive advantages, intellectual property, and market differentiation.

In contrast, firms that adopt an imitation strategy often avoid many of these initial expenses, as they rely on replicating or adapting technologies that have already been developed and validated by others. While this approach can offer cost savings and reduce the risks associated with unproven innovations, it comes with its own set of challenges. Imitative firms are typically dependent on the timing of knowledge spillovers and may face delays in accessing the latest technological breakthroughs. Furthermore, the knowledge they acquire is often incomplete or fragmented, limiting their ability to fully replicate the performance or efficiency of the original innovators. Legal and institutional barriers, such as intellectual property protections, patents, and trade secrets, can further constrain their capacity to imitate effectively, potentially leading to litigation risks or the need to negotiate costly licensing agreements. As a result, while imitation may appear to be a less resource-intensive strategy in the short term, its vulnerabilities can hinder long-term sustainability and limit the firm's ability to shape technological trajectories proactively.

Hence, in the upcoming model, we will again be implementing two primary strategies. Enterprises aiming to drive technological advancement (strategy a, implemented by fraction x) allocate resources towards research and development, incurring a specific cost to achieve technological progress. In this scenario, let's assume that the cost of research and development is 1 unit, and the return upon attaining technological breakthrough is 2 units. Enterprises that make technological advancements can generate returns that surpass the initial cost of the technological investment. By embracing and implementing technological progress, enterprises can gain a competitive edge and enhance their overall performance.

A second strategic approach that we will be considering is imitation. When a firm adopts an imitation strategy (strategy b, implemented by fraction e), it does not have to incur additional costs. Instead, it can generate returns by imitating technologically advanced enterprises. Imitators can gain a competitive advantage by strategically imitating others' innovations at the right time. Despite allocating a smaller budget for research and development (R&D) than innovative enterprises, imitators can effectively position themselves as formidable competitors by making well-timed and strategic moves.

When two companies collaborate on an investment, they can achieve a mutual return of $2 - \alpha(\alpha > 1)$. In this scenario, the symbol α represents the expenses associated with adapting to technological advancements, responding to environmental fluctuations, and managing uncertainty. This joint investment allows both enterprises to share the costs and benefits of addressing these factors.

The probability of the fraction x, representing firms in agreement about the necessity of technological investment, interacting with a successful firm keeping pace with technological developments, is given by the equation $\varphi + (1 - \varphi)x > x$. Similarly, the probability of the fraction of firms favoring non-technology due to short-run return disadvantage or exogenous reasons being matched with a firm making technological investments can be expressed as $(1 - \varphi)x < x$.

The difference between these two probabilities, denoted by $\varphi \in [0,1]$, is referred to as the segmentation (homogenization) coefficient. φ captures how clustered or separated firms are in terms of their technological behavior. When segmentation is high, firms that invest in technology are more likely to interact, trade, or form networks with other technology-investing firms, creating a relatively homogeneous subgroup. Conversely, low segmentation implies a more mixed environment in which investors and non-investors frequently interact and influence one another (Vega-Redondo, 2007).

Empirically, this coefficient can be interpreted as an index of market structure or network configuration. For example, in regions with specialized industrial clusters—such as Silicon Valley in the United States or the Shenzhen technology cluster in China—firms often engage with partners, suppliers, and competitors who also prioritize technological development. In such settings, the segmentation coefficient would be high because interactions overwhelmingly occur within a homogeneous set of innovation-oriented firms (Porter, 1998). In contrast, in markets where innovative firms are dispersed among many conservative or resource-constrained firms, interactions are more random and cross-cutting, resulting in a low segmentation coefficient.

The practical implications of this parameter are also significant. A high segmentation coefficient can strengthen the diffusion of innovation within the cluster by allowing specialized knowledge to circulate rapidly and by reducing the influence of non-investing firms (Breschi & Malerba, 2001). However, this same segmentation can also limit broader knowledge spillovers to the rest of the economy. Firms outside these clusters may find it more challenging to access frontier knowledge, and imitation strategies may become less effective due to restricted information flows. In contrast, low segmentation encourages more diverse interactions, which can facilitate the spread of new ideas across the entire population but may dilute the intensity of innovation within any one subgroup.

Lastly, in evolutionary modeling terms, the segmentation coefficient directly affects equilibrium outcomes. When segmentation is high, the replicator dynamics show a tendency toward stable clusters of innovation, as firms interact primarily with peers that reinforce similar strategies. When segmentation is low, equilibrium points are influenced more by the broader payoff landscape, and imitation or mixed strategies can spread more easily.

The general equilibrium condition of the updated model can be written as follows.

$$x^* = {\alpha - 1}/{(1-\varphi)\alpha} \quad (6)$$

As can be easily seen, ${\partial x^*}/{\partial \alpha} > 0$ is obtained. In keeping with expectations, companies that imitate or produce imitations are forgoing this approach due to rising costs and greater environmental uncertainty. Conversely, the quantity of technological innovators will rise in an atmosphere where imitation expenses and environmental uncertainties mount. The escalating environmental uncertainties create challenges for enterprises in pinpointing their customer base. Therefore, it is crucial to ascertain the customer structure accurately through research and development expenditures.

Moreover, ${\partial x^*}/{\partial \varphi} > 0$ is obtained. Higher levels of segmentation can raise the equilibrium point for firms that are making investments in technology. A positive segmentation that encourages investments in technological exploration can lead to increased interaction among these firms, thus diminishing the positive external effects on imitating firms and impacting their frequency. Key factors of positive segmentation may involve enhanced protection of copyright and intellectual property rights, government incentives, and tax benefits. Nevertheless, an increase in positive segmentation might potentially lower productivity and average returns. This could result in a slower flow of information from technological explorers to imitators, as well as challenges in accessing current information, ultimately reducing the effectiveness of imitators and firms looking to capitalize on existing information before investing in exploration.

The following section will present a more comprehensive analysis.

3.3 Evolutionary Points

Asymptotic stationarity refers to a state where a system tends towards equilibrium over time. In the context of evolutionary dynamics, this means that an evolutionary equilibrium is attainable. When the system is in this state, small deviations from the equilibrium point are not permanent and the system returns to the old equilibrium point due to corrective effects. This property implies that mutant strategies are unable to permanently eliminate this equilibrium, as the system tends to return to its former point. The necessary condition for asymptotic stationarity is ${\partial \Delta \rho}/{\partial \rho} < 0$.

$$ {\partial \Delta \rho}/{\partial \rho} = \delta r'_{(\rho)} \varphi (1 - 2p) \quad (7) $$

The scenarios required to meet this condition can be summarized. First, let us to examine two extreme cases. In the first case $p = 1$. This is an extreme equilibrium. Throught which we get

$$ {\partial \Delta \rho}/{\partial \rho} = -\delta r'_{(\rho)} \varphi \quad (8) $$

The state of equilibrium is evolutionary stationary when all enterprises within the population allocate their resources towards technological advancements. This is achieved when companies that invest in technology experience a competitive advantage, or when the majority of enterprises in the population prioritize technological investment under all circumstances, thus dominating the fully conformist case. In a payoff-oriented game ($i.e.\ K = 0$), if the entire population invests in technology ($p = 1$) but does not realize the expected payoff difference $\left(\pi_{i(\rho)} - \pi_{y(z)} \right)$, the equilibrium where the entire population prefers technological investment is not evolutionarily stable and can be overtaken by another strategy, such as not investing in technology.

The same analysis can be applied to another extreme equilibrium, where $p = 0$. The population will stay in a state of equilibrium if none of the enterprises within it decide to make any technological investments and if the current returns are deemed satisfactory. Alternatively, the equilibrium can be sustained if the market is largely dominated by enterprises that either have no intention of investing in technology or are unable to do so due to external factors such as conformism, political and legal issues, or other constraints.

Other balances are $\delta = 0$, $\varphi = 0$, $r'_{(\rho)} = 0$ and $p = \frac{1}{2}$. The stationarity condition is not met by any of these equilibria. If there is a minor adjustment in the relevant parameters and variables in the next period, it will set off a cumulative process, guiding the system towards new equilibrium points. The most general condition for stationarity can be written as follows.

- If $p < \frac{1}{2}$, $K(\chi) > \left[(1 - K)\left(\pi_{i(\rho)} - \pi_{y(z)} \right) \right]$
- If $p > \frac{1}{2}$, $K(\chi) < \left[(1 - K)\left(\pi_{i(\rho)} - \pi_{y(z)} \right) \right]$

Adaptive pressure can lead to the persistence and resilience of low-return strategies within a population. This suggests that population structure may be influenced by the motivation to adapt rather than by material returns. The persistence of low-return strategies despite the presence of return-dominant strategies is attributed to the inability of the latter to eliminate the former. As a result, low-return strategies can continue to exist for extended periods.

Upon analyzing the contrast between random and non-random (endogenous) preferences, we arrive at the following inequality.

$$x^* < p^{max} \quad (9)$$

In equilibrium-level random matches, there is a greater presence of companies involved in technological exploration and investment. This is since imitating companies benefit from positive externalities. The insights and knowledge gained by firms that invest in technological discovery are shared with imitating enterprises through their interactions, allowing the spread of valuable information within the business ecosystem.

4. Conclusion and Discussion

This research reveals that an evolutionary balance can emerge through the interaction between conformity and returns in the decision-making processes of enterprises. Suppose there is a strong belief in long-term technological investments in society. In that case, some firms may prefer to stick to innovation activities even if they make less profit in the short term than those who do not invest. In such environments, the trust in the long-term benefits of technology may be more effective than short-term profits, which encourages permanent investments.

In this context, it is seen that social conformity plays a decisive role. As the level of conformity increases, firms' sensitivity to return differences decreases, and enterprises tend to act by social norms rather than individual profitability analysis. This situation may cause firms to remain loyal to technology investments despite some economic, legal, or structural obstacles. On the other hand, in environments where the level of conformity is low, enterprises evaluate more based on financial returns. Nevertheless, some companies may be reluctant to switch to technology due to permanent obstacles.

The study also draws attention to the differences between innovative enterprises and imitators. While innovative companies bear the entire cost of R&D activities, imitators can benefit from these innovations and gain a competitive advantage without incurring the same costs. However, as environmental uncertainty increases and imitation costs increase, the imitation strategy loses its sustainability. In these conditions, innovation becomes both more attractive and a strategic necessity, and more firms turn to active technology production.

However, the increasing emphasis on technological developments brings about stronger collaborations among innovative firms. This may reduce the competitive advantage of imitators. This process can be encouraged by various policy instruments, especially protection of intellectual property, tax reductions and public support. However, the increase of such innovative clusters may cause the flow of knowledge and technology to be limited, which may negatively affect the overall efficiency of the system and total returns.

To solve this problem in developing or underdeveloped countries, intellectual property rights should be strengthened, state incentives should be increased, and innovation funds should be established. In addition, enterprises need to strengthen their information technology infrastructures and develop training programs on innovative leadership skills so that they can follow global technology trends. Improving the education system is also of great importance in order to increase long-term innovation capacity.

Enterprises are the basic building blocks of economic development. Increasing the skills to integrate technology into enterprises processes positively affects not only firm-level productivity, but also employment, foreign trade, financial stability, and general economic resilience. Therefore, technology-based transformation policies should be placed at the center of national development strategies, especially in developing countries.

4.1. Note on Empirical Support

This study primarily advances a theoretical contribution by developing an evolutionary game-theoretic model that explains how firms integrate technological development into their investment behavior. The model formalizes key mechanisms—such as conformity effects, segmentation structures, and the stabilizing influence of persistent investors —to shed light on the conditions under which innovation becomes evolutionarily stable.

In its current form, the study does not incorporate a detailed empirical dataset or a full case study. The main reason lies in the limited availability of consistent, longitudinal firm-level data that simultaneously capture technological investments, behavioral influences such as conformity, and structural variables like segmentation across different economic contexts. Existing data sets are often fragmented, sector-specific, or lack the necessary variables to estimate the parameters proposed in this model (Teece, 2010). Furthermore, some firm behaviors, such as the persistence of investment despite low short-term returns, are not systematically recorded in publicly available databases, which constrains immediate empirical calibration.

Nonetheless, future researchers could use panel data from innovation surveys to estimate the payoff differentials between investing and non-investing firms and to identify the proportion of persistent investors within specific industries. While such visuals and data are beyond the scope of the current paper, acknowledging this limitation and pointing to future work is essential for academic rigor. Future research should thus aim to test the model against real-world data or develop illustrative simulations that replicate the dynamics described herein. Policymakers and industry analysts could then use such validated models to design interventions—such as targeted R&D incentives, improved intellectual property frameworks, or cluster-based development strategies—that actively shape the parameters of conformity, segmentation, and persistent investment behavior.

However, there are some important empirical studies that provide evidence that is highly consistent with the mechanisms and outcomes described in the model. One key conclusion of this study is that a subset of firms continues to invest in technological development even under conditions of high risk or temporary losses, and that these persistent investors stabilize innovation within an industry. Empirical research supports this conclusion. For example, Hall and Lerner (2010) demonstrate that firms maintaining R&D expenditures over time tend to achieve superior long-term productivity growth. Similarly, Peters et al., (2017) provide evidence from German manufacturing firms showing that those who sustained innovation activities during economic downturns outperformed peers in subsequent periods. These findings align with the model's prediction that persistent investors play a crucial stabilizing role, ensuring that innovation trajectories do not collapse during adverse market conditions.

Another important theoretical insight is the role of conformity in shaping investment behavior. The model suggests that as conformity levels rise, firms become less sensitive to short-term differences in returns and more inclined to align with prevailing industry norms. Empirical studies have observed similar patterns. Bikhchandani et al., (1992) present influential evidence of herd behavior, showing that firms and investors often follow the decisions of others even when private signals suggest alternative strategies. Aghion et al. (2014) also find that trust is an important factor in increasing conformity (strengthening conformism) in firm preferences.

The model further highlights the impact of market segmentation and clustering on the diffusion of technological investment. High segmentation, as captured by the model's homogenization coefficient, indicates that firms primarily interact within a subgroup of innovators, amplifying knowledge circulation within that cluster but restricting broader spillovers. This is supported by empirical research on industrial clusters and geographic innovation hubs. Porter (1998) documents how concentrated clusters such as Silicon Valley foster intense collaboration among technology-oriented firms, while Breschi and Malerba (2001) and Audretsch and Feldman (2004) show that such clustering enhances localized knowledge spillovers and accelerates innovation cycles. These findings align closely with the model's assertion that segmentation shapes evolutionary dynamics by determining who firms interact with and learn from.

Taken together, these empirical studies provide strong indirect validation for the theoretical mechanisms developed in this article. While the current work does not include its own dataset or case study, the convergence between the model's predictions and documented patterns in innovation behavior suggests that the framework is well-grounded in observable reality. Future research can build on these insights by explicitly testing the model's parameters with firm-level data, thereby strengthening the bridge between theoretical development and empirical application.

References

Aghion, P., Bloom, N., & Reenen, J. N. (2014). Incomplete Contracts and the Internal Organizations of Firms. *The Journal of Law, Economics & Organization, 30(1),* i37-i63.

Alger, I., & Weibull, J.W. (2016). Evolution and Kantian morality. *Games and Economic Behaviour, 98,* 56–67

Almeida, M., & Terra, B. (2018). Technological strategies and sustainable management for small businesses in the Brazilian innovation context. *International Journal of Innovation and Sustainable Development, 13(1),* 20-35.

Arrow, K. J. (1962). The Economic Implications of Learning by Doing. *The Review of Economic Studies, 29(3),* 155–173.

Aruwa, S. A. (2004), Financing options for small and medium scale enterprises in Nigeria, *Nigerian Journal of Accounting Research*, 1(2), 50- 99.

Audretsch, D. B., & Feldman, M. P. (2004). Knowledge spillovers and the geography of innovation. In J. V. Henderson & J.-F. Thisse (Eds.), *Handbook of Regional and Urban Economics* (Vol. 4, pp. 2713–2739). Elsevier

Baden-Fuller, C., & Haefliger, S. (2013). Business Models and Technological Innovation. *Long Range Planning, 46(6),* 419-426.

Bauch, T., & Bhattacharyya, S. (2012). Evolutionary game theory and social learning can determine how vaccine scare unfold. *Evolutionary Game Theory and Vaccine Scares, 8(4),* Article e1002452.

Bayarcelik, E. B., Tasel, F., & Apak, S. (2016). Innovation Factors in Service Industry and Knowledge Based Economy. *Journal of Management Marketing and Logistics, 3(2),* 145-155.

Bayer, P., Brown, J.S., Dubbeldam, J., & Broom, M. (2021) *A markov chain model of cancer treatment.* bioRxiv doi: 10.1101/2021.06.16.448669

Bikhchandani, S., Hirshleifer, D., & Welch, I. (1992). A theory of fads, fashion, custom, and cultural change as informational cascades. *Journal of Political Economy, 100(5),* 992–1026.

Bonito, A., & Pais, C. (2018). The Macroeconomic Determinants of the Adoption of IFRS for SMEs. *Span. Account. Rev.,* 21, 116–127.

Breschi, S., & Malerba, F. (2001). The geography of innovation and economic clustering: some introductory notes. *Industrial and Corporate Change, 10(4),* 817–833.

Camerer, C. F., & and Fehr, E. (2002). *Measuring social norms and preferences using experimental games: A guide for social scientists*. IEER Working Paper No. 97.

Chen, J. (2006). Development of Chinese small and medium-sized enterprises. *Journal of Small Business and Enterprise Development,* 13(2), 140-147.

Daude, C., & Fernandez, E. (2010). *On the Role of Productivity and Factor Accumulation in Economic Development in Latin America and the Caribbean,* IDB Working Paper 41.

De Vrande, V., & De Jong, J.P.J. (2009). Open innovation in SMEs: Trends, motives and management challenges. *Technovation, 29*, 423-437.

Drejeris, R., & Oželienė, D. (2019). New approach to the technological aspect of corporate sustainable development. *Business: Theory and Practice*, *20*, 363-371.

Drew, S. (2003). Strategic Uses of E-Commerce by SMEs in the East of England. *European Management Journal,* 21(1), 79-88.

Edmondson, A. C., & McManus, S. E. (2007). Methodological fit in management field research. *Academy of Management Review, 32(4), 1155*–1179.

Hall, B. H., & Lerner, J. (2010). The financing of R&D and innovation. In B. H. Hall & N. Rosenberg (Eds.), *Handbook of the Economics of Innovation* (Vol. 1, pp. 609–639). Elsevier.

Han, A., Pereira, L., Santos, F., & Lenaerts, T. (2020). To regulate or not: A social dynamics analysis of an idealised AI race. *Journal of Artificial Intelligence Research, 69*, 881–921.

Haseeb, M., Hussain, H.I., Kot, S., Androniceanu, A., & Jermsittiparsert, K. (2019). Role of Social and Technological Challenges in Achieving a Sustainable Competitive Advantage and Sustainable Business Performance. *Sustainability,11(14)*,3811.

Herliana, S. (2015). Regional Innovation Cluster for Small and Medium Enterprises (SME): A Triple Helix Concept. *Procedia Soc. Behav. Sci.,* 169, 151–160.

Huff, S., & Munro, M. (1985). Information Technology Assessment and Adoption: A Field Study. *MIS Quarterly, 9(4),*327-340.

Keen, P. (1991). *Every Manager's Guide to Information Technology*. Harvard Business School Press, Boston, MA.

Khuan, H., Andriani , E., & Rukmana, A. Y. (2023). The Role of Technology in Fostering Innovation and Growth in Start-up Businesses. *West Science Journal Economic and Entrepreneurship*, *1*(08), 348–357. https://doi.org/10.58812/wsjee.v1i03.151

Liu, X. (2008), SME Development in China: A Policy Perspective on SME Industrial Clustering. in Lim, H. (ed.), *SME in Asia and Globalization*, ERIA Research Project Report 2007-5, pp.37-68. Available at: http://www.eria.org/SME%20Development%20in%20China_A%20Policy%20Perspective%20on%20SME%20Industrial%20Clustering.pdf

Muñiz, H., Accinelli, E., & Hernández, E. (2023) An evolutionary game theoretical approach to the teaching-learning techniques in the post-pandemic era. *Open Access Library Journal, 10*, 1–22.

Nelson, R. R., & Winter, S. G. (1985). *An evolutionary theory of economic change*. Harvard University Press.

Peters, B., Roberts, M. J., Vuong, V., & Fryges, H. (2017). Estimating dynamic R&D demand: An analysis of costs and long-run benefits. *RAND Journal of Economics, 48(2),* 409–437.

Pipitone, V. (2009). The Role of Total Factor Productivity in the Mediterranean Countries. *IJEMS,* 2 (1), 27-51.

Porter, M. E. (1998). Clusters and the new economics of competition. *Harvard Business Review, 76,* 77–90.

Prasanna, R., Jayasundra, J., Gamage, S., Ekanayake, E., Rajapakshe, P., & Abeyrathne, G. (2019). Sustainability of SMEs in the Competition: A Systemic Review on Technological Challenges and SME Performance. *Journal of Open Innovation,* 5(4), 100-118.

Rogers, E. M. (2003). *Diffusion of innovations (5th ed.).* London: Free Press.

Romer, P.M. (1986). Increasing Returns and Long-Run Growth. *Journal of Political Economics,* 94, 1002–1037.

Shahadat, M. M. H., Nekmahmud, Md., Ebrahimi, P., & Fekete-Farkas, M. (2023), Digital Technology Adoption in SMEs: What Technological, Environmental and Organizational Factors Influence in Emerging Countries?. *Global Business Review,* 1-27.

Smith, J.M., & Price, G. (1973). The logic of animal conflict. *Nature, 246*, 15–18.

Teece, D. J. (2010). Technological Innovation and the Theory of the Firm: The Role of Enterprise-Level Knowledge, Complementarities, and (Dynamic) Capabilities. In B. H. Hall & N. Rosenberg (Eds.), *Handbook of the Economics of Innovation* (Vol.1, pp. 679-730). Elsevier.

Vega-Redondo, F. (2007). *Complex social networks*. Cambridge University Press.

Windrum, P., & Berranger, P. (2002*). The adoption of e-business technology by SMEs.* http://collections.unu.edu/eserv/UNU:1124/rm2002-023.pdf.

Young, H. P. (1998). *Invidual Strategy and Social Structure: An Evolutionary Theory of Institutions.* USA: Princeton University Press.