

Repositório ISCTE-IUL

Deposited in *Repositório ISCTE-IUL*:

2020-12-29

Deposited version:

Accepted Version

Peer-review status of attached file:

Peer-reviewed

Citation for published item:

Dias, Á., Manuel, Elcio Carlos, Dutschke, Georg, Pereira, R. & Pereira, L. (2021). Economic crisis effects on SME dynamic capabilities. *International Journal of Learning and Change*. 13 (1), 63-80

Further information on publisher's website:

10.1504/IJLC.2021.111662

Publisher's copyright statement:

This is the peer reviewed version of the following article: Dias, Á., Manuel, Elcio Carlos, Dutschke, Georg, Pereira, R. & Pereira, L. (2021). Economic crisis effects on SME dynamic capabilities. *International Journal of Learning and Change*. 13 (1), 63-80, which has been published in final form at <https://dx.doi.org/10.1504/IJLC.2021.111662>. This article may be used for non-commercial purposes in accordance with the Publisher's Terms and Conditions for self-archiving.

Use policy

Creative Commons CC BY 4.0

The full-text may be used and/or reproduced, and given to third parties in any format or medium, without prior permission or charge, for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes provided that:

- a full bibliographic reference is made to the original source
- a link is made to the metadata record in the Repository
- the full-text is not changed in any way

The full-text must not be sold in any format or medium without the formal permission of the copyright holders.

ECONOMIC CRISIS EFFECTS ON SME DYNAMIC CAPABILITIES

Dias, Álvaro*; **Manuel, Elsio Carlos**; **Dutschke, Georg**; **Pereira, Renato** and **Pereira, Leandro**

Álvaro Dias*, Instituto Superior de Gestão, Av. Mal. Craveiro Lopes 2, 1700-097 Lisbon, Portugal; and ISCTE-IUL. Av. das Forças Armadas, Lisbon, Portugal. alvaro.dias1@gmail.com.

Elsio Carlos Manuel, Instituto Superior de Gestão, Av. Mal. Craveiro Lopes 2, 1700-097 Lisbon, Portugal elsiocarlos01@gmail.com.

Georg Dutschke, Atlântica - Escola Universitária de Ciências Empresariais, Saúde, Tecnologias e Engenharia, Barcarena, Portugal; Dutschke@uatlantica.pt.

Renato Pereira, Observare Research Centre, Lisbon, Portugal and ISCTE-IUL. Av. das Forças Armadas, Lisbon, Portugal. pereiren@hotmail.com

Leandro Pereira, ISCTE-IUL. Av. das Forças Armadas, Lisbon. leandro.pereira@iscte-iul.pt

* (Corresponding Author) alvaro.dias1@gmail.com; Phone: +351 91 474 01 12; Fax: +351 21 757 39 66 Av. Mal. Craveiro Lopes 2, 1700-097 Lisboa, Portugal.

Álvaro Lopes Dias

Álvaro Dias is Professor of Strategy at Instituto Superior de Gestão and ISCTE-IUL, both in Lisbon, Portugal. He got his PhD in Management from Universidad de Extremadura, Spain, after an MBA in International Business. Professor Dias has over 24 years of teaching experience. He has had several visiting positions in different countries and institutions including Brazil, Angola, Spain, Poland and Finland. He regularly teaches in English, Portuguese, and Spanish at undergraduate, master and doctorate levels, as well as in executive programs. Professor Dias has produced extensive research in the field of Tourism and Management, including books, book chapters, papers in scientific journals and conference proceedings, case studies, and working papers.

Elsio Carlos Manuel

Elsio Manuel is Professor of Strategy at Universidade Privada de Angola. He is a PhD student in Management, MsC in Management and Ba in Management. He has over 8 years of teaching experience. He is a senior consultant and coordinator of several entrepreneurship programs in Angola.

Georg Dutschke,

Georg Dutschke holds PhD in Marketing & Management by the University of Seville. He is a professor and researcher in Portuguese and Spanish universities, also conducting consulting and interim management projects. He has research papers, books and articles published in Portugal and abroad. In the past he has held managerial positions, having been director and manager in companies such as Nobre (Sara Lee Processed Meat), Pescanova Portugal, Angelini Portugal,

Johnson & Johnson, Warner Brothers and Johnson Wax. The main areas of knowledge are strategic Marketing, innovation and organizational happiness.

Renato Pereira

Renato Pereira is Professor of Entrepreneurship and Innovation at IBS, Business School of ISCTE-University Institute of Lisbon and integrated researcher at Observare-UAL Research Centre, also in Lisbon, Portugal. He got his PhD in Management Science from Université Paris Dauphine, France, after which he received advanced training in Corporate Strategy at the MIT – Sloan School of Management, US. Professor Pereira has over 15 years of teaching experience. He has had several visiting positions in different countries and institutions including Brazil, Angola, Mozambique, India, France, Peru and UK. He regularly teaches in English, Portuguese, and French at undergraduate, master and doctorate levels, as well as in executive programs. Dr Renato Pereira has produced extensive research in the field of Management, including books, book chapters, papers in scientific journals and conference proceedings, case studies, and working papers. His current key line of research is on Innovative Business Models. He has been Director of the Executive Master in Innovation Management.

Leandro Pereira,

Leandro Pereira is an Assistant Professor at ISCTE Business School in Lisbon and Director of Executive Master Programs and Project Management at INDEG-ISCTE. He has a Ph.D. in Management, specialized in Project Management Field. Dr. Pereira is the CEO of WINNING Scientific Management, a consultant company with hundreds of employees that manage more than 50M€ in their portfolio. He received a national distinction of the Best Team Leader in Portugal, an award from Best Team Leaders Association. Dr. Pereira has seven books written about “Value Creation”. ISCTE-IUL. Av. das Forças Armadas, Lisbon. leandro.pereira@iscte-iul.pt

ECONOMIC CRISIS EFFECTS ON SME DYNAMIC CAPABILITIES

Dias, Álvaro*; Carlos, Elsio; Dutschke, Georg; Pereira, Renato and Pereira, Leandro

Abstract

Based on dynamic capabilities theoretical framework, this research sought to understand the implications of the recent economic crisis on the capability of developing new products by Portuguese SMEs. Specifically, we assessed how this capability was affected by variables such as entrepreneurship, innovation capacity, the knowledge accumulation, and partnerships. The hypotheses were tested using two samples, one before the crisis, with 180 and another with 105 respondents, applied during the crisis (2012). Results reveal that during the crisis SMEs were more objective and effective in the use of their resources and capabilities. In particular, was found that during the crisis the entrepreneurship, innovation capacity, accumulation of knowledge and partnerships, have an impact on the capability of developing new products. Before the crisis, only entrepreneurship and knowledge accumulation have affected this capability.

Keywords: Dynamic Capabilities, Economic Crises, SMEs, Entrepreneurship, Innovation Capacity, Partnerships, Knowledge Accumulation

1. Introduction

In the short term, the economic crisis has dramatically reduced the interest of companies to invest in innovation (Archibugi, Filippetti and Frenz, 2013). However, while in most of the companies, innovation investment decreased as a result of the economic crisis, a minority chose to do exactly the opposite, increasing their expenditure on innovation (Stadler, Helfat and Verona, 2013). Other authors look to practices of companies that follow an 'innovative behavior', before and during the economic recessions (Kanerva and Hollanders, 2009). These authors, by analyzing the data of Innobarometer for Europe, found no association between the size of the company and the reduction of investments, in line with the results obtained by Antonioli et al. (2010), which

demonstrate that most innovative SMEs are comparable to large firms during economic crisis situations. Kanerva and Hollanders (2009) studies also demonstrate that most innovative enterprises keep on investing in innovation, also, during the economic crisis.

In addition, when more young companies are facing issues in their internationalization processes, they tend to reduce expenditure in innovation but, also, to look for new opportunities by encouraging entrepreneurship processes within the company (Filippetti and Archibugi, 2011) and to maximize partnerships potential (Glattstein and Su Lei, 2014).

This research theoretical framework is supported by the Resources Based View theory (RBV). This approach is amplified, in its evolutive perspective, by dynamic capacities perspective (Blome, Schoenherr and Rexhausen (2013), and aims respond to a lack identified in the literature. Macher and Mowery (2009) consider that although there is a strong theoretical and conceptual progress in the field of dynamic capabilities, to understand the basis for a sustainable competitiveness, there is a lack of studies developed in crisis contexts.

Easterby-Smith and Prieto (2008) consider that there are few empirical studies identifying the interaction of mutual reinforcement between knowledge management and dynamic capabilities. "The lack of explicit connection that we noticed between dynamic capabilities and knowledge management can be related to the distributed nature of the adoption of strategies in the business community" (p. 245).

This subject is particularly relevant in Portuguese context, as the economic crisis has strongly contributed to the bankruptcy and loss of competitiveness of a significant number of Portuguese companies, being SMEs those more affected. Although the theoretical field of RBV and dynamic capabilities has been the subject of a vast field of empirical research (e.g. Danneels, 2008; Ambrosini, et al., 2009; Cabanelas, et al., 2013), to our best knowledge, research on the effect of the crisis on competitive factors still needs further investigation. Previous research addressed specific topics during crisis periods. Glattstein and Su Lei (2014) analyzed the role of partnerships on financial intermediaries. Archibugi et al. (2013) studied the effect of economic crisis on firm's innovation investment and Filippetti and Archibugi (2011) on the national innovation systems. Yang and Hsieh (2013) focused on the organizational knowledge and resource mobilization.

Dynamic capabilities have direct influence in the development of competitive advantage, and contribute to the achievement of sustainable competitive differentiation, allowing, this way, companies to overcome their competitors (Eisenhardt and Martin, 2000; Teece, 2007). The achievement of higher levels of performance requires the development of new products, processes and the implementation of new organizational business models (Teece, 2007). Then, will be important for this research to understand the implications of dynamic capabilities for new products development.

2. Theoretical Framework

The entrepreneurial competitiveness is an important subject, brought to the academic debate by Porter (1980, 1986). However, this author perspective presents some limitations due to his strategy approach be based just on the market, neglecting the company characteristics, as suggested by the Resources Based Vision theory (RBV) (Barney, 1991; Prahalad and Hamel, 1990; Grant, 1991; Wernerfelt, 1984). This theory emerges as an alternative, and by being centered in the company, provides a framework for the development of competitive advantage. In its initial approaches, RBV focuses attention on the heterogeneity of resources as they represent the origin of its strengths and weaknesses (Barney, 1991; Wernerfelt, 1984). In this understanding Powell (1992), Bates and Flynn (1995) consider that RBV is based on the generation of a sustainable competitive advantage and on the economic value of resources, which must be unique, difficult to imitate, not easily replaced and obtained in the market. Thus, the RBV is based on the acronym VRINA (the resources should valuable, rare, inimitable, non-substitutable and adaptive). Later, other researchers have focused on the configuration of the resources (cf. Eisenhardt and Martin, 2000; Teece, 2007). In fact, the simple existence of heterogeneous resources may not be sufficient to justify competitive differentials between companies. The difference is most the result of how the resources and capabilities are developed, configured and operated (Allred, Fawcett, Wallin Magnan, 2011). Once assured VRINA characteristics, companies must strategically develop their resources and capabilities, allow the maximization of its competencies and distinctive features, in the best possible way, so to create a sustainable competitive advantage (DeSarbo, Di Benedetto, Jedidi & Song, 2006). This approach may be understood in its dynamic (Chaharbaghi looming and Lynch, 1999).

The research on dynamic capabilities is rooted in RBV (Macher and Mowery, 2009) is having an increasing number of contributions since Teece, Pisano and Schuen (1997)

basilar article allowed the affirmation of this concept in the international panorama of research. Is a research subject with rapid evolution (Oliver and Holzinger, 2008) and well established in the researchers' agenda (Zahra, Sapienza & Davidson, 2006).

Among those several studies published on this subject, some authors have been criticizing the dynamic capabilities approach as uncompetitive, vague or tautological (Williamson, 1999; Kraatz & Zajac, 2001). This originates the responses of those academics defending this approach (among others, Eisenhardt and Martin, 2000).

The dynamism explanation has different approaches (e.g. evolutionary economy). However, the dynamic capabilities management theoretical relevance is related to the sustainability and competitive advantage in rapidly changing environments (Teece et al., 1997; Zahra et al., 2006). Teece (2007) consider dynamic capabilities as "the capacity of a company to integrate, build and reconfigure internal and external expertise to face contexts that change rapidly" (p. 516). For such, can be materialized through processes or routines, allowing to combine, transform or renew the resources of an organization in new strengths and in accordance with markets evolution (Eisenhardt and Martin, 2000). Based on VBR, the dynamic capabilities approach assumes that most valuable capabilities are those unique to each company, and developed over time. Are not able to be acquired in the market (Makadok 2001) and resulting from an evolution, on the basis of the evolution of decisions and of lifelong learning time (Opera Ambrosini, Bowman and Collier, 2009).

In the field of capacities resource reconfiguration, dynamic capabilities play an important role (Teece et al., 1997; Eisenhardt and Martin, 2000; Winter, 2003). Zahra et al. (2006, p. 912) "distinguish substantive capabilities (used to solve a problem or obtain a result) from the dynamic ability to change or reconfigure existing substantive capacities, which we denominate as the dynamic capabilities of the company". Dynamic capabilities are the nuclear factors of change on the basis of the organization's resources (Winter, 2003), capabilities of highest level promoting the changing in common capacities or substantive capabilities (Zahra et al., 2006). Eisenhardt and Martin (2000) they use the term capacities, Zollo and Winter (2002) refer dynamic capabilities as being routines dedicated to the modification of the operational routines. Danneels (2008) uses the term second-order competencies because their ability to build new skills. The same author defines dynamic capabilities as the competence to build new skills, based on the looming that the accumulation of new resources allows new

organizational competencies, being this a form of organizational learning, suggesting a connection between the evolution of dynamic capabilities and mechanisms of learning (Zollo and Winter, 2002).

Eisenhardt and Martin (2000) have enumerated several dynamic capabilities, among others, routines of product development, strategic decision making, routines for replication and negotiation.

For the purposes of this research, we will adopt the specification of Macher and Mowery (2009). These authors consider dynamic capabilities to include the strategic and organizational processes, namely, the development of products, strategic alliances, entrepreneurship, innovation and knowledge management.

In this study we aim to confirm five hypotheses:

H1: The higher the entrepreneurial capacity, the greater the capacity for development of new products.

According to Stevenson and Jarillo (2009), the economic crisis enhances the ability of companies to develop strategies and search of new opportunities. For Shane and Venkataraman (2000) entrepreneurship must have two complementary approaches: the path of opportunities and the existence of the organization of individuals with entrepreneurial skills.

For Newey and Zahra (2009), the need to develop dynamic capabilities is more urgent when the operational capacities react to a rigid form before 'exogenous shocks' as economic crises. According to these authors, depending on the sector of activity, the cycles of interaction between dynamic capacities and the operational, allows reformulating the organizational routines and the implementation of new strategies. In fact, the role of the knowledge and individual skills, are crucial to the organizational strategy (Barney, 1991). Wright, McMahan and McWilliams (1994) added the motivation to this catalog of competencies. Later, Dabu (2012) specified the need to consider also the entrepreneurship, completing the proposal of Barney (1991). In this context, the entrepreneur role in a business context is related to the knowledge creation and other competencies, contributing, positively, to the identification and exploitation of new business opportunities (Davidsson and Honig, 2003).

The role of entrepreneurship, in the social and economic development, is essential in the new products development process and production (Zott and Amit, 2007). These

business processes can occur at the individual levels, team, organization, inter-organizational or sectorial (Hoskisson, Covin, Volberda and Johnson, 2011). The development of strategies based on inter-organizational cooperation (networks or alliances), the connection to higher education institutions, the access to venture capital and the way the country stimulates the entrepreneurship, are key factors to assess new business opportunities (Hoskisson, et al., 2011). For Chadwick and Dabu (2009) dynamic capacities resulting from the way, ventures act when working in environments of uncertainty. The entrepreneurial businesses, with an open-minded approach, creates, define and exploit new opportunities, allowing organizations gain value and be ahead of competitors (Zahra, Colosseum and Davidsson, 2006). Whereas entrepreneurship may be considered as a process through which the individuals exploiting new opportunities (Stevenson and Jarillo, 2009), we may understand that the way opportunities are perceived by the entrepreneur, allows a better or worse evaluation of the competitive changes within a sector, influencing the launch of new products (Hoskisson, et al., 2011).

H2: The greater the innovative capacity, the greater the capacity for development of new products.

In competitive markets, the capacity to innovate is essential for the organization competitiveness. Macher and Mowery (2009) refer that R&D practices are key for the organization's sustainability, in particular in the new product development process. According to these authors, the existence of suitable procedures together with best practices in organizational behavior and the management of information technology, are the basis for the organizational learning. Essentially, by having an effective integration between new knowledge creation and codification, based on the formal mechanisms of learning and assimilation (Zollo and Winter, 2002), becomes possible a better sharing of encoded knowledge throughout the organization. Those organizations with more agile and flexible structures may have an advantage in contexts of constant change, and, this way, to profit from new market opportunities (Stadler, Helfat and Verona, 2013). In more traditional sectors of activity, during the economic crisis period, there is a tendency for organizations to suspend, or even abandon, ongoing innovation projects, as a way to reduce costs. This will contribute to the organization weakness (Stadler, et al., 2013).

A way of circumventing the risks and the investment associated with the innovation is the establishment of alliances, which according to Jiang, Tao and Santoro (2010) allow (i) the sharing of complementary skills, costs, and risks, so to reduce projects costs and uncertainty and (ii) the access or acquisition of the capabilities and knowledge necessary for the pursuit of innovation. For Jiang, et al. (2010) a higher intensity of the alliance is positively associated with higher rates of growth and survival, as well as to higher levels of innovation.

Depending on the level of innovation wanted, there are diverse possibilities of partnerships, that could be between big multinationals companies, public and private companies, and between companies and non-profit organizations such as universities and government entities (Jiang, et al., 2010). Due to the uniqueness of each company, partnerships arising from different sets of resources and capabilities (Barney, 1991). In the case of non-profit organizations, universities and government entities alliances, they may provide access to new research, enabling access to new knowledge that, in a medium term, may allow the company supplant their competitors (Santoro and Chakrabarti, 2002). These innovation partnership possibilities allow to limit the risk of dependence but increases the requirement of coordination that not all the smaller firms have (Jiang, et al., 2010).

Innovation is essential for competitiveness, not only, but also, during economic crisis periods. In the dynamic capacities context, the linkage between innovation and the development of new products involves the introduction of organizational routines specifically for the process of innovation management (Pavitt, 2005), be developed internally (organic development) or the result of partnerships (external development).

The development of dynamic capabilities implies the establishment of active approaches related to innovation (Macher and Mowery, 2009), considering the following hypothesis:

H3: The higher the ability of knowledge accumulation, the greater the capacity for development of new products.

According to Macher and Mowery (2009), the accumulation of knowledge is the process by which the organizations determine the effectiveness of certain organizational approaches and communicate this information to the entire organization. These authors

argue that two approaches should be considered: multifunctional teams (working groups); joint development of people and of knowledge.

The competitive development based on the accumulation of knowledge consider the principle of co-evolution as a central dynamic capacity for knowledge management (Easterby-Smith and Prieto, 2008). This principle of co-evolution is particularly relevant in this study since there is a path of dependencies that must be considered by the organizations to harden their sources of competitive advantage to resist in economic crises (Helfat and Peteraf, 2009).

The principle of co-evolution is also important due to the accumulation of knowledge and innovation. Stadler, Helfat and Verona (2013) analyzed high innovative organizations noting persistence is an important characteristic. Newey and Zahra (2009) consider that organizations need to be able to recognize the strategic value of new knowledge, now how to assimilate and apply in new business, either through the development of new products or by managing the current portfolio. Specifically, organizations should be able to develop four key competencies on knowledge: acquisition, assimilation, processing and exploitation.

The ability to learn allows organizations to overcome the crises more effectively. Yang and Hsieh (2013) argue that crises do not repeat for same reasons. So, a specific solution for one crisis may not be able to be applied directly in another one, implying the ability for radical changes in the organizational routines.

Individuals are crucial in the accumulation of knowledge. It is through the development of routines and collective abilities, that organizations may achieve sustainability and competitive advantages in VBR (Barney, 1991). However, the dependency from individuals takes some risk, since there are negative competitive consequences due to loss of key employees to the competition when key employees leave for competitors (Aime, Johnson, Ridge and Hill, 2010).

In the context of crisis, the possession of knowledge relevant to the business becomes essential for the dynamism, since organizations tend to base their competitive performance in the way the current knowledge is used (Haas and Hansen, 2004). The knowledge depends on the circumstances of each task, suggesting the importance of including a dynamic looming in how is managed, shifting the emphasis from the

acquisition of resources to the optimization of the one existing (Grewal and Slotegraaf, 2007).

According to this framework, the accumulation of knowledge and learning represent essential processes for competitiveness in times of crisis, encompassing activities such as creation, development, retention and the transfer of knowledge (Chiva and joyful, 2005; Easterby-Smith and Prieto, 2008). The accumulation of knowledge is a dynamic process of strategic renewal, involving the normal tension between the creation of new knowledge (exploration) and use the existing knowledge (exploitation) (Crossan, Lane and White, 1999). In both situations, the accumulation of knowledge process may result from partnerships, merger or acquisitions, or the recruitment of qualified staff, in what Zahra and George (2002) classified as 'absorption capacity'. Can also result from organic growth by implementing diverse mechanisms for intra-organizational knowledge sharing (Tsai, 2002).

In this vision, the accumulation of knowledge is fundamental for the development of competitive capacity, in particular, through the development of new products. So, the following hypothesis should be considered:

H4: The greater the degree of partnerships development, the greater the capacity of new products development.

Eisenhardt and Martin (2000) consider that dynamic capabilities are the result of concrete strategic and organizational processes, as partnerships, that create competitive advantages for organizations, especially in dynamic markets, through the development creating value strategies. The organizations use partnerships to accumulate knowledge and resources, start new ventures and enter into new market segments (Hoskisson, et al., 2011).

Access to resources is essential to achieve competitive advantage (Allred et al., 2011). However, is not sufficient, since it is key to ensuring the effective management and exploitation of these resources so to create unique capabilities (Barney, 1991; Teece et al., 1997). The resources reconfiguration not always depends on from internal sources and may be a result of establishing partnerships (Eisenhardt and Martin, 2000). In fact, the analyses of the relevant literature on this subject, reveals that the terms as "coordinate", "combine" and "integrated" are essential to the resources and capabilities approach (Barreto, 2009). This suggests that organizations must develop partnerships

(Allred et al., 2011). The use of partnership allows develop new business and reach new markets, through the abolition of resources gaps and the development of complementarities with partners, motivating higher levels of corporate entrepreneurship. (Hoskisson, et al., 2011).

The studies presented by Glattstein and Su Lei (2014) demonstrate that those organizations establishing more partnerships are able to develop additional dynamic capabilities. These authors refer that organizations developing partnerships may even profit from economic crisis periods to strengthen their capacities. Also enables the development of unique competitive advantages, not easy to replicate, since partnerships combining various complementary competencies (Wang and Wei, 2007). During adverse contexts to consider partnerships as strategic, allows the accumulation and the use of resources to boost competitiveness, but, with the constant need of monitoring the relationship (Sirmon, Hitt and Irish, 2007).

Partnerships are developed to access resources that are not available internally. But, it is not always possible to consider that these new resources may start being an integral part of the company's internal resources (Cui, Calantone and Griffith, 2010). Managers should consider the internal development of resources as an alternative (Cui et al., 2010).

For Hoskisson, et al. (2011), due to the small nature of SME's, it is not always possible to develop internally the resources needed to profit from new business opportunities. In these cases, partnerships could be the solution to obtain external resources (Madhok and Tallman, 1998). This is one of the reasons why networks of collaboration are being increasingly understood as an important element of entrepreneurship (Hoskisson, et al., 2011).

Cui et al., (2011) consider that the establishment of multiple connections between partner companies enhances the level of collaboration and the accumulation of experience, leading to the development of inter-organizational routines and the absorption of new knowledge

By resuming the literature reviewing, we may say that the development of partnerships is fundamental for organizations to access new resources and complementary skills, providing access to new markets and/or new products. Also, the implication of partnerships in the entrepreneurship and innovation. For these reasons, we believe that

partnerships are essential for SME's to overcome situations of economic crisis, and the following hypothesis could be stated:

H5: There are significant differences between the companies in the context of crisis and those operating in a favorable environment in how dynamic capabilities affect the capacity for new products development.

This last hypothesis aims to understand if the reflections made in the previous sections may vary during economic crisis situations when compared to contexts of stability. It is possible that companies, during the crisis period, may adopt different strategies (Stadler, et al., 2013).

3. Method

First, a literature review was performed based on search words as "entrepreneurship", "knowledge management", "alliances team" and "innovativeness". The conceptual model was developed subsequently as the basis for the questionnaire construction. This was based on the collection of measurement instruments available in the bibliography.

The questionnaire was pre-test by four entrepreneurs aiming to validate questions meaning and identifying response difficulties. On the basis of the comments received, a final version was developed.

Since was intended to evaluate the impact of the economic crisis in the organizations, a longitudinal study was conducted. As such, the questionnaire was first applied in 2009, in Portugal, in paper format, distributed in hand or sent by email, during a period of three months. The same questionnaire was applied, the second time in 2015 (after Portuguese economic crisis), with the same procedure, during a period of two months. The confidentiality was guaranteed. On both cases, a convenience sample was obtained using snowball method.

The operationalization of variables considered in the conceptual model was achieved by using a Likert Scale of 5 points (1= much worse; 5 = much better). The questionnaire is presented in Appendix I.

The entrepreneurial capacity was measured by using the model proposed by of Hult, Snow and Kandemir (2003) with four questions aim to valuate the organization

proactivity, innovation time to market, projects pioneering when compared to competitors and the responsiveness among other organizations/*stakeholders*.

The innovation capacity was measured by using the model proposed by Tanriverdi (2005) with five questions aim evaluate the innovation time of acceptance, the generation of innovative ideas for products and services and the encouragement for innovation.

Tanriverdi (2005) model was also used to measure the accumulation of knowledge. In this case with twelve questions aim to valuate the integration of relevant knowledge in the organization, the integration of knowledge from customers and the transfer of relevant knowledge to business practices.

To measure partnership was used the model proposed by Kale, Singh and Perlmutter (2000), with five questions aim to valuate the partnership support based on mutual trust or personal friendship and the level of interaction between the partners.

Finally, the development of new products was measured by using the model proposed by Kusunoki, Notiaka and Nagata Co. (1998), with eleven questions aim to valuate the creation of products or concepts lead time, the improvements in production technologies, among others.

Target population was managers of Portuguese SMES from Lisbon and other regions in center of the country. Was considered a convenience sample, having been surveyed, in the first stage (2009) 180 respondents and, in the second (2015) 105. The sample characteristics are presented in Table 1.

Table 1. Sample characteristics

2009 Sample (N=180)	%	2015 Sample (N=105)	%
Dimension		Dimension	
Less than 9 employees	16%	Less than 9 employees	15%
10 – 49 employees	22%	10 – 49 employees	17%
49 – 99 employees	27%	49 – 99 employees	35%
More than 100 employees	35%	More than 100 employees	33%
Number of years of activity		Number of years of activity	
Less than 3 years	15%	Less than 3 years	12%
3 – 5 years	25%	3 – 5 years	23%
6-10 years	27%	6-10 years	31%
More than 11 years	33%	More than 11 years	34%

4. Results and Discussion

We have started by verifying correlations before the crisis (Table 2). We find that entrepreneurial capability and knowledge accumulation are significantly correlated with new product development performance. Considering the before crisis scenario, this supports the hypothesis 1 and 3, considering that firms with better entrepreneurial capability and knowledge accumulation have higher new product development performance. Observing the entrepreneurial capability, our findings are in line with those from Zott and Amit's (2007) regarding the entrepreneurship scroll in new product development and the implementation of innovative production methods. Findings on the positive interaction effects of knowledge accumulation are coherent with those from Crossan, Lane and White (1999) that innovative practices are central both for knowledge exploration and exploitation.

However, in our findings, is in evidence that innovation capability and alliances are not correlated with new product development before the crisis, not supporting our hypothesis 2 and 4. These findings are distinctive from those of Macher and Mowery (2009) and may reflect the individualistic way of doing business in most Portuguese SME's.

Table 2. Descriptive statistics and correlation matrix (before crisis)

	\bar{X}	The s.d.	A	Entrepreneurial Capability	Innovation Capability	Knowledge Accumulation	Alliances team
New product development performance	3.64	0.49	0.87	,21**	,04	,24**	,03
Entrepreneurial Capability	3.4	0.56	0.8		,52**	,47**	,12
Innovation Capability	3.4	0.51	0.77			,48**	,04*
Knowledge Accumulation	3.3	0.53	0.94				,16*
Alliances team	3.2	0.52	0.84				

* $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.001$, (two-tailed Fisher's test).

Results obtained during the economic crisis are shown in Table 3. Unlike before crisis, we find that all constructs are significantly correlated with new product development

performance. Furthermore, during the economic crisis, SME's have developed better capabilities in the four areas, supporting our hypothesis 1, 2, 3 and 4.

This improvement of organizational capabilities (before / during the economic crisis) suggests a greater dynamism in a context of uncertainty as referred Chadwick and Dabu (2009). Results demonstrate a higher level of entrepreneurship that will contribute positively to the identification and exploitation of business opportunities. Also, improves the capacity of responding to the development of operational capabilities, with a much higher flexibility than before crisis context.

The role of innovation is also higher, suggesting a major focus, mainly, at the organizational structure and responsiveness, levels. As referred by Stadler, et al., (2013), a more agile and flexible structure allows obtain best results in contexts of constant change, take advantage of new market opportunities and overcome existing barriers placed to innovation.

Results are significant regarding the role of alliances. This is important for SME's since allows the sharing of knowledge and complementarity competencies, that may contribute to the development of unique competitive advantages, difficult to replicate. Results in line with findings from Jiang, et al. (2010), Wang and Wei (2007) and Cabanelas, et al., (2013).

Table 3. Descriptive statistics and correlation matrix (during crisis)

	\bar{X}	The s.d.	A	Entrepreneurial Capability	Innovation Capability	Knowledge Accumulation	Alliances team
New product development performance	3.5	0.8	0.98	,77**	,76**	,73**	,66**
Entrepreneurial Capability	3.5	0.84	0.89		,82**	,66**	,69**
Innovation Capability	3.5	0.82	0.91			,66**	,68*
Knowledge Accumulation	3.3	0.85	0.97				,60**
Alliances team	3.3	0.8	0.98				

** $p < 0.001$. (two-tailed Fisher's test).

By applying regression analyses, we were able to verify significant differences before and after the economic crisis (Table 4.). With the economic crisis, SME's have developed a greater effectiveness in the use of their capacities. These suggest the validation of hypothesis 5.

Table 4. Results of regression analyses (before / during economic crisis)

	Entrepreneurial Capability		Innovation Capability		Knowledge Accumulation		Alliances team	
	Before	During	Before	During	Before	During	Before	During
	0.77***	0.21***	-	0.76***	0.73***	0.24***	-	0.66***
	(0,05)	(0,08)	-	(0,05)	(0,06)	(0,09)	-	(0,07)
Constant	2.95***	0.96***	-	0.91***	0.75***	2.86***	-	1.47***
	(0,29)	(0,17)	-	(0,17)	(0,22)	(0,3)	-	(0,23)
R2	0.03	0.59	-	0.58	0.53	0.05	-	0.44
F test	4.76	223,03	-	- 220.82	157,74	6,11	-	72,97

Smr regression coefficients are shown in the table. Standard deviations are in parentheses

*** p < 0.01 (two-tailed Fisher's test).

5. Conclusions

5.1. Theoretical contributions

This research proposes new contributions to the theory. There are limited recent studies on this subject that consider the recent economic crisis and a before/during crisis comparative analysis.

The differences found when analyzing the two samples are relevant. Before the crisis was observed a greater concentration of the studied capacity on mean values, a reality less evident during the crisis, when organizations with smaller capacities when with partnerships with others, generate superior capabilities.

Important conclusions are also obtained by the hypotheses verification. We propose evidence regarding the variables articulation and how they contribute to new products development capacities. The results showed that during the crisis, SME's are more

focused on the use of its resources and capabilities, probably, due to the less effectiveness of existing strategies to face adversity, declining in demand and the increase of taxation.

In particular was verified that the innovation capacity and the establishment of partnerships, began to have an influence on the ability to develop new products, not happening before the crisis. Also, the increase of the entrepreneurial spirit and accumulation of knowledge on new product development wasn't due to higher investments, but to the improvement, in the way, these capabilities were used. The average values obtained were not very different in the two samples, however, when we analyzed the B value in the regressions analysis, is verified a significant increase in the influence of independent variables on the ability to develop new products.

From the theoretical framework used - dynamic capacities – this study verifies that SME's were able to reformulate features and capabilities in order to become more objective and effective in investments, becoming more dynamic and responsive in contexts of economic crisis.

5.2. Managerial implications

Results show that during economic crisis organizations have become more objective on the use of their capabilities, in particular the ones related to entrepreneurship, innovation, and knowledge accumulation. Also, the development of partnerships is considered to be important in the strategic planning, especially as may contribute to foster innovation and improving new product development processes.

As such, strategic formulation should incorporate both formal and informal mechanisms fostering a more innovative and entrepreneurial organizational culture. Simultaneously, the organizational processes should incorporate knowledge accumulation routines. They contribute to reduce organizational dependence of individual knowledge. Furthermore, the external link with partners reinforces knowledge acquisition and accumulation through collective innovation platforms such as open innovation or collaborative design thinking.

5.2. Limitations and further research

The models presented don't aim to explain all the SME's reality. In fact, other independent variables could have been considered as, among others, the capacity to export, strategic planning, marketing or organizational capacity. We know, not empirically, that these variables are referred as gaps to fulfill in SMES and it would be highly relevant to bring evidence on these. Also, despite the sample have reached a reasonable number of responses, there are limitations regarding the generalization of the results.

For future research, will be relevant to have a fine-tuning analysis by sector of activity, findings in this study may vary from the sector of activity, and test the model with a larger sample.

References

- Aime, F., Johnson, S., Ridge, J. W., & Hill, A. D. (2010). The routine may be stable but the advantage is not: competitive implications of key employee mobility. *Strat. Mgmt. J*, 31(1), 75-87.
- Allred, C. R., Fawcett, S. E., Wallin, C., & Maignan, G. M. (2011). A Dynamic Collaboration Capability as a Source of Competitive Advantage. *Decision Sciences*, 42(1), 129-161.
- Ambrosini, V., Bowman, C., & Collier, N. (2009). Dynamic Capabilities: An Exploration of How Firms Renew their Resource Base. *British Journal of Management*, 20, S9-S24.
- Amit, R., & Schoemaker, P. J. (1993). Strategic assets and organizational rent. *Strat. Mgmt. J*, 14(1), 33-46.
- Antonioli, D., Bianchi, A., Mazzanti, M., Montresor, S., & Pini, P., (2010). Economic Crisis and Innovation Strategies. Evidence from Italian firm-level Data. *Università degli Studi di Ferrara, Quaderno 2*
- Archibugi, D., Filippetti, A., & Frenz, M. (2013). Economic crisis and innovation: Is destruction prevailing over accumulation? *Research Policy*, 42(2), 303-314. doi:10.1016/j.respol.2012.07.002
- Barney, J. (1991). Firm Resources and Sustained Competitive Advantage. *Journal of Management*, 17(1), 99-120. doi:10.1177/014920639101700108
- Barreto, I. (2009). Dynamic Capabilities: A Review of Past Research and an Agenda for the Future. *Journal of Management*, 36(1), 256-280.
- Bates, K. & Flynn, E. (1995). Innovation history and competitive advantage: a resource-based view analysis of manufacturing technology innovations. *Academy Of Management Proceedings*, 1995(1), 235-239.
- Blome, C., Schoenherr, T., & Rexhausen, D. (2013). Antecedents and enablers of supply chain agility and its effect on performance: a dynamic capabilities perspective. *International Journal Of Production Research*, 51(4), 1295-1318.
- Cabanelas, P., Omil, J., & Vázquez, X. (2013). A methodology for the construction of dynamic capabilities in industrial networks: The role of border agents. *Industrial Marketing Management*, 42(6), 992-1003.

- Chadwick, C. & Dabu, A. (2009). Human Resources, Human Resource Management, and the Competitive Advantage of Firms: Toward a More Comprehensive Model of Causal Linkages. *Organization Science*, 20(1), 253-272.
- Chaharbaghi, K. & Lynch, R. (1999). Sustainable competitive advantage: towards a dynamic resource-based strategy. *Management Decision*, 37(1), 45-50.
- Chiva, R. (2005). Organizational Learning and Organizational Knowledge: Towards the Integration of Two Approaches. *Management Learning*, 36(1), 49-68. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1350507605049906>
- Crossan, M., Lane, H., & White, R. (1999). An organizational learning framework: from intuition to institution. *Academy Of Management Review*, 24(3), 522-537.
- Cui, A., Calantone, R., & Griffith, D. (2010). Strategic change and termination of interfirm partnerships. *Strat. Mgmt. J.*, 32(4), 402-423.
- Chadwick, C. & Dabu, A. (2009). Human Resources, Human Resource Management, and the Competitive Advantage of Firms: Toward a More Comprehensive Model of Causal Linkages. *Organization Science*, 20(1), 253-272. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1287/orsc.1080.0375>
- Dabu, A. (2008). Strategic human resources management: Between the resource-based view of the firm and an entrepreneurship approach. Mercatus Center, George Mason University, Fairfax, VA (nd).
- Danneels, E. (2008). Organizational antecedents of second-order competences. *Strat. Mgmt. J.*, 29(5), 519-543.
- Davidsson, P. & Honig, B. (2003). The role of social and human capital among nascent entrepreneurs. *Journal Of Business Venturing*, 18(3), 301-331.
- DeSarbo, W., Di Benedetto, C., Jedidi, K., & Song, M. (2006). Identifying Sources of Heterogeneity for Empirically Deriving Strategic Types: A Constrained Finite-Mixture Structural-Equation Methodology. *Management Science*, 52(6), 909-924.
- Eisenhardt, K. & Martin, J. (2000). Dynamic capabilities: what are they?. *Strat. Mgmt. J.*, 21(10-11), 1105-1121.
- Filippetti, A. & Archibugi, D. (2011). Innovation in times of crisis: National Systems of Innovation, structure, and demand. *Research Policy*, 40(2), 179-192.
- Glattstein, D. & Su Lei, J. (2014). The positive effect of the financial crisis on the dynamic capabilities of international intermediaries. *Nankai Business Review International*, 5(1), 70-94.
- Grant, R. (1991). The Resource-Based Theory of Competitive Advantage: Implications for Strategy Formulation. *California Management Review*, 33(3), 114-135.
- Grewal, R. & Slotegraaf, R. (2007). Embeddedness of Organizational Capabilities. *Decision Sciences*, 38(3), 451-488.
- Haas, M. & Hansen, M. (2004). When using knowledge can hurt performance: the value of organizational capabilities in a management consulting company. *Strat. Mgmt. J.*, 26(1), 1-24.
- Helfat, C. & Peteraf, M. (2009). Understanding dynamic capabilities: progress along a developmental path. *Strategic Organization*, 7(1), 91-102.
- Hoskisson, R., Covin, J., Volberda, H., & Johnson, R. (2011). Revitalizing Entrepreneurship: The Search for New Research Opportunities. *Journal Of Management Studies*, 48(6), 1141-1168.
- Hult, G., Snow, C., & Kandemir, D. (2003). The Role of Entrepreneurship in Building Cultural Competitiveness in Different Organizational Types. *Journal Of Management*, 29(3), 401-426.
- Jiang, R., Tao, Q., & Santoro, M. (2010). Alliance portfolio diversity and firm performance. *Strat. Mgmt. J.*, 31(10), 1136-1144.

- Kale, P., Singh, H., & Perlmutter, H. (2000). Learning and protection of proprietary assets in strategic alliances: building relational capital. *Strat. Mgmt. J.*, 21(3), 217-237.
- Kanerva, M. & Hollanders, H. (2009). *The Impact of the Economic Crisis on Innovation. INNO Metrics Thematic Paper, Brussels: European Commission, DG Enterprise, 2009.* Presentation.
- Kraatz, M. & Zajac, E. (2001). How Organizational Resources Affect Strategic Change and Performance in Turbulent Environments: Theory and Evidence. *Organization Science*, 12(5), 632-657.
- Kusunoki, K., Nonaka, I., & Nagata, A. (1998). Organizational Capabilities in Product Development of Japanese Firms: A Conceptual Framework and Empirical Findings. *Organization Science*, 9(6), 699-718.
- Macher, J. & Mowery, D. (2009). Measuring Dynamic Capabilities: Practices and Performance in Semiconductor Manufacturing. *British Journal Of Management*, 20, S41-S62.
- Madhok, A. & Tallman, S. (1998). Resources, Transactions and Rents: Managing Value Through Interfirm Collaborative Relationships. *Organization Science*, 9(3), 326-339.
- Makadok, R. (2001). Toward a synthesis of the resource-based and dynamic-capability views of rent creation. *Strat. Mgmt. J.*, 22(5), 387-401.
- Newey, L. & Zahra, S. (2009). The Evolving Firm: How Dynamic and Operating Capabilities Interact to Enable Entrepreneurship. *British Journal Of Management*, 20, S81-S100.
- Oliver, C. & Holzinger, I. (2008). The Effectiveness of Strategic Political Management: A Dynamic Capabilities Framework. *Academy of Management Review*, 33(2), 496-520.
- Pavitt, K. (2005). Innovation Process. In j. Fagerberg, J., Mowery, D.C. & Nelson, R. (EDS). *The Oxford Handbook of Innovation* (1st ed.). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Powell, T. (1992). Research notes and communications strategic planning as competitive advantage. *Strat. Mgmt. J.*, 13(7), 551-558.
- Prahalad, C. K. & Hamel G. (1990). The Core Competence of the Corporation. *Harvard Business Review* 3, 79-91.
- Santoro, M. & Chakrabarti, A. (2002). Firm size and technology centrality in industry–university interactions. *Research Policy*, 31(7), 1163-1180.
- Shane, S. & Venkataraman, S. (2000). The Promise of Entrepreneurship as a Field of Research. *The Academy Of Management Review*, 25(1), 217.
- Sirmon, D., Hitt, M., & Ireland, R. (2007). Managing firm resources in dynamic environments to create value: looking inside the black box. *Academy Of Management Review*, 32(1), 273-292.
- Song, M., Droge, C., Hanvanich, S., & Calantone, R. (2005). Marketing and technology resource complementarity: an analysis of their interaction effect in two environmental contexts. *Strat. Mgmt. J.*, 26(3), 259-276.
- Stadler, C., Helfat, C., & Verona, G. (2013). The Impact of Dynamic Capabilities on Resource Access and Development. *Organization Science*, 24(6), 1782-1804.
- Stevenson, H. H., & Jarillo, J. C. (2009). The paradigm of Entrepreneurship: Entrepreneurial Management. *Strategic Management Journal*, 11, 17-27.
- Tanriverdi, H. (2005). Information Technology Relatedness, Knowledge Management capability, and performance of Multibusiness Firms. *MIS Quarterly*, 29(2), 311-334
- Teece, D. J. (2007). Explicating dynamic capabilities: the nature and microfoundations of (sustainable) enterprise performance. *Strategic Management Journal*, 28(13), 1319-1350.
- Teece, D. J., Pisano, G. & Shuen, A. (1997). Dynamic Capabilities and Strategic Management. *Strategic Management Journal* 18, 509-533.

- Tsai, W. (2002). social structure of "coopetition" within the multiunit organization: Coordination, competition, and intraorganizational knowledge sharing. *Organization science*, 13(2), 179-190.
- Wang, E. T., & Wei, H. L. (2007). Interorganizational Governance Value Creation: Coordinating is information visibility and flexibility in supply chains. *Decision Sciences*, 38(4), 647-674.
- Wernerfelt, B. (1984). The Resource-based view of the Firm. *Strategic Management Journal*, 5, 171-180.
- Williamson, O. E. (1999). Strategy Research: Governance and Competence Perspective. *Strategic Management Journal* 20, 1087-1108
- Winter, S. G. (2003). Understanding dynamic capabilities. *Strategic Management Journal*, 24(10), 991-995.
- Wright, P. M., McMahan, G. C., & McWilliams, A. (1994). Human resources and sustained competitive advantage: the resource-based perspective. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 5(2), 301-326.
- Yang, T. K., & Hsieh, M. H. (2013). Case analysis of capability deployment in crisis prevention and response. *International Journal of Information Management*, 33(2), 408-412.
- Zahra, S. A., & George, G. (2002). Absorptive capacity: the review, reconceptualization, and extension. *Academy of management review*, 27(2), 185-203.
- Zahra, S. A., Sapienza, H. J., & Davidsson, P. (2006). Entrepreneurship and Dynamic Capabilities: The Review, Model and Research Agenda. *Journal of Management Studies*, 43(4), 917-955.
- Zollo, M., & Winter, S. G. (2002). Deliberate learning and the evolution of dynamic capabilities. *Organization science*, 13(3), 339-351.
- Zott, C., & Amit, R. (2007). Business Model Design and the performance of Entrepreneurial Firms. *Organization Science*, 18(2), 181-199.

Appendix I - Questionnaire Items

A. Product Development

- 1) Ability to develop new products/services
- 2) Development of new products/services to contribute toward investment in R&D projects ...

- 3) Studies of the creation of new products/services
- 4) Successful launches of new products/services
- 5) The development effectiveness of products/services to meet the needs of customers

B. Entrepreneurship

- 1) Responsiveness among other organizations/*stakeholders*
- 2) Speed in the introduction of new products and services in the market
- 3) Proactiveness in projects of high risk
- 4) Degree of initiative in efforts to optimize the possibility to explore new opportunities

C. Innovation

- 1) Rapid acceptance of technical innovations, based on the search results
- 2) Constant generation innovative ideas for products and services
- 3) Rapid uptake of innovation in the management of programs/projects
- 4) Penalising people for new ideas that do not work
- 5) Encouragement of innovation

D. The accumulation of knowledge

- 1) Creation of skills and operational knowledge and R&D applicable in various business units (BU)
- 2) Transfer of operational knowledge and R&D relevant applicable in various UN
- 3) Integration of and operational knowledge of relevant R&D of several UN so as to create new products/services
- 4) Change of operational policies and R&D based on lessons learned in other UN
- 5) Creation of skills and knowledge of marketing applicable to various UN
- 6) Transfer of relevant knowledge about customers between the UN
- 7) Integration of knowledge about customers of UN to obtain new perspectives of customers
- 8) Change of policies and marketing processes and product of UN to obtain new perspectives of customers
- 9) Creation of skills and knowledge management measures applicable in various UN
- 10) Sharing of best practices in management between the UN
- 11) Integration of policies and relevant management processes in various UN
- 12) Change of policies and management processes on the basis of lessons learned in other UN management

E. PERFORMANCE IN PRODUCT DEVELOPMENT

- 1) Development costs
- 2) The effectiveness of investment in development
- 3) Delivery deadlines
- 4) Ease of transfer for the production phase
- 5) Precedence of marketing
- 6) Product Cost
- 7) Improvement in the quality of the Product/Feature
- 8) Improvement in the product technology
- 9) The level of innovation in the technologies of the product
- 10) The level of innovation in the product as a whole
- 11) Creation of new product concepts

F. Relational capital

- 1) Close interaction between the various levels between the partners of the alliance

- 2) Mutual respect the various levels between the partners of the alliance
- 3) Confidence level at various levels between the partners of the alliance
- 4) Friendship level at various levels between the partners of the alliance
- 5) Reciprocity between the partners of the alliance