REVISTA TURISMO ESTUDOS & PRÁTICAS
RTEP
ISSN: 2316-1493

ARTIGO / ARTICLE

ON THE IMPACT OF DYNAMIC CAPABILITIES AND INNOVATIVENESS ON HOTEL PERFORMANCE

EL IMPACTO DE LAS CAPACIDADES DINÁMICAS Y DE LA CAPACIDAD DE INNOVACIÓN EN EL DESEMPEÑO ORGANIZACIONAL

Marilia Nunes Valença[1]
Viviane Santos Salazar[2]
Julio Cesar Ferro de Guimarães[3]
Jakson Renner Rodrigues Soares[4]

ABSTRACT: Despite the challenges faced by the hotel and tourism sectors, hotel companies have demonstrated competitiveness even during crises. One theoretical explanation for this competitive advantage is the role of dynamic capabilities and innovativeness. One of the possible theoretical explanations for this competitive advantage is the role of dynamic capabilities and innovativeness. This paper empirically examines the relationship between dynamic capabilities, innovativeness, and hotel performance by investigating 54 companies. Data were collected using a questionnaire with validated scales for dynamic capabilities, innovativeness, and performance, along with publicly available company data. Statistical analyses, including confirmatory factor analysis and multiple linear regression, were employed to assess the influence of these variables on hotel performance. The results indicate that dynamic capability sensing positively affects innovativeness. However, the abilities to seize and reconfigure did not significantly influence innovativeness. Innovativeness, in turn, positively impacts performance, with the quality of products and services being the most significant aspect of innovativeness affecting performance. This research contributes theoretically to the understanding of these relationships and provides practical insights for hotels seeking to enhance their performance. **KEYWORDS:** dynamic capabilities; innovativeness; organizational performance; hotels; tourism.

[1] Universidad Federal de Pernambuco, Brazil. marilia.nvalenca@ufpe.br. https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5738-9614
[2] Universidad Federal de Pernambuco, Brazil. viviane.ssalazar@ufpe.br. https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7046-3703
[3] Universidad Federal de Pernambuco, Brazil. julio.cfguimaraes@ufpe.br. https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3718-6075
[4] Universidad de la Coruña, España. jakson.soares@udc.gal. https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9859-8009

RESUMEN: A pesar de los desafíos que enfrentan los sectores hotelero y turístico, las empresas hoteleras han demostrado competitividad incluso durante las crisis. Una de las posibles explicaciones teóricas de esta ventaja competitiva es el papel de las capacidades dinámicas y la capacidad de innovación. Este artículo examina empíricamente la relación entre las capacidades dinámicas, la capacidad de innovación y el rendimiento hotelero mediante la investigación de 54 empresas. Los datos se recopilaron utilizando un cuestionario con escalas validadas para capacidades dinámicas, capacidad de innovación y rendimiento, junto con datos de la empresa disponibles públicamente. Se emplearon análisis estadísticos, incluido el análisis factorial confirmatorio y la regresión lineal múltiple, para evaluar la influencia de estas variables en el rendimiento del hotel. Los resultados indican que la capacidad dinámica de detección afecta positivamente a la capacidad de innovación. Sin embargo, las habilidades para aprovechar y reconfigurar no influyeron significativamente en la innovación. La capacidad de innovación, a su vez, impacta positivamente en el rendimiento, siendo la calidad de los productos y servicios el aspecto más significativo de la innovación que afecta al rendimiento. Esta investigación contribuye teóricamente a la comprensión de estas relaciones y proporciona conocimientos prácticos para los hoteles que buscan mejorar su rendimiento. **PALABRAS CLAVE**: capacidades dinámicas; capacidad de innovación; desempeño organizacional; hoteles; turismo.

INTRODUCTION

Scenarios of instability in tourism are defined as significant events that threaten normal operations, causing uncertainty due to unexpected reductions in tourist traffic and damage to the reputations of destinations (Jiang et al., 2019). Such scenarios can arise from both crises and disasters (Jiang et al., 2019; Correia, Pereira, 2021), which have been increasing in frequency. Effective preparation, management, and response are crucial for destinations and companies to address and recover from these adverse events. Research in strategic management highlights the theoretical framework of dynamic capabilities as essential for companies to not only survive but also achieve superior performance during times of instability.

The concept of dynamic capabilities (DC) has gained prominence in academic research (Teece, Pisano, 1994; Teece et al., 1997). Dynamic capabilities (DC) can be defined as a company's ability to integrate, build, and reconfigure internal and external competencies to deal with turbulent and rapidly changing environments.

A current focus in DC research is the relationship between dynamic capabilities and innovativeness, which is defined as the ability to adopt new findings, technologies, or knowledge that provide a competitive advantage (Wu et al., 2023). Both DCs and innovativeness influence organizational performance and offer insights into how companies deal with the highly dynamic environments that precede crises and disasters (Donate et al., 2022; Winter, 2003).

Danneels (2002) was among the first to explore the relationship between innovation capacity and dynamic capabilities in enhancing companies' resources and capabilities. Subsequent research has confirmed a significant and direct relationship between dynamic capabilities and innovativeness (Wang, Ahmed, 2007; Lin et al., 2016).

Despite a long research tradition, dynamic capabilities remain an emerging topic (Wu et al., 2023), particularly within specific contexts such as the tourism and hospitality sector (Lakshman et al., 2023; Vieira et al., 2023; Bezerra et al., 2016). To address this gap, especially in light of the COVID-19 pandemic, recent research has focused on the relationship between dynamic capabilities and hotel performance. This study seeks to answer the following question:

What is the effect of dynamic capabilities and innovativeness on the performance of hotels in Brazil?

To achieve this objective, a quantitative approach was employed. The data collection used a 7-point Likert scale, as utilized in previous studies to minimize potential biases (Nieves, Haller, 2014; Leonidou et al., 2015). The study's population comprised 299 hotels, with questionnaires sent out repeatedly from November 2022 to February 2023. The response rate was 18.06%, yielding a sample of 54 hotels. To ensure data readability (Hair et al., 2009), three statistical tests were conducted: the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) test, the Bartlett test, and Cronbach's Alpha. Research hypotheses were tested using confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) and multiple linear regression (MLR).

Results are presented across five dimensions: (a) dynamic detection capability (DCC) with 5 items; (b) dynamic apprehension capability (DCA) with 8 items; (c) dynamic reconfiguration capability (DRC) with 8 items; (d) innovation capability with 3 items; and (e) performance, measured with 4 items. The results demonstrated that dynamic capabilities have a positive influence on performance outcomes confirming other research that aimed to explore the impact of dynamic capabilities on performance during crises, specifically COVID-19 (Amar et al., 2021). In the hotel industry, there are several studies investigating dynamic capabilities and performance. One study found a significant relationship between customer satisfaction and superior performance (Maia, Costa, 2021) and between sustainability and performance in three, four, and five-star hotels (Pereira-Moliner et al., 2021).

The article is organized into seven sections. The first section is the introduction. The second section provides the theoretical framework, including references on dynamic capabilities, innovation capability, and performance. The third section outlines the methodology used. The fourth section presents the results. The fifth section discusses these results. The sixth section addresses the theoretical and managerial implications, and the final section offers the conclusion.

THEORICAL FOUDATION

In this section we discuss dynamic capabilities, innovativeness and performance.

DYNAMIC CAPABILITIES

The term "dynamic capabilities" emerged in the mid-1990s as a paradigmatic alternative to the resource-based view (RBV), which was considered a static theoretical approach (Priem, Butler, 2001; Foss et al., 2023). The DC focuses on a company's strategic capacity to adapt, integrate, and reconfigure its skills, resources, and competencies to address volatile and rapidly changing environments (Teece, Pisamo, 1994).

According to these authors, dynamic capabilities are a subset of competencies that enable a company to develop products and processes and respond to changing market conditions. They are viewed as mechanisms to build resilience against external challenges (Jiang et al., 2021). These capabilities also facilitate the reconfiguration of internal and external competencies to support management in confronting challenges in turbulent environments (Lin et al., 2016), such as post-crises and disasters.

Research has proposed that dynamic capabilities can be decomposed into three microfoundations: sensing, seizing, and transforming (Teece, 2007). This framework contributes to micromanagement research and aids in constructing various theories by understanding organizational performance through the interaction of macro variables mediated by micro actions (Foss, Pedersen, 2016).

Teece's model divides dynamic capabilities into three microfoundations: sensing, seizing, and transforming (Teece, 2007; Teece, 2018). Sensing, or detection capability, refers to the ability to identify and shape new opportunities in the environment (Chirumalla et al., 2023).

This capability is essential, as companies can observe local and global markets, assess customer preferences and identify new opportunities (Kindstrom et al., 2013). This capability involves a set of resources dedicated to competitive intelligence in search of opportunities. Seizing means the ability to seize opportunities and apply them, for example, by anticipating re-actions to competitors and protecting intellectual property (Teece, 2007; Teece, 2018). The term also refers to the company's ability to generate possible solutions. Furthermore, it can be said that the concept refers to the ability to explore new possibilities, creating new services (Chirumalla et al., 2023). With-out this ability, companies can identify opportunities and threats, but are unable to act in a timely manner (Kindstrom et al., 2013).

Finally, transforming, or reconfiguration capacity, refers to the ability to manage changes within the organization. It also has to do with the ability to recon-figure existing business model elements to take advantage of emerging opportunities (Kindstrom et al., 2013). It can also be said that this concept refers to the actual implementation of change, how quickly changes are made and by what means. This capability contributes to long-term success as it causes leaders to reallocate resources to emerging opportunities (Chirumalla et al., 2023). These microfoundations have already been researched in different contexts and types of companies (Foss et al., 2023; Kindstrom et al., 2013, Pattanasing et al., 2019). Thus, showing its potential for analyzing DCs.

Microfoundations have already been researched in different contexts and types of companies and related to different concepts as leadership (Foss et al., 2023). This study concluded that the capacity for reconfiguration seems to be the most important in leadership. One study looks at the microfoundations of the high performance of hotels in Thailand and posit a difference between high performance and performance (Pattanasing et al., 2019). Additionally, authors argues that the microfoundation of detection affects the innovation process of companies, reducing uncertainty and enabling better capacity to exploit opportunities that arise (Lin et al., 2016). Therefore, they argue that additional relationships may exist between the microfoundations of dynamic capabilities and innovativeness.

INNOVATIVENESS

The concept of innovation forms the foundation for research into innovativeness and its characteristics (Wang, Ahmed, 2007). Innovation is defined as the creation of new products or processes that generate wealth and result in financial returns (Teece, 2006). In other words, a product or service is considered innovative if it is commercialized and leads to increased profits (Pattanasing et al., 2019; Schumpeter, 1982). The Austrian economist Joseph Schumpeter (1982) was the first to argue that innovation and technological change are crucial for the development of companies and nations, and he linked innovations to periods of economic crisis (Schumpeter, 1982).

A central argument for dynamic capabilities is also grounded in the neo-Schumpeterian perspective that managerial choices, intellectual property protection, and the company's asset structure significantly impact innovation (Teece, 2006). Schumpeter suggested that while successful innovation relies on certain internal factors, these were not fully explained. Dynamic capabilities may elucidate why entrepreneurial companies not only adapt to but also shape business ecosystems through innovation and collaboration. Importantly, innovation encompasses not just new technologies but also the organizational and managerial innovations needed to sustain competitiveness (Teece, 2007).

Literature indicates a significant relationship between dynamic capabilities and innovation (Donate et al., 2022; Kindstrom et al., 2013). According to Teece (2006) and Winter (2003), innovation strengthens dynamic capabilities, leading to competitive advantage. Teece argues that a company's internal assets significantly contribute to innovation, with success often stemming from internal factors rather than market conditions. Strong dynamic capabilities are crucial for success, particularly for companies that aim to pioneer new markets or product categories (Teece, 2006).

Thus, we infer a strong relationship between innovation and dynamic capabilities, as innovation is a prominent capability observed in dynamic capabilities research, and its importance is well-documented in the literature (Wu et al., 2023; Donate et al., 2022). Innovativeness can be defined as the integration of resources to develop activities aimed at creating new or improved products or processes (Donate et al., 2022).

Thus, based on the relationship between innovativeness and DC, the following hypotheses were developed:

H1: Detection capacity positively affects innovativeness.

H2: The ability to seizing positively affects innovativeness.

H3: The ability to reconfigure positively affects innovativeness.

Furthermore, it is necessary to understand whether this innovativeness affects performance.

PERFORMANCE

The business performance construct is a central concept in strategic management. This field emerged to explain why some companies outperform their competitors (Wang, Ahmed, 2007). Performance is a multifaceted construct encompassing both financial and non-financial measures. Broadly, it is defined as the economic value a company generates and its ability to earn profits. Measuring organizational performance is crucial for planning and decision-making, as it links strategy, competitiveness, revenue management, and service provision, thereby facilitating the achievement of objectives and goals (Maia, Costa, 2021).

In the hotel industry, performance measurement is increasingly important due to intense competition and a dynamic environment, driving efforts to enhance quality and profitability (Lee et al., 2022). Performance metrics in this sector include both financial and non-financial indicators. Non-financial measures encompass service quality, customer satisfaction, and online reputation (Banker et al., 2000). However, financial measures such as occupancy rate, average daily rate, revenue per room, operating profit percentage, and market share are predominant in most studies (Wu et al., 2023; Lee et al., 2022).

Due to challenges in obtaining absolute performance numbers, some researchers use comparative questions to infer a company's performance relative to its competitors. These questions address (a) whether the company's returns exceed those of competitors (Guimaraes et al., 2019; Severo et al., 2017; Correa et al., 2017); (b) whether the company's return on assets is higher than that of competitors (Guimaraes et al., 2019; Severo et al., 2017; Correa et al., 2017); (c) whether the total operating cost is lower than that of competitors (Guimaraes et al., 2019; Severo et al., 2017; Correa et al., 2017); and (d) whether the company's performance last year was better than that of its main competitor (Guimaraes et al., 2019; Severo et al., 2017; Correa et al., 2017).

Theories explaining superior organizational performance include the structure-conduct-performance (SCP) model, which originated in the 1930s and laid the groundwork for the five competitive forces model (Porter, 1986). Additionally, the resource-based view (RBV), which emerged in the 1980s, posits that superior performance is attributable to a company's resources, capabilities, and competencies (Porter, 1986).

Furthermore, studies exploring long-term positive performance through dynamic capabilities, including innovativeness, indicate that this relationship is complex and not always straightforward (Wang, Ahmed, 2007; Ambrosini, Bowman, 2009). Hence, our fourth research hypothesis is:

H4: Innovativeness positively affects hotel performance.

To address this hypothesis, it is essential to employ an analysis method that accurately reflects the relationship between dynamic capabilities, innovativeness, and performance.

METHOD

This research employs a quantitative approach, as results were quantified using methods that facilitate the measurement of outcomes and the analysis of variables (Gerhardt, Silveira, 2009). The data collection instrument consisted of multiple-choice questions assessing the degree of agreement or disagreement on a 7-point Likert scale, ranging from strongly disagree to strongly agree. This scale, previously used in studies to minimize potential biases, was adapted for this research (Nieves, Haller, 2014; Leonidou et al., 2015). To analyze dynamic capabilities, the scales were modified through translation (Garrido-Moreno et al., 2020). For innovativeness, indicators from previous studies (Guimaraes et al., 2019; Severo et al, 2019) were utilized, as these authors reported significant results with their scales in Brazilian companies. Performance measurement indicators were adapted from studies (Guimaraes et al., 2019; Severo et al., 2017; Correa et al., 2017) that also yielded significant findings.

Approximately two months prior to the main study, the scale was validated by sending the questionnaire to a hotel manager, who was contacted personally, and to a specialist in the hotel industry at the Federal University of Pernambuco. Both respondents evaluated the questionnaire for question validity, clarity, appropriateness of responses, and completion time. It is important to note that this hotel was not included in the final sample. Based on their feedback, some questions—such as those related to hotel billing and respondent identification—were removed due to their complexity.

The research population consisted of 299 hotels, with contact information obtained through an internet search of hotel websites. The list was compiled without prioritizing location or any other identifying characteristics. Hotels were selected based on the availability of contact details such as telephone, email, or WhatsApp, and the willingness of the manager to complete the questionnaire.

Contact was made with these 299 hotels to request the email address or telephone number of the manager or the person responsible for responding to the survey. Questionnaires were sent multiple times between November 2022 and February 2023, resulting in a response rate of 18.06%, corresponding to a sample of 54 hotels.

The only requirement for completing the questionnaire was a valid email address, and none of the questions requested names or other identifying information. Thus, the size of the responding hotels was inferred from Question PH1, which inquired about the number of employees. The results indicated that the responding hotels had an average of 66 employees, suggesting that the sample comprised medium-sized or large hotels.

To ensure data readability, three statistical tests were conducted (Hair et al., 2009): the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) test, Bartlett's test, and Cronbach's Alpha. Research hypotheses were tested using confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) and multiple linear regression (MLR). Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA) is employed to assess how well measured variables represent underlying constructs (Hair et al., 2009), thereby validating the reliability and validity of the data (Wu, 2020).

Multiple linear regression is utilized to examine whether a linear relationship exists between the dependent and independent variables, specifically to determine if the independent variable influences the dependent variable. This analytical approach was selected due to its capability to address the objectives of this study effectively.

The results are organized into five dimensions: (a) Dynamic Detection Capacity (DDC), with 5 statements; (b) Dynamic Apprehension Capacity (DAC), with 8 statements; (c) Dynamic Reconfiguration Capacity (DRC), with 8 statements; (d) Innovativeness, assessed with 3 questions; and (e) Performance, measured using 4 questions. Data analysis was conducted using SPSS statistical software, version 19.0.

RESULTS

The survey was completed by managers or individuals familiar with hotel management and performance. To ensure the confidentiality of respondents and avoid any impact on response rates, hotel and manager identities were not disclosed throughout the research. Participants were only required to provide a valid email address to access the questionnaire; no questions solicited names or other identifying information. Consequently, the average size of the responding hotels could only be inferred from question PH1, which inquired about the number of employees. The results indicated that the hotels have an average of 66 employees and include both chain and independent hotels.

This section presents the results of the data analysis and their theoretical implications. The findings from the reliability tests conducted on the sample are summarized in Table 1.

Table 1. Cronbach's Alpha, Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) Test, and Bartlett's Test.

Dimensions	Cronbach's alpha	Kaiser-Meyer- Olkin	Bartlett's test
DDC (detecting)	0.837	0.761	< 0.001
DAC (seizing)	0.946	0.893	< 0.001
DRC (Reconfiguration)	0.860	0.711	< 0.001
Innovation Cap	0.745	0.568	< 0.001
Performance	0.847	0.729	< 0.001

Source: The authors (2023).

The results indicate that the reliability indices, measured by Cronbach's Alpha, were satisfactory for each dimension, with values exceeding 0.7 (Hair et al., 2009). Additionally, the internal consistency of the scale was confirmed, as all Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) values were above 0.5, which is considered ideal. Furthermore, four out of the five dimensions had KMO values above 0.7, suggesting that the sample was adequate and significant for conducting Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA). Bartlett's test of sphericity revealed significance levels below 0.001 for all tests, indicating that the sample is significant and that correlations exist among the variables.

CFA is employed to analyze latent factors that cannot be measured through a single variable (Hair et al., 2009), making its application appropriate for the objectives of this study. Initially, the communality of each question was assessed to determine the total variance explained by each question in relation to its construct (Hair et al., 2009).

The results of the commonalities and factor loadings are presented in Table 2.

Table 2. Commonalities and Factor Loadings.

Questions	Commonalities	Factor Loadings
DDC1	.516	.718
DDC2	.735	.858
DDC2	.536	.732
DDC4	.620	.787
DDC5	.630	.794
DAC1	.751	.866
DAC2	.844	.919
DAC3	.762	.873
DAC4	.577	.760
DAC5	.745	.863
DAC6	.761	.872
DAC7	.789	.888
DAC8	.589	.768
DRC1	.790	.637
DRC2	.784	.693
DRC3	.548	.740
DRC4	.687	.688
DRC5	.719	.783
DRC6	.613	.697
DRC7	.700	.817
DRC8	.472	.622
IN1	.818	.904
IN2	.857	.926
IN3	.354*	.595
D1	.896	.946
D2	.932	.965
D3	.235*	.485*
D4	.792	.890

Source: The authors (2023).

The commonalities for the majority of questions were above 0.5, indicating that they are largely explained by their respective constructs. However, questions IN3 and D3 yielded results below 0.5, specifically 0.354 and 0.235, respectively. This suggests that these questions are less well explained by their constructs. Question IN3, which addresses the incorporation of new technological knowledge into new services, demonstrates that part of its variance is attributable to other factors. Consequently, only 35.4% of the variance is explained by the innovativeness dimension. Similarly, question D3, which assesses whether operating costs are lower than competitors' costs, has only 23.5% of its variance explained by the performance dimension. Despite this, no questions were found to belong to constructs other than their respective ones. In other words, IN3 is part of the innovativeness construct, and D3 is part of the performance construct.

Table 2 also presents the factor loadings, which, when exceeding 0.5, confirm that each question significantly contributes to its general dimension. All questions, except for D3 (which had a satisfactory but slightly lower loading), demonstrated strong factor loadings, with some exceeding 90%. This supports the validity of the questions in analyzing dynamic capabilities, innovativeness, and performance. D3 had a factor loading of 48.5%, indicating a 48.5% correlation between company performance and cost. This result highlights that hotel costs influence overall company performance, and a lower cost compared to competitors should positively impact the company's performance. This finding aligns with other studies that emphasize the importance of financial factors, such as costs and investments, in shaping hotel performance, as observed by managers (Maia, Costa, 2021).

MULTIPLE LINEAR REGRESSION RESULTS

Multiple linear regression (MLR) was conducted to analyze the relationships between the dependent and independent variables. Initially, analyses were performed to assess the relationship between dynamic capabilities and innovativeness, followed by an examination of the relationship between innovativeness and performance. The analyses utilized the "Enter" method (SPSS, version 19.0), which includes all independent variables in the model and evaluates the results collectively.

The chosen model does not exclude variables that do not show significant results, which may influence the overall significance of the findings. The "Stepwise" method (SPSS, version 19.0) was employed only for analyzing the relationship between innovativeness and performance to better understand the variables affecting hotel performance. This method includes only the variables that significantly impact the observed construct.

It is worth noting that the measurement of the influence relationship of Innovativeness was made using only the observable variables that resulted in significant Beta values ($p>0.05$), therefore the multiple linear regression presented in Tables 3, 4 and 5 refer to the results of the influence of the significant variables, according to the MLR analysis using the "Stepwise" method.

The analysis initially focused on the relationship between dynamic capabilities and innovativeness, measured by the following variables:

IN1: The quality of our products/services is higher than that of competitors.

IN2: Our products/services, in terms of functionality and resources, are superior to those of competitors.

IN3: Our new products/services largely incorporate new technological knowledge.

R^2 represents the coefficient of determination, indicating the extent to which the independent variables explain the variability of the dependent variable. The adjusted R^2 accounts for the number of independent variables and adjusts the R^2 value accordingly. Both the R^2 and adjusted R^2 values for the dependent variables related to innovativeness (IN1) are presented in Table 3

Table 3. Model adjustment coefficients IN1.

Dependent variables	Independent	R2	adjusted R2 _
IN1	DDC	0.170	0.083
IN1	DAC	0.249	0.106
IN1	DRC	0.207	0.062

Source: The authors (2023).

An analysis of the values presented in Table 3 reveals that the superiority of hotel products/services relative to competitors is more strongly explained by the ability to seize opportunities (24.9%) and the ability to reconfigure (20.7%) than by detection capacity (17%), as indicated by the R^2 values. This suggests that the enhancement of hotel services/products is primarily driven by the company's ability to capitalize on opportunities (seizing) and to make necessary adjustments to leverage these opportunities (reconfiguring). Simply detecting an opportunity is insufficient without subsequent action. For instance, if a hotel identifies a new technology that could be beneficial and implements it effectively, the innovation will have a greater impact than if the hotel merely recognizes the opportunity without taking action.

It is also important to note that the R^2 values below 0.5 may indicate that other factors influencing innovativeness are not captured by the current model. Potential factors not included in the model might include hotel type and entrepreneurial orientation (Victorino et al., 2015; Nasution et al., 2011).

Furthermore, Table 3 shows the adjusted R^2 values as follows: 0.083 for detection capacity, 0.106 for the ability to seize opportunities, and 0.062 for reconfiguration capacity. These adjusted R^2 values suggest that variations in innovativeness may occur with changes in dynamic capabilities. Overall, these results validate the model for the variable IN1 (the quality of our products/services is superior to those of competitors).

Similar procedures were applied to analyze the variable IN2 (products/services in terms of functionality and resources being superior to competitors), as detailed in Table 4.

Table 4. Model adjustment coefficients IN2.

Dependent	Independent	R2	adjusted R2 _
IN2	DDC	0.295	0.222
IN2	DAC	0.191	0.036
IN2	DRC	0.369	0.255

Source: The authors (2023).

It can be inferred that having more functional products and services, along with superior features compared to competitors, is related to reconfiguration capabilities (DRCs). In other words, to achieve superior and more functional resources, hotels need to adapt their operations to innovate effectively. Merely detecting an opportunity does not automatically result in more functional or superior products and services. For example, a hotel may identify a system that can expedite check-in, but the benefits of this innovation can only be realized if the hotel implements and adapts the system (reconfiguration). Thus, when compared to competitors, the manager recognizes that the innovative check-in system enhances the hotel's functionality and resources.

Regarding the adjusted R^2, similar to innovativeness 1, it is noted that variations in IN2 may occur due to changes in dynamic capabilities. This implies that if a company's ability to detect, seize, and appropriately apply opportunities is compromised, its innovativeness will also be negatively affected.

Finally, Table 5 presents the adjustment coefficients for IN3 (new services incorporating new technological knowledge). The data indicate that the highest R^2 value is associated with reconfiguration capacity (0.469), meaning that 46.9% of the variance in the IN3 variable is explained by reconfiguration capability. Detection and apprehension capabilities also show significant explanatory values for the IN3 variable. In summary, this indicates that dynamic capabilities and their three microfoundations significantly influence the incorporation of new technologies in hotels. In other words, for a hotel to adapt and acquire new technologies in pursuit of competitive advantages, it must also enhance its overall dynamic capabilities.

As for the adjusted R^2, reconfiguration capacity also presented the highest value (0.373). Detection and apprehension capacities also show significant values that could lead to changes in IN3.

Table 5. Model adjustment coefficients IN3.

Dependent	Independent	R2	adjusted R2
IN3	DDC	0.197	0.113
IN3	DAC	0.307	0.175
IN3	DRC	0.469	0.373

Source: The authors (2023).

Furthermore, the results of the regression model and ANOVA for the dependent variables of innovation capacity were analyzed. Thus, initially, it was verified whether the estimated model was better than the null model. The results can be seen in Table 6.

Table 6. Regression model and ANOVA IN1.

DDC	F	*p*-Value
Regression	1965	0.101
DAC	F	*p*-Value
Regression	1,744	0.116
DRC	F	*p*-Value
Regression	1,433	0.210

Source: The authors (2023).

For the proposed model to be significant, the p-value must be less than 0.05, which was not the case. Thus, the model that relates innovativeness 1 (the quality of services being superior to competitors) to dynamic capabilities is not statistically significant in the analysis of variance. In other words, this means that there were differences between the response averages that caused the model to present non-significant results in the analysis of variance, indicating that the responses were so varied that it was not possible to establish a reliable pattern or estimate a dependable model. Practically, the responses regarding the quality of services being superior to competitors were so diverse that little can be concluded from this specific sample.

This can be justified because the research analyzed the results of independent hotels and chain-operated hotels jointly, leading to varied responses. Indeed, several authors have argued that responses differ depending on the type of hotel management (Orfila-Sintes et al., 2005; Nieves et al., 2015). Therefore, it is likely that the responses from participants in chain hotels differ from those in independent hotels. Consequently, it can only be said that the response averages are diverse and varied, and analyzing the average, for example, would not accurately represent the respondents.

Similarly, the model is analyzed with the variable IN2 (products/services in terms of functionality and resources being superior to competitors) in Table 7.

Table 7. Regression model and ANOVA IN2.

DDC	F	*p*-Value
Regression	4,020	0.004
DAC	F	*p*-Value
Regression	1,236	0.303
DRC	F	*p*-Value
Regression	3,220	0.006

Source: The authors (2023).

Based on the p-value in Table 6, the analysis of variance is significant when relating the variable IN2 with detection and reconfiguration capabilities. This indicates that the estimated model has a 95% confidence level for these capabilities. Unlike the results for the variable IN1 (Table 6), the findings demonstrate that services are superior to competitors in terms of functionality and services (IN2) and are influenced by dynamic capabilities.

Similarly, Table 8 presents the analysis of the model with the variable IN3, which pertains to products/services incorporating new technological knowledge.

Table 8. Regression model and ANOVA IN3.

DDC	F	*p*-Value
Regression	2,351	0.055
DAC	F	*p*-Value
Regression	2,327	0.036
DRC	F	*p*-Value
Regression	4,861	< 0.001

Source: The authors (2023).

Table 8 demonstrates that, for IN3 (products/services that largely incorporate new technological knowledge), the apprehension and reconfiguration capabilities are statistically significant in the variance analysis. This indicates that the estimated model has a 95% confidence level for these capabilities. It highlights that a hotel's ability to seize and apply new technological opportunities significantly influences the results, in contrast to merely identifying the opportunity without acting on it.

Furthermore, the estimated beta coefficients, their significance levels, and the improvements in model prediction for the variables IN1, IN2, and IN3 are provided below. These results are displayed in the adjusted R-square column in SPSS.

The results for the variable IN1 (the quality of services being superior to competitors) are detailed in Table 9.

Table 9. Significance of the IN1 model.

Variables		Coefficients		
Dependent	Independent	*Beta*	Meaningfulness	adjusted R-square
IN1	DDC	0.423	0.023	0.095
	DAC	0.167	0.400	0.013
	DRC	0.258	0.178	0.034

Source: The authors (2023).

The results in Table 9 indicate that only the detection capability yielded significant results for the variable IN1, with a significance level below 0.05. The adjusted R-square value showed that incorporating detection capabilities in the model improved the prediction of IN1 by 0.095, or approximately 10%, compared to a model without detection capabilities. In other words, excluding detection capability from the model would reduce its predictive power for IN1 by 10%. This suggests that a company's ability to perceive opportunities significantly influences its capability to offer products and services superior to those of competitors.

For the other variables analyzed, the significance values were above 0.05, indicating that the null hypothesis (H0) cannot be rejected.

A similar analysis is conducted for the variable IN2 (products and services superior to competitors in terms of functionality and resources) in Table 10.

Table 10. Significance of the IN2 model.

Variables		Coefficients		
Dependent	Independent	*Beta*	Meaningfulness	adjusted R-square
IN2	DDC	0.637	< 0.001	0.215
	DAC	-0.42	0.838	0.001
	DRC	0.188	0.270	0.018

Source: The authors (2023).

The results in Table 10 indicate that only detection capacity was significant for the model. Furthermore, incorporating these variables improved the predictive power of the IN2 variable by 21.5%. For the other variables analyzed, the significance values exceeded 0.05, suggesting that the null hypothesis (H0) cannot be rejected. Lastly, the data for the IN3 variable (products and services incorporating new technological knowledge) are presented in Table 11.

Table 11. Significance of the IN3 model.

Variables		Coefficients		
Dependent	Independent	*Beta*	Meaningfulness	adjusted R-square
	DDC	0.493	0.008	0.129
IN3	DAC	-0.188	0.325	0.016
	DRC	0.075	0.628	0.003

Source: The authors (2023).

According to Table 11, the results for the IN3 variable were consistent with those for the IN1 and IN2 variables. Once again, only detection capacity was significant, improving the prediction of the variable by 0.129, which was the best result among the three innovativeness variables. This indicates that detection capacity is the most influential factor in driving innovativeness in this research. Among the hotels surveyed, the ability to perceive opportunities is the skill that most significantly impacts their innovation efforts. This is likely because detection is considered the first step among the three microfoundations. If an opportunity is not perceived (detection), the hotel cannot implement innovation.

The summary of the findings is presented in Table 12.

Table 12. Results of the hypotheses related to the dependent variables IN1, IN2 and IN3.

Hypotheses	Results
H1: Sensing ability positively affects innovativeness.	Yes, the ability to detect positively affects innovativeness
H2: The ability to seize positively affects innovativeness.	This cannot be said, as there is no linear relationship between the variables.
H3: The ability to reconfigure positively affects innovativeness.	This cannot be said, as there is no linear relationship between the variables.

Source: The authors (2023).

The findings confirm that detection capability is the dynamic capability that most positively influences innovativeness. This result corroborates previous research and indicates that innovativeness involves utilizing one's skills and resources, such as the ability to identify opportunities to create new products and services (Donate et al., 2022). Furthermore, the demand for innovation is driven by identifying a new problem or a perceived deficiency (detection capacity) (Birkinshaw et al., 2008).

The positive effect of detection capacity on innovativeness demonstrates that managers rely on this capacity throughout the process (Lin, Su, 2016), from the initiation of an action to its implementation. Market dynamism and competitive turbulence may increase the intensity of this relationship. Analysis of dynamic capabilities during the COVID-19 pandemic in hotels showed that detection capacity increased due to new rules and needs, such as customers using masks in common areas and avoiding direct contact (Liu, Yang, 2021). Therefore, periods of turbulence and uncertainty are critical for analyzing investment risk, including innovation (Dias et al., 2021).

Finally, the results of multiple linear regression evaluating the relationship between performance and innovativeness are presented in Table 12. The following independent variables were analyzed:

D1: The company's returns on investments are higher than those of competitors.

D2: The company's returns on assets are higher than those of competitors.

D3: The company's total operating cost is lower than the total cost of competitors.

D4: The company's overall performance was greater than the main competitor's overall performance.

Table 13 shows the model adjustment.

Table 13. Model adjustment coefficients D1, D2, D3 and D4.

Dependent variables	Independent variable	R^2	adjusted R2 -
D1	Innovativeness	0.401	0.363
D2	Innovativeness	0.402	0.365
D3	Innovativeness	0.015	-0.47
D4	Innovativeness	0.224	0.175

Source: The authors (2023).

Based on Table 13, R^2 demonstrates a strong explanatory power for variables D1, D2, and D4. Performance is significantly influenced by innovativeness, aligning with previous studies (Wu et al., 2023). Variable D3, however, shows lower factor loadings, indicating that additional variables beyond innovativeness may better explain the company's total cost advantage over competitors.

Analyzing the adjusted R^2 coefficient reveals that changes in innovativeness most significantly impact returns on investments and company assets (D1 and D2). For instance, ceasing innovation could negatively affect investment returns, while increased innovativeness could reduce company costs, supporting the observed inverse relationship.

Furthermore, the regression model and ANOVA results for dependent variables D1, D2, D3, and D4 must be examined.

Table 14 verifies the relationship between performance variables and innovativeness.

Table 14. Innovativeness and Performance Results – Regression and ANOVA model.

D1	F	*p*-Value
Regression	10,698	< 0.001
D2	F	*p*-Value
Regression	10,755	< 0.001
D3	F	*p*-Value
Regression	0.242	0.866
D4	F	*p*-Value
Regression	4,527	0.007

Source: The authors (2023).

The results demonstrate that innovativeness has a statistically significant influence on performance in questions D1, D2, and D4. Like the results presented previously, the company's total costs (D3) do not seem to be significant for the analysis of innovativeness. There seem to be costs that do not change whether the hotel innovates or not.

Furthermore, to respond to the hypotheses generated, it is necessary to analyze the significance of the beta coefficient and the adjusted R-square. The method used was SPSS "step by step," which analyzes the model only with the variables that have a significant impact on the observed dimension or construct, thus removing the variables that do not impact the model.

The results are presented in Table 15.

Table 15. Significance of performance.

Variables		Coefficients		
Dependent	Independent	*Beta*	Meaningfulness	R-square change
D1	IN1	0.546	< 0.001	0.298
D2	IN1	0.520	< 0.001	0.270
D4	IN1	0.347	0.013	0.120

Source: The authors (2023).

The step-by-step analysis indicates that IN1 (the quality of products/services is superior to competitors) significantly influences performance. The model improves performance predictability by 29.8% for D1, 27% for D2, and 12% for D4, highlighting the importance of product/service quality in enhancing performance. The summary of the findings related to H4 is presented in Table 16.

Table 16. Results of the hypotheses related to the dependent variables IN1:

Hypotheses	Results
H4: Innovativeness positively affects hotel performance.	Yes, the innovativeness positively affects the performance.

Source: The authors (2023).

The findings conclude that performance is particularly influenced by how the company presents superior quality in its products/services compared to competitors (IN1). This aspect of innovativeness has a more significant impact on performance than other factors in this sample.

DISCUSSION

This research aimed to examine the impact of dynamic capabilities on innovativeness and the subsequent effect of innovativeness on hotel performance. Initial factor analysis confirmed that each variable (a) represents its respective construct and (b) significantly contributes to the observed results.

The first hypothesis proposed that detection capacity positively influences innovativeness in the hotels studied. The second hypothesis suggested that the ability to seize opportunities positively influences innovativeness, while the third hypothesis posited that the ability to reconfigure positively affects innovativeness. The latter two hypotheses were not supported by the data, indicating that the results may have exhibited considerable variability, preventing the establishment of a consistent pattern in response to these hypotheses. Practically, this implies that, within the sample of this research, the impact of apprehension and reconfiguration on innovativeness could not be determined. However, it was evident that the most significant contributor to innovativeness was the hotel's detection capacity—the ability to identify market opportunities. This suggests that improving a company's ability to detect opportunities can enhance its innovation capabilities, while failing to perceive these opportunities may hinder innovation.

The confirmed hypothesis regarding detection capacity aligns with previous research indicating that the need to innovate drives managers to seek new opportunities (Donate et al., 2022; Birkinshaw et al., 2008). Additionally, the COVID-19 pandemic has been identified as a factor prompting hotel companies to focus on environmental stewardship and explore new opportunities (Liu, Yang, 2021; Dias et al., 2021). Previous studies also support the significant role of detection capacity in fostering innovation, particularly within the hotel industry (Nieves et al., 2015; Lin et al., 2016). This does not diminish the importance of the abilities to seize and reconfigure but highlights that, in this sample, the primary focus for hotel managers is on recognizing opportunities. The study underscores the dynamic and reciprocal relationship between innovation and existing organizational competencies (Danneels, 2002).

The fourth hypothesis, which proposed that innovativeness influences hotel performance, was confirmed. This finding demonstrates that innovativeness positively impacts hotel performance, consistent with other research on these variables within the hotel industry (Wu et al., 2023; Danurdara et al., 2021; Wilke et al., 2019). In other words, higher innovativeness leads to better performance, while a lack of innovation negatively affects performance. Previous studies have highlighted that various factors, including information technology, influence innovation, which in turn affects company performance (Chen et al., 2021). The results indicate that several factors contribute to innovativeness and impact hotel performance (Donate et al., 2022).

Specifically, the results showed that among the innovativeness indicators, the perception that services are superior to competitors (IN1) significantly affects performance. Managers perceive a stronger link between performance and the superiority of their products/services compared to competitors. This suggests that other indicators of innovativeness, such as functionality and technological resources (IN2 and IN3), may not be as impactful on performance from the managers' perspective. Alternatively, this might indicate that these factors have less influence in the sample studied, as no linear relationship was observed between the variables. Nonetheless, the superiority of services remains the most significant factor affecting performance according to the managers.

In summary, dynamic capabilities are crucial for hotels to foster innovation and enhance their performance.

THEORICAL AND MANAGERIAL IMPLICATIONS

This study examines the relationships among dynamic capabilities, innovativeness, and performance. The findings reveal that dynamic detection capacity has the most significant influence on innovativeness. This suggests that companies may struggle to apply identified opportunities and adapt their strategies effectively (i.e., their ability to seize and reconfigure). The results indicate that managers should focus on enhancing their company's dynamic detection capacity—the ability to identify market opportunities—as it can substantially boost innovativeness. Specifically, hotels need to improve their environmental scanning, conduct market research, monitor emerging trends, and understand customer preferences and behavioral changes. Additionally, if hotels aim to achieve superior performance in terms of innovativeness, they may need to invest more in their seizing and reconfiguration capabilities.

The study also demonstrates that innovativeness positively impacts performance. Practically, this means that managers seeking to enhance performance should focus on improving their innovation capabilities. Innovativeness, such as enhancing the quality of products and services or offering unique services, significantly affects performance. In a highly competitive global market, improving performance is crucial for the survival of hotels.

This research provides practical insights by showing that the analyzed hotels are focused on identifying latent market opportunities (detection capacity) but lack effective actions for leveraging these opportunities. Concerning innovativeness, the hotels are primarily concerned with ensuring their services and products are superior in quality compared to competitors (IN1), but they do not sufficiently emphasize improving product functionalities and technological aspects (IN2 and IN3).

Theoretically, the research contributes to understanding the relationships among the three constructs in the hotel sector. The use of confirmatory factor analysis was instrumental in modeling these constructs, presenting a model that could be applied in other contexts, such as different service industries or other sectors within tourism. This research provides new theoretical and practical insights into dynamic capabilities, innovativeness, and performance, as well as the behavior of hotel companies striving for improved performance.

Epistemically, this study confirms existing theories and offers detailed insights into how dynamic capabilities, innovativeness, and performance are interconnected. Furthermore, it demonstrates the tangible benefits of investing in dynamic capabilities and innovativeness to enhance hotel performance.

CONCLUSION

The objective of this study was to analyze the relationships between dynamic capabilities, innovativeness, and performance. The results indicated that a company's detection capacity most significantly influences innovativeness and that innovativeness impacts performance primarily in terms of product quality superiority.

In practical terms, this finding suggests that hotels should invest in enhancing their dynamic capabilities and innovativeness to improve their performance. Additionally, these results imply that there may be other factors not captured in this research that could have a more substantial impact on innovativeness and performance within the sampled hotels.

While this study provides valuable insights into the hospitality industry's dynamic capabilities, innovativeness, and performance, it does have some limitations:

1) Access Restrictions: Despite multiple attempts to contact hotels and explain the research purpose, many hotels declined to provide even basic contact information for managers.

2) Limited Data Collection: The study did not collect more specific information about the hotels or respondents, such as location, hotel type, or other profile details, due to the extensive nature of the questionnaire.

3) Statistical Insignificance: Some variables were found to be statistically insignificant, suggesting that other factors may influence innovativeness or performance and warrant further investigation.

Future research should consider the following approaches: (a) conducting qualitative analyses to gain deeper insights into the decision-making processes and outcomes related to dynamic capabilities and innovativeness in hotels; (b) directly evaluating the impact of dynamic capabilities on hotel performance; and (c) exploring innovativeness as a moderating variable in these relationships.

REFERENCES

Amar, Muhhamad Yunus, Syariati, Alim, Ridwan, Ridwan, Parmitasari & Rika Dwi Ayu (2021). Indonesian Hotels' Dynamic Capability under the Risks of COVID-19. *Risks*, 9(11), 1-18, https://doi.org/10.3390/risks9110194.

Ambrosini, Veronique & Bowman, Cliff (2009). What are dynamic capabilities and are they a useful construct in strategic management?. *International Journal of Management Review, 11*(1), 29-49. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2370.2008.00251.x

Banker, Rajiv D., Potter, Gordon & Srinivasan, Dhinu (2000). An empirical investigation of an incentive plan that includes nonfinancial performance measures. *The Accounting Review, 75*(1), 65-92. https://www.jstor.org/stable/248633

Bezerra, Eduardo D., Silva, Gabriel, & Silva, Daniel E. P. (2016). Capacidade absortiva em agências de viagens: um estudo no estado de Sergipe, Brasil. *Revista Brasileira de Pesquisa em Turismo, 10*(1), 89-107. http://dx.doi.org/10.7784/rbtur.v10i1.1054.

Birkinshaw, Julian, Hamel, Gary & Mol, Michael J. (2008). Management innovation. *Academy of Management Review, 33*(4), 825–845. http://dx.doi.org/10.5465/AMR.2008.34421969

Chen, Ming, Chen, Ying, Liu, Hao & Xu, Hui (2021). Influence of information technology capability on service innovation in manufacturing firms. *Industrial Management & Data Systems, 21*(2), 173-191. https://www.emerald.com/insight/content/doi/10.1108/IMDS-04-2020-0218/full/html

Chirumalla, Koteshwar, Leoni, Luna & Oghazi, Pejvak (2023). Moving from servitization to digital servitization: Identifying the required dynamic capabilities and related microfoundations to facilitate the transition. *Journal of Business Research*, 158, 1-23. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2023.113668

Correa, Suelen, Guimarães, Julio Cesar Ferro, Severo, Eliana Andréa & Cruz, Márcia Rohr da (2017). As relações entre a orientação para o mercado, a inovação de produto e processo, e a performance organizacional. *Contextus Revista Contemporânea de Economia e Gestão, 15*(3), 174-202. https://doi.org/10.19094/contextus.v15i3.940

Correia, Adriana Mirely Silva Spindola & Pereira, Yákara, Vasconcelos Pereira (2021). International entrepreneurship and the impacts of catastrophes on the tourism sector. *Rosa dos Ventos Turismo e Hospitalidade*, 13(4), 1-19, https://doi.org/10.18226/21789061.v13i4p09.

Danneels, Erwin (2002). The dynamics of product innovation and firm competences. *Strategic Management Journal*, 23(12), 1095-1121, https://doi.org/10.1002/smj.275.

Danurdara, Ananta Budhi, Darmawan, Haryadi & Kalsum, Elly Umi (2021). General management. *General Management, 22*(184), 179-185. https://doi.org/10.47750/QAS/22.184.23

Dias, Álvaro, Costa, Renato, Pereira, Leandro & Santos, José (2021). Implementation of eco-innovation in hotels: A dynamic capabilities approach. *Tourism, 69*(1), 58-72. https://doi.org/10.37741/t.69.1.5

Donate, Mario J., González-Mohíno, Miguel, Appio, Francesco Paolo & Bernhard, Fabian (2022). Dealing with knowledge hiding to improve innovation capabilities in the hotel industry: The unconventional role of knowledge-oriented leadership. *Journal of Business Research*, 144, 572-586, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2022.02.001.

Elsharnouby, Tamer H., & Elbanna, Samer (2021). Change or perish: Examining the role of human capital and dynamic marketing capabilities in the hospitality sector. *Tourism Management, 82*, 1-13. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2020.104184

Foss, Nicolai J., Schmidt, Jens & Teece, David J. (2023). Ecosystem leadership as a dynamic capability. Long Range Planning, 56(1), 1-16. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lrp.2022.102270

Foss, Nicolai J. (2016). Reflections on a decade of microfoundations research. *RAUSP, 51*(01), 117-120. https://doi.org/10.5700/RAUSP1227

Foss, Nicolai J. & Pedersen, Torben (2016). Microfoundations in strategy research. *Strategic Management Journal, 37*(13), E22-E34. https://doi.org/10.1002/smj.2362

Garrido-Moreno, Aurora, García-Morales, Víctor J., King, Stephen F. & Lockett, Nigel J. (2020). Social media use and value creation in the digital landscape: A dynamic capabilities perspective. *Journal of Service Management, 31*(3), 331-343. https://doi.org/10.1108/JOSM-09-2018-0286

Gerhardt, Tatiana Engel & Silveira, Denise Tolfo (2009). *Métodos de pesquisa*. Editora da UFRGS: Porto Alegre, Brasil.

Guimarães, Julio Cesar Ferro, Severo, Eliana Andréa, Campos, Domingos Fernandes, El-Aouar, Walid Abbas & Azevedo, Fabiana Lucena Bezerra de (2019). Strategic drivers for product and process innovation: A survey in industrial manufacturing, commerce and services. *Benchmarking: An International Journal, 27*(3), 1159-1187. https://doi.org/10.1108/BIJ-12-2018-0403

Hair, Joseph F., Babin, Barry, Money, Arthur H. & Samouel, Phillip (2009). *Fundamentos de Método de Pesquisa em Administração*. Editora Bookman.

Hariandja, Eddy S. (2021). Customer perspective on dynamic marketing capability in international hotels of Indonesia during Covid-19: Confirmatory factor analysis. *Innovative Marketing, 17*(3), 74-87. https://doi.org/10.21511/im.17(3).2021.06

Jiang, Yawei, Ritchie, Brent W. & Verreynne, Martie-Louse (2019). Building Tourism Organizational Resilience to Crises and Disasters: A dynamic capabilities view. *International Journal of Tourism Research*, 21(6), 882-900, https://doi.org/10.1002/jtr.2312.

Jiang, Yawei, Ritchie, Brent & Verreynne, Martie-Louise (2021). Developing disaster resilience: A processual and reflective approach. *Tourism Management, 87*, 104374. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2021.104374

Kindström, Daniel, Kowalkowski, Christian, & Sandberg, Erik (2013). Enabling service innovation: A dynamic capabilities approach. *Journal of Business Research, 66*(8), 1063-1073. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2012.03.003

Lakshman, C., Lakshman, Sangeetha & Gok, Kubilay (2023). Managers' knowledge and customer-focused knowledge management as dynamic capabilities: implications for innovation performance. *Asian Business y Management*, 22(11), 246–274, https://doi.org/10.1057/s41291-021-00165-z.

Lee, Tzong-Haw, Su, Yi-Ju & Chang, Hung-Hao (2022). The impact of COVID-19 on tourist hotel performance and tourism demand: Empirical evidence using population-based administrative data from Taiwan. *The Singapore Economic Review, 1-24*. https://doi.org/10.1142/S0217590822500151

Leonidou, Leonidas C., Leonidou, Constantinos N., Fotiadis, Thomas A. & Aykol, Bilge (2015). Dynamic capabilities driving an eco-based advantage and performance in global hotel chains: The moderating effect of international strategy. *Tourism Management, 50*, 268-280. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2015.03.005

Lin, Hai-Fen, Su, Jing-Qin & Higgins, Angela (2016). How dynamic capabilities affect adoption of management innovations. *Journal of Business Research*, 69(2), 862–876, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2015.07.004.

Liu, Chun-Hung & Yang, Jing (2021). How hotels adjust technology-based strategy to respond to COVID-19 and gain competitive productivity (CP): Strategic management process and dynamic capabilities. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management, 33*(9), 2907-2931. https://doi.org/10.1108/IJCHM-10-2020-1143

Maia, Ana F. & Costa, Ricardo (2021). Performance measurement in hotels: A case study of Pestana Pousadas de Portugal. *Journal of Tourism e Development, 36*(2), 167-183. https://doi.org/10.34624/rtd.v36i2.26022

Nasution, Hanny N., Mavondo, Felix T., Matanda, Margaret Jekanyika & Ndubisi, Nelson Oly (2011). Entrepreneurship: Its relationship with market orientation and learning orientation and as antecedents to innovation and customer value. *Industrial Marketing Management, 40*(3), 336–345. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.indmarman.2010.08.002

Nieves, Javier & Haller, Stephan (2014). Building dynamic capabilities through knowledge resources. *Tourism Management, 40*, 224-232. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2013.06.010

Nieves, Julia, Quintana, Agustín & Osorio, Javier (2015). Organizational knowledge, dynamic capabilities and innovation in the hotel industry. *Tourism and Hospitality Research, 16*(2), 158-171. https://doi.org/10.1177/1467358415600208

Orfila-Sintes, Francina, Crespí-Cladera, Rafel & Martínez-Ros, Esther (2005). Innovation activity in the hotel industry: Evidence from Balearic Islands. *Tourism Management, 26*(6), 851–865. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2004.05.005

Pattanasing, Kanittha, Aujirapongpan, Somnuk & Srimai, Suwit (2019). Dynamic capabilities and high performance organization of hotel business: Empirical investigation into world class tourism destination. *Tourism and Hospitality Management, 25*(2), 377-401. https://doi.org/10.20867/thm.25.2.8

Pereira-Moliner, Joaquín, López-Gamero, María D., Font, Xavier, Molina-Azorín, José F., Tarí, Juan J. & Pertusa-Ortega, Emilio M. (2021). Sustentabilidade, vantagens competitivas e desempenho na indústria hoteleira: Uma relação sinérgica. *Revista de Turismo e Serviços, 23*(12), 132-149. https://doi.org/10.29036/jots.v12i23.282

Porter, Michael E. (1986). *Vantagem competitiva*. Editora Campos: Rio de Janeiro, Brasil

Priem, Richard L., & Butler, John E. (2001). Is the resource based “view” a useful perspective for strategic management research?. *Academy of Management Review, 26*(1), 22-40. https://doi.org/10.2307/259392

Schumpeter, Joseph A. (1982). *Teoria do desenvolvimento econômico*. Abril Cultural: São Paulo, Brasil.

Severo, Eliana Andréa, Guimarães, Julio Cesar Ferro & Dorion, Eric Charles Henri (2017). Cleaner production and environmental management as sustainable product innovation antecedents: A survey in Brazilian industries. *Journal of Cleaner Production, 142*(1), 87-97. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2016.06.090

Severo, Eliana Andréa, Sbardelotto, Bruno, Guimarães, Julio Cesar Ferro & Vasconcelos, César Ricardo Maia (2019). Project management and innovation practices: Background of the sustainable competitive advantage in southern Brazil enterprises. *Product Planning & Control, 31*(15), 1276-1290. https://doi.org/10.1080/09537287.2019.1702734

Teece, David. J. & Pisano, Gary (1994). Capabilities of Firms: an introduction. *Industrial and Corporate Change*, 3(3), 537-556, https://doi.org/10.1093/icc/3.3.537-a.

Teece, David. J., Pisano, Gary & Shuen, Amy (1997). Dynamic Capabilities and Strategic Management. *Strategic Management Journal*, 18(7), 509-533, https://www.jstor.org/stable/3088148.

Teece, David J. (2007). Explicating dynamic capabilities: The nature and microfoundations of (sustainable) enterprise performance. *Strategic Management Journal, 28*(13), 1319-1350. https://doi.org/10.1002/smj.640

Teece, David J. (2018). Business models and dynamic capabilities. *Long Range Planning, 51*(1), 40-49. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lrp.2017.06.007

Teece, David J. (2006). Reflections on "Profiting from Innovation". *Research Policy, 35*(8), 1131–1146. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.respol.2006.09.009

Victorino, Liana, Verma, Rohit, Plaschka, Gerhard & Dev, Chekitan (2015). Service innovation and customer choices in the hospitality industry. *Managing Service Quality, 15*(6), 555-576. https://doi.org/10.1108/09604520510634023

Vieira, Daniel P., Reyes Junior, Eduardo & Vasquez, Pedro L. A. (2023). A influência dos relacionamentos interorganizacionais no desempenho de empresas hoteleiras – evidências de destinos peruanos. *Revista Brasileira de Pesquisa em Turismo, 17*, e-2739. https://doi.org/10.7784/rbtur.v17.2739

Wang, Catherine L. & Ahmed, Pervaiz K. (2007). Dynamic Capabilities: A review and research agenda. *International Journal of Management Review*, 9(1), 31-51, https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2370.2007.00201.x.

Wilke, Eduardo P., Costa, Bruno K., Freire, Otávio B. L. & Ferreira, Manuel P. (2019). Interorganizational cooperation in tourist destination: Building performance in the hotel industry. *Tourism Management, 72*, 340-351. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/S0261517718303194

Winter, Sidney G. (2003). Understanding Dynamic Capabilities. *Strategic Management Journal*, 24(10), 991-995, https://www.jstor.org/stable/20060593.

Wu, Qihan, Yan, Dong & Umair, Muhammad (2023). Assessing the role of competitive intelligence and practices of dynamic capabilities in business accommodation of SMES. *Economic Analysis and Policy*, 77, 1103-1114, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eap.2022.11.024.

Wu, Anning (2020). Improving tourism innovation performance: Linking perspectives of asset specificity, intellectual capital, and absorptive capacity. *Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Research, 44*(6), 908-930. https://doi.org/10.1177/1096348020927453

Cronologia do Processo Editorial
Editorial Process Chronology

Recebido em: 01/12/2024
Aprovado em: 29/12/2024

Received in: December 01, 2024
Approved in: December 29, 2024