


Please cite the Published Version

Pereira, Vijay, Mellahi, Kamel, Temouri, Yama, Patnaik, Swetketu and Roohanifar, Mohammad  (2019) Investigating Dynamic Capabilities, Agility and Knowledge Management Within EMNEs-Longitudinal Evidence From Europe. *Journal of Knowledge Management*, 23 (9). pp. 1708-1728. ISSN 1367-3270

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1108/JKM-06-2018-0391>

Publisher: Emerald

Version: Accepted Version

Downloaded from: <https://e-space.mmu.ac.uk/621911/>

Additional Information: Accepted manuscript published in *Journal of Knowledge Management*, copyright Emerald Publishing.

Enquiries:

If you have questions about this document, contact openresearch@mmu.ac.uk. Please include the URL of the record in e-space. If you believe that your, or a third party's rights have been compromised through this document please see our Take Down policy (available from <https://www.mmu.ac.uk/library/using-the-library/policies-and-guidelines>)



Investigating Dynamic Capabilities, Agility and Knowledge Management within EMNEs- Longitudinal Evidence from Europe

Journal:	<i>Journal of Knowledge Management</i>
Manuscript ID	JKM-06-2018-0391.R1
Manuscript Type:	Research Paper
Keywords:	Dynamic capabilities, Agility, Knowledge management, Emerging-country Multinational Enterprises (EMNEs), Resource-based-theory, UK

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

Investigating Dynamic Capabilities, Agility and Knowledge Management within EMNEs- Longitudinal Evidence from Europe

Abstract

Purpose: This paper analyses the impact of dynamic capability (DC) of emerging market multinationals (EMNEs) on their firm technological performance by teasing out the concepts of agility and knowledge management (KM) through DC.

Design/methodology/approach: Evidence from this study is contextualised on EMNEs that operate in the UK, Germany and France. The investment in intangible assets through which EMNEs are able to develop their DC over the period 2005-2016, is examined and how this leads to increased firm technological performance, is investigated.

Findings: Results show that higher investments in DC allows EMNEs to be more agile and gain competencies through KM and thereby sustain competitiveness in the three leading European countries. This research also identifies which EMNE groupings show greater technological performance and how such EMNE groupings are able to translate dynamic capabilities into greater technological performance compared to others over time. In summary, the role of DC during of the global financial crisis was also examined, where they are required to be more agile.

Originality/value: This paper sheds light on a novel way and motivation of successful EMNEs in using developed host countries as a location for generating DC through agility and KM.

Keywords: Dynamic Capabilities, Agility, Knowledge Management, Emerging-country Multinational Enterprises (EMNEs), UK, Germany, France, Resource-based-theory

1. Introduction

In the latest global rankings for attracting foreign direct investment (FDI), the United Kingdom, Germany and France were ranked 3rd, 4th and 5th respectively (UNCTAD, 2017). The other developed countries in the EU and North America have traditionally made up the largest share of inward investors into the UK, Germany and France in terms of FDI stocks (Bundesbank, 2012). However, a more recent trend is that the share of FDI from emerging market multinational enterprises (EMNEs) into Europe and particularly into the UK, Germany and France has risen constantly over the last decade, although from a lower base. This important aspect has not been researched as much in the literature on foreign investment.

Thus, a major limitation of the existing literature in this area has been the focus on “North-North” FDI, focussing on inter-EU investment with the addition of US affiliates (Blonigen and Piger, 2014). Historically, this focus has been data driven, with pre-2000 data only including small amounts of FDI from EMNEs (and even then much of the firm level data that is required is missing). Apart from data limitations that can capture the heterogeneity of FDI flows, this has led to limitations from a conceptual perspective, in the sense that any analysis includes mostly FDI that is market seeking in its motives and driven by its firm-specific advantages. Incorporating FDI from emerging and developing countries into technologically advanced countries such as the UK, Germany and France are more likely to capture technology sourcing FDI, as well as market seeking FDI. This distinction is important when discerning any variation in performance across firm types (Driffield and Love, 2006; Rice, Liao, Galvin and Martin, 2015). Therefore, such analysis requires updating, in order to include investments from EMNEs and to trace the changes in performance across EMNEs over time (e.g. Trahms, Ndofor and Sirmon, 2013).

1
2
3 Further, the existing literature is rather static in showing which firms are, on average,
4 more productive, rather than highlighting the important and relevant drivers of this superior
5 productivity, such as dynamic capabilities (DC), agility and knowledge management (e.g.
6 Schilke, 2014). This is particularly important in terms of the debates on the extent to which
7 inward investment generates productivity growth, or the types of inward investment host
8 countries should attract in order to generate post-crisis growth. For example, productivity
9 growth can be generated through intangible asset accumulation or the need for firms to
10 generate cash flow endogenously in order to finance productivity growth.
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19

20 Building on the existing literature on the topic of EMNEs, knowledge management,
21 DC and agility (see e.g. Bamel and Bamel, 2018; Dove, 1999; Chen, Duan, Edwards and
22 Lehaney, 2006; Denford, 2013; Guo, Jasovska, Rammal, and Rose, 2018; Malik, 2004;
23 Nielsen, 2006; Pérez-Bustamante, 1999; Taghizadeh, Rahman, Hossain, 2018; Williamson,
24 2016), this paper thus offers the following contributions. Firstly, we examine the DC, agility
25 and knowledge management within EMNEs that operate in the UK, Germany and France
26 before, during and after the recovery from the recent global financial crisis of 2008. Second,
27 we contribute to the literature by investigating the impact of EMNE investments in DC (see
28 e.g. Barreto, 2010; Helfat and Peteraf, 2003; 2011) on their technological performance over
29 the period 2005 to 2016. Third, we further dig deeper to identify which EMNE country
30 groups show greater technological performance and how such EMNE country groups are able
31 to translate DC into greater technological performance compared to other country groups
32 over time (Barreto, 2010; Rice et al, 2015). Lastly, our paper contributes by investigating
33 how EMNEs with dynamic capabilities show greater agility and how EMNEs from certain
34 groupings show greater agility as compared to others, over time.
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51

52 The rest of the paper is structured as follows. First, we review the literature on DC,
53 agility and knowledge management and derive our hypotheses through the lens of RBT and
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 deliberate learning investments. The next section explains our empirical research design and
4 describes our data sample and variables. We then present and discuss our findings. This is
5 followed by a conclusion where we discuss the implications of our findings with regards to
6 advancing the literature on DC by emerging market firms in advanced European countries
7 and outline limitations of this paper which may offer avenues for future research.
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15

16 **2. Literature Review and Hypothesis Development**

17
18 In the face of relentless competition and uncertainties, firms are advised to constantly adapt,
19 renew, re-configure and re-create their resources and capabilities to survive and prosper
20 (Barney, 2001). In this context, the concept of DC has become a central research area in the
21 strategy literature, including knowledge and innovation (Teece, 2006). Indeed, Teece et al.'s
22 (1997) seminal work paved the way to numerous scholars from different research
23 backgrounds to use different theoretical perspectives to explore the nature of DC. However,
24 despite the popularity of the concept, the literature remains fragmented (see Ambrosini and
25 Bowman, 2009). Notwithstanding this fragmentation, scholars concur that DC are 'higher
26 order capabilities' that allow for collation, creation and dissemination of knowledge;
27 continuous updating of operational processes; dynamic interaction with the environment and
28 reflexivity in decision making (Easterby-Smith et al., 2009).
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42

43 Although Teece et al.'s (1997) seminal paper on the DC highlights the work of Nelson
44 and Winter (1982) on *Evolutionary Theory of Economic Change*, Pavlou and El Sawy (2006)
45 suggest that the emergence of DC comes from "Schumpeterian competition" where
46 competitive advantage is associated with the "creative destruction" of existing resources and
47 "novel combination" of the resource based theory (RBT) (Barney, 2001; Metcalfe, 1998).
48 Consistent with this view, DC are seen as originating from the RBT of the firm (Nielsen,
49 2006) and while RBT of the firm is mainly concerned with selecting and combining resources
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 (Ferreira and Fernandes, 2017), DC stresses renewing and reconfiguring existing resources
4
5 (Karim, 2006). Seen through this lens, DC is an extension of the RBT and organisation
6
7 performance is influenced by the “capacity” of a firm to accumulate, deploy, refresh and
8
9 reconfigure resources and competencies to match alterations in the external environment
10
11 (Teece et al, 1997; Eisenhardt and Martin, 2000; Pandza et al, 2003; Lee and Slater 2007;
12
13 Griffith et al, 2006; Wilson and Daniel, 2006; Smart et al, 2007; Wang and Ahmed, 2007;
14
15 Lee and Kelley, 2008; Rice et al, 2015).

16
17
18 Therefore, Helfat et al. (2007) assert that that reconfiguration of tangible and
19
20 intangible assets is at the heart of the DC construct. They define DC as “the capacity of an
21
22 organisation to purposefully create, extend, or modify its resource base.... The ‘resource
23
24 base’ of an organisation includes tangible, intangible and human assets (or resources) as well
25
26 as capabilities which the organisation owns, controls, or has access to on a preferential basis”.
27
28 Simply put, DC are the ability of the organisations to use their respective organisational
29
30 processes to change the firm’s resource base (see for instance: Penrose, 1959; Priem and
31
32 Butler, 2001; Ambrosini and Bowman, 2009, p.5). In this context, Zollo and Winter (2002)
33
34 posit that the role of DC, in essence, is to reconfigure firm specific intangible assets such as
35
36 organisational knowledge over a period of time. Hence, the influence of deliberate learning
37
38 investments, knowledge accumulation and articulation are central to DC contributing to the
39
40 firm performance (Rice et al, 2015). They assert, “a dynamic capability is a learned and
41
42 stable pattern of collective activity through which the organization systematically generates
43
44 and modifies its operating routines in pursuit of improved effectiveness” (2002, p.340).
45
46 Similarly, Bergman et al (2004) believe that learning and knowledge creation are
47
48 fundamental to the generation of DC while Nielsen (2006, p.65) views DC as “concrete and
49
50 well known knowledge management activities” of the firm where “the performance of a firm
51
52 is dependent on the ability to exploit its integrated knowledge resources”. In this paper, we
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 concur with the view that reconfiguration of intangible assets through deliberate learning
4 investments (i.e. training and learning investments) and protection of intellectual property
5 rights (Augier and Teece, 2007; Harreld et al, 2007) lead to greater firm performance.
6
7

8
9
10 While the RBT has been viewed an influential framework that accounts for
11 performance differences across the firms based on firm specific assets (Barney, 1996; Wright
12 et al, 1994; Grant, 1996; Peteraf and Barney, 2003; Wiklund and Shepherd, 2003; Beard and
13 Sumner, 2004; Barney and Clark, 2007), the RBT fails to elaborate how reconfiguration of
14 these resources over time can account for enhanced performance as a response to changes in
15 the external market. In this respect, DC is viewed as an extension of the RBT that explains
16 how reconfiguration of firm specific assets could lead to greater performance and competitive
17 advantage (Teece et al, 1997; Zott, 2003; Janutnen et al, 2005; Zahra et al, 2006; Teece,
18 2007, 2012; Wang and Ahmed, 2007; Helfat and Peteraf, 2009, 2011; Wilden et al, 2013).
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29

30 Nonetheless, while many previous research of the DC-performance has focused on
31 theoretically advancing this relationship, very few studies have attempted to empirically
32 assess the mediating role of dynamic capabilities on performance (Zahra et al, 2006;
33 Ambrosini and Bowman, 2009; Arend and Bromiley, 2009; Giudici and Reinmoeller, 2012).
34 Helfat et al (2007) allege that to understand the DC-performance relationship, it is imperative
35 that one must assess how much value DC really creates. An organisation could gain
36 advantage if its DC create higher value than competing firms (Helfat et al, 2007). This,
37 however, by no means confirms that DC necessarily lead to superior performance. Similar to
38 competitive advantage based on the RBT, there are several conditions to be met in order for
39 DC to be considered the source of competitive advantage. The first condition is that the same
40 DC must exhibit heterogeneity in the technical fitness (Helfat et al, 2007); secondly, the
41 application of dynamic capabilities must be in demand since they only have value when in
42 use and competitive advantage could only be generated when dynamic capabilities are
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 applied. Finally, similar to VRIO resources, dynamic capabilities must be rare simply
4
5 because no competitive advantage could be generated if firms possess similar DC. Consistent
6
7 with their view, assessing performance is a useful way to evaluate the value creation of DC
8
9 relative to competitive advantage.
10

11
12 Helfat et al (2007) argue that performance differences across firms could be explained
13
14 by differences across DC of competing firms. Other research on the DC-performance
15
16 relationship have demonstrated the contribution of DC to firm performance and competitive
17
18 advantage through asset reconfiguration. For instance, Harreld et al (2007) believe that IBM's
19
20 remarkable transformation to success has been due to various reasons, but one of the main
21
22 reasons has been their ability to identify and seize opportunities and to reconfigure the firm
23
24 specific assets to achieve superior performance. Harreld et al (2007, p.41) conclude that:
25
26 "sustained competitive advantage comes from the firm's ability to leverage and reconfigure
27
28 its existing competencies and assets". Similarly, Wu (2007) in the study of entrepreneurial
29
30 resources, dynamic capabilities and start-up performance of Taiwanese high tech companies
31
32 evaluates the relationship between asset reconfiguration dynamic capabilities and
33
34 performance. Wu's (2007) study evaluates the resources and performance of start-ups in a
35
36 rapidly changing market. By using data from Taiwanese high tech companies, it investigates
37
38 and demonstrates that DC were significantly helping to leverage entrepreneurial resources to
39
40 benefit start-up performance, and illustrates that through asset reconfiguration, DC
41
42 contributed towards firm's performance.
43
44
45
46

47
48 Other research has also argued how DC lead to greater performance over time (Zollo
49
50 and Winter, 2002; Macher and Mowery, 2009; Drnevich and Kriauciunas, 2011; Prange and
51
52 Verdier, 2011; Protogerou et al, 2012; Wilden et al, 2013; Lin and Wu, 2014; Teece, 2012,
53
54 2014 (a); Wang et al, 2015). Furthermore, recent studies have highlighted the significant role
55
56 of DC in MNEs (Teece, 2012, 2014 (b); Vahlne and Ivarsson, 2014; Lessard et al, 2016) and
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 asset seeking EMNEs (Parthasarathy et al, 2017). When MNEs extend their international
4 activities, their success is not only dependent on the portfolio of resources they possess but
5 also on their ability to continuously modify their resource base (Li, 1998; Prange and Verider,
6 2011). In this vein as Teece (2007, 2009, 2012 and 2014) argues that DC are particularly
7 relevant to studies of MNEs performance because such firms operate in fast changing global
8 markets. Nonetheless, the examples of studies investigating the role of DC in EMNEs is very
9 limited. In this paper, we strive to advance the current understanding of DC-performance
10 relationship in EMNEs. More specifically, we show technological performance differences of
11 EMNEs in Germany, France and UK before, during and in the post global financial crisis of
12 2008. The arguments above lead to the following hypothesis for our empirical work:
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

25 **Hypothesis 1a:** *The higher the investment in dynamic capabilities by EMNEs in*
26 *developed countries, the greater the EMNE's technological performance over time.*
27
28
29

30 The extent to which EMNEs differ in their ability to perform with higher technological
31 performance and translate investments in DC into higher performance in developed countries
32 may also depend on where these EMNEs are coming from. The literature on firm
33 internationalisation has in detail outlined the need for MNEs to overcome the 'liability of
34 foreignness' in markets abroad where the business environment is different from the one at
35 home (Dunning, 1988). However, this inherent 'cost of doing business' abroad is shown to
36 differ on a number of characteristics. In general, the narrower the gap between the source
37 country characteristics and the host country characteristics the smaller the liability of
38 foreignness and the effort required on the part of the MNE to adopt its activities to the host
39 country setting. For example, the same language, similarity of the legal system, institutional
40 structures and business practices will lower the 'liability of foreignness' of FDI between such
41 countries and enhance the chances of success in the foreign investment.
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 This literature also emphasises the concept of ‘psychic distance’ (Johansson and
4 Vahlne, 1977) whereby MNEs are aware of their differences between where they come from
5 and the various options in locating their foreign investments. This realisation is argued to lead
6 MNEs to initially invest in foreign countries where the ‘psychic distance’ is lower. However,
7 as their international business experience increases the MNE is able to progressively target
8 foreign markets with higher levels of ‘psychic distance’ (Chikhouni, Edwards and Farashahi,
9 2017).

10
11
12 In this regard, we follow the literature in arguing that certain EMNEs have closer ties
13 with each host country, which are due to cultural, historical or institutional similarities (Bae
14 and Salomon, 2010; Ramamurti, 2008; Marchand, 2017; Munjal and Pereira, 2015). There is
15 empirical evidence that shows that, for example, Commonwealth member countries are
16 inclined to do better in their investments in the UK (e.g. Lundan and Jones, 2002). A similar
17 argument can be made about the historical ties that exist between France and its ex-colonies
18 which to varying levels have kept language, legal, education and other institutional structures
19 that resemble that of France (Head, Mayer and Ries, 2010; Grier, 1999; Mayer, Méjean and
20 Nefussi, 2010). In regard to Germany, Eastern Europe has always had closer links, certainly
21 with Eastern Germany prior to re-unification in 1989 and the proximity of Eastern Europe to
22 Germany (Brenton, Di Mauro and Lücke, 1999; Marin, Lorentowicz and Raubold, 2003;
23 Petrakos, 2013). This familiarity of the business environment by EMNEs with closer cultural,
24 historical and institutional similarities leads to the argument that such EMNEs are in a better
25 position to convert DC into higher technological performance. This leads to the following
26 two hypotheses:

27
28
29 **Hypothesis 1b:** *EMNEs from similar cultural, historical or institutional contexts as the*
30 *host country show greater technological performance over time compared to EMNEs that are*
31 *less similar compared to the host country.*

1
2
3 **Hypothesis 1c:** *EMNEs from similar cultural, historical or institutional contexts as the*
4 *host country are able to translate dynamic capabilities into greater technological*
5 *performance over time compared to EMNEs that are less similar compared to the host*
6 *country.*
7
8
9
10

11
12 Although the concept of strategic agility was introduced about two decades ago, it is
13 only recently, particularly in the backdrop of financial crisis and subsequent socio-political,
14 technological and economic uncertainties, that it has attracted renewed interest from
15 academic scholars (Adler et al., 1999; Grewal & Tansuhaj, 2001; Judge & Miller, 1991;
16 Tallon and Pinsonneault, 2011; Weber and Tarba, 2014). Organisational agility is often
17 conceptualised as the “ability to remain flexible in facing new developments, to continuously
18 adjust the company’s strategic direction, and to develop innovative ways to create value”
19 (Weber and Tarba, 2014). Other organizational theorists have associated organisational
20 agility to its ability to remain flexible and adaptable in the face of changing internal and
21 external circumstances (Worley et al, 2014; Teece et al., 2016). Although uncertainty has
22 always been a feature of business environment, highly advanced and integrated global
23 economy means the external shocks have become more frequent and the implications are not
24 well predictable. Thus, organisations possessing strategic agility should have the ability to
25 change the course of its actions more frequently and more effectively. Agile organisations,
26 according to Weber and Tarba (2014:13) those that “have the ability to initiate continuous
27 renewal that includes adapting existing competencies to an ever-changing environment and
28 simultaneously reconfiguring themselves in order to survive and thrive for the long term”. In
29 other words, firms that successfully cope with strategic discontinuities and disruptions are the
30 ones, which possess amongst others high level of organizational flexibility and processes to
31 capture, integrate and produce knowledge.
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 As previously noted, one of the key arguments underpinning dynamic capabilities is
4 that they positively influence organisational performance (Zollo and Winter, 2002; Macher
5 and Mowery, 2009; Drnevich and Kriauciunas, 2011; Prange and Verdier, 2011; Protogerou
6 et al, 2012; Wilden et al, 2013; Lin and Wu, 2014; Wang et al, 2015). They also create
7 conditions for firms to thrive by responding to change and uncertainty from the external
8 environment (Teece et al, 1997; Eisenhardt and Martin, 2000; Pandza et al, 2003; Lee and
9 Slater 2007; Griffith et al, 2006; Wilson and Daniel, 2006; Smart et al, 2007; Wang and
10 Ahmed, 2007; Lee and Kelley, 2008). During crises, many underlying forces in the industry
11 could change at a rapid pace and dynamic capabilities are key to superior performance in fast
12 changing industries (Teece et al, 1997; Teece, 2014a, Pezeshkan et al, 2016). In fact, research
13 has suggested that dynamic capabilities are more applicable and in demand during regimes of
14 rapid change such as financial crisis (Newey and Zahra, 2009; Ambrosini et al, 2009).
15 However, although previous studies have suggested that dynamic capabilities afford an
16 organisation the ability to achieve congruence with the external environment (Fainshmidt et
17 al., 2017), examples of empirical studies of dynamic capabilities during crises are rare¹.
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35

36 Given the tripartite micro-foundations (sensing, seizing, reconfiguring) of dynamic
37 capabilities focusing on the ability of the firm to reconfigure their resource base in response
38 to external challenges, therefore the application of dynamic capabilities is particular relevant
39 to studies and actions of firm performance during crisis. It is in this backdrop that Teece et
40 al., (2016) have attempted to present the relationship between dynamic capabilities and
41 organisational agility. In doing so, they aim to bring on board the role of managerial
42 cognition and decision making by CEOs and senior managers, who at a critical juncture have
43 to make sense of key developments and delineate the response of the firm. Thus, they
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52

53
54 ¹ More recently, some studies have focused on the role of dynamic capabilities during crises. For instance, Nair
55 et al (2013) found that Enterprise Risk Management (ERM) as a dynamic capability allowed firms to respond
56 more effectively to the financial crisis of 2008. Similarly, Makkonen et al (2014) found that dynamic
57 capabilities allowed firms to perform better during the 2008 financial crisis.
58
59
60

conceptualise organisational agility as a distinct dynamic capability that helps a firm manage environmental uncertainties.

Nonetheless, no study has investigated the effectiveness of EMNEs' dynamic capabilities and in that respect, organisational agility during crisis and consequently, our second hypothesis is formulated as follow:

Hypothesis 2a: *EMNEs with higher dynamic capabilities show greater agility over time.*

Hypothesis 2b: *EMNEs from similar cultural, historical or institutional contexts as the host country show greater agility over time as compared to EMNEs that are less similar compared to the host country.*

3. Research Design

The data for our analysis is drawn from *ORBIS*, which is a commercially available database of annual accounts. A unique feature of the data set is the identification of foreign-owned firms, where the nationality of a firm is determined by the ultimate owner's country of ownership (see Temouri et al, 2008 or Geishecker et al, 2009 for a more detailed discussion of *ORBIS*²). We include firms for which we have information on our key variables, such as the factor inputs to estimate firm performance as total factor productivity (TFP). We have a panel of firms over the period 2005-2016 across the manufacturing sector and services sector. All variable definitions and summary statistics are presented in the appendix, where we also offer a matrix of correlations for all our variables used in the analysis.³

² For a discussion comparing such data with other data sources, see Ribeiro et al. (2010).

³ The Orbis dataset will list small firms. However, we had to exclude these as they do not report all the variables needed in our analysis. In Germany, small firms of up to 10 employees or total assets of up to 350,000 euros or annual revenues of 700,000 euros are exempted from full accounts disclosure and may report limited financial statements.

Table 1 shows the distribution of EMNEs across Germany, France and the UK and the regions of foreign ownership. The share of EMNEs in the UK is the largest with 1,669 firms, followed by France (1,340) and Germany (1,119). EMNEs from BRICS countries represent the largest number of firms in Germany and France, with the exception of EMNEs from Commonwealth countries in the UK. The number of EMNEs for Eastern and Central Europe is largest in Germany and EMNEs from former French colonies are mostly concentrated in France, as expected. Countries which we have not grouped for our analysis are captured by countries labelled ‘Rest of emerging countries’.

[Insert Table 1]

Estimation technique

In estimating firm performance, we rely on firm level total factor productivity (TFP) which is an economic concept and essentially measures technological or efficiency improvements of firms not attributable to traditional inputs such as labour and capital used in production. In order to measure a firm’s TFP, an estimate of TFP can be obtained from a production function as follows:

$$y_{it} = \alpha_0 + \alpha_k k_{it} + \alpha_l l_{it} + \alpha_m m_{it} + \varepsilon_{it}, \quad (1)$$

where y is the output of a firm, and k , l , and m are three typical inputs, namely capital, labour, and material, respectively. The residual $\hat{\varepsilon}_{it}$ from (1) is interpreted as TFP. Estimating this equation using Ordinary Least Squares (OLS) is likely to lead to biased and inconsistent estimates of TFP. The reason is that when estimating unobserved productivity as the residual of the production function at the firm-level, one encounters the problem of endogeneity. The endogeneity problem occurs when at least a part of the TFP is unobserved by the econometrician but observed by the firm at a time early enough so as to change the factor

1
2
3 input decision. If that is the case, then profit maximization implies that the realization of the
4 error term is expected to influence the decision on factor inputs. In other words, the
5 regressors and the error term are correlated, which makes OLS estimation biased and
6 inconsistent. The remedies to control for endogeneity include, among others, the Levinsohn
7 and Petrin (2003) approach by using material inputs as a proxy to control for unobservable
8 productivity shocks. The full description of the LP estimation method and algorithm is
9 beyond the scope of this paper. Readers interested in more detail are referred to the original
10 work by Levinsohn and Petrin (2003) which is a popular approach in the literature to deal
11 with the endogeneity of inputs (e.g. Smarzynska Javorcik 2004; Griffith et al. 2006). Having
12 controlled for endogeneity in inputs using this approach, we use this estimate of TFP as a
13 dependent variable to estimate the following main equation:
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

$$26 \quad TFP_{it} = \alpha + \beta_1 \text{Intangibles}_{ijt} + \beta_2 \text{EMNE} + \beta_3 \text{EMNE} * \text{Intangibles}_{ijt} + \beta_4 \text{Controls}_{it} + \lambda_j + \mu_t + \varepsilon_{it} \quad (2)$$

27
28 where subscripts i , j and t refer to firm, year and industry respectively and ε_{it}
29 represents the error term. With regards to the main independent variables, the key variable is
30 intangible assets. We have used both the level of intangible assets and the annual change in
31 intangible assets in testing for technological performance in the analysis. Since our findings
32 were consistent with both levels and annual change in intangible assets we decided to
33 illustrate the findings for levels only. The focus on intangible assets, builds on the wider
34 literature that seeks to empirically investigate the role and contribution of intangible
35 investment on the growth of the 'knowledge economy' (Corrado et al., 2013). Intangible
36 assets are also used in work seeking to operationalise ideas around knowledge capital or firm
37 specific assets (Blonigen et al., 2003). The relationship between intangible assets and
38 productivity therefore illustrates how locally generated knowledge or technology is translated
39 into productivity growth. For example, the standard analysis of the MNE assumes that, apart
40 from resource seeking, there are essentially two motives for a firm entering a given location.
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Knowledge exploiting, where the firm seeks to exploit knowledge or technology generated
4 within the parent company in a new location, or knowledge sourcing, where the MNE seeks
5 to invest in a location in order to acquire knowledge in a given location. Indeed, Driffield and
6 Love (2006) demonstrate the importance of this distinction in terms of the likely social
7 returns to that investment, and also, for the UK, demonstrate how this differs by country of
8 ownership (Driffield and Love, 2005). However, while the data for both of these studies is for
9 the UK, and analysed at the aggregate level, it does highlight the key distinction between
10 what is essentially transatlantic investment, and investment into Europe from the emerging
11 economies.
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22

23 The typical approach to estimating (2) – see Temouri et al. (2008) for a discussion of
24 this literature, is to estimate this with a set of ownership dummies to capture the
25 heterogeneity of EMNEs and determine the ordering in terms of productivity. Our focus,
26 however, is to estimate this model for each group separately to examine differences in the
27 drivers of productivity across the different groups of firms in Germany, France and the UK.
28 The rationale for doing this is to provide information on the drivers of productivity growth
29 within the German, French and UK economy for the pre-crisis, crisis and recovery period.
30 The focus is on the comparison of the determinants of productivity growth, and in particular
31 the interactions between the drivers of productivity growth and ownership type.⁴
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42

43 We start with the three groups of EMNEs point, contrasting the relative importance of
44 DC to drive productivity growth. This builds on the literature that follows Hansen (2000) in
45 linking internal resources to productivity growth.⁵ A positive relationship between DC and
46
47
48
49
50
51

52
53 ⁴ The result of estimating the three countries together does not drastically change the overall message that there
54 is significant heterogeneity of EMNEs depending on where they are from. However, it is really the estimation
55 for each country separately that draws our attention to differences which are country-specific such that certain
56 EMNEs tend to translate DC into higher technological performance compared to others.

57 ⁵ For a wider discussion of this literature see Corricelli et al. (2012).
58
59
60

1
2
3 productivity suggests that knowledge capital is generating productivity growth at the firm
4
5 level. These effects are expected to vary across country/region of ownership.
6
7

8 A similar pattern is expected across country of ownership, with firms from more
9
10 technologically advanced EMNE countries are more reliant on intangible assets to generate
11
12 productivity growth than firms from emerging and developing countries, who are more likely
13
14 to focus on cash flow. This is consistent with the analysis of outward FDI by emerging
15
16 market firms, which is driven by cash flow generated at home, and the desire to access global
17
18 technology (Ramamurti, 2012). We divide the source countries of EMNEs into five region
19
20 categories: (a) BRICS, (b) MINT (c) Eastern Europe (d) French colonies and (e)
21
22 Commonwealth.
23
24

25 We subsequently add another dimension to capture the crisis periods, namely the pre-
26
27 crisis period (2005-07), the crisis period (2008-12) and then the post crisis period (2012-16).
28
29 The focus here is to link what impact DC development has on it before the global financial
30
31 crisis (2005-07), during the global financial crisis (2008-2012) and also immediately after the
32
33 global financial crisis (2013-2016). We utilise TFP as our dependent variable in linking what
34
35 impact DC development has on it before the global financial crisis (2005-07), during the
36
37 global financial crisis (2008-2012) and also immediately after the global financial crisis
38
39 (2013-2016).
40
41
42

43 Finally, we also control for both firm size and age and industry affiliation. Firm age is
44
45 measured in years and firm size is proxied by the number of employees in each EMNE. We
46
47 further have included one year lags on the independent variables to reduce potential
48
49 endogeneity.
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

4. Findings and Discussion

Table 2 reports the results of equation (3) for Germany, followed by results for France and the UK in tables 3 and 4, respectively. All specifications are estimated separately for the before-, during- and post-crisis period, in order to uncover potential differences in the impact of DC on technological performance across firm types. In terms of estimation, we show whether a specific group of EMNEs is different in their impact of DC on technological performance compared with the other country groups of EMNEs. This allows us to have the other groups as the reference category.

Our first main result offers evidence in support of hypothesis 1a and 2a. More specifically, the coefficients on DC are all positive and statistically significant. This means that the higher the investment in dynamic capabilities by EMNEs in the three developed countries, the greater the EMNEs technological performance in general (i.e. H1a) as well as over the three phases (i.e. H2a). Thus, evidence from our study demonstrates that the investment in organisational knowledge and learning have resulted in DC which in turn contributes to greater technological performance (Bergman 2004; Nelson 2006; Zollo and Winter, 2002).

Having established a clear link between DC investments and greater technological performance, we now test hypothesis 1b by identifying certain groupings of the EMNEs that show greater technological performance as compared to other EMNEs over the three phases. This can be seen in the second row of each table for Germany, France and the UK. For Germany, the coefficients for BRICS and MINT EMNEs are positive and statistically significant before the crisis, but are only positive for MINT during the crisis period, whereas both for BRICS and MINT, they show no discernible difference in the post crisis period. In terms of Central and Eastern Europe, we consistently find a lower tech performance

1
2
3 throughout the three phases. This offers some evidence for the nature of the firms from
4
5 Central and Eastern Europe who perform less well even though they enjoy geographical and
6
7 cultural proximity.
8
9

10 For France, both EMNEs from BRICS and former French colonies are less
11
12 technologically advanced than other EMNEs which is consistent throughout the three phases.
13
14 For the UK, EMNEs from BRICS more technologically advanced (during and post crisis
15
16 period) whereas EMNEs from the Commonwealth show no discernible difference in terms of
17
18 their performance, which again is consistently observed throughout the three phases. The
19
20 group of EMNEs from MINT countries are no different in their technological performance as
21
22 compared with the other EMNEs in the case of France and the UK. This offers some
23
24 supporting evidence to hypothesis 1b, which states that EMNEs from certain groupings show
25
26 greater technological performance compared to others over time.
27
28
29

30 With regards to our evidence for testing hypothesis 1c, this is shown in the third row
31
32 of each table. In Germany, EMNEs from Central and Eastern Europe show consistently
33
34 positive and statistically significant coefficients, which means that they are able to translate
35
36 dynamic capabilities into greater technological performance as compared to others over the
37
38 three phases. We attribute this to the fact that they operate from a lower technological base as
39
40 compared to others (shown in row 2), which means that they utilise learning and experience
41
42 in becoming more efficient. At the same time, EMNEs from BRICS show no discernible
43
44 difference in translating DC into higher tech performance, which could be due to the nature
45
46 and level of their industry affiliation and technological background. However, it is interesting
47
48 to uncover negative and statistically significant coefficient for EMNEs from MINT countries
49
50 before and during the crisis. It seems that their ability to translate DC into higher tech
51
52 performance is least successful in the period before and during crises, but this is alleviated in
53
54 the post crisis period, where they show similar ability as compared to other EMNEs.
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Agility as a concept is evident during the periods of deep uncertainty, such as the global
4 financial crisis. Our evidence isolates this in phase 2 and therefore tests hypothesis 2b.
5
6 According to our results, we find that the EMNEs from BRICS countries are the ones which
7 show greater agility in respect to their operations in France, whereas EMNEs from Central
8 and Eastern are more agile in their operations in Germany. The reason for this is confirmed
9 by the extant literature which suggests that EMNEs from BRICS are more experienced in
10 their international operations. However, in the face of higher uncertainty in the UK the
11 EMNEs from the commonwealth show less agility which highlights perhaps the limited
12 entrepreneurial management capabilities of these EMNEs. This is despite the fact that
13 EMNEs from the Commonwealth have strong historical and cultural proximity to the UK.
14 One of the reasons for their limited agility could be that the EMNEs from the Commonwealth
15 are very much heterogeneous in nature and background, which subsequently mitigates the
16 positive impact that actually comes from a few leading countries, such as India and Nigeria.
17 Similarly, the results for the French colonies shows a negative coefficient throughout the
18 three phases. Again, this seems to suggest that historical and cultural proximity are not
19 sufficient reasons that can substitute for greater levels of agility. In other words, historical
20 and cultural proximity may reduce an EMNEs liability of foreignness which the literature has
21 unambiguously shown, but our study suggests that this does not necessarily correlate with the
22 ability and agility to translate DC into greater technology performance.
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43

44 [Insert Table 2, 3 and 4]

45
46
47 In summary, our findings convey two general trends in terms of EMNE operations in
48 the UK, Germany and France. Firstly, investments by EMNEs in organisational knowledge
49 and learning lead to DC which in turn contribute to greater technological performance.
50
51 Therefore, the subset of EMNEs that are able to maintain their deliberate investments in
52 intangible assets are the ones that are growing the fastest in terms of their technological
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 performance which is necessary to compete with their rivals in such advanced developed
4 countries. Secondly, our findings have uncovered significant differences in EMNE country
5 groupings. In particular, the technological performance and the ability to be agile is different
6 across EMNEs origin country groupings and at different time periods (i.e. pre-, during- and
7 post-crisis). The reasons could be due to the historical and cultural proximity, as well as
8 EMNE experience in the respective European countries.
9
10
11
12
13
14
15

16 **5. Conclusions**

17
18
19 This paper contributes to the EMNE literature by exploring for the first time the relationship
20 between DC, agility and technological firm performance and observing variation in
21 technological performance of EMNEs over three distinct time phases. We conceptualise
22 technological performance in our paper as an output of a firm's capacity in integrating
23 knowledge and processes. As our study is exploratory in nature, we provide a number of
24 valuable insights through our empirical study for EMNEs that operate in advanced countries.
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32

33 Our first finding is that DC impacts positively on technological firm performance in
34 EMNEs that operate in Europe, with evidence from UK, Germany and France. The
35 implications of this result for the senior managers of EMNEs is, the strategic decision to
36 internationalise to advanced developed economies should be coupled with deliberate learning
37 investments at the organizational level in order attain and maintain technological
38 performance.
39
40
41
42
43
44
45

46 Further, our study was deliberately designed longitudinally to capture the relationship
47 between DC and tech performance over three different and important phases in order better
48 capture and isolate the extent of agility demonstrated by EMNEs. This paper further
49 contributes by investigating EMNEs' technological performance and ability to be agile in
50 three different European countries over the same period of time. Our results show that not all
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 EMNEs are similar in their capacity to be agile at different phases and different countries.
4
5 This could be due to the country background, historical and cultural proximity, as well as
6
7 experience that the EMNEs had in the respective European countries.
8
9

10 The implications for EMNE managers is that they cannot purely rely on historical and
11
12 cultural connections to the host country to be successful in tech performance, particularly in
13
14 different phases of uncertainty. Instead, our findings suggest that the reliance on and
15
16 investment in DC would be much more fruitful to gain better tech performance.
17
18

19 [Insert Figure 1 here]
20
21

22 Theoretically, our paper also contributes to the ongoing debate in the literature. We
23
24 observe that the literature on DC has two broad schools of thought. The first school of
25
26 thought has emerged from the works of Nelson and Winter's (1982) *The Evolutionary Theory*
27
28 *of Economic Change*, which was adopted by Zollo and Winter (2002) to argue that DC
29
30 develops from repetitive routines. Routines are facilitated by deliberate learning investments
31
32 and firms that make such learning investments, perform better. The second school of thought
33
34 builds on the RBT and argues that DC results from a firm's capacity to reconfigure
35
36 organisational resources, thus further improving existing resource configuration (Teece et al.,
37
38 1997; Eisenhardt and Martin, 2000). Teece et al. (2016) further builds on this perspective and
39
40 argues that organisational agility is a DC in itself, which firms adopt in the times of deep
41
42 uncertainties.
43
44
45

46
47 In our research, we note that in the pre-crisis period, the greater technological
48
49 performance of EMNEs across different advanced European countries could be explained as
50
51 a result of adaption of deliberate learning investments by these firms. However, in the crisis
52
53 period we observe that DC are predominantly about taking agile decisions to adapt to
54
55 changing environments. Thus, in our study we observe the two perspective on DC in action.
56
57
58

1
2
3 In stable environments (pre-crisis) the routine perspective takes precedent whereas in in a
4
5 crisis environment the agility perspective is more prominent. We would argue that the two
6
7 perspective are to a certain extent complimentary and not exclusive (See Figure 1). Our study
8
9 is not without limitations and we would like to highlight three main ones. Firstly, we
10
11 endeavoured to measure DC with the help of intangible assets, but future research may be
12
13 able to use a finer grained analysis in terms of other ways of measuring DC. Secondly, we
14
15 merely uncovered some differences across EMNE groupings, but much more research is
16
17 needed to try and find out empirically and conceptually the reasons why certain country
18
19 groupings are different in terms of their technological performance (this could perhaps be
20
21 more fruitful with qualitative research methods). Lastly, future research should investigate
22
23 and shed more light on the complimentary nature of the two perspectives on DC as described
24
25
26
27 above.

32 **References**

33
34
35 Ambrosini, V. and Bowman, C. (2009), "What are dynamic capabilities and are they a useful
36
37 construct in strategic management?", *International Journal of Management Reviews*, Vol. 11
38
39 No.1, pp.29-49.

40
41 Arend, R., and Bromiley, P. (2009), "Assessing the dynamic capabilities view: spare change,
42
43 everyone?", *Strategic Organization*, Vol. 7 No. 1, pp. 75.

44
45 Augier, M. and D. J. Teece (2009), "Dynamic capabilities and the role of managers in
46
47 business strategy and economic performance", *Organization Science*, Vol. 20 No. 2, pp.410-
48
49 421.

50
51 Bae, J-H and Salomon, R. (2010), "Institutional distance in international business research".
52
53 In Devinney Timothy, Pedersen Torben, Tihanyi Laszlo (ed.) *The Past, Present and Future
54
55 of International Business & Management* (Advances in International Management, Volume
56
57 23) Emerald Group Publishing Limited, pp.327 – 349.

58
59 Bamel, U, K., Bamel, N. (2018), "Organizational resources, KM process capability and
60
strategic flexibility: a dynamic resource-capability perspective", *Journal of Knowledge
Management*, <https://doi.org/10.1108/JKM-10-2017-0460>.

1
2
3 Barney, J.B., (2001), "Resource-based theories of competitive advantage: A ten-year
4 retrospective on the resource-based view", *Journal of Management*, Vol. 27 No. 6, pp.643-
5 650.

6
7 Barney, J. B., and Clark, D. N. (2007), *Resource-based theory: Creating and sustaining*
8 *competitive advantage*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

9
10 Barreto, I. (2010), "Dynamic capabilities: A review of past research and an agenda for the
11 future", *Journal of Management*, Vol. 36 No. 1, 256-280.

12
13 Beard, J. W. and Sumner, M. (2004), "Seeking strategic advantage in the post-net era:
14 viewing ERP systems from the resource-based perspective." *The Journal of Strategic*
15 *Information Systems*, Vol. 13 No. 2, 129-150.

16
17 Bergman, J., Jantunen, A., and Saksa, J. M. (2004), "Managing knowledge creation and
18 sharing—scenarios and dynamic capabilities in inter-industrial knowledge networks", *Journal*
19 *of Knowledge Management*, Vol. 8 No. 6, pp.63-76.

20
21 Blonigen, B.A. and Piger, J. (2014), "Determinants of foreign direct investment", *Canadian*
22 *Journal of Economics*, Vol. 47 No. 3, pp.775-812.

23
24 Brenton, P., Di Mauro, F., & Lücke, M. (1999). "Economic integration and FDI: An
25 empirical analysis of foreign investment in the EU and in Central and Eastern
26 Europe". *Empirica*, 26(2), 95-121.

27
28 Chen, S., Duan, Y., Edwards, S, J., Lehaney, B. (2006), "Toward understanding inter-
29 organizational knowledge transfer needs in SMEs: insight from a UK investigation", *Journal*
30 *of Knowledge Management*, Vol. 10 No. 3, pp.6-23.

31
32 Chikhouni, A., Edwards, G., & Farashahi, M. (2017). "Psychic distance and ownership in
33 acquisitions: Direction matters". *Journal of International Management*, 23(1), 32-42.

34
35 Denford, J.S. (2013), "Building knowledge: developing a knowledge-based dynamic
36 capabilities typology, *Journal of Knowledge Management*, Vol. 17 No. 2, pp.175-194.

37
38 Dove, R. (1999), "Knowledge management, response ability, and the agile
39 enterprise", *Journal of Knowledge Management*, Vol. 3 No. 1, pp.18-35.

40
41 Drnevich, P.L. and Kriauciunas, A.P. (2011), "Clarifying the conditions and limits of the
42 contributions of ordinary and dynamic capabilities to relative firm performance", *Strategic*
43 *Management Journal*, Vol. 32 No.3, pp.254-279.

44
45 Dunning, J.H. (1988), "The Eclectic Paradigm of International Production: A Restatement
46 and Some Possible Extensions", *Journal of International Business Studies*, Vol. 19 No. 1, pp.
47 1-31.

48
49 Easterby-Smith, M., Lyles, M.A. and Peteraf, M.A. (2009), "Dynamic Capabilities: Current
50 Debates and Future Directions", *British Journal of Management*, Vol. 20, pp. S1-S8.

1
2
3 Eisenhardt, K. M. and Martin, J.A. (2000), "Dynamic Capabilities: What Are They?"
4 *Strategic Management Journal*, 21(10/11), pp.1105-1121.

5
6 Ferreira, J. and Fernandes, C. (2017), "Resources and capabilities' effects on firm
7 performance: what are they? *Journal of Knowledge Management*, Vol. 21 No. 5, pp.1202-
8 1217.

9
10 Giudici, A., & Reinmoeller, P. (2012), "Dynamic capabilities in the dock: A case of
11 reification?", *Strategic Organization*, Vol. 10 No. 4, pp.436-449.

12
13 Grant, R. M. (1996), "Toward a knowledge-based theory of the firm", *Strategic Management*
14 *Journal*, Vol. 17, pp.109-122.

15
16 Griffith, D. A., Noble, S. M., and Chen, Q. (2006), "The performance implications of
17 entrepreneurial proclivity: A dynamic capabilities approach", *Journal of Retailing*, Vol. 82
18 No.1, pp.51-62.

19
20 Grier, R. M. (1999). "Colonial legacies and economic growth". *Public choice*, 98(3-4), 317-
21 335.

22
23 Guo, Y., Jasovska, P., Rammal, H. G., Rose, E. L. (2018), "Global mobility of professionals
24 and the transfer of tacit knowledge in multinational service firms, *Journal of Knowledge*
25 *Management*, <https://doi.org/10.1108/JKM-09-2017-0399>.

26
27 Harrel, J. B., O'Reilly, C. A., and Tushman, M.L. (2007), "Driving Strategy Into Action",
28 *California Management Review*, Vol. 49 No.4, pp.87-110.

29
30 Head, K., Mayer, T., & Ries, J. (2010). "The erosion of colonial trade linkages after
31 independence". *Journal of international Economics*, 81(1), 1-14.

32
33 Helfat, C. E. and M. Peteraf (2011), "Understanding dynamic capabilities: progress along a
34 developmental path", *Strategic Organization* Vol. 7 No. 1, pp.91-102

35
36 Helfat, C.E., Finkelstein, S., Mitchell, W., Peteraf, M., Singh, H., Teece, D. and Winter, S.G.,
37 (2007), *Dynamic capabilities: Understanding strategic change in organizations*. John Wiley
38 & Sons.

39
40 Helfat, C. E. and M. A. Peteraf (2003), "The dynamic resource-based view: capability
41 lifecycles", *Strategic Management Journal*, Vol. 24 No.10, pp. 997-1010.

42
43 Johansson, J. and J.E. Vahlne (1977), "The Internationalization Process of the Firm—A
44 Model of Knowledge Development and Increasing Foreign Market Commitments", *Journal*
45 *of International Business Studies*, Vol. 8 No. 1, pp. 23–32.

46
47 Karim, S. (2006), "Modularity in organizational structure: The reconfiguration of internally
48 developed and acquired business units", *Strategic Management Journal*, Vol. 27 No. 9,
49 pp.799-823.

1
2
3 Kogut, B. and H. Singh (1988), "The Effect of National Culture on the Choice of Entry
4 Mode", *Journal of International Business Studies*, Vol. 19 No. 3, pp. 411–432.

5
6 Lee, H. and D. Kelley (2008), "Building dynamic capabilities for innovation: an exploratory
7 study of key management practices", *Rand Management*, Vol. 38 No. 2, pp.155-168.

8
9 Lee, J. and J. Slater (2007), "Dynamic capabilities, entrepreneurial rent-seeking and the
10 investment development path: The case of Samsung", *Journal of International Management*
11 *Vol.* 13 No. 3, pp. 241-257.

12
13 Lessard, D., Teece, D.J. & Leih, S. (2016), "The Dynamic Capabilities of Meta-
14 Multinationals", *Global Strategy Journal*, Vol. 6 No. 3, pp. 211-224.

15
16 Lin, Y. and Wu, L.Y. (2014), "Exploring the role of dynamic capabilities in firm performance
17 under the resource-based view framework", *Journal of Business Research*, Vol. 67 No. 3,
18 pp.407-413.

19
20 Lundan, S. and G. Jones (2002), "The "Commonwealth Effect" and the Process of
21 Internationalisation", *World Economy*, Vol. 24 No. 1, pp. 99–118.

22
23 Macher, J.T. and Mowery, D.C. (2009), "Measuring dynamic capabilities: practices and
24 performance in semiconductor manufacturing", *British Journal of Management*, 20(s1), pp.
25 S41-S62.

26
27 Malik, K. (2004), "Coordination of technological knowledge flows in firms", *Journal of*
28 *Knowledge Management*, Vol. 8 No. 2, pp.64-72.

29
30 Marchand, M. (2017). "Do All Emerging Market Firms Partner with Their Acquisitions in
31 Advanced Economies? A Comparative Study of 25 Emerging Multinationals' Acquisitions in
32 France". *Thunderbird International Business Review*, 59(3), 297-312.

33
34 Marin, D., Lorentowicz, A., & Raubold, A. (2003). "Ownership, capital or outsourcing: what
35 drives German investment to Eastern Europe?". In *Foreign direct investment in the real and*
36 *financial sector of industrial countries* (pp. 147-163). Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg.

37
38 Mayer, T., Méjean, I., & Nefussi, B. (2010). "The location of domestic and foreign
39 production affiliates by French multinational firms". *Journal of urban economics*, 68(2), 115-
40 128.

41
42 Metcalfe, J. (1998). *Evolutionary economics and creative destruction*, London: Routledge.

43
44 Munjal, S., and Pereira, V. (2015). "Opportunities and Challenges for Multiple-
45 Embeddedness through Mergers and Acquisitions in Emerging Economies". *Journal of*
46 *Organizational Change Management*, 28(5), 817-831.

47
48 Nelson, R.R. and Winter, S.G. (1982), *An evolutionary theory of economic change*. Harvard
49 University Press.

1
2
3 Nielsen, A.P., (2006), "Understanding dynamic capabilities through knowledge
4 management", *Journal of Knowledge Management*, Vol. 10, No. 4, pp.59-71.
5

6 Pandza, K., Horsburgh, S., Gorton, K., and Polajnar, A. (2003), "A real options approach to
7 managing resources and capabilities", *International Journal of Operations and Production*
8 *Management*, Vol. 23 No. 9, pp.1010-1032.
9

10 Parthasarathy, S., Momaya, K.S. & Jha, S.K. (2017), "EMNEs venturing into advanced
11 economies: Findings from comparative cases of two Indian MNEs", *Thunderbird*
12 *International Business Review*, Vol. 59, No. 3, pp. 437-454.
13

14 Pavlou, P. A. and O. A. El Sawy (2006), "From IT leveraging competence to competitive
15 advantage in turbulent environments: The case of new product development." *Information*
16 *Systems Research* Vol. 17 No. 3, pp.198-227.
17

18 Penrose, E. T. (1959). *The Theory of the Growth of the Firm*, Oxford University Press
19 Oxford. UK.
20

21 Pérez-Bustamante, G. (1999), "Knowledge management in agile innovative
22 organisations", *Journal of Knowledge Management*, Vol. 3 No. 1, pp.6-17
23

24 Peteraf, M. A. and J. B. Barney (2003), "Unraveling the resource-based tangle", *Managerial*
25 *and Decision Economics* 24(4), pp.309-323.
26

27 Petrakos, G. (2013). The spatial impact of East–West integration in Europe. In *Integration*
28 *and transition in Europe* (pp. 56-86). Routledge.
29

30 Prange, C. and Verdier, S. (2011), "Dynamic capabilities, internationalization processes and
31 performance", *Journal of World Business*, Vol. 46 No. 1, pp.126-133.
32

33 Priem, R. L. and J. E. Butler (2001). "Is the resource-based view a useful perspective for
34 strategic management research?" *Academy of Management Review*, Vol. 26 No. 1, pp.22-40.
35

36 Protogerou, A., Caloghirou, Y. and Lioukas, S. (2012), "Dynamic capabilities and their
37 indirect impact on firm performance", *Industrial and Corporate Change*, Vol. 21 No. 3,
38 pp.615-647.
39

40 Ramamurti, R (2008). What Have We Learned about EMNEs, In Ravi Ramamurti and
41 Jitendra Singh (eds.) *Emerging Multinationals from Emerging Markets*, Cambridge
42 University Press, Cambridge, UK.
43

44 Rice, J., Liao, T. S., Galvin, P., and Martin, N. (2015), "A configuration-based approach to
45 integrating dynamic capabilities and market transformation in small and medium-sized
46 enterprises to achieve firm performance", *International Small Business Journal*, Vol. 33 No.
47 3, pp.231-253.
48
49
50
51
52
53

Schilke, O. (2014), "On the contingent value of dynamic capabilities for competitive advantage: The nonlinear moderating effect of environmental dynamism", *Strategic Management Journal*, Vol. 35 No. 2, pp.179-203.

Smart, P., Bessant, J., and Gupta, A. (2007), "Towards technological rules for designing innovation networks: a dynamic capabilities view", *International Journal of Operations and Production Management*, Vol. 27 No. 10, pp.1069-1092.

Taghizadeh, S, K., Rahman, S, A., Hossain, M, M. (2018), "Knowledge from customer, for customer or about customer: which triggers innovation capability the most?", *Journal of Knowledge Management*, Vol. 22 No. 1, pp.162-182

Teece, D. J. (2006), "Reflections on "profiting from innovation", *Research Policy*, Vol. 35 No. 8, pp.1131-1146.

Teece, D. J. (2007), "Explicating dynamic capabilities: the nature and microfoundations of (sustainable) enterprise performance." *Strategic Management Journal*, Vol. 28 No. 13, pp.1319-1350.

Teece, D. J. (2009), *Dynamic capabilities and strategic management: organizing for innovation and growth*, Oxford University Press, USA.

Teece, D. J. (2012). "Dynamic capabilities: Routines versus entrepreneurial action", *Journal of Management Studies*, Vol. 49 No. 8, pp.1395-1401.

Teece, D.J., 2014(a), "The foundations of enterprise performance: Dynamic and ordinary capabilities in an (economic) theory of firms" *The Academy of Management Perspectives*, Vol. 28 No. 4, pp.328-352.

Teece, D.J. 2014(b), "A dynamic capabilities-based entrepreneurial theory of the multinational enterprise", *Journal of International Business Studies*, Vol. 45, No. 1, pp. 8-37.

Teece, D.J., Pisano, G. and Shuen, A. (1997), "Dynamic capabilities and strategic management. *Strategic Management Journal*, Vol. 18 No. 7, pp.509-533.

Teece, D., Peteraf, M., and Leih, S. (2016), "Dynamic Capabilities and Organizational Agility: Risk, Uncertainty, and Strategy in the Innovation Economy", *California Management Review*, Vol. 58 No. 4, pp.13-35

Trahms, C. A., Ndofor, H. A., and Sirmon, D. G. (2013), "Organizational decline and turnaround a review and agenda for future research", *Journal of Management*, Vol. 39 No. 5, pp.1277-1307.

UNCTAD (2017) http://unctad.org/en/PublicationsLibrary/wir2017_en.pdf

Vahlne, J.E. and Ivarsson, I. (2014), "The globalization of Swedish MNEs: Empirical evidence and theoretical explanations", *Journal of International Business Studies*, Vol. 45 No. 3, pp.227-247.

1
2
3 Wang, C. L. and P. K. Ahmed (2007), "Dynamic capabilities: A review and research
4 agenda", *International Journal of Management Reviews* Vol. 9 No. 1, pp.31-51.
5

6 Wang, C.L., Senaratne, C. and Rafiq, M. (2015), "Success traps, dynamic capabilities and
7 firm performance", *British Journal of Management*, Vol. 26 No. 1, pp.26-44.
8

9 Weber, Y. and Tarba, S.Y. (2014), "Strategic Agility: A State of the Art", *California
10 Management Review*, Vol 56 No. 3, pp.5-12.
11

12 Wiklund, J. and D. Shepherd (2003), "Knowledge-based resources, entrepreneurial
13 orientation, and the performance of small and medium-sized businesses." *Strategic
14 Management Journal* Vol. 24 No. 13, pp.1307-1314.
15

16
17 Wilden, R., Gudergan, S.P., Nielsen, B.B. and Lings, I. (2013), "Dynamic capabilities and
18 performance: strategy, structure and environment", *Long Range Planning*, Vol. 46 No. 1,
19 pp.72-96.
20

21
22 Williamson, P.J. (2016), "Building and leveraging dynamic capabilities: insights from
23 accelerated innovation in China", *Global Strategy Journal*, Vol. 6 No. 3, pp.197-210.
24

25 Wilson, H. and Daniel, E. (2007), "The multi-channel challenge: A dynamic capability
26 approach", *Industrial Marketing Management*, Vol. 36 No 1, pp.10-20.
27

28 Wright, P. M., McMahan, G. C., and McWilliams, A. (1994), "Human resources and
29 sustained competitive advantage: a resource-based perspective", *International Journal of
30 Human Resource Management*, Vol. 5 No. 2, pp.301-326.
31

32 Wu, L. Y. (2007), "Entrepreneurial resources, dynamic capabilities and start-up performance
33 of Taiwan's high-tech firms." *Journal of Business Research*, Vol. 60 No 5, pp.549-555.
34

35
36 Zahra, S. A., Sapienza, H. J., and Davidsson, P. (2006), "Entrepreneurship and dynamic
37 capabilities: a review, model and research agenda", *Journal of Management studies*, Vol. 43
38 No. 4, pp.917-955.
39

40 Zheng, S., Zhang, W. and Du, J., 2011. Knowledge-based dynamic capabilities and
41 innovation in networked environments. *Journal of Knowledge Management*, Vol. 15 No. 6,
42 pp.1035-1051.
43

44
45 Zollo, M. and S. G. Winter (2002), "Deliberate learning and the evolution of dynamic
46 capabilities." *Organization Science*, Vol. 13 No. 3, pp.339-351.
47

48 Zott, C. (2003), "Dynamic capabilities and the emergence of intraindustry differential firm
49 performance: insights from a simulation study." *Strategic Management Journal*, Vol. 24 No.
50 2, pp.97-125.
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Journal of Knowledge Management




Figure 1: Theoretical model developed based on authors proposed contribution

**Table 1 Distribution of EMNEs in Germany, France and the UK
(2005-2016)**

	Germany	France	UK
BRICS	336	351	353
MINT	48	72	48
Eastern and Central Europe	180	62	61
French colonies	9	251	27
Commonwealth	197	226	667
Rest of emerging markets	349	378	513
Total Number of Firms	1,119	1,340	1,669

Source: Authors' calculations from the ORBIS dataset.

Table 2: Impact of Dynamic Capabilities on Knowledge Management in Germany

	Before Crisis (2005-2007)			During Crisis (2008-2012)			Post Crisis (2013-2016)		
	BRICS	MINT	Eastern Europe	BRICS	MINT	Eastern Europe	BRICS	MINT	Eastern Europe
Dependent variable: log TFP	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
log Intangible assets	0.0386*** (0.00732)	0.0349*** (0.00632)	0.0258*** (0.00671)	0.0375*** (0.00544)	0.0349*** (0.00468)	0.0272*** (0.00496)	0.0193*** (0.00556)	0.0189*** (0.00478)	0.0173*** (0.00513)
Group	0.126** (0.0591)	0.612** (0.292)	-0.246*** (0.0640)	0.103** (0.0435)	0.637*** (0.240)	-0.223*** (0.0485)	0.0106 (0.0432)	-0.0927 (0.334)	-0.0712 (0.0486)
Group*Intangible assets	-0.0169 (0.0105)	-0.117** (0.0461)	0.0304** (0.0132)	-0.0112 (0.00774)	-0.109*** (0.0386)	0.0339*** (0.0101)	-0.000353 (0.00779)	0.0611 (0.0583)	0.00970 (0.0102)
Firm size	0.0281** (0.0114)	0.0280** (0.0114)	0.0269** (0.0114)	0.0213** (0.00865)	0.0221** (0.00864)	0.0194** (0.00865)	0.0353*** (0.00983)	0.0352*** (0.00983)	0.0343*** (0.00990)
Firm age	0.0807*** (0.0119)	0.0804*** (0.0119)	0.0756*** (0.0120)	0.0892*** (0.00986)	0.0889*** (0.00988)	0.0840*** (0.00994)	0.0744*** (0.0136)	0.0753*** (0.0136)	0.0722*** (0.0137)
Industry dummies	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Constant	4.433*** (0.469)	4.484*** (0.468)	4.612*** (0.470)	4.933*** (0.356)	4.933*** (0.356)	4.744*** (0.357)	3.170*** (0.394)	3.177*** (0.393)	3.202*** (0.393)
Observations	2,787	2,787	2,787	4,645	4,645	4,645	3,716	3,716	3,716
F-statistic	15.20	15.25	15.43	26.45	26.51	26.76	20.37	20.41	20.41
Prob > F stat	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
R-squared	0.269	0.270	0.272	0.276	0.277	0.278	0.263	0.270	0.270

Note: ***, **, * denote significance at the 1%, 5% and 10% level, respectively. Robust standard errors are in parentheses.

Table 3: Impact of Dynamic Capabilities on Knowledge Management in France

	Before Crisis (2005-2007)			During Crisis (2008-2012)			Post Crisis (2013-2016)		
	BRICS	MINT	French Colonies	BRICS	MINT	French Colonies	BRICS	MINT	French Colonies
Dependent variable: log TFP	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
log Intangible assets	0.0398*** (0.0067)	0.0468*** (0.00564)	0.0563*** (0.00612)	0.0308*** (0.00503)	0.0390*** (0.00418)	0.0464*** (0.00452)	0.0265*** (0.00539)	0.0369*** (0.00441)	0.0407*** (0.00473)
Group	-0.0888* (0.0538)	0.123 (0.387)	-0.0780 (0.0528)	-0.0883** (0.0398)	0.158 (0.294)	-0.111*** (0.0400)	-0.0202 (0.0429)	-0.170 (0.272)	-0.194*** (0.0442)
Group*Intangible assets	0.0192* (0.0103)	-0.0480 (0.0583)	-0.0370*** (0.0119)	0.0218*** (0.00748)	-0.0435 (0.0419)	-0.0209** (0.00882)	0.0226*** (0.00801)	-0.00588 (0.0460)	-0.00355 (0.00970)
Firm size	0.186*** (0.0109)	0.185*** (0.0109)	0.170*** (0.0111)	0.201*** (0.00821)	0.199*** (0.00818)	0.186*** (0.00838)	0.212*** (0.00897)	0.213*** (0.00895)	0.199*** (0.00918)
Firm age	0.0574*** (0.0111)	0.0572*** (0.0111)	0.0582*** (0.0110)	0.0569*** (0.00927)	0.0568*** (0.00928)	0.0584*** (0.00925)	0.0695*** (0.0130)	0.0691*** (0.0130)	0.0707*** (0.0130)
Industry dummies	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Constant	3.644*** (0.199)	3.626*** (0.199)	3.649*** (0.198)	3.644*** (0.153)	3.620*** (0.153)	3.639*** (0.153)	3.544*** (0.173)	3.529*** (0.172)	3.558*** (0.172)
Observations	3,552	3,552	3,552	5,920	5,920	5,920	4,736	4,736	4,736
F-statistic	38.12	38.05	38.97	66.58	66.39	67.50	52.32	52.02	53.08
Prob > F stat	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
R-squared	0.441	0.441	0.447	0.451	0.450	0.454	0.447	0.445	0.450

Note: ***, **, * denote significance at the 1%, 5% and 10% level, respectively. Robust standard errors are in parentheses.

Table 4: Impact of Dynamic Capabilities on Knowledge Management in the UK

	Before Crisis (2005-2007)			During Crisis (2008-2012)			Post Crisis (2013-2016)		
	BRICS	MINT	Common wealth	BRICS	MINT	Common wealth	BRICS	MINT	Common wealth
Dependent variable: log TFP	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
log Intangible assets	0.0423*** (0.00543)	0.0490*** (0.00484)	0.0587*** (0.00626)	0.0458*** (0.00410)	0.0465*** (0.00364)	0.0550*** (0.00472)	0.0561*** (0.00422)	0.0556*** (0.00373)	0.0609*** (0.00485)
Region	-0.0693 (0.0640)	-0.154 (0.831)	0.0111 (0.0569)	0.0799* (0.0475)	-0.410 (0.581)	0.00306 (0.0426)	0.109** (0.0476)	-0.176 (0.385)	0.00436 (0.0432)
Region*Intangible assets	0.0212** (0.00843)	0.0542 (0.122)	-0.0183** (0.00773)	0.00145 (0.00631)	0.0752 (0.0879)	- 0.0162*** (0.00582)	-0.00176 (0.00646)	0.0367 (0.0655)	-0.0103* (0.00603)
Firm size	0.0435*** (0.00780)	0.0452*** (0.00782)	0.0456*** (0.00779)	0.0457*** (0.00590)	0.0471*** (0.00591)	0.0476*** (0.00589)	0.0388*** (0.00606)	0.0403*** (0.00607)	0.0408*** (0.00606)
Firm age	0.0891*** (0.00879)	0.0872*** (0.00882)	0.0849*** (0.00879)	0.0835*** (0.00715)	0.0825*** (0.00718)	0.0793*** (0.00716)	0.0859*** (0.00918)	0.0857*** (0.00922)	0.0831*** (0.00922)
Industry dummies	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Constant	3.067*** (0.186)	3.061*** (0.185)	3.027*** (0.187)	3.028*** (0.142)	3.057*** (0.142)	3.030*** (0.143)	3.027*** (0.152)	3.062*** (0.152)	3.045*** (0.153)
Observations	3,864	3,864	3,864	6,440	6,440	6,440	5,152	5,152	5,152
F-statistic	15.77	15.54	15.97	24.15	23.85	24.48	21.27	20.94	21.15
Prob > F stat	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
R-squared	0.250	0.247	0.253	0.233	0.231	0.235	0.251	0.248	0.250

Note: ***, **, * denote significance at the 1%, 5% and 10% level, respectively. Robust standard errors are in parentheses.

Appendix

Definitions of variables

Variable name	Description	Mean	Standard Deviation
Sales	Total Operating Revenue (Net sales +Other operating revenue + Stock variations). These figures do not include VAT or excise taxes and similar obligatory payments. (Sales) is defined in the Balance Sheet account	93,421	743,793
Tangible Fixed Assets	All tangible fixed assets, such as building and machinery. The Tangible Fixed Assets are defined in the Balance Sheet account	22,071	226,451
Employees (also used to proxy firm size)	Total number of full time employees of the company (personnel)	265.51	1770.16
Material costs	The amount invested in the production of goods and services. It is financial item of the Profit & Loss account	74,636	453,459
Log of TFP	Log of Total Factor Productivity as the residual of production functions	4.21	0.93
Intangible Fixed Assets	All intangible assets such as formation expenses, research expenses, goodwill, development expenses and all other expenses with a long term effect. The Intangible Fixed Assets is a financial label of the Balance Sheet account	8,140	125,727
Firm age	Age of Firm since the year of incorporation	14.80	18.02
BRICS	Dummy equals 1 if the EMNE has its ultimate country of ownership in one of the BRICS countries, otherwise zero.	0.25	0.43
MINT	Dummy equals 1 if the EMNE has its ultimate country of ownership in one of the MINT countries, otherwise zero.	0.01	0.07
Eastern and Central Europe	Dummy equals 1 if the EMNE has its ultimate country of ownership in one of the Eastern and Central European countries, otherwise zero.	0.18	0.38
French colonies	Dummy equals 1 if the EMNE has its ultimate country of ownership in one of the former French colonial countries, otherwise zero.	0.05	0.21
Commonwealth	Dummy equals 1 if the EMNE has its ultimate country of ownership in one of the Commonwealth countries, otherwise zero.	0.33	0.47

Note: The monetary values for sales, tangible/intangible assets and material costs are all shows in millions of US dollars.

Correlation matrix

	1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	7.	8.	9.	
1.Log TFP	1									
2.Log Intangibles	0.0771	1								
3.Firm size	0.1684	0.5596	1							
4.Firm age	0.1334	-0.0738	0.1542	1						
5.BRICS	0.0406	-0.0133	0.0659	0.0488	1					
6.MINT	0.0205	0.0102	0.0128	0.0251	-0.0423	1				
7.Eastern block	0.0237	-0.0736	-0.073	-0.0768	0.0134	-0.0199	1			
8.French colonies	-	0.0926	-0.1402	-0.2536	-0.037	-0.1993	-0.0194	-0.0936	1	
9.Commonwealth	-	0.0349	0.171	0.1351	-0.0294	0.0774	-0.0138	-0.21	-0.1113	1

Dear Editors,

Thank you for your email from the 28th August 2018 inviting us to revise and resubmit our paper. We thank the referees for their valuable comments. We have considered each comment in detail and have revised the paper to account for all of them. In our view, the changes have significantly improved our paper and we hope you agree with the changes we have made.

Please see our responses listed below each comment that is raised (in bold font).

Yours sincerely

From: Journal of Knowledge Management <onbehalfof@manuscriptcentral.com>

Date: 28 August 2018 at 16:25:45 GMT+4

To: vijay.pereira@port.ac.uk, vijaypereira2003@yahoo.com

Subject: Journal of Knowledge Management - Decision on Manuscript ID JKM-06-2018-0391

Reply-To: sanjay.singh@adu.ac.ae

28-Aug-2018

Dear Assoc. Prof. Pereira:

Manuscript ID JKM-06-2018-0391 entitled "Investigating Dynamic Capabilities, Agility and Knowledge Management within EMNEs- Longitudinal Evidence from Europe" which you submitted to the Journal of Knowledge Management, has been reviewed. The comments of the reviewer(s) are included at the bottom of this letter.

The reviewer(s) have recommended publication, but also suggest some revisions to your manuscript. Therefore, I invite you to respond to the reviewer(s)' comments and revise your manuscript.

To revise your manuscript, log into <https://mc.manuscriptcentral.com/jkm> and enter your Author Centre, where you will find your manuscript title listed under "Manuscripts with Decisions." Under "Actions," click on "Create a Revision." Your manuscript number has been appended to denote a revision.

You will be unable to make your revisions on the originally submitted version of the manuscript. Instead, revise your manuscript using a word processing program and save it on your computer. Please also highlight the changes to your manuscript within the document by using the track changes mode in MS Word or by using bold or coloured text. Once the revised manuscript is prepared, you can upload it and submit it through your Author Centre.

When submitting your revised manuscript, you will be able to respond to the comments made by the reviewer(s) in the space provided. You can use this space to document any changes you make to the original manuscript. In order to expedite the processing of the revised manuscript, please be as specific as possible in your response to the reviewer(s).

1
2
3 IMPORTANT: Your original files are available to you when you upload your revised
4 manuscript. Please delete any redundant files before completing the submission.
5

6 Because we are trying to facilitate timely publication of manuscripts submitted to the Journal
7 of Knowledge Management, your revised manuscript should be uploaded as soon as
8 possible. If it is not possible for you to submit your revision in a reasonable amount of time,
9 we may have to consider your paper as a new submission.
10

11 Once again, thank you for submitting your manuscript to the Journal of Knowledge
12 Management and I look forward to receiving your revision.
13

14 Sincerely,
15 Dr. SANJAY SINGH
16 Guest Editor, Journal of Knowledge Management
17 sanjay.singh@adu.ac.ae
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Reviewer: 1
4

5 Recommendation: Minor Revision
6

7 Comments:
8

9
10 1. The manuscript has not been able to strongly establish the reason why research should be
11 undertaken for the objectives laid out by you. You need to first build a need to the desired
12 research that you are keen to undertake.
13

14 **Response: Many thanks for your comment. Please refer to page 3 in the introduction**
15 **where we highlight the reasons why our research is needed and how EMNEs can benefit**
16 **from our findings. More specifically, we build our case on the rationale made in our**
17 **introduction on the following gaps in the literature and calls for research on the topic of**
18 **‘Investigating Dynamic Capabilities, Agility and Knowledge Management within**
19 **EMNEs- Longitudinal Evidence from Europe’. In our paper, we uniquely contribute by**
20 **analysing the impact of dynamic capability (DC) of EMNEs on their firm technological**
21 **performance by teasing out the concepts of agility and knowledge management (KM)**
22 **through DC. We have done this in our very strongly laid out rationale in the**
23 **introduction, identified gaps in the literature and clearly articulated our contributions.**
24 **These are reproduced below from the paper for ease (7 points):**
25

- 26
27
- 28 1. A more recent trend is that the share of FDI from emerging market
29 multinational enterprises (EMNEs) into Europe and particularly into the UK,
30 Germany and France has risen constantly over the last decade, although from a
31 lower base. This important aspect has not been researched as much in the
32 literature on foreign investment- *Rationale*
33
 - 34 2. A major limitation of the existing literature in this area has been the focus on
35 “North-North” FDI, focussing on inter-EU investment with the addition of US
36 affiliates (Blonigen and Piger, 2014)- *Identifying gap and limitation in extant*
37 *literature*
38
 - 39 3. Incorporating FDI from emerging and developing countries into technologically
40 advanced countries such as the UK, Germany and France are more likely to
41 capture technology sourcing FDI, as well as market seeking FDI. This distinction
42 is important when discerning any variation in performance across firm types
43 (Driffield and Love, 2006; Rice, Liao, Galvin and Martin, 2015)- *Again here*
44 *identifying gap and limitation in extant literature*
45
 - 46 4. The existing literature is rather static in showing which firms are, on average,
47 more productive, rather than highlighting the important and relevant drivers of
48 this superior productivity, such as dynamic capabilities (DC), agility and
49 knowledge management (e.g. Schilke, 2014). This is particularly important in
50 terms of the debates on the extent to which inward investment generates
51 productivity growth, or the types of inward investment host countries should
52 attract in order to generate post-crisis growth- *Rationale, identifying gap and*
53 *limitation in extant literature*
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
5. **Building on the existing literature on the topic of EMNEs, knowledge management, DC and agility (see e.g. Bamel and Bamel, 2018; Dove, 1999; Chen, Duan, Edwards and Lehaney, 2006; Denford, 2013; Guo, Jasovska, Rammal, and Rose, 2018; Malik, 2004; Nielsen, 2006; Pérez-Bustamante, 1999; Taghizadeh, Rahman, Hossain, 2018; Williamson, 2016), this paper thus offers the following contributions. Firstly, we examine the DC, agility and knowledge management within EMNEs that operate in the UK, Germany and France before, during and after the recovery from the recent global financial crisis of 2008- *First contribution***
 6. **We further contribute to the literature by investigating the impact of EMNE investments in DC (see e.g. Barreto, 2010; Helfat and Peteraf, 2003; 2011) on their technological performance over the period 2005 to 2016. Third, we further dig deeper to identify which EMNE country groups show greater technological performance and how such EMNE country groups are able to translate DC into greater technological performance compared to other country groups over time (Barreto, 2010; Rice et al, 2015)- *Second contribution***
 7. **Lastly, our paper contributes by investigating how EMNEs with dynamic capabilities show greater agility and how EMNEs from certain groupings show greater agility as compared to others, over time- *Third contribution***

28
29
30

2. The factors identified by the author(s) is not through a rigorous methodology and thus I am not sure how much relevant the factors are.

31
32
33
34
35
36

Response: Thanks for this comments. We have now made clearer the discussion on the factors which are derived from the literature on dynamic capabilities. This is then tested with a robust and rigorous methodology that is consistent in the literature on firm performance as applied in international business and economics (see arguments made by us on pages 5 and 6 of our paper). The same is reproduced below...

37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

...Zollo and Winter (2002) posit that the role of DC, in essence, is to reconfigure firm specific intangible assets such as organisational knowledge over a period of time. Hence, the influence of deliberate learning investments, knowledge accumulation and articulation are central to DC contributing to the firm performance (Rice et al, 2015). They assert, “a dynamic capability is a learned and stable pattern of collective activity through which the organization systematically generates and modifies its operating routines in pursuit of improved effectiveness” (2002, p.340). Similarly, Bergman et al (2004) believe that learning and knowledge creation are fundamental to the generation of DC while Nielsen (2006, p.65) views DC as “concrete and well known knowledge management activities” of the firm where “the performance of a firm is dependent on the ability to exploit its integrated knowledge resources”. In this paper, we concur with the view that reconfiguration of intangible assets through deliberate learning investments (i.e. training and learning investments) and protection of intellectual property rights (Augier and Teece, 2007; Harreld et al, 2007) lead to greater firm performance.

3. How will a reader get benefited after reading your manuscript? You can further strengthen the Discussion section.

Response: Many thanks for this important comment. We have now strengthened the discussion section by highlighting the two general trends emerging from our findings, which the reader will benefit from. This new discussion can be found in the last paragraph of the results and discussion section on page 19. This is apart from the implications of our research for managers of EMNEs as well host country policy-makers in the UK, Germany and France which is already discussed in the conclusion section which is very important for the reader (please also see response to comment 4 below in this regard).

4. You can mention the limitations of your study.

Response: Thanks for this comment. We have now included a discussion on the limitations of our study in the conclusion section, please see page 21 and how future research can help us in understanding mainly three issues which are:

- 1. A finer grained analysis in terms of other ways of measuring DC.**
- 2. Trying to find out empirically and conceptually the reasons why certain country groupings are different in terms of tech performance.**
- 3. How future research should investigate and shed more light on the complimentary nature of the two perspectives on DC**

We have incorporated these three issues in the conclusion section on the back of our limitations in our study.

Additional Questions:

**1. Originality: ** Does the paper contain new and significant information adequate to justify publication?: Yes.

**2. Relationship to Literature: ** Does the paper demonstrate an adequate understanding of the relevant literature in the field and cite an appropriate range of literature sources? Is any significant work ignored?: It needs to be further strengthened.

**3. Methodology: **Is the paper's argument built on an appropriate base of theory, concepts, or other ideas? Has the research or equivalent intellectual work on which the paper is based been well designed? Are the methods employed appropriate?: Appropriate.

**4. Results: **Are results presented clearly and analysed appropriately? Do the conclusions adequately tie together the other elements of the paper?: Satisfactory.

**5. Implications for research, practice and/or society: **Does the paper identify clearly any implications for research, practice and/or society? Does the paper bridge the gap between theory and practice? How can the research be used in practice (economic and commercial impact), in teaching, to influence public policy, in research (contributing to the body of knowledge)? What is the impact upon society (influencing public attitudes, affecting quality of life)? Are these implications consistent with the findings and conclusions of the paper?: Discussion section needs to be written in more detailed manner.

**6. Quality of Communication: ** Does the paper clearly express its case, measured against the technical language of the field and the expected knowledge of the journal's readership? Has attention been paid to the clarity of expression and readability, such as sentence structure, jargon use, acronyms, etc.: Easy to read.

Reviewer: 2

Recommendation: Major Revision

Comments:

Reviewer's comment on the manuscript, entitled "Investigating Dynamic Capabilities, Agility and Knowledge Management within EMNEs- Longitudinal Evidence from Europe" JKM-06-2018-0391.

This paper aims to explore how dynamic capabilities of a firm enhance its technological performance, with a focus on emerging market multinational enterprises investing in Germany, France and UK. In addition, this paper tests which country firm groups are in a better position to convert dynamic capabilities to technological performance. Overall, I find this paper is very interesting and has some potentials to advance our understanding about the importance of dynamic capabilities for multinational enterprises. I have following comments for you to consider during the revision.

1. Dynamic capabilities are the capacity of firms to recreate, reconfigure and modify their existing resource-bases. In this paper the key variable used to measure dynamic capabilities is a firm's accumulated intangible assets, rather than an annual investment (or annual change) in intangible assets. You can consider using annual increase in intangible assets, rather than accumulated intangible assets, to capture dynamic capabilities of the firm, at least for a robustness exercise.

Response: Many thanks for this comment. We have used both the level of intangible assets and the annual change in intangible assets in testing for technological performance in the analysis. Since our findings were consistent with both levels and annual change in intangible assets we decided to illustrate the findings for levels only. However, we agree with you that it is important to make this point in the discussion, which is now added on page 14 in the methodology section.

2. Hypothesis H1c proposes that certain country firms are in a better position to translate dynamic capabilities to performance. This hypothesis is unclear as to which specific countries are in a better position to convert dynamic capabilities to performance. There is a need of including some theoretical reasoning to explain why these country firms can benefit more from dynamic capabilities. Similarly, in hypotheses H1b and H2b it is unclear as to which country firms are more productive, and which country firms show greater agility. These hypotheses need to be clear and to be supported by the existing literature.

Response: Many thanks for this comment. We have now endeavoured to add appropriate and extensive literature to back up hypotheses H1b, H1c and H2b, so that they are now based on sound theoretical reasoning. Please refer to the text preceding hypotheses 1b and 1c for the changes.

1
2
3 3. Regarding methodology part, there are various factors influencing technological
4 performance of a firm. Have you considered these factors in the analysis, and are the results
5 robust after you add these control variables, in particular considering that R-squared in your
6 estimations are relatively low? Data in the analysis are longitudinal, but what methods have
7 you used in the regression? Is it random or fixed effect estimations, and why you choose this
8 method?
9

10 **Response: Many thanks for this comment. We have controlled for firm size and firm**
11 **age, and industry dummies which we now show explicitly in the tables. Generally, these**
12 **are considered the main control variables in the literature (year dimension we capture**
13 **already with dividing pre- during- and post crisis period and country dimension is**
14 **captured by separate country estimation). With regards to the estimation we have used**
15 **OLS, after Levinsohn and Petrin (2003) to control for endogeneity. We further have**
16 **included one year lags on the independent variables to reduce potential endogeneity.**
17 **Due to the smaller sample we have available, we did not opt for GMM estimation which**
18 **puts more requirements on the sample than we currently have (in future work GMM**
19 **estimation may be possible with a larger dataset). We have added more discussion on**
20 **the methodology in the text on pages 13-16.**
21
22

23 4. There are six country groups in your analysis. Why do you include one country group in
24 each estimation, instead of including all country groups in one estimation?
25

26 **Response: Many thanks for this comment. Our objective is to test whether a specific**
27 **group of EMNEs is different in their impact of DC on technological performance**
28 **compared with the other country group EMNEs. This allows us to have the other**
29 **groups as the reference group. As you suggest to having all country groups (i.e. five**
30 **groups) versus one reference groups, this will not allow us to test our hypothesis 1b, 1c,**
31 **2b the way we have derived them from the literature. We humbly submit and make the**
32 **above case as we believe that isolating each country grouping against the other 5**
33 **groupings is preferred in this context than including them all in one estimation. We**
34 **make this point on page 16-17 in order to offer clarity for the reader.**
35
36

37 5. You need to present a summary statistics table showing the average and standard
38 deviation of the key variables used in this paper including those variables you used for
39 calculating total factor productivity of the firm. It would be useful to include a matrix table
40 showing correlation coefficients between every two variables that are used in the analysis.
41
42

43 **Response: Many thanks for this comment. We now include summary statistics (mean**
44 **and standard deviation for every variable used in the analysis) and we also provide a**
45 **correlation matrix table. We refer to both in the text as well.**
46

47 6. You ran an analysis based on firms investing in Germany, and then re-ran the analysis
48 for firms investing in France, and then for firms investing in the UK. Would your results be
49 consistent when you include all samples together? Before running the subsample analysis, it
50 would be useful to know the estimates based on the whole samples.
51

52 **Response: Many thanks for this comment. We now include a footnote on page 15 that**
53 **states the result of estimating the three countries together, which does not drastically**
54 **change the overall message that there is significant heterogeneity of EMNEs depending**
55 **on where there are from. However, and as we make the case above, it is really the**
56
57

1
2
3 **estimation for each country separately that draws our attention to differences which are**
4 **country-specific such that certain EMNEs tend to translate DC into higher**
5 **technological performance compared to others. We like to present and highlight these**
6 **separate estimations and feel that referring to the estimation for all three countries in**
7 **the footnote is a good addition. Thank you.**
8
9

10 Minor comments:

11
12 7. Are the values in parentheses robust standard errors?
13

14 **Response: Many thanks for spotting this mistake. Yes, they are robust standard errors**
15 **and not t-statistics. We have now corrected this in the text and below every results table.**
16
17

18 8. Fourth line on page 14, is it 2013-2016 or 2012-2016 for the post crisis period?
19

20 **Response: Many thanks for this comment. We are consistent in capturing the post-crisis**
21 **period as 2013-2016, whereas during-crisis period is 2008-12 and pre-crisis period is**
22 **2005-07.**
23
24

25 I hope you find the above comments are useful.
26
27
28
29
30

31 Additional Questions:

32 1. Originality: Does the paper contain new and significant information adequate to
33 justify publication?: This paper explores how dynamic capabilities improve technological
34 performance of the firms, with a focus on emerging country multinational enterprises. The
35 paper has some potentials to advance our understanding about dynamic capabilities and link
36 it to foreign direct investment FDI.

37 2. Relationship to Literature: Does the paper demonstrate an adequate
38 understanding of the relevant literature in the field and cite an appropriate range of literature
39 sources? Is any significant work ignored?: Yes, some seminal work and recent literature on
40 dynamic capabilities have been cited and discussed.

41 3. Methodology: Is the paper's argument built on an appropriate base of theory,
42 concepts, or other ideas? Has the research or equivalent intellectual work on which the paper
43 is based been well designed? Are the methods employed appropriate?: The analysis of this
44 paper largely builds upon a longitudinal database. I ask author(s) to further explain the
45 methodology.
46

47 4. Results: Are results presented clearly and analysed appropriately? Do the
48 conclusions adequately tie together the other elements of the paper?: Data analysis part is
49 interesting as a whole. I asked authors to run some additional tests for robustness exercises.

50 5. Implications for research, practice and/or society: Does the paper identify clearly
51 any implications for research, practice and/or society? Does the paper bridge the gap
52 between theory and practice? How can the research be used in practice (economic and
53 commercial impact), in teaching, to influence public policy, in research (contributing to the
54 body of knowledge)? What is the impact upon society (influencing public attitudes, affecting
55 quality of life)? Are these implications consistent with the findings and conclusions of the
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 paper?: Yes, there are some policy and managerial implications for promoting foreign direct
4 investment FDI and maximizing the benefits of FDI.

5 6. Quality of Communication: Does the paper clearly express its case, measured
6 against the technical language of the field and the expected knowledge of the journal's
7 readership? Has attention been paid to the clarity of expression and readability, such as
8 sentence structure, jargon use, acronyms, etc.: Yes, the paper is clearly written, and
9 information is well presented as well.
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60