Orientación al mercado, innovación y capacidades competitivas, determinantes del Desempeño de las PYMEs del estado de Aguascalientes

Market orientation, innovation and competitive capabilities, determinants of the performance of SMEs in the state of Aguascalientes

Orientação para o mercado, as capacidades de inovação e competitivas, determinantes do desempenho das PME no Estado de Aguascalientes

DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.23913/ricea.v6i11.93

Elena Patricia Mojica Carrillo
Universidad Autónoma de Aguascalientes, México
epmojica@correo.uaa.mx

María del Carmen Martínez Serna
Universidad Autónoma de Aguascalientes, México
mcmartin@correo.uaa.mx

Resumen

Las empresas pequeñas y medianas (Pymes) requieren mejorar sus niveles de desempeño y sus expectativas de supervivencia, sin embargo, por lo general carecen de estrategias y mecanismos pertinentes para ello en el contexto mexicano. La teoría de recursos y capacidades enfatiza la necesidad de que las empresas desarrollen fortalezas para tener mayores posibilidades de éxito competitivo, entre las que destacan por su importancia las capacidades humanas, comerciales, directivas, asociativas, de innovación y financieras, que además de ser cruciales para competir, son transferibles a diversos mercados. Con este trabajo se pretende profundizar en el conocimiento de estrategias y orientaciones empresariales que permitan a las Pymes fortalecerse. Al respecto, se han definido factores como la orientación al mercado y la innovación, detonantes de los buenos resultados empresariales y a la vez factores clave para el aprendizaje y la generación de conocimiento

al interior de las organizaciones. Las empresas más orientadas al mercado desarrollan maneras para captar información de sus consumidores, la comparten con eficiencia entre sus colaboradores y la emplean para responder más acertadamente a las necesidades de sus mercados; asimismo, las empresas más innovadoras implementan constantemente cambios en sus productos, en sus procesos operativos, en su mercadotecnia y en sus sistemas de gestión, lo cual les permite aventajar a sus competidores. Con base en estas reflexiones se fijó como objetivo de la investigación analizar la influencia de la orientación al mercado y la innovación en las capacidades competitivas y en el desempeño de las Pymes, para lo cual se formularon seis hipótesis integradas en un modelo teórico que orientó la investigación. La información empírica se recopiló a través de la aplicación de un cuestionario a una muestra de 200 propietarios y/o directivos de Pymes ubicadas en el Estado de Aguascalientes. El análisis de los datos se realizó mediante los software SPSS 19.0 y EQS 6.1., empleando para ello la técnica de modelaje de ecuaciones estructurales. Como resultado se aporta evidencia de una influencia directa y positiva de la orientación al mercado y de la innovación en las capacidades competitivas, y de las capacidades competitivas en el desempeño, mientras que, tanto la orientación al mercado como la innovación presentan una influencia indirecta en el desempeño que puede explicarse a partir de su contribución a la formación de mayores capacidades al interior de las empresas. Lo anterior implica la conveniencia de que las Pymes implementen estrategias específicas para desarrollar habilidades comerciales, directivas, asociativas, humanas, financieras y de innovación, estimulando prácticas para recopilar información relevante de sus mercados, distribuirla en todos los niveles organizacionales y para responder con mayor eficiencia a sus consumidores ofertando productos/servicios y sistemas de atención innovadores. Para el futuro se propone la medición del modelo en otros contextos a fin de realizar estudios comparativos.

Palabras clave: orientación al mercado, innovación, capacidades competitivas, desempeño, Pymes.

Abstract

Small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs) need to improve their performance levels and expectations of survival; however, in the Mexican context, they generally lack relevant strategies and mechanisms in order to achieve such goals. The theory of resources and capabilities emphasizes the need for companies to develop strengths in order to have greater possibilities for competitive success, among them, the importance of human, commercial, managerial, associative, innovation and financial capacities that, in addition to being crucial to compete, are transferable to various markets. This work intends to deepen the knowledge of strategies and business orientations that allow SMEs to strengthen. In this regard, factors such as market orientation and innovation have been defined, triggering good business results and at the same time key factors for learning and knowledge generation within organizations. More market-oriented companies develop ways to capture information from their consumers, share it efficiently among their employees, and use it to respond more accurately to the needs of their markets; In addition, the most innovative companies constantly implement changes in their products, in their operating processes, in their marketing and in their management systems, which allows them to outperform their competitors. Based on these reflections, the objective of the research was to analyze the influence of market orientation and innovation on the competitive capacities and performance of SMEs, for which six hypotheses were formulated and integrated into a theoretical model that guided the investigation. The empirical information was compiled through the application of a questionnaire to a sample of 200 owners and / or managers of SMEs located in the State of Aguascalientes. Data analysis was performed using the software SPSS 19.0 and EQS 6.1., using the modeling technique of structural equations. As a result, there is evidence of a direct and positive influence of market orientation and innovation on competitive capacities and competitive performance capacities. On the other hand, both market orientation and innovation have an indirect influence on performance, which can be explained due to the contribution to the formation of greater capacities within companies. This implies the desirability of SMEs to implement specific strategies to develop commercial, managerial, associative, human, financial and innovation skills, stimulating practices to gather relevant information from their markets, distribute it at all

organizational levels and to respond more efficiently to their consumers by offering innovative products / services and care systems. For the future, it is proposed to measure the model in other contexts in order to carry out comparative studies.

Key words: market orientation, innovation, competitive capabilities, performance, SMEs.

Resumo

As pequenas e médias empresas (PME) precisam melhorar seus níveis de desempenho e expectativas de sobrevivência, no entanto, geralmente não possuem estratégias e mecanismos relevantes no contexto mexicano. A teoria dos recursos e capacidades enfatiza a necessidade de as empresas desenvolverem forças para ter maiores possibilidades de sucesso competitivo, entre elas a importância das capacidades humanas, comerciais, gerenciais, associativas, inovadoras e financeiras que, além de serem cruciais Para competir, são transferíveis para vários mercados. Este trabalho pretende aprofundar o conhecimento de estratégias e orientações empresariais que permitem que as PME se fortaleçam. Nesse sentido, fatores como a orientação e a inovação do mercado foram definidos, desencadeando bons resultados comerciais e, ao mesmo tempo, fatores-chave para a aprendizagem e a geração de conhecimento nas organizações. Mais empresas orientadas para o mercado desenvolvem maneiras de capturar informações de seus consumidores, compartilhá-lo eficientemente entre seus funcionários e usá-lo para responder com mais precisão às necessidades de seus mercados; Além disso, as empresas mais inovadoras implementam constantemente mudanças em seus produtos, nos seus processos operacionais, na sua comercialização e em seus sistemas de gerenciamento, o que lhes permite superar seus concorrentes. Com base nessas reflexões, o objetivo da pesquisa foi analisar a influência da orientação do mercado e da inovação nas capacidades competitivas e desempenho das PME, para as quais foram formuladas seis hipóteses, integradas em um modelo teórico que orientou a Pesquisa. A informação empírica foi compilada através da aplicação de um questionário a uma amostra de 200 proprietários e / ou gerentes de PME localizadas no estado de Aguascalientes. A análise de dados foi realizada utilizando o software SPSS 19.0 e EQS 6.1, utilizando a técnica de modelagem de equações estruturais. Como resultado, há evidências de uma influência direta e positiva da

orientação do mercado e da inovação em capacidades competitivas e capacidades de desempenho competitivo, enquanto tanto a orientação do mercado quanto a inovação têm uma influência indireta sobre O desempenho que pode ser explicado a partir da contribuição para a formação de maiores capacidades dentro das empresas. Isso implica a necessidade de as PME implementarem estratégias específicas para desenvolver habilidades comerciais, gerenciais, associativas, humanas, financeiras e inovadoras, estimulando práticas para coletar informações relevantes de seus mercados, distribuí-las em todos os níveis organizacionais e responder de forma mais eficiente A seus consumidores, oferecendo produtos / serviços inovadores e sistemas de atendimento. Para o futuro, propõe-se medir o modelo em outros contextos para realizar estudos comparativos.

Palavras-chave: orientação ao mercado, inovação, capacidades competitivas, desempenho, PMEs.

Fecha recepción: Agosto 2016 **Fecha aceptación:** Diciembre 2016

Introduction

The State of Aguascalientes is experiencing a new industrial boom with the installation of multinational companies mainly in the automotive industry. However, most of the local SMEs face important challenges to sustain themselves and achieve good levels of performance. This research starts from the interest of defining mechanisms through which these companies could improve their competitive conditions and their life expectancy, overcoming problems that are persistent in this type of companies such as low operational efficiency, lack of administrative strategies, the use limited ICT, lack of innovation, deficiencies in consumer care, high financial and fiscal costs, lack of linkage, among others (Fong, Robles et al., 2007).

From the perspective of the Resource and Capability theory, differences in the performance of companies operating in the same environmental environment can be explained by the way in which they feed and use their strengths to operate, build advantages and achieve their objectives (Wernerfelt, 1984, Huerta, Navas and Almodóvar, 2004). Within this logic,

for companies to improve their performance, they must constantly increase both their material and financial resources (land, facilities, machinery, raw materials, cash) and their intangible strengths, such as knowledge, skills, motivation, (Huerta, Navas and Almodóvar, 2004), so it is important to define and implement efficient mechanisms for this (Borch, Huse and Senneseth, 1999; Amit and Schoemaker 1993 , Barney 1986, 1991, Rumelt, 1984, Wernerfelt 1984, Barney 1991, Ray, Barney and Muhanna, 2004).

Market orientation is a business philosophy that fosters greater customer interest and encourages behaviors for better care (Slater and Narver, 1994). From a behavioral perspective, it has been studied from its three dimensions: the generation of intelligence, the dissemination of acquired intelligence and the response to the market (Kohli and Jaworski, 1990), activities that also favor organizational learning, increasing the number of resources and capacities needed to face the competitive challenges that are of great use in stimulating innovative activity (Narver and Slater, 1990). In this sense, it is considered that more market oriented companies are more able to perform functions such as consumer exploration, product and process innovation, timely decision making, learning and adaptation, leading to a better organizational performance (Stanton, Etzel y Walker, 2004; Kotler y Amstrong, 2008; Lamb y Hair y McDaniel, 2011; Kotler y Amstrong, 2008; Jaworski y Kohli, 1993; Kirca et al., 2005; Jia-Jeng, 2008).

Innovation, understood as any significant change in products, processes and management systems (OECD, 2006), is a necessary practice. When companies innovate, they generally differentiate themselves from their competitors and can offer better satisfaction alternatives, increasing their sales and positioning. Innovation is fundamental to serve diverse, demanding and fragmented markets (Porter, 1996; Fong, Robles et al., 2007), allows the acquisition of greater economic resources derived from the commercial success of the products / services as well as of savings achieved by efficiency operational, and strengthens the organizational capacities related to the processes of research, research and development (Camisón and Villar-López, 2010). However, it is important to consider that innovating can be very costly for companies, especially in the short term, depending on the need to invest more resources (Schnarch, 2009).

Competitive skills are various skills that companies possess and that allow them to create useful advantages to differentiate themselves from their competitors, among which are some especially valuable in the search for better levels of performance. Camisón and Villar López (2010) point out the importance of human capacities (enabling and motivating staff for work), innovation (skills needed to execute innovative processes), commercial skills (capacities for efficient distribution and sale of products / services) and financial (skills to manage financial resources conveniently). In addition, Blesa and Ripollés (2008) emphasize as strategic capacities the directives (skills that have the owners and / or officials of the company to conduct it properly) and the associative (capacities to establish favorable alliances and work together with other people and organizations for the fulfillment of shared objectives). The development of greater capabilities has been highlighted as an important factor to stimulate business performance.

Performance has been conceptualized as the result that the company achieves based on the goals set. This variable has been measured from objective and subjective indicators such as the amount of sales achieved, the profitability generated, the market share of the company, the positioning achieved, customer satisfaction, process efficiency, quality of the product, the image of the company, the proper organization of tasks, the speed of response, the motivation of the workers and the increase of productivity, among others (García et al., 2009).

Performance has also been linked to levels of efficiency and productivity, growth capacity, use of information and communication to achieve adequate control in the organization, as well as the effectiveness of human work (Quinn and Cameron, 1983; Quinn and Rohrbaugh, 1981). In a financial context, good performance implies an attractive economic performance, as well as a good share of sales (Houthoofd, 2009; Slater and Olson, 2000), as a result of the proper administration of profitable relationships with customers (Hsiung - Lee, Yan-Huang, Barnes and Kao, 2010). Achieving superior performance has been seen as the primary purpose of profitable organizations (Quinn and Rohrbaugh, 1983).

Objective of research

Based on the above, the following general objective was defined:

"Analyze the influence of market orientation, innovation and competitive capacities in the performance of SMEs in the State of Aguascalientes".

Then, six hypotheses are based on the theoretical model that guided this work:

a) Market orientation and performance

"Market-oriented" companies are driven by a philosophy of greater consumer attention, develop ways to detect their needs and desires, systematically socialize information and use it to more appropriately adapt the products and services they offer (Kohli et al. Jaworski, 1990). These companies generally manage to better capture their customers' preferences and consequently increase their sales and market share, meet their objectives and achieve better performance levels (Stanton, Etzel and Walker, 2004, Kotler and Amstrong, 2008; Hair, 2011, Slater and Narver, 1994, Cadogan and Diamantopoulos, 1995, Jaworski and Kohli, 1993, Evanschitsky, 2007).

The existence of a direct and positive influence of market orientation on entrepreneurial performance has been widely analyzed at the theoretical and empirical level (Shapiro, 1988, Desphandé, Farley and Webster 1993, Kohli and Jawoski 1990, Narver and Slater, 1990, Jaworski and Kohli, 1993), however, their study has evolved to deepen the knowledge of moderating variables that in some cases potentiate, while in others they attenuate the effect of this relationship (Blesa and Ripollés, 2005, Frishammar and Ake- Hörte, 2007, González-Benito, González-Benito and Muñoz-Gallego, 2008, Li, Zhao, Tan and Liu, 2008, Verhoef and Leeflang, 2009); progress has also been made towards the study of the relationship in the context of non-profit organizations (Flavian and Lozano, 2007). In general terms, the literature suggests the existence of a positive relationship between market orientation and business performance, which gives rise to the following hypothesis:

H1: Market orientation positively influences performance.

b) Market orientation and competitive capabilities

Recently, it has been emphasized that the more market oriented companies not only perform better, but also through their consumer listening practices, their information analysis systems and their ways of responding, they constantly increase their competitive capacities (Liyun, Keyi, Xiaoshu and Farfang, 2008, Chatzipanagiotou, Vassilikopoylou and Simokos, 2008). In this sense, market orientation contributes to the constant formation of skills necessary to make the necessary adaptations and to compete in better conditions, especially when dealing with complex and diversified markets (Kholi and Jaworski 1990, Narver and Slater 1990, Blesa , Ripollés and Monferrer, 2008, Wardrobe, Ruiz and Wardrobe, 2008).

Armario, Ruiz and Armario (2008) consider that market orientation is in itself an intangible resource that allows the company to manage the information for the achievement of its objectives, activating learning processes based on market research activities, data integration and analysis and product / service development, all of which leads to the strengthening of unique and differential skills that allow you to generate advantages over your competitors. Based on the above, the following hypothesis is proposed:

H2: Market orientation positively influences competitive capacities.

c) Market orientation and innovation

Innovation is an essential activity to increase business competitiveness and to maintain consumer preference (Oldenboom and Abratt, 2000) (Narver, Slater and MacLachlan, 2004). Market-oriented companies are also essentially innovative because they systematically use the information they capture to develop new products and services or new ways of operating in their markets. Market orientation can then be understood as a

necessary input and as a variable that potentiates the innovative action for a better attention to the consumer.

This relationship is particularly important in companies that are strongly based on knowledge management (Jiménez-Zarco, Martínez-Ruiz and González-Benito, 2008) and less relevant in companies where innovation is based more on the proposal of technological advances than on those that attend to consumer preferences (Renko, Carsrud and Bränback, 2009). Grinstein (2008) emphasizes that the relationship between market orientation and innovation is stronger in markets with high competitive turbulence, but with a low technological content, it is also stronger in large companies, where they belong to the services sector and in markets with more demanding consumers.

Market orientation facilitates the collection, analysis and use of information on the consumer and on the competitive environment, which is the basis for the creation and modification of products and services, of the operational processes and in the management systems that the companies implement (Eg, Akman and Yilmaz, 2008, Frishammar and Ake-Hörte, 2007, Desphandé, Farley and Webster, 1993, Atuahene-Gima, 1996), Gatingnon and Xuereb (1997), Hurley and Hult 1998, Appiah-Adu and Singh 1998, Baker and Sinkula, 1999, Lado and Mydeu-Olivares 2001, Atuahenne-Gima and Ko, 2001, Noble, Sinha and Kumar, 2002, Verhees and Meulenberg, 2004, Aldas-Manzano, Kûster and Vila, 2005). Based on the above, the following hypothesis is formulated:

H3: Market orientation positively influences innovation.

d) Innovation and performance

Innovation allows organizations to capture the preference of consumers who decide to buy products / services motivated by the expectation of greater value (Klomp and van Lewuwen, 2001; Van-Auken, Madrid-Guijarro and García-Pérez-deLema, 2008) . The new products generate sales revenues, improvements in production processes allow for optimizing costs and maintaining attractive prices, and increasingly efficient forms of

management favor a better adaptation to market conditions, all of which contribute to the superior performance of (Heunks, 1998).

According to Laursen and Salter (2006), it is essential that companies use external sources of information to guide innovative processes and generate better results, while Bhaskaran (2006) explains that, above all, incremental innovation allows companies to consolidate advantages that can be quickly assimilated by the markets generating a good response in sales and profitability. In this regard, Li-min and Ying-yi (2004) point out that innovative action has a positive influence on sales, and both the innovative atmosphere and the capacity to innovate have a direct impact on the profitability of companies. The positive influence of innovation on performance has also been observed through its indirect action, enhancing other variables such as organizational learning (Aragón, García and Cordón, 2005). In accordance with all of the above, the following hypothesis is proposed:

H4: Innovation positively influences performance.

e) Innovation and competitive capabilities

Globalization has meant that companies now face more complex competitive scenarios, which makes it necessary to constantly offer new and better products and services, produce them efficiently and implement better and better management systems, all to deliver superior value to the consumer and capture their preference (Bocigas and Fernández del Hoyo, 2009, Blesa, Ripollés and Monferrer, 2008, Wardrobe, Ruiz and Wardrobe, 2008, Cadogan and Diamantopoulos, 1995).

The innovative process by nature triggers within companies a change and improvement effect (OECD, 2006), but also stimulates the mechanisms of internal and external research, learning, efficient use of information and other organizational resources for innovative action. These mechanisms allow for increased organizational skills, some of which are unique and unrepeatable and can be used to build competitive advantages.

Innovation is considered in itself an explanation of the success of companies, however, the way in which innovation contributes to the strengthening of the company, its good performance and survival has been explained in different ways. Fonfría (2010) points out that innovation directly contributes to strengthening the capacity to learn, to plan, to adapt, to collaborate and to protect knowledge, while Camisón and Villar López (2010) explain that the organizational learning generated by innovation allows to improve the skills needed to serve diverse and complex markets. Based on the above, the following hypothesis is proposed:

H5: Innovation positively influences competitive capacities.

f) Competitive Capabilities and Performance

Every company develops own abilities that when consolidated can be used as source of their differential advantages (Camisón and Villar López, 2010; Brouthers, Nakos, Hadjimarcou and Brouthers, 2009). Some of the most valuable competitive capacities are initially derived from the size of the firm, because larger companies have a more organized structure and resources, but there are also other capabilities that indistinctly develop in large or small enterprises such as leadership, commitment or motivation, among others essential for achieving good performance (Dhanaraj and Beamish, 2003).

A skill of great value for the strengthening of the companies is the one that allows to use the acquired knowledge to attend diverse markets, activating differentiating business strategies (Martín, Rastrollo and González, 2008). Other skills such as innovation, the sum of staffing skills, the skills to develop and operate distribution and sales systems, the ability of managers to guide the company, the ability to establish collaborative networks, and the skills to manage with efficiency financial resources are essential to achieve a good performance (Camisón and Villar López, 2010, Blesa and Ripollés, 2008). Based on the above reflections the following hypothesis is delineated:

H6: Competitive capacities positively influence performance.

Method

The study was carried out in the industrial SME of the State of Aguascalientes and through the implementation of a survey 200 valid questionnaires were collected. The information was analyzed through the modeling technique of structural equations in order to contrast the hypotheses proposed. The following table shows the research data sheet.

Table 1. Ficha técnica de la investigación.

Población	208 empresas.
Unidad de estudio	Pymes industriales en el Estado de Aguascalientes
Número de empresas encuestadas	200 cuestionarios válidos.
Investigación cuantitativa	Aplicación de instrumento compuesto por escalas de medición tipo Likert de 5 puntos y una sección de información general.
Recolección de datos	A través de encuesta auto-aplicada
Sujeto de estudio	Propietarios o directivos de primer nivel de Pymes industriales ubicadas en el Estado de Aguascalientes.

Source: elaboración propia.

In a first stage of work, the reliability and validity of the integrated questionnaire for the investigation were evaluated by means of a confirmatory factorial analysis (CFA), through which it was verified that the instrument met the necessary adjustment conditions according to the reference values are shown below (Table 2):

Table 2. Índices de bondad de ajuste.

INDICE/INDICADOR	Criterio	Fuente
Normed fit index (NFI)	Mayor a 0.80 en escalas nuevas.	EQS 6.1 (Bentler, 2005)
Non normed fit index (NNFI)	Mayor a .80 en escalas nuevas.	EQS 6.1 (Bentler, 2005)
Comparative fit index (CFI)	Mayor a .80 en escalas nuevas.	EQS 6.1 (Bentler, 2005)
Cargas factoriales estandarizadas de cada factor	Mayores a .60	Bagozzi y Yi (1988)
Promedio de las cargas factoriales estandarizadas	Mayores a .70	Hair *et al*., (1995)
Alfa de Cronbach	Mayor a .70 y cercano a la unidad.	Nunnally y Beristein, 1994
Índice de fiabilidad compuesta (IFC)	Mayor a .70	Bagozzi y Yi (1988)
Índice de varianza extraída (IVE)	Mayor a .50	Fornell y Larcker (1981)

Source: elaboración propia con base en Aldas-Manzano y Maldonado (2008).

The following table (number 3) shows the results of the confirmatory factor analysis, where it can be seen that in all cases the data meet the reference criteria indicated in the previous table.

Table 3. Resultados AFC.

Variable	Clave	Carga Factorial	Valor t *** = p < 0.001	Promedio de la Carga Factorial	Alfa de Cronbach	IFC	IVE	ÍINDICES DE BONDAD DE AJUSTE
Generación de Inteligencia	GI5	0.743	1.000[a]	0.722	0.846	0.884	0.523	IFI=.909, NNFI= .903, CFI= .935
	GI6	0.678	7.853***					
	GI7	0.689	7.952***					
	GI8	0.735	7.454***					
	GI9	0.702	8.062***					
	GI10	0.777	7.843***					
	GI14	0.731	7.414***					
Diseminación de Inteligencia	DI3	0.69	1.000[a]	0.724	0.844	0.847	0.525	IFI=.967, NNFI= .959, CFI= .979
	DI4	0.722	7.049***					
	DI5	0.666	6.798***					
	DI7	0.771	7.099***					
	DI8	0.769	7.111***					
Respuesta	R4	0.656	8.373***	0.75	0.833	0.838	0.565	NFI=.971, NNFI= .931, CFI= .977
	R5	0.758	8.294***					
	R6	0.808	8.495***					
	R7	0.776	8.718***					
Innovación en productos	IP1	0.749	1.000[a]	0.783	0.862	0.864	0.614	IFI= .998, NNFI= .999,
	IP2	0.785	15.785***					
	IP3	0.77	15.461***					
	IP4	0.827	16.322***					
Innovación en procesos	IPR1	0.746	1.000[a]	0.820	0.891	0.892	0.675	IFI= .978, NNFI= .946, CFI= .982
	IPR2	0.871	12.159***					
	IPR3	0.807	11.292***					
	IPR4	0.856	11.978***					
Innovación en sistemas de gestión	IGE1	0.817	1.000[a]	0.852	0.913	0.914	0.727	IFI= .972, NNFI= .927, CFI= .976
	IGE2	0.838	13.764***					
	IGE3	0.908	15.309***					
	IGE4	0.846	13.950***					
Capacidades Humanas	CH1	0.647	1.000[a]	0.734	0.852	0.855	0.543	IFI= .945 NNFI= .914, CFI= .957
	CH2	0.768	8.827***					
	CH3	0.822	9.229***					
	CH4	0.773	8.868***					
	CH6	0.658	7.838***					
Capacidades Directivas	CD2	0.699	1.000[a]	0.767	0.866	0.871	0.576	IFI= .923 NNFI= .870, CFI= .935
	CD3	0.789	9.984***					
	CD4	0.805	10.151***					
	CD5	0.826	10.368***					
	CD6	0.664	8.654***					
Capacidades Comerciales	CC2	0.636	1.000[a]	0.716	0.862	0.864	0.518	IFI= .928 NNFI= .906 CFI= .944
	CC4	0.698	8.143***					
	CC7	0.621	7.419***					
	CC8	0.809	9.064***					
	CC9	0.811	9.083***					
	CC10	0.719	8.330***					
Capacidades Financieras	CF3	0.612	1.000a	0.748	0.834	0.839	0.572	IFI= .978 NNFI= .956, CFI= .983
	CF5	0.834	8.862***					
	CF6	0.887	9.004***					
	CF7	0.657	7.561***					
Capacidades Asociativas	CA1	0.766	1.000[a]	0.793	0.909	0.911	0.632	IFI= .909 NNFI= .875, CFI= .925
	CA2	0.849	12.714***					
	CA3	0.88	13.261***					
	CA4	0.701	10.167***					
	CA5	0.808	11.996***					
	CA6	0.753	11.038***					
Capacidades de Innovación	CI2	0.741	1.000[a]	0.777	0.859	0.860	0.670	IFI= .951 NNFI= .871, CFI= .957
	CI3	0.689	9.198***					
	CI4	0.848	11.135***					
	CI5	0.828	10.959***					
Desempeño	DE1	0.781	1.000[a]	0.813	0.939	0.940	0.663	IFI= .916 NNFI= .902, CFI= .930
	DE2	0.869	13.830***					
	DE3	0.866	13.775***					
	DE4	0.805	12.511***					
	DE5	0.807	12.551***					
	DE6	0.868	13.820***					
	DE7	0.752	11.495***					
	DE8	0.758	11.600***					

Source: elaboración propia.

The discriminant validity of the scales was also measured, table 4 (correlation matrix) shows the values obtained and it is noted that below the diagonal, none of the values contains the value 1, which indicates that in the model does not exist elements that are measuring the same (Anderson and Gerbing, 1987). The diagonal of the same table shows the value of the extracted variance (IVE) and above the diagonal the variance squared of each one of the factors, fulfilling the condition that the IVE is superior in all cases to the square of the variance of the factors (Fornell and Larcker, 1981). Based on the fulfillment of these conditions it can be determined that there is sufficient discriminant validity in the instruments used.

Table 4. Matriz de correlaciones.

VARIABLES	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
1 Generación de Inteligencia	**0.524**	0.107	0.033	0.080	0.064	0.038	0.021	0.038	0.045	0.025	0.029	0.036	0.044
2 Diseminación de Inteligencia	0.203-0.451	**0.512**	0.033	0.087	0.086	0.170	0.056	0.124	0.057	0.022	0.038	0.099	0.043
3 Respuesta	0.099-0.263	0.080-0.268	**0.510**	0.044	0.028	0.025	0.021	0.025	0.030	0.003	0.045	0.033	0.004
4 Innovación Productos	0.179-0.387	0.175-0.415	0.122-0.298	**0.588**	0.164	0.116	0.046	0.088	0.075	0.018	0.095	0.099	0.032
5 Innovación Procesos	0.160-0.344	0.184-0.404	0.090-0.242	0.287-0.523	**0.675**	0.120	0.045	0.078	0.048	0.027	0.083	0.077	0.036
6 Innovación Sistemas	0.100-0.288	0.276-0.548	0.074-0.242	0.266-0.454	0.240-0.452	**0.737**	0.067	0.147	0.045	0.031	0.092	0.104	0.033
7 Capacidades Humanas	0.068-0.220	0.136-0.336	0.074-0.214	0.128-0.300	0.133-0.289	0.167-0.351	**0.614**	0.054	0.026	0.010	0.046	0.062	0.019
8 Capacidades Humanas	0.096-0.292	0.214 - 0.490	0.073-0.241	0.180-0.412	0.173 - 0.385	0.251 - 0.515	0.139 - 0.327	**0.585**	0.055	0.024	0.106	0.094	0.038
9 Capacidades Comerciales	0.131 - 0.295	0.143 - 0.335	0.101 - 0.245	0.180-0.368	0.142 - 0.298	0.127-0.295	0.094 - 0.226	0.142 - 0.326	**0.541**	0.013	0.068	0.032	0.022
10 Capacidades Financieras	0.081-0.237	0.059-0.239	0.004-0.116	0.057-0.209	0.089-0.237	0.091-0.259	0.036-0.160	0.071-0.239	0.054-0.178	**0.620**	0.047	0.006	0.035
11 Capacidades Asociativas	0.077-0.265	0.080-0.308	0.121-0.305	0.197-0.421	0.188-0.388	0.191-0.415	0.125-0.305	0.201-0.449	0.169-0.353	0.124-0.308	**0.738**	0.047	0.046
12 Capacidades de Innovación	0.101-0.277	0.196-0.432	0.102-0.262	0.210-0.418	0.186-0.370	0.216-0.428	0.162-0.334	0.194-0.418	0.106-0.254	0.008-0.148	0.119-0.315	**0.590**	0.023
13 Desempeño	0.124-0.296	0.107-0.307	0.003-0.131	0.096-0.264	0.111-0.267	0.093-0.269	0.069-0.209	0.103-0.287	0.800-0.216	0.108-0.264	0.123-0.307	0.071-0.231	**0.693**

Source: elaboración propia.

Results

Whenever the reliability and validity of the instrument were checked, the model was tested using structural equation analysis. Through the calculation of the coefficient of determination "r^2" (square of the Pearson correlation coefficient) that predicts the quality and fit of the theoretical model in relation to the empirical data of the investigation, as well as the explanatory level of the variables, it is observed that the economic performance of SMEs under study is explained at 39.3% by the joint action of market orientation, innovation and competitive capacities; in this sense, competitive capacities are explained in 78.4% based on market orientation and innovation and finally market orientation explains the innovation in 57.7%. These figures give evidence of a good fit and consistency of the theoretical model of research (Table 5).

Table 5. Resultados r^2 obtenidos a partir del análisis estructural del modelo.

Variable(s) Explicativas	**Variable Explicada**	**r^2**
Orientación al mercado Innovación Capacidades competitivas	Desempeño Económico	39.3 %
Orientación al mercado Innovación	Capacidades competitivas	78.4 %
Innovación	Orientación al mercado	57.7 %

Source: elaboración propia.

In relation to the results obtained in the hypothesis test, Table 6 shows that there is sufficient support for the acceptance of hypotheses 2, 3, 5 and 6, whereas hypotheses 1 and 4 are not accepted. These results are discussed below.

Table 6. Contrastación de las hipótesis.

HIPÓTESIS:	Efecto Directo (β)	Efecto indirecto	Efecto total	Valor de t	Conclusión
H1: La orientación al mercado influye positivamente en el desempeño.	0.025	0.536	0.561	0.156	*No se soporta la hipótesis 1*
H2: La orientación al mercado influye positivamente en las capacidades competitivas.	0.243	0.334	0.577	**3.244*** **	*Sí se soporta la hipótesis 2*
H3: La orientación al mercado influye positivamente en la innovación.	0.884	-----	0.884	**9.197*** **	*Sí se soporta la hipótesis 2*
H4: La innovación influye positivamente en el desempeño.	-0.14	0.359	0.345	0.086	*No se soporta la hipótesis 3*
H5: La innovación influye positivamente en las capacidades competitivas.	0.378	-----	0.378	**5.493*** **	*Sí se soporta la hipótesis 2*
H6: Las capacidades competitivas influyen positivamente en el desempeño.	0.951	-----	0.951	**3.093*** **	*Sí se soporta la hipótesis 2*
*** p<0.001, ** p<0.01, * p<0.05*					

Source: elaboración propia.

Contrast of Hypothesis 1

The hypothesis number 1 proposes that market orientation positively influences performance. In this sense, values of $\beta = 0.561$ and $t = 0.156$ were obtained, which implies that there is no support for the verification of this hypothesis, however, it is important to inform that according to the results of the structural analysis it was observed that market orientation is exerting an indirect influence on performance, enhancing the effect of innovation and competitive capacities on this variable. This relationship has been previously detected in studies such as Pelham (1993), who describes that the effect of market orientation on performance is not direct but indirect in its impact on the efficiency of marketing strategies, and Jia-Jeng (2008), who emphasizes an indirect trajectory through the action of market orientation as a variable that contributes to the creation of greater capacities for the attention of markets and these in turn influence a better performance.

In the same vein, Maydeu-Olivares and Lado (2003) conclude that the relationship between market orientation and performance, which has traditionally been assumed as a direct and positive relationship, has rather an indirect function over other variables such as innovation

, successful adoption of innovation or customer loyalty, which directly impact performance. It is also important to consider that the technique of structural equations used in this study offers the possibility of detecting the diversity of effects that simultaneously exert the variables and items of a model, so the results of this research may differ from those of other studies where the variables were analyzed in isolation and not in a joint and integral way (Manzano and Zamora, 2009, Bollen, 1989).

Contrast of Hypothesis 2

This hypothesis suggests that market orientation positively influences the competitive capacities of SMEs. Based on the results obtained ($\beta = 0.577$, $t = 3.244$, $p < .001$), the hypothesis is supported, concluding that market orientation accounts for 57.7% of competitive capacities. Consistent with this result, Varela and Del Río (2009) point out that market-oriented companies are able to develop important skills for the detection of business opportunities, the establishment of efficient communication processes with consumers and the coordination of actions necessary to give more relevant answers; Likewise, Camisón and Villar López (2010) point out the importance of market orientation to trigger learning processes, and develop differential skills that allow them to excel in diverse markets and achieve better performance levels.

In addition, Armario, Ruiz and Armario (2008), Varela, Gutiérrez and Antón (1998) and Slater and Narver (1996) argue that more market-oriented firms acquire greater skills for obtaining and analyzing information about consumers, competitors and environmental forces, which also stimulates individual and collective learning, strengthening the organizational capacities needed to deliver superior customer value.

Contrast of Hypothesis 3

This hypothesis proposes that market orientation positively influences innovation. Based on the results ($\beta = 0.884$, $t = 9.197$, $p < 0.001$) the hypothesis is supported, highlighting that the market orientation explains the innovation in 88.4%. The results obtained are congruent

with studies such as those of Narver, Slater and MacLachlan (2004), Jiménez-Zarco, Martínez-Ruiz and González-Benito (2008), Frishammar and Ake-Hörte (2007) and Grinstein (2008) this influence is mainly based on the use of the superior capabilities developed by market-oriented companies to collect, distribute and use information in the detection of latent or unresolved consumer needs, as well as to monitor the changes that occur on the scene competitive and in the environment in general.

The results are also consistent with the work of Renko, Carsrud and Brännback (2009), who explain that more market-oriented firms develop links with customers, business partners and even competitors. The network of connections makes information flow better that is an essential input for innovation. Also, working together in networks and distribution chains stimulates efficiency by increasing the flow of economic resources that support innovation activities. Jiménez-Zarco, Martínez-Ruiz and González-Benito (2008) explain the relationship between market orientation and innovation, based on the use of market intelligence, to align innovative efforts to create better ways to satisfy customers.

Contrast of Hypothesis 4

In hypothesis number four it was argued that innovation positively influences the performance of SMEs, however, the empirical results do not support the hypothesis (β = 0.345 and t = 0.086). In this respect, it is important to mention that in general it has been understood that innovation allows companies to propose new things to better respond to the needs of consumers and the dynamic conditions of the environment (Van Auken et al., 2008), however , the relationship between innovation and performance may be moderated by various factors such as firm size, even generating a negative effect on smaller firms, which generally do not have sufficient structure and resources to innovate (Feeny and Rogers , 2003), or factors such as the dynamism of the technological environment and the capacity to assimilate environmental information, which facilitates or hinders the detection of new opportunities that trigger innovative processes (Klomp and Lewuwen, 2001).

It is also important to consider the stage of the innovation process as firms face higher costs in the initial stages, which may reduce or even reverse the effect of innovation on performance in the short term (Hughes, 2001) , as well as the type of innovation, which in incremental processes could favor a positive effect and in radical processes a negative effect (Bhaskaran, 2006), except for companies with high technological content, where radical innovation favors a better performance (Cozzarin, 2004). Fosfuri and Tribó (2008) also point out that innovation has a positive influence on performance in companies with greater learning capacity, whereas Droge, Calantone and Harmancioglu (2008) explain that the level of competitive turbulence is one of the factors which can further modify the intensity and meaning of the relationship between innovation and performance. It is important to note that in this study, based on the trajectories defined in the structural analysis, it is observed that innovation is indirectly influencing performance, enhancing the influence of competitive capacities.

Contrast of Hypothesis 5

Hypothesis number five proposes that innovation positively influences competitive capacities, and according to the results obtained ($\beta = 0.378$, $t = 5.493$, $p < .001$) empirical support is given for its acceptance. The literature has pointed out the importance of innovative activity as a trigger for learning processes and for greater capacity of companies to face the competitive challenges (Yoguel and López, 2000; Akman and Yilmaz, 2008). Companies that innovate, especially those that do it in a systematic and organized way, strengthen technological, creative, adaptive skills, for the capture of information, for research and development, improve their production and distribution systems, implement better promotional forms and manage prices using differentiated strategies (Yoguel and López, 2000, Ramírez, 2004).

According to Akman and Yilmaz (2008), innovating companies accumulate knowledge that is essential to be able to increase their abilities, mainly the ability to react quickly to unexpected conditions and requirements of diverse markets. In this regard, Camisón and

Villar-López (2010) explain that companies that are innovative use organizational learning generated from experience to improve and strengthen in a constant way.

Contrast of Hypothesis 6

Finally, it was considered that competitive capacities have a positive influence on the performance of SMEs, in this case the structural analysis yielded results that support the hypothesis ($\beta = 0.951$ and $t = 0.3.093$, $p < .001$). Several studies have emphasized the importance of companies developing their competitive capabilities to improve their results. Camisón and Villar López (2010) reported a direct, positive and significant influence of a set of capabilities that were considered essential to compete in global environments in performance. These skills allow the construction of competitive advantages from them and can be transferred and exploited in different markets, in this group they indicate the human capacities, the financial capacities, the commercial capacities and the innovation capacities.

Blesa and Ripollés (2008) emphasize the contribution of two types of essential competitive capacities to the performance of companies, especially when they serve diverse markets: managerial capacities and associative capacities. Firms that develop the most managerial skills generally better select their markets and define relevant strategies, while companies that develop associative skills are prone to partnering and collaborating with diverse partners, leveraging the synergy of value chains while stimulating their learning processes by interacting daily with suppliers, customers, distributors and competitors. From this information can be outlined clearer strategies to stimulate good performance by specifically strengthening these capabilities.

Conclusions

The theory of resources and capabilities has in recent times been very useful to explain business performance in terms of the development and strategic use of competitive skills within organizations. The market orientation in the companies represents their level of assimilation of the concept and values of the marketing as a guide of the directives decisions and of its action. Market orientation is present in organizations to some extent and is manifested through activities or behaviors related to the collection of information, its

dissemination or socialization and the responses that companies give to their market as a result of an efficient connection with their consumers.

In general terms it is understood that the more market oriented companies have a greater commercial success derived from the preference of the consumers and, therefore, they obtain to obtain better levels of performance. On the other hand, companies with more market orientation, when carrying out the activities of capturing and using information to adapt their offer to the needs of the consumer, develop skills based on individual and collective learning, enhancing their particular and distinctive heritage (Jia- Jeng, 2008).

Innovation is now considered an indispensable element for the survival of companies, especially in dynamic competitive contexts where it is necessary to constantly propose novelties to win the preference of consumers. According to the OECD (2006), organizations need to constantly introduce new or significantly improved products, increasingly efficient processes and better management and marketing systems to be competitive and achieve their objectives.

Both market orientation and innovation have been studied previously in terms of their contribution to the good performance of companies and more recently in relation to their role as an input for training and the enhancement of the competitive capacities of companies. Among the various capacities that companies can develop, different studies have found some of them considered essential to compete in diverse and highly valued markets in order to achieve better performance: human, financial, innovation, commercial, managerial and associative capacities (Camisón and Villar López, 2010, Blesa and Ripollés, 2008).

Based on the literature, a theoretical model was designed for this research that proposes that market orientation, innovation and competitive capacities influence the performance of SMEs, and that market orientation also influences innovation, subjecting model to an empirical test in the business context of the State of Aguascalientes for which the

information was collected from 200 owners and / or managers of industrial SMEs, processed through the modeling technique of structural equations.

Derived from the above, relevant findings are reported, first, market orientation, which is traditionally assumed to have a direct and positive influence on business performance, shows in this model an indirect influence through three different trajectories that together explain 39.3% (r2) of performance (joint action of market orientation, innovation and competitive capabilities), which strengthens the idea that market orientation may be acting indirectly in performance by leveraging other variables.

In this same sense, it was found that the market orientation explains 57.7% of the competitive capacities, which represents a relevant finding because in the literature there was no history of the study of the relationship between these two variables in the context of the SMEs in Mexico and based on the possible implications of this result, which suggests that from the stimulation of specific actions such as monitoring the current and future needs of consumers, the socialization and use of market information and of the adequacy of the offer to better satisfy the consumers, SMEs can have greater commercial success in the short term and also strengthen competitive capacities useful to improve their performance.

According to the empirical results obtained, the market orientation also explains innovation in 88.4%, which is consistent with the previous theory in relation to which companies that have a better connection with their consumers, manage to detect with greater opportunity and precision their current and future needs, as a result, can develop new products, better ways to operate and better ways to manage. Also, more market-oriented firms develop skills to partner with distributors and other competitors by leveraging networks to obtain key information for innovation (Renko, Carsrud and Bränback, 2009).

An important finding is also the influence of innovation on business performance, in this sense in the original theoretical model it is proposed that innovation positively influences performance, however, the empirical results do not support the acceptance of this hypothesis, which is congruent with similar studies that explain that investment in

innovation processes negatively affects the firm's economy (Hughes, 2001). However, it is important to note that structural analysis shows that between innovation and performance there is an indirect influence from the trajectory of competitive capacities (indirect effect of innovation on performance through competitive capacities = (0.378) (0.951) = 0.345 = 34.5%).

The innovation explains competitive capacities at 37.8%, which implies that innovative companies that constantly propose changes or improvements in their products and adapt them to the needs of their consumers, develop better ways to produce, sell and direct their actions, with which they constantly feed their capacities, mainly the creative and adaptive ones. These results are consistent with those of other studies which explain that innovation is a success factor because it favors both the adaptation and differentiation of products, the constant improvement of work systems and the updating of management systems (Yoguel and López, 2000; Akman and Yilmaz, 2008).

Camisón and Villar-López (2010) explain that through experience and learning, companies increase their creative and adaptive capacities to respond appropriately to changing market conditions, while Yoguel and López (2000) point out that the activity innovative approach mainly stimulates the capacities to research, develop appropriate products for different markets, implement new marketing methods, improve production systems, develop promotion proposals and creatively manage pricing systems.

Finally, according to the results obtained from the structural analysis of the theoretical model, evidence is provided that SMEs' business performance is explained in 95.1% by competitive capacities, which is an important finding. In this sense, SMEs can focus their resources on the development of specific competitive capacities to improve their performance, mainly financial capacities, which allow them to access better credits and manage the cost of capital, human capacities, stimulating individual learning and collective, the motivation and sense of belonging of its staff, commercial skills, participating in more appropriate and lower-cost marketing networks, the capacity for innovation through favoring the generation of new and better products, improvements in production processes

and management systems (Camisón and Villar López, 2010), as well as in the managerial capacities that favor an indispensable strategic vision for a better conduction of the businesses and the associative abilities that facilitate the integration of the companies to networks of collaboration (Blesa y Ripollés, 2008).

Implications

The results of this work can be useful to guide business decisions that allow to improve the performance of SMEs, as well as to guide policies and support programs for these companies. Firstly, SMEs should focus their efforts on strengthening their competitive capacities, particularly associative, innovation and management capacities, as they have the greatest impact on performance. In this sense, it is advisable to encourage collaboration with other companies and organizations and constantly implement changes and improvements especially in production processes. In relation to managerial skills, it is important that owners and managers improve their personal capacity to establish and coordinate efficient management systems, to understand the different groups of consumers and to design specific attention actions to respond to each of them depending on your needs.

In order to strengthen the human capacities of SMEs, it is necessary to foster good internal communication and to keep staff motivation high. These two factors contribute to both the successful implementation of business strategies and the socialization of individual accumulated knowledge. In relation to the strengthening of commercial capacities, it is necessary to establish effective external communication systems that allow monitoring of environmental changes to know the actions of competitors, maintaining the connection with customers, suppliers and distributors. There are serious shortcomings of SMEs in their financial management, which requires that those responsible for making financial decisions are increasingly enabled in the search and evaluation of appropriate sources of financing at a lower cost.

The innovation in products, processes and management systems was highlighted in the research as a variable that contributes to the formation of competitive capacities, so it is advisable to encourage it through activities of generation of intelligence, in particular it is advisable to establish mechanisms to collect comments, complaints and suggestions from customers and use this information to constantly improve the products and services that the company offers. In this sense, it is also recommended that SMEs periodically evaluate their results in terms of quality of service delivered to clients and set goals to overcome their areas of opportunity. In order to improve innovative activity it is also necessary to take actions to disseminate quickly and efficiently the valuable information that is collected and take it as input to undertake changes that allow adapting the offer of products and services to the needs of consumers, in this way SMEs can generate competitive advantages and strengthen their positioning. In relation to management systems, it is important to implement more modern and flexible administrative systems that provide sufficient support for the operation of the company.

Market orientation also contributes to the formation of competitive capacities and influences performance. Therefore, it is necessary to promote a consumer-centered culture, to systematize the connection activities with the clients, the dissemination of information and to meet identified needs.

Limitations of research

It is considered that the main limitation was the refusal of some entrepreneurs to provide information, which is attributed to the insecurity that is experienced in the country. Another limitation was that owners or managers were surveyed considering that they have a broader and deeper view of the reality that organizations live in, however, there may be some bias derived from the fact that subjects, being owners or managers, want to project a better company image. This risk, however, is present in all investigations based on data provided by individuals.

Future lines of research

Future research lines may be the comparison between service sector companies in other cities in Mexico and other countries, as well as the implementation of longitudinal projects that allow observing the evolution of the variables over time.

Bibliography

Akman, G. & Yilmaz, C. (2008). Innovative Capability, Innovation Strategy and Market Orientation. *International Journal of Innovation Management*, *12*(1), 69-111.

Amit, R., y Schoemaker, P. J. (1993). Strategic Assets and Organizational Rent. *Strategic Management Journal*, 33-46.

Anderson, J. y Gerbing, D. (1987). An Approach for Confirmatory Measurement and Structural Equation Modeling of Organizational Properties. *Management Science*, *33*(April), 525–41.

Appiah-Adu, K. y Singh, S. (1998). Customer Orientation and Performance: A Study of S.M.E.s. *Management Decision, 36* (6), 385-394.

Aragón, A., García, V. y Cordón, E. (2005). Leadership and Organizational Learning`s Role on Innovation and Performance: Lessons From Spain. *Industrial Marketing Management*, 36, 349-359.

Armario, J., Ruiz, D. y Armario, E. (2008). Market Orientation and Internationalization in Small and Medium Sized Enterprises. *Journal of Small Business Management*, *46*(4), 485-511.

Atuahene-Gima, K. (1996). Market Orientation and Innovation. *Journal of Business Research*, 35, 93-103.

Atuahene-Gima, K., y Ko, A. (2001). An Empirical Investigation of the Effect of Market Orientation and Entrepreneurship Orientation Alignment on Product Innovation, *Organization Science*, 12(1), 54-74.

Bagozzi, R. P. y Yi, Y. (1988). On the Evaluation of Structural Equation Models. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science. 16*(1), 74-94.

Baker, W., y Sinkula, J. (1999). Learning Orientation, Market Orientation and Innovation: Integrating and Extending Models of Organizational Performance. *Journal of Market Focused Management, 4*, 295-308.

Barney, J. B. (1986). Strategic Factor Markets: Expectation, Luck, and Business Strategy. *Management Science, 32*(10), 1231-1241.

Barney, J. (1991). The Resource-Based Model of the Firm: Origins, Implications and Prospects. *Journal of Management*, *17*(1), 99-120.

Bentler, P. (02 de enero de 2016). EQS 6 structural equations program manual. Recuperado de http://84.89.132.1/~satorra/CourseSEMVienna2010/EQSManual.pdf

Bhaskaran, S., (2006). Incremental Innovation and Business Performance: Small and Medium Size Food Enterprises in a Concentrated Industry Environment. *Journal of Small Business Management*, *44*(1), 64-80.

Blesa, A. y Ripollés, M. (2005). Relación entre la Orientación al Mercado y la Orientación Emprendedora, su influencia en el Rendimiento de la Empresa. *Revista Europea de Dirección y Economía de la Empresa, 14*(3), 165-180.

Blesa, A., y Ripollés, M. (2008). The influence of marketing capabilities on economic international performance. *International Marketing Review, 25*(6), 651-673.

Blesa, A., Ripollés, M. y Monferrer, D. (2008). La Orientación al Mercado como Determinante en la Internacionalización de las Nuevas Empresas. *Instituto Valenciano de Investigaciones Económicas*, 2-39.

Bocigas, O. y Fernández del Hoyo, A. (2009). Relación entre el Grado de Orientación al Mercado y el Ámbito Geográfico Empresarial: El Caso de la Empresa Española del Siglo XX. *Universidad Pontificia de Madrid*, 1-22.

Bollen, K. (1989). *Structural Equations with Latent Variables* (1a. edición) New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Borch, O., Huse, M. y Senneseth, K. (1999). Resource Configuration, Competitive Strategies, and Corporate Entrepreneurship, an empirical examination of small firms. *Entrepreneurship, Theory and Practice*. Fall, 49-70.

Brouthers, L., Nakos, G., Hadjimarcou, J. y Brouthers,K. (2009). Key Factors for Successful Export Performance for Small Firms. *Journal of International Marketing, 17*(3), 21-38.

Cadogan, J. y Diamantopoulos, A. (1995). Narver and Slater, Kohli and Jaworsky and the Market Orientation Construct: Integration and Internationalization. *Journal of Strategic Marketing*, 3, 41-60.

Camisón, C. y Villar López, A. (2010). Effect of SMEs´ International Experience on Foreign Intensity and Economic Performance: The Mediating Role of Internationally Exploitable Assets and Competitive Strategy. *Journal of Small Business Management*, 48(2), 116-151.

Chatzipanagiotou, K., Vassilikopoylou, A. y Simokos, G. (2008). An Empirical Investigation of the Relationship between Market Orientation and MrklS

effectiveness in Upscale Hotels in Greece. *Journal of Targeting, Measurement and Analysis for Marketing*, *16*(4), 285-297.

Cozzarin, B. (2004). Innovation Quality and Manufacturing Firms´ Performance in Canada. *Economics of Innovation and New Tecnology*, 13, 199-216.

Desphandé, R., Farley, J. y Webster, F. (1993). Corporate Culture, Customer Orientation and Innovativeness in Japanese Firms. *Journal of Marketing*, 57, 23-27.

Dhanaraj, Ch. y Beamish, P. (2003). A Resource-Based Approach to the Study of Export Performance. *Journal of Small Business Management*, *41*(3), 242-261.

Droge, C., Calantone, R. y Harmancioglu, N. (2008). New Product Succes: Is It Really Controllable by Managers in Highly Turbulent Enviroments? *The Journal of Product Innovation Management*, 25, 272-286.

Evanschitzky, H. (2007). Market Orientation of Service Networks: Direct and Indirect Effects on Sustained Competitive Advantage. *Journal of Strategic Marketing*, 15, 349-368.

Feeny, S. y Rogers, M. (2003). Innovation and Performance: Benchmarking Australian Firms. *The Australian Economic Review*, *36*(3), 253-264.

Flavian, C. y Lozano, F. (2007). Influencias Ambientales en la Relación Orientación al Mercado-Resultados del Profesorado de Marketing en la Universidad Española. *Cuadernos de Economía y Dirección de Empresa*, 32, 49-80.

Fonfría, A. (2010). Innovación Tecnológica e Internacionalización: Un Análisis Causal, Universidad Complutense de Madrid, 4, 30-50.

Fong, Robles, De la O., Ramírez y cols., (2007). *La PYME en México, Situación Actual y Retos Estratégicos* (1ª edición). Guadalajara: Universidad de Guadalajara, Centro Universitario de Ciencias Económicas y Administrativas.

Fornell, C. y Larcker, D. (1981). Evaluating structural equation models with unobservable variables and measurement error: algebra and statistics. *Journal of Marketing Research, 18* (3), 382-398.

Fosfuri, A. y Tribó, J. (2008). Exploring the Antecedents of Potential Absorptive Capacity and its Impact on Innovation Performance. *The International Journal of Management Science,* 36,173-187.

Frishammar, J. y Ake-Hörte, S. (2007). The Role of Market Orientation and Entrepreneurial Orientation for New Product Development Performance in Manufacturing Firms. *Technology Analysis and Strategic Management*, *19*(6), 765-788.

García, D., Martínez, M. y Maldonado, G., *et. al.* (2009). *Innovación y Cultura Empresarial de las MIPYME* (1ª edición). Aguascalientes: Universidad Autónoma de Aguascalientes y Universidad Politécnica de Cartagena.

Gatingnon, H. y Xuereb, J. (1997). Strategic Orientation of the Firm and New Product Performance. *Journal of Marketing Research, 34* (1), 77-90.

González-Benito, O., González-Benito, J. y Muñoz-Gallego, P. (2008). Papel de la Orientación Emprendedora y la Orientación al Mercado en el Éxito de las Empresas. *Documentos de Trabajo de la Fundación de las Cajas de Ahorros,* 406, 1-27.

Grant, R. (1996). Prospecting in Dinamically-Competitive Enviroments: Organizational Capability as Knowledge Integration. *Organization Science, 7*(4), 375-387.

Grinstein, A. (2008). The Effect of Market Orientation and its Components on Innovation Consequences: a Meta Analysis. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 36, 166-173.

Hair, J., Anderson, R., Totham, R. y Black, W. (1995). *Multivariate Data Analysis* (4a edición). Upper Saddle River, New Jersey: Prentice Hall

Heunks, F. (1998). Innovation, creativity and success. *Small Business Economics*, 10, 263–272.

Houthoofd, N. (2009). Business Definition and Performance Implications: The Case of The Belgian Construction Sector. *Construction Management and Economics*, 27, 639-652.

Hsiung Lee, Ch., Yan Huang, S., Barnes, B. y Kao, L. (2010). Business Performance and Customer Relationship Management: The Effect of IT, Organizational Contingency and Business Process of Taiwanese Manufacturers. *Total Quality Management*, *21*(1), 43-65.

Huerta, P. Navas, J. y Almodóvar, P. (2004). La Diversificación desde la Teoría de Recursos y Capacidades. *Cuadernos de Estudios Empresariales*, 14, 87-104.

Hughes, A. (2001). Innovation and Business Performance, Small Entrepreneurial Firms in the U.K. and the E.U. *New Economy*, 157-163.

Hurley, R., y Hult, G. (1998). Innovation, Market Orientation and Organizational Learning: An Integration and Empirical Examination. *Journal of Marketing*, *62*(3), 42-54.

Jaworski B.J., y Kohli, A.K. (1993). Market Orientation: Antecedents and Consequences. *Journal of Marketing*, 57, 53-70.

Jia-Jeng, Hou. (2008). Toward a Research Model of Market Orientation and Dynamic Capabilities. *Social Behavior and Personality*, *36*(9), 1251-1258.

Jiménez-Zarco, A., Martínez-Ruiz y M., González-Benito, O. (2008). Implicaciones de la Orientación Proactiva hacia el Mercado, la Cooperación y el Uso de las TIC en los Procesos de Innovación de Productos y Servicios. *Universia Business Review*, cuarto trimestre, 54- 67.

Klomp, L. y Van Lewuwen, G. (2001). Linking Innovation and Firm Performance: A New Approach. *International Journal of the Economics of Business*, *8*(3), 343-364.

Kohli, A, y Jaworski B. (1990). Market Orientation: The Construct, Research Propositions, and Managerial Implications. *Journal of Marketing*, 54, 1-18.

Kotler, P. y Amstrong, G. (2008). *Fundamentos de Marketing* (8a edición). México: Pearson Education.

Lado, N. y Mydeu-Olivares, A. (2001). Exploring Between Market Orientation and Innovation in the European and US Insurance Markets. *International Marketing Review*, *18*(2), 130- 144.

Lamb, Ch., Hair, C. y Mc. Daniel, C. (2011). *Marketing* (11a edición). México:Thompson Editores, CENGAGE Learning.

Laursen, K., y Salter, A. (2006). Open for Innovation: The Role of Openness in Explaining Innovation Performance among U.K. Manufacturing Firms. *Strategic Management Journal*, 27,131-150.

Liyun, Q., Keyi, W., Xiaoshu, W. y Fangfang, Z. (2008). Research on the Relationship among Market orientation, Customer Relationship Management, Customer

Knowledge Management and Business Performance. *Management Science and Engineering*, *2*(1), 31-37.

Manzano, A. y Zamora, S. (2009). *Sistema de Ecuaciones Estructurales, Una Herramienta de Investigación*. Cuadernos Técnicos, CENEVAL. México: Centro Nacional de Evaluación para la Educación Superior, A.C.

Maydeu-Olivares y Lado, A. (2003). Market Orientation and Business Economic Performance: A Mediated Model. *International Journal of Service Industry Management*, *14* (3), 284-309.

Narver, J., Slater, S. y Mac Lachlan, D. (2004). Responsive and Proactive Market Orientation and New-Product Success. *Journal of Product Innovation Management*, *21*(5), 334-347.

Narver, J., y Slater, S. (1990). The Effect of Market Orientation on Business Profitability. *Journal of Marketing*, 54, 20-35.

Noble, C., Sinha, R. y Kumar, A. (2002). Market Orientation and Alternative Strategic Orientations: A Longitudinal Assessment of Performance Implications. *Journal for Marketing*, *66*(4), 25-39.

Nunnally, J.C. y Bernstein, I.H. (1994). *Psychometric Theory* (3a edición). New York: McGraw-Hill.

OCDE. (20 de enero de 2016). Manual de Oslo sobre Innovación. Recuperado de http://portal.uned.es/portal/page?_pageid=93,23280929&_dad=portal

Oldenboom, N. y Abratt, R. (2000). Success and Failure Factors in Developing New Banking and Insurance Services in South Africa. *International Journal of Bank Marketing*, *18* (5), 233-245.

Pelham, A. (1993). Mediating Influences on the Relationship Between Market Orientation on Business Profitability (tesis doctoral, The Pennsylvania State University).

Porter, M. (29 de Agosto de 2008). The Five Forces that Shape Industry Competition. Recuperado de www.harvardbusinessonline.hbsp.harvard.edu

Quinn, R. y Cameron, K. (1983). Organizational Life Cycles and Shifting Criteria of Effectiveness: Some Preliminary Evidence. *Management Science, 29* (1), 33-51.

Quinn, R., Rohrbaugh, J., (1981). Competing values approach to organizational effectiveness. *Public Productivity Review*, 5, 122-140.

Quinn, R., y Rohrbaugh, J. (1983). A Spatial model of Efectiveness Criteria: Towards a Competing Values Aproach to Organizatinal Analysis. *Management Science*, *29*(3), 363-377.

Ramírez, M. (2004). La Importancia de los Recursos Intangibles en la Internacionalización de la Empresa. *Universia Business Review- Actualidad Económica*, tercer trimestre, 62-69.

Ray, G., Barney, J. y Muhanna, W. (2004). Capabilities, business processes and competitive advantage: choosing the dependent variable in empirical test of resource-based view. *Strategic Management Journal*, 25, 23-37.

Renko, M., Carsrud, A. y Brannback, M. (2009). The Effect of a Market Orientation, Entrepreneurial Orientation and Tecnological Capability on Innovativeness. *Journal of Small Business Management*, 47(3), 331-369.

Rumelt, R. P. (1984). *Towards a Strategic Theory of the Firm in Competitive Strategic Management*. Engelwood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.

Schnarch, A. (2009). *Desarrollo de Nuevos Productos y Empresas* (5ª edición). Bogotá: Mc. Graw Hill.

Shapiro, Benson P. (1988). What the Hell is 'Market Oriented? *Harvard Business Review*, 66, 119-125.

Slater, S. y Narver, J. (1994). Market Orientation, Customer Value and Superior Performance. http://findarticles.com/p/articles/es/mi_ml038/is_n2_v37/ai_15419777 Fecha de consulta: 05/03/2009.

Slater, S., y Olson, E., (2000). Strategy Type and Performance: The Influence of Sales Force Management. *Strategic Management Journal*, 21, 813-829.

Stanton, W., Etzel, M. y Walker, B. (2004). *Fundamentos de Marketing* (14a edición). México: Mc. Graw-Hill.

Van Auken, H., Madrid-Guijarro, A., García-Pérez-de-Lema, D. (2008). Innovation and Performance in Spanish Manufacturing SMEs. *International Journal of Entrepreneurship and Innovation Management*, *8*(1), 36-56.

Varela, J. y Del Río, M. (2009). Orientación al Mercado, Rendimiento Empresarial y Resultado Exportador. *Mediterráneo Económico*, 11, 79-112.

Verhees, F. y Meulenberg, M. (2004). Market Orientation, Innovativeness, Product Innovation and Performance in Small Firms. *Journal of Small Business Management*, *42*(2), 134-154.

Verhoef, P. y Leeflang, P. (2009). Understanding the Marketing Departament´s Influence Within the Firm. *Journal of Marketing*, 14-37.

Wernerfelt, B. (1984). A Resource-Based View of the Firm. *Strategic Management Journal*, *2*(5), 171-180.

Yoguel, G., y López, M. (2000). Sistemas de Innovación y Desarrollo de la Capacidad Innovativa de las Firmas: Las Evidencias del Cuasi Distrito Industrial de Rafaela. *Redes*, *7*(15), 45-94.