

International Journal of Productivity and Quality Management

ISSN online: 1746-6482 - ISSN print: 1746-6474

<https://www.inderscience.com/ijpqm>

Smart systems to mitigate failure of strategic alliances

Sara Las Cunha, Renato Lopes da Costa, Rui Gonçalves, Leandro Pereira, Álvaro Dias

DOI: [10.1504/IJPQM.2021.10053024](https://doi.org/10.1504/IJPQM.2021.10053024)

Article History:

Received: 31 January 2021

Accepted: 25 April 2021

Published online: 27 January 2023

Smart systems to mitigate failure of strategic alliances

Sara Las Cunha*

ISCTE – Instituto Universitário de Lisboa,
1649-026 Lisbon, Portugal
Email: saralascunha@gmail.com
*Corresponding author

Renato Lopes da Costa

Business Research Unit – BRU-IUL,
ISCTE – Instituto Universitário de Lisboa,
Lisbon, Portugal
Email: renatojlc@gmail.com

Rui Gonçalves

PIAGET Almada,
2805-059 Almada, Portugal
Email: ruiahgoncalves@gmail.com

Leandro Pereira

WINNING Lab,
Business Research Unit (BRU),
ISCTE – Instituto Universitário de Lisboa,
Lisbon, Portugal
Email: leandro.pereira@iscte-iul.pt

Álvaro Dias

Universidade Lusófona de Humanidades e Tecnologias,
Campo Grande, 376, 1700 Lisbon, Portugal
and
ISCTE – Instituto Universitário de Lisboa,
1649-026 Lisbon, Portugal
Email: alvaro.dias1@gmail.com

Abstract: Despite the strategic importance of alliances and the numerous benefits that this corporate strategy brings to companies, success rates are still very low, with several causes of failure presented in the literature. On the other hand, the implementation of smart systems has proved to be very promising when applied to the different tools of business management. In order to find solutions to this problem, the main objective of this investigation was to study

the impact that the use of smart systems has on the operational optimisation of the company and in mitigating the causes of failure of strategic alliances in Portugal. This research used a qualitative approach, through the content analysis of 17 interviews with managers and professionals in the area. The study concludes that the implementation of smart systems has the potential to mitigate 7 of the 10 main causes of failure of strategic alliances. Also, concerning the future of the implementation of smart systems, it was concluded that the traditional models of strategic alliances are being questioned regarding their effectiveness and adequacy in dealing with the new market challenges brought about by technological development and should therefore be rethought and adapted to a more collaborative and integrated model.

Keywords: artificial intelligence; strategic alliances; smart systems.

Reference to this paper should be made as follows: Cunha, S.L., da Costa, R.L., Gonçalves, R., Pereira, L. and Dias, Á. (2023) 'Smart systems to mitigate failure of strategic alliances', *Int. J. Productivity and Quality Management*, Vol. 38, No. 1, pp.26–52.

Biographical notes: Sara Las Cunha is a PhD student from the ISCTE Business School in the field of Strategic Alliances. She is also a Coordinator at the CIEE Council on International Educational Exchange Lisbon. She is also holds a Master Science from the ISCTE in Business Administration and General Management.

Renato Lopes da Costa holds a PhD in General Management, Strategy and Business Development by the ISCTE, Portugal, and has articles published in several specialised journals in the East, the USA, Canada, Africa, South America and Portugal. He is currently a researcher and member of the BRU-UNIDE and Professor at INDEG where he holds the post of Director of the Master's in Business Administration (MScBA) and guides students in the development of master's and PhD theses. He teaches business strategy modules in executive and postgraduate master's degrees. Since 2013, he has also accumulated teaching duties as an Invited Professor at the Military Academy where he teaches the Knowledge Management.

Rui Gonçalves holds a PhD in Management from the Instituto Superior de Economia e Gestão, with research in information systems for operational risk management, Master's in Statistics and Information Management from NOVA Information Management School (NOVA IMS), with research in the area of Intelligent Agents, and degree in Business Management from International University. He is currently a Guest Assistant Professor at the NOVA IMS and works as Manager in Business Expertise Division at SAS Portugal. In recent years, he has coordinated the areas of operational risk, compliance, fraud, audit and money laundering.

Leandro Pereira is a Professor of Strategy and Management at the ISCTE Business School. He holds a PhD in Project Management. He is also the CEO and Founder of the WINNING Scientific Management. He is also the former President of the Business Case Institute, PMI Portugal Chapter and Training Specialist of the Court of Auditors. As the CEO, he receives from Best Teams Leaders the award of Best Team Leader and CEO of Portugal in 2017 in Portugal. He is also a PMP from PMI and ROI certified. As a researcher, he published more than 80 scientific publications and ten books. As a student, he received the Best Student Award from the University of Minho. He is an international expert in strategic management, project management, benefits realisation management and problem solving.

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

1 Introduction

Most current organisations live in an increasingly competitive and globalised context, which forces them to rethink their growth strategies, adapting them to the turbulent and unpredictable environment that characterises today. In an era in which the market is rapidly and constantly changing, companies are no longer holding permanent competitive advantages, being forced, if they want to survive, to innovate and search for alternatives (Amini et al., 2020; Atkinson, 2019).

The growing number of strategic alliances and the consequent exponential record of failures in this area have generated a great deal of interest and concern among managers and the academic community (Gomes, 2020; Russo and Cesarani, 2017). Despite the extensive literature on the many key benefits and success factors of forming alliances (Aldakhil and Nataraja, 2014; Ferreira and Franco, 2019; Goerzen, 2007; Lazzarini et al., 2013; Sarkar et al., 2001; Varadarajan and Cunningham, 1995; Wang et al., 2012), some authors warn of the high failure rates of alliances, which can have disastrous results for the company's competitive advantage (Weller et al., 2019). In this article, we list the ten main causes of failure in strategic alliances, according to the literature review.

On the other hand, the use of smart systems has grown exponentially in recent years, namely due to the era of big data in which we live, and to developments in the area of knowledge of the human mind (Cummings and Stimpson, 2019; Naidoo and Ramphal, 2020). The literature found on the use of smart systems is extensive and very recent, meaning that research in this area has developed considerably in recent years (Abdallah and Ayoub, 2020; Simon, 2019; Tucker et al., 2018). Some of the main advantages for companies include reductions in cost and processes, time savings, and faster response times for costumers (Simon, 2019; Stone et al., 2016; Tucker et al., 2018; Pereira et al., 2020).

There are several articles, reports and books that deal with practical problems related to the application of smart systems in companies in numerous sectors, addressing the advantages that technology could bring to each one (Kale and Singh, 2009; Kamble and Wankhade, 2021). However, as far as we know, there are still no studies that address the applicability of these systems as a means of closing potential gaps in the formation and maintenance of strategic alliances (da Costa et al., 2021).

In this sense, the theoretical objective of this study is to investigate whether the implementation of smart systems can help companies to optimise their activity by mitigating the risks of failure of strategic alliances. Empirically, this article aims to:

- 1 Contribute to the development of literature in the area of strategic alliances and intelligent systems.
- 2 Respond to the literature gap by relating both of the topics mentioned above.
- 3 Check in depth whether the implementation of intelligent systems by managers has the ability to help companies optimise their operation and mitigate the causes of failure associated with strategic alliances.
- 4 Understand how managers can use smart systems tools to help their businesses bridge the gaps of failure of their alliances, increasing their chances of success.
- 5 Raise issues adjacent to the consequences of implementing business systems in a business context, creating suggestions for future investigations.

This article is organised as follows:

- 1 literature review on the themes of strategic alliances and smart systems
- 2 methodology used, namely a qualitative approach, through interviews and content analysis
- 3 results' presentation and discussion in the light of the literature
- 4 main conclusions of the study.

2 Literature review

2.1 Strategic alliances

The popularity of strategic alliances in a business context has increased exponentially in the last decades (Lambe et al., 2002; Russo and Cesarani, 2017) becoming an obvious component of the competitive environment in which companies live today. There are several benefits that lead companies to seek to establish strategic alliances. Among the main ones are the possibility of accessing new markets, the sharing of research and development costs, greater strategic flexibility in responding to market requests, the expansion (or filling in gaps) of the product line and the learning of new competences (Aldakhil and Nataraja, 2014; Goerzen, 2007; Santoso and Wahyuni, 2018; Varadarajan and Cunningham, 1995).

However, and despite the collaborative efforts and market growth opportunities that lead so many companies to form strategic alliances, studies claim that most partnerships do not meet the expectations created by the partners, which results in the failure of the alliances (Makino et al., 2007; Moon and Huh, 2019). Estimates of failure rates vary between 50% and 70% (Li and Gongming, 2018; Lunnan and Haugland, 2008; Russo and Cesarani, 2017), and therefore, this is a topic that has attracted the attention and

interest of the scientific community and managers (Gomes et al., 2011; Greve et al., 2010; Shah et al., 2015). In their study, Dan and Zondag (2016) elaborate the so famous question: ‘Why do alliances fail?’, introducing the concept of perceived value of the alliance as one of the keys to the answer.

There are several reasons that justify the instability of alliances (Aggarwal and Kapoor, 2018; Lokshin et al., 2011) including those that end in an unplanned and premature manner (McCutchen et al., 2008; Russo and Cesarani, 2017; Sadowski and Duysters, 2008). Among the factors responsible for these results is the rigidity of some companies, the poor degree of communication, the presence of misadjusted objectives and the perception of distorted performance, as well as various internal and external factors (Aldakhil and Nataraja, 2014). Unexpected changes in the business environment can also change the motivations of partners and affect the relationship between companies (Najaf et al., 2017).

Das and Teng (2000) suggest that strategic alliances are places where contradictory forces develop, and can be analysed by three pairs of competing forces: cooperation versus competition, rigidity versus flexibility and short-term versus long-term orientation, arguing that a good balance between the three can bring positive results for companies. It was found that alliances are more likely to end when companies’ skills and competences converge over time, leaving little room for organisational learning between partners (Ho et al., 2019). Also, the loss of reputation plays a possible role in the failure of alliances, and a company previously involved in the early termination of a partnership can be seen as suspicious by possible future partners (McCutchen et al., 2008; Moon and Huh, 2019).

High values of technological intensity are also associated with a greater number of unsuccessful alliances (Costa et al., 2018). According to the authors, the more technological the companies are, the more they generate innovation and market success, so they attract more partners and may require a greater commitment of resources and management capacity for the alliance to survive. On the other hand, changes in the rivalry of partners due to the change in the concentration levels of the industry, can also contribute to the failure of partnerships, with more failure in alliances between direct competitors (Mamédio et al., 2019). Sadowski and Duysters (2008) also state that cultural differences between partners should not be denied, which can lead to unnecessary failures.

Even with high alliance failure rates, it must be taken into account that those that survive, end up consuming a large number of resources, in order to maintain efficiency (Dan and Zondag, 2016). In this sense, Cui et al. (2011) underline the importance of the value of resources, stating that, more important than the resources themselves, is the integration that the company makes of these same resources, in relation to its partners. That is, changes in the relationship between resources can lead to losses in the creation of value for the client, and consequently, create an imbalance in the initial authenticity of the partnership (Kogut, 1989; Mihardjo et al., 2019).

Also, changes in business strategy, and consequent changes in the structure of companies, are linked to a greater probability of unsuccessful alliances (Reuer and Zollo, 2005). According to the authors, most alliances end due to changes in partners’ priorities. With regard to the literature of international alliances, it is important that partners are

aware of local economic and cultural policies (Beamish and Inkpen, 1995). Other organisational decisions can also directly and indirectly affect the success of these alliances, namely due to possible problems with the selection of partners and negotiations between both, which compromises the vital fit in the formation of this type of strategies (Swoboda et al., 2011).

Although it is difficult for managers to predict the propensity of failure at the time of the formation of the alliance, Dan and Zondag (2016) suggest that it is important to monitor the business environment, especially the entry of new competitors in the market, since these changes can affect the viability of existing partnerships. Partnerships with substantial overlaps in their core activities, geographic markets and/or functional skills have low success rates, given that competitors tend to maximise their own individual goals to the detriment of their collaborative interests (Lokshin et al., 2011). According to the study by McCutchen et al. (2008), the discrepancy between partners in the degree of previous experience in alliances often leads to the failure of these strategies.

Finally, it should be noted that most of the literature on the subject is based on post-phenomenon research (Li and Gongming, 2018; Moon and Huh, 2019), with researchers often assuming that a lasting alliance is synonymous with success. However, it is important to underline that the instability of partnerships does not necessarily correspond to a failure of partners and employees, and can also be seen as a natural process of this type of commitment in an unstable business context (Rahman and Korn, 2014; Reuer and Zollo, 2005). Table 1 summarises the main causes of failure of strategic alliances.

Table 1 Causes of failure of strategic alliances

-
- Rigidity
 - Poor degree of communication
 - Unsuitable objectives
 - Unexpected changes in the business environment
 - Discordant values of technological intensity
 - Rivalry between partners
 - Changes in business strategy
 - Entry of new competitors in the market
 - Lack of value creation for the customer
 - Cultural differences between partners
-

By analysing Table 1, it is possible to identify the ten main factors responsible for these results, with no particular order between them, are:

- 1 the rigidity of some companies
- 2 the poor degree of communication between them
- 3 the presence of unsuitable objectives
- 4 unexpected changes in the business environment
- 5 different levels of technological intensity
- 6 rivalry and tensions between partners

- 7 potential changes in business strategy
- 8 the entry of new competitors in the market
- 9 lack of value creation for the client
- 10 great cultural differences between partners (Aldakhil and Nataraja, 2014; Anand and Khanna, 2000; Cui et al., 2011; Li and Gongming, 2018; Makino et al., 2007; McCutchen et al., 2008; Mihardjo et al., 2019; Moon and Huh, 2019; Najaf et al., 2017; Nakamura et al., 1996; Rahman and Korn, 2014; Russo and Cesarani, 2017; Santoso and Wahyuni, 2018; Swoboda et al., 2011; Weller et al., 2019).

2.2 *Smart systems*

The artificial intelligence (AI) area is currently in a period of rapid change, large-scale growth and increasing innovation applied to the industry (Amini et al., 2020). As this area of research grew, the scientific community began to distinguish sub-themes within AI, with specific objectives in solving real problems (Bosse and Hoogendoorn, 2015). There are several sectors that can benefit from the development of autonomous technologies: transport, medicine, education, public security, entertainment, among others (Antonova, 2014; Atkinson, 2019; Simon, 2019; Stone et al., 2016). In fact, there are so many AI applications today and they are so present in our lives, that many of us have grown accustomed to interacting with screens and smartphones, as stated by Stone et al. (2016, p.6): “People’s future relationships with machines will become ever more nuanced, fluid, and personalized as AI systems learn to adapt to individual personalities and goals.”

Although the theme is not new, its use has grown exponentially in recent years, namely due to the era of big data in which we live, and to developments in the area of knowledge of the human mind. The implementation of smart systems in most sectors has been of great order, and as such, there is an increased need to understand how these systems should be designed to promote effective interactions between users and technology (Abdallah and Ayoub, 2020; Cummings and Stimpson, 2019).

According to the report of the European Center for the Development of Vocational Training (CEDEFOP, 2018) despite the high levels of unemployment that have been felt in European countries in recent years, especially in the younger strata, there is a large gap between skills necessary for companies and those available in the labour market, with 40% of employers admitting that they are unable to fill the vacancies available because they do not find people with the right set of skills. These data make the discussion on the subject relevant, especially with regard to the use of AI tools in the business world.

Although it is too early to assess the real consequences of AI, experts believe that technology will replace only concrete tasks in the short-term, not jobs, and will also create new types of jobs, still difficult to imagine in advance (Atkinson, 2019). Changes in employment will appear gradually, starting with the replacement of small amounts of work, until, in extreme cases, resulting in the total replacement of jobs (Stone et al., 2016). It is difficult to predict exactly which tasks will be immediately affected by automation (Furman et al., 2016). According to the authors, since AI is not a single technology, but a set of technologies applied to specific tasks, the effects of AI will be

felt unevenly in the economy, that is, some work tasks will be more easily automated than others, and some will be more affected than others. Even so, it is expected that the AI will gradually and in an optimisation, logic integrate most of the employment sectors we know (Stone et al., 2016), especially those whose cognitive needs are lower, such as driving cars or cleaning services (Furman et al., 2016).

AI can also influence the size and location of the workforce, as many organisations perform functions that can only grow with the addition of human labour (Stone et al., 2016). In this case, with the help of technology, companies will be able to obtain economies of scale more easily and without requiring so much manpower. Another important point defended by the authors is the possibility of using the resource to AI to create new markets, lowering barriers to entry and increasing participation, resulting in an alternative with the potential to drastically reduce production costs, and consequently, prices to the consumer, making the general population, in a way, richer (Huang et al., 2019).

In this follow-up, Russell et al. (2015) argue that it is urgent to advance the research in order to determine the maximisation of the benefits that AI can bring in an economic aspect and to mitigate possible adverse effects, namely in the following four areas:

- 1 forecast of evolution labour market and potential effects of AI on less qualified human resources
- 2 disruption of current markets, which have become obsolete due to AI
- 3 policies to encourage and support unemployment protection, for example, through unconditional basic income (RBI) programs
- 4 updating economic measures, such as the gross domestic product (GDP), to reflect the benefits of AI.

However, and according to McAfee's (2019) analysis, the big issue is not related to the fact that technology can replace human work, but rather to the impact that this can have on the increase or decrease of competences on the part of qualified labour. In other words, will AI be seen as a complementary or substitute tool for the acquisition of professional skills? According to Lee (2018), one of the great pioneers in the field of AI, this type of technology works more as a tool for amplifying human intelligence, rather than as something that intends to replace this experience. Still, Lee (2018) highlights the fact that over the next 15 to 20 years, AI will gradually dominate the performance of routine tasks, which is why it is very important to invest in the education and training of the younger strata and in the review of social values for the new technological age. The author believes that it is necessary to create new jobs, of a more human character, where aspects such as sensitivity and compassion, impossible to be reproduced by machines, are valued.

It is, therefore, essential that joint research between industry and academia go hand in hand, in order to generate a significant development in AI. For Amini et al. (2020), this success has to be perceived by both parties, and since AI is a disruptive technology with the potential to create value on a large-scale, the search for talent and market share is quite high. That is, a successful collaboration model between the two must include industrial investments in academia, making them sustainable in the long-term and capable of promoting the advancement of science, as well as impacting the adoption of technology (Amini et al., 2020).

Promoting joint efforts between research and industry can also be beneficial for:

- 1 understanding which projects have the greatest potential to impact the market
- 2 realising what advances can be critical in the transfer of new technology for a product or service
- 3 determine the best way to obtain corporate sponsorships (Amini et al., 2020).

According to the authors, companies are immersed in an environment influenced by business strategies, market growth and competitive differentiation, which can be very useful to achieve these goals.

However, and despite these advantages, in some sectors, it is feared that advances in AI are so rapid that they replace all human work in a single generation, including those that are largely cognitive or that involve judgement (Naidoo and Ramphal, 2020; Stone et al., 2016). Other risks and fears are also raised by the growing development of this area, among which are important ethical and social issues, including concerns about user privacy, public security, transparency of information and regulation by governments (Simon, 2019; Tucker et al., 2018; Wasilow and Thorpe, 2019; Evans, 2011; Gomes, 2020; Kumar et al., 2019; Reuer and Ragozzino, 2014; Zhao and Flenner, 2019).

The literature on the use of smart systems is extensive and very recent, meaning that research in this area has developed considerably in recent years (Atkinson, 2019). During this research, and within the universe of the authors studied, several articles, reports and books were found that deal with these problematic practices of application of smart systems in companies from numerous sectors, addressing the advantages that technology may bring to each one (Amini et al., 2020). However, as far as we know, there are still no studies that address the applicability of these systems as a means of bridging the potential flaws in the formation and maintenance of strategic alliances, which leads us to the research question of this work: how can the implementation of smart systems can help companies to optimise their activity and mitigate the risks of failure of strategic alliances? What are the future consequences of such actions?

3 Methodology

The research question that motivates this article was answered using a qualitative methodology, through the content analysis of a set of interviews, which sought to measure the phenomenon of the impact of smart systems on the failure of strategic alliances. Since the main objective of this question was to generate new theory based on specific instances of empirical observations and to make sense of the answers provided, without resorting to a coding previously defined in the literature, an inductive approach was used. To quote Gioia et al. (2013, p.16), “Advances in knowledge that are too strongly rooted in what we already know delimit what we can know.”


The main distinguishing characteristics of this approach are related to the steps related to data analysis and the articulation of grounded theory. According to the authors, this methodology is based on three basic assumptions that are worth mentioning: the first is that the organisational world is socially constructed. The second is that the people who build their organisational realities are ‘knowledgeable agents’, which means that people

in organisations know what they are trying to do and can explain their thoughts, intentions and actions. And finally, the third is that researchers are able to recognise patterns in the data and create concepts and relationships that can escape the informants' conscience (Gioia et al., 2013).

Given the objectives of this thesis, the interview was considered the most appropriate tool for collecting primary qualitative information, because, although the analyses may be implicit in a certain degree of subjectivity associated with the answers given, it is a method that allows the actors themselves to provide data on the phenomenon under study (Carmo and Ferreira, 2008). Seventeen interviews were carried out. After interview number 14, the results were found saturated and repetitive, so it was decided to stop at 17. Nevertheless, this number still guarantees a good degree of reliability (Vilelas, 2009).

Before being interviewed, participants were invited to attend an online lecture through the Zoom platform, where relevant information on the topic was transmitted. The lecture had the theme 'The impact of smart systems on business management' and was sponsored by ISCTE Business School and the Business Case Institute, with the participation of speaker Bernardo Gomes Pinto, Coordinator of ISCTE AI Business Hub. The lecturer shared with the public the main advantages that smart systems have brought to the business world, as well as the topics that have been on the top of scientific development on the subject. In total, 36 experts in the field were present who actively participated in the discussion of the topic, having generated very interesting insights for the present research. That being said, and after attending the lecture and interacting with their peers, the participants were better equipped to answer the interview questions, namely how the use of these technologies could help mitigate the risk of unsuccessful alliances. Figure 1 shows the categorisation and codification of the *corpus* of the interview that gave rise to the qualitative analysis.

Figure 1 Categorisation and codification of the interview *corpus* for qualitative analysis



In terms of software, this content analysis was performed using the MAXQDA 2020 program, a software package for qualitative data analysis used specifically for content analysis. Of the 17 interviews carried out, 4 (24%) were made to female participants, and 13 (76%) were made to male participants, with 5 (29%) having a bachelor's degree, 9 (53%) having a master's degree and 3 (18%) having a PhD. As for the activity sector of the participants, 3 (18%) work with financial and insurance activities, 4 (23%) are engaged in wholesale and retail trade, 3 (18%) work in the area of transport and storage, 5 (29%) work with information technologies, and finally, only 2 (12%) work in other sectors. On the other hand, 3 of the interviewees (18%) work in a micro company with up to ten workers, 5 (29%) work in a small company with up to 50 workers, 6 (35%) work in a medium company with up to 250 workers, and finally 3 (18%) work in a large company with more than 250 workers. Finally, and with regard to the position they occupy in the respective company, seven interviewees (41%) occupy the role of specialists, 6 (35%) perform team leader roles and 4 (24%) have a position as manager or director.

This research was divided into four phases, namely:

- 1 literature review and information processing
- 2 the transfer of the theoretical construct to the field of observation, in order to obtain the best possible confidence in terms of results
- 3 fieldwork and data collection
- 4 qualitative analysis of the data collected from the interviews, in order to contribute to new theoretical conceptual approaches combined with empirical data.

Figure 2 shows the research design used in this study.

Figure 2 Research design





Figure 3 illustrates the link between the research goal, the research questions and the literature review.

Figure 3 Link between the research goal, the research questions and the literature review



4 Presentation and discussion of results

4.1 Main advantages of using smart systems

The first generic category of this research aimed to ask what the main advantages are and gains that the interviewees associate with the implementation of smart systems in the business context. During the interviews, the vast majority of participants in this study recognised that the treatment of large amounts of data by companies is the main source of information that assists decision making based on a credible record. Table 2 presents some of the main arguments mentioned by the participants about the advantages attributed to the use of smart systems. As it can be seen, in the perspective of the majority of the respondents, the use of this type of systems has a strong potential to reduce the cost

structure, to speed up processes, and to reduce human error, generating more transversal benefits throughout the company's operational management.

Table 2 Main advantages of implementing smart systems

<i>Text</i>	<i>Generic category</i>	<i>Number of times</i>	<i>Interviewees</i>
The treatment of data by companies is the main source of relevant information that helps decision making	1.1	14	1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 12, 13, 14, 16, 17
The use of smart systems helps greatly to reduce the structure of operational costs, through the identification and reduction of errors	1.1	12	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17
Promotes the raising of extra income, greatly streamlining all the company's financial processes and assisting treasury management	1.1	11	2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17
Assists in attracting, maintaining and managing customers, as well as attracting new business	1.1	9	2, 3, 4, 5, 8, 9, 14, 15, 16
Causes increased quality on the production line, saving time and money on repairs	1.1	7	1, 2, 6, 7, 11, 12, 15
Savings in salaries: it is not necessary to have as many human resources to perform certain tasks	1.1	5	2, 4, 5, 8, 13
Increases customer satisfaction by eliminating bureaucratic steps and thereby reducing the response time	1.1	5	5, 7, 11, 15, 16
AI can help companies generate insights and develop solutions linked to innovation	1.1	3	2, 7, 9
Allows you to redirect people to other tasks related to the feeling economy	1.1	2	4, 8

Based on the analysis of Table 2, the three most mentioned reasons are highlighted throughout the interviews regarding the main advantages of implementing smart systems in the business context, in order to meet the needs of an increasingly demanding market. The first one concerns improving decision making based on a history of relevant information as defended by the authors (Atkinson, 2019; Simon, 2019). As one of the interviewees affirms, "the development of the market depends 100% on technological advancement, because this way we can be more organized as organizations and work with a volume of data that, humanly, would be impossible to decipher." In addition, "the fact that we have access to more and more credible information, enables us to make better decisions and ensure that we act in accordance with the interests of the organization to achieve our goals more quickly and effectively", says another interviewee.

The second added value pointed out by managers, highlights the reduction in operating costs as another of the advantages brought by smart systems (Amini et al., 2020; Cummings and Stimpson, 2019). In the voice of one of the participants in the study, smart systems "make it possible to reduce various production processes and thereby increase quality in the production line." The participant shared his experience of working in a factory where some machines already had internet of things technology, referring that "the machine itself told us when we should stop it because it was in the process of needing some mini repair, instead of escalating the problem and cause a major upset later on. As you can calculate, this translates into enormous savings in time and

money.” Still in this segment, another interviewee is of the opinion that “from the perspective of the company, they are only advantages. The installed capacity of smart systems allows us to streamline hundreds of internal processes, eliminating several bureaucratic steps and, thus, cutting many costs and reducing the response time to customers.”

The third most emphasised advantage in the interviews, is the raising of extra income, as the implementation of smart systems “allows to leverage the capture, maintenance and management of customers, as well as assists in the acquisition of new business and revenue companies”, as described by one of the participants. Another interviewee adds that “AI can help with the procurement issue, that is, opening strategic horizons for companies and making management of purchasing processes more efficient”, which consequently can bring more revenue to the company (Antonova, 2014; Stone et al., 2016).

Thus, it is possible to affirm, through the content analysis of the interviews carried out, that the results are in line with the theory proposed by the authors studied, as the implementation of smart systems has the ability to contribute to the improvement of decision making, to drastically reduce the cost structure and human error, and to make more agile the productive and bureaucratic processes, increasing the productivity of tasks (Antonova, 2014; Atkinson, 2019; Cummings and Stimpson, 2019; Simon, 2019; Stone et al., 2016). In addition, the growing use of these technologies also allows companies not to need as much human labour, providing them with the opportunity to redirect their human resources to other types of tasks (Huang et al., 2019; McAfee, 2019; Russell and Norvig, 2010).

4.2 Risks associated with the implementation of smart systems

The second generic category of research is related to the potential risks associated with the implementation of smart systems, according to the interviewees’ view. This being an inductive study, it was possible to distinguish the content resulting from the interviews in two subcategories: the risks related to the employer and the risks to the worker. Table 3 illustrates the result of the managers’ responses regarding the main risks and fears that companies face, resulting from the growing use of smart systems, and the main challenges from the employer’s perspective are related to the lack of investment capacity that this technology needs and with concerns related to information security and data protection.

After analysing Table 3, we can say that there are a strong percentage of respondents who have serious concerns regarding the challenges and risks associated with the implementation of this type of systems. On the one hand, and according to the interviewees, the high costs of implementation and the lack of financial resources to resort to this type of systems are the main reasons that delay demand and cause them to lose some of their value when leveraging the business productivity, as Atkinson (2019) argues in his study. In the words of one of the interviewees, “unfortunately in Portugal it is very difficult to access a budget to invest in this type of technology. Only large companies have this capacity (...) and we must not forget that the majority of companies are small and medium-sized.”

On the other hand, ethical and moral issues related to information security and data protection are also raised, following what the studied authors defend (Atkinson, 2019; Cummings and Stimpson, 2019; Evans, 2011; Kumar et al., 2019; Simon, 2019; Stone

et al., 2016; Wasilow and Thorpe, 2019; Zhao and Flenner, 2019). According to one of the managers interviewed, “with regard to information security and risk management, today there are many more threats than before digitalization.” In other words, “despite the robustness of the systems that companies use, the main current threat to cybersecurity is human action (...) most people are unaware of the risks they take when doing certain operations on the internet, when clicking on a certain unknown link, and the worst thing is that our knowledge about it is not increasing at the rate it should have”, says another interviewee.

Table 3 Main risks associated with the implementation of smart systems: the employer’s perspective

<i>Text</i>	<i>Generic category</i>	<i>Subcategory</i>	<i>Number of times</i>	<i>Interviewees</i>
It is very difficult for a small company to have a budget for the implementation of such systems. Only large companies have this investment capacity.	1.2	1.2.1	10	1, 3, 4, 6, 7, 11, 13, 14, 16, 17
The main concerns arising from this technological wave are the issues of information security and data protection.	1.2	1.2.1	8	2, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 12, 14
Knowledge about risks is not widespread, it is necessary to train people.	1.2	1.2.1	5	3, 8, 10, 15, 17
Concepts like this take a long time to be absorbed by everyone. It is as if we are witnessing a gradual democratisation of this type of technology.	1.2	1.2.1	4	1, 4, 9, 16

At the same time, it is also possible to associate some challenges in the implementation of smart systems in the perspective of workers, contemplated in the second subcategory. Some of the main risks refer to the increase in unemployment and the social impact that this technological wave may have on the general population. Table 4 summarises, therefore, the opinions of respondents with regard to this topic.

Table 4 Risks associated with the implementation of smart systems: the worker’s perspective

<i>Text</i>	<i>Generic category</i>	<i>Subcategory</i>	<i>Number of times</i>	<i>Interviewees</i>
The increasing use of systems will lead to a significant increase in unemployment	1.2	1.2.2	11	1, 3, 4, 5, 7, 8, 12, 14, 15, 16, 17
Social impacts, such as depression, increased poverty and the difficulty of adapting to a new reality	1.2	1.2.2	8	4, 7, 9, 10, 12, 14, 15, 16
Loss of organisational identity due to standardisation of processes	1.2	1.2.2	6	1, 2, 6, 9, 10, 11
There is a risk of loss of intellectual stimulation and mental gymnastics due to automation of tasks	1.2	1.2.2	4	8, 10, 14, 17

As shown in Table 4, respondents demonstrate their concerns about the risk of implementing smart systems for workers, with rising unemployment ranking first on that

list. The automation of many of the companies' routine tasks is presented as one of the main factors of this outcome. As one of the stakeholders says, "machines will replace many of today's jobs, as they will perform these tasks faster, more efficiently and with a minimal margin of error. In other words, companies will not need to have as many human resources and that can be problematic for people." It is also important to highlight the potential social impacts that this scenario may have on the population, as many people may not have the necessary capacity to adapt to this new reality. One of the interviewees warns of the need to "integrate the large number of people in their 40s and 50s whose profession will soon become obsolete and who do not have the personal and professional resources to turn the situation around. How are they going to live? It is important that companies and governments think about this."

That said, it is possible to see that, despite the many advantages associated with the implementation of smart systems, the results of the interviews conducted also show that there are several fears and associated risks, which is in accordance with the authors studied (Antonova, 2014; Atkinson, 2019; Simon, 2019; Stone et al., 2016). Therefore, the way in which these types of issues are handled is very important, both at the organisational and governmental levels.

4.3 The implementation of smart systems as a mitigation tool for the failure of strategic alliances

According to the authors studied, the ten main factors responsible for these results, with no particular order between them, are:

- 1 the rigidity of some companies
- 2 the poor degree of communication between them
- 3 the presence of unsuitable objectives
- 4 unexpected changes in the business environment
- 5 different levels of technological intensity
- 6 rivalry and tensions between partners
- 7 potential changes in business strategy
- 8 the entry of new competitors in the market
- 9 lack of value creation for the client
- 10 great cultural differences between partners (Aldakhil and Nataraja, 2014; Anand and Khanna, 2000; Beamish and Inkpen, 1995; Cui et al., 2011; Dan and Zondag, 2016; Das and Teng, 2000; Day, 1995; Gomes, 2020; Greve et al., 2010; Kogut, 1989; Lokshin et al., 2011; Lunnan and Haugland, 2008; Makino et al., 2007; McCutchen et al., 2008; Nakamura et al., 1996; Rahman and Korn, 2014; Reuer and Ragozzino, 2014; Sadowski and Duysters, 2008; Shah and Swaminathan, 2008).

In this way, the third generic category of this content analysis aimed to understand the extent to which the implementation of smart systems can help partner companies to mitigate the risks of failure of their strategic alliances. Table 5 presents the main points discussed by the managers during the interviews regarding this topic.

Table 5 Implementation of smart systems as a mitigation tool for the failure of strategic alliances

<i>Text</i>	<i>Generic category</i>	<i>Number of times</i>	<i>Interviewees</i>
More agile processes, making companies more flexible and improving the efficiency of alliance management	1.3	11	2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 8, 9, 11, 14, 16, 17
Communication becomes clearer and faster, without unnecessary noise	1.3	9	1, 3, 5, 6, 8, 9, 10, 12
Definition of clearer and more realistic objectives, due to the increase in the volume of data and its correct treatment	1.3	8	3, 4, 7, 9, 10, 11, 14, 16
Allows both companies to have identical levels of technological development, improving the fluidity of the partnership	1.3	6	2, 5, 8, 9, 10, 13
Mitigation of cultural differences between partners, making processes more uniform and globalised	1.3	5	4, 7, 9, 11, 14
These systems mitigate the risks of unsuccessful alliances by creating added value for the customer at the end	1.3	3	7, 10, 14
Digital channels open doors for adjustments to the business model more quickly and effectively	1.3	3	4, 10, 12

By analysing Table 5, it can be seen that all the seven results of Table 5 come to fill some of the reasons for the alliances' failure. Thus, and as this is a central point of the work, the author proceeded to illustrate these seven main points with quotes from the interviews. Firstly, and being present in more than 60% of the respondents' responses, we will look at the importance of reaching a level of balance with regard to business flexibility.

According to Das and Teng (2000), the rigidity of organisations is considered a key factor in the failure of alliances. Therefore, according to the analysis of the data collected in the interviews, we can affirm that the implementation of smart systems presents itself as a viable measure in streamlining productive and operational processes, which in turn provide greater flexibility and fluidity to the alliance. As one of the interviewees says, "smart systems will allow and facilitate the multiplicity of exchanges of information and processes between partner organizations, giving companies more flexibility and removing old obstacles when creating new ways of working." Another participant adds that "only the most agile companies and those that best adapt to disruptive environments will survive, and the use of these technologies is the best way to do so."

Second, with regard to the degree of communication of the partnership, the authors associate weak degrees of communication with a higher failure rate (Aldakhil and Nataraja, 2014; Anand and Khanna, 2000; Day, 1995). When analysing the contents of the interviews, it is possible to state that, in the opinion of the interviewees, the implementation of this type of systems also facilitates communication between the members of a strategic alliance. "Nowadays the communication between partner companies becomes much clearer, more agile and faster, since the use of these systems causes less human interaction and, with this, reduction of error, optimization of results and reduction of response time. Companies have everything to gain from this", says one of the study participants. Another interviewee shares a concrete example: "If we are

talking about a supplier, for example, and if I have access to an algorithm that helps me to better process customer information and stocks available through AI, it is clear that the communication with my supplier will improve. I will be able to optimize my orders, giving him more accurate information and saving on purchasing and storage costs. If he has access to that same information, even better, because he can foresee my needs.”

According to Aldakhil and Nataraja (2014), the presence of maladjusted objectives is one of the causes of alliances’ failure. In this way, the third main point in which the implementation of smart systems can help mitigate the risk of failure of alliances is related to the ability to define clearer and more realistic objectives, due to the increase in the volume of data and its correct treatment. In the words of one of the participants, “Goal setting is a key issue for a successful partnership, otherwise, how can we determine whether we are on the right track? (...) as I have access to more information and a larger volume of data, I am able to make more credible predictions and, consequently, adjust my goals and better understand what I want to achieve with my partnership.”

The fourth question under analysis in the interpretation of Table 5 is related to the level of technological development of the partner companies. According to Dan and Zondag (2016), different levels of technological intensity are also associated with a greater number of unsuccessful alliances. In other words, according to the results obtained in the interviews, we can say that the implementation of smart systems can contribute to mitigate this cause, as it provides companies with the opportunity to match their levels of technological development, through the use of platforms and specific software for that purpose. As stated by one of the interviewees, “two organizations that do not have the same level of development of their smart systems, are unlikely to collaborate, so it is important for both companies to have a baseline of technological development, and AI tools can help with that.”

Fifth in the analysis, a topic was raised related to cultural differences between partner companies. For Sadowski and Duysters (2008), the more prominent the cultural differences between partners, the greater the degree of failure of the alliance. Thus, by reducing cultural gaps between partner companies, the implementation of smart systems can help to mitigate such risks of failure. “One of the questions that the European Commission makes is precisely the loss of identity and cultural references due to the massive use of AI, which, despite being a negative effect for culture, will mitigate many business failures that occur due to cultural differences in companies and the way people work”, says one of the interviewees. In other words, “in a more mechanized and global world, most of the processes will be standardized and we will no longer come across as the X or Y way that a given culture usually operates (...) we will lose a large part of the cultural indicators that are associated with the individuals of each country or society and this will allow us to end many misunderstandings, prejudices and biased interpretations that so often undermine commercial relations.”

For some authors, losses in creating value for the client can also contribute to the failure rate of strategic partnerships (Cui et al., 2011; Kogut, 1989). On the 6th place in Table 5, and according to the information collected in the interviews, smart systems can help companies to generate substantial increases in value for the customer, as they open doors for information optimisation and reduction of response time, as stated by one of the participants: “some partnerships only work well because they generate and transfer value to the customer. In this case, AI helps a lot because it optimizes the management of the databases and allows the customer to have a better and more personalized service in their shopping experience.” It is also worth mentioning the participation of another interviewee

who mentions that “smart systems bring unlimited opportunities to please the customer and, ultimately, this is our main stakeholder when we enter into a partnership (...) When we give more value to the customer, the more loyal he becomes and the more he recommends, increasing his satisfaction cycle.”

Finally, in 7th place in Table 5, we analysed the last point mentioned by three interviewees, regarding the adjustments that need to be made to the business model, especially in times of great uncertainty. For Anand and Khanna (2000), unexpected changes in the business environment can also change the motivations of partners and substantially affect the relationship between companies. However, as shown in the interviews, here the implementation of smart systems can also help companies to close this gap. According to one of the interviewees, “digital channels are an excellent tool to cope with major market changes, especially in environments as volatile and in times as uncertain as those we have been experiencing since the appearance of COVID-19.” “As we are all watching, most companies are only surviving this global crisis because they dared to rediscover themselves, to question traditional business models and adapted (...) and this was only possible due to the large-scale use of smart systems”, adds another interviewee. In summary, as we can see in Table 5 and in the interpretation of the results of the interviews, it is possible to affirm that the implementation of smart systems has the potential to mitigate 7 of the ten reasons presented by the authors as the main failure factors of the strategic alliances, which translates into a very positive balance for this type of tools.

4.4 Dynamics of future implementation of smart systems

During this inductive research, several references and suggestions were made by the interviewees on how these smart systems would be implemented in the future, which resulted in the creation of this last generic category dedicated to looking at the dynamics of the future implementation of smart systems. In order to organise the information collected in a more visible way, two subcategories were created: one that contemplates the redefinition of the traditional model of strategic alliances, and a second that addresses the new social paradigm of work. Table 6 shows the interviewees’ observations regarding the redefinition of the traditional model of strategic alliances.

When analysing Table 6, it is possible to verify that part of the interviewees raises questions related to the adequacy of the current models of strategic alliances to the moment in which we live. In other words, for several participants in the study, the implementation of smart systems exposes the current mechanisms and protocols of strategic partnerships, questioning their effectiveness in dealing with the new market challenges brought about by technological development: “Basically, integration of smart systems reduces the need to establish strategic alliances as we know them, not only because of them intrinsically, but because the market itself changes very quickly. (...) All of this is changing so quickly that even the traditional strategic alliances that we were used to are also losing relevance. It is necessary to redefine this model”, says one of the interviewees.

The truth is that the current reality has changed at an unimaginable pace, largely due to the democratisation of technological progress, as stated by one of the participants: “smart systems come to question many of the traditional models of partnership, as they currently exist, not only by technological means, but also because they are causing global geostrategic changes, beginning to question classic sectors and to revolutionize the way

we live, as is the case with remote work and internet shopping.” In other words, this phenomenon allows us to bring viable alternatives to companies that were on the verge of rupture: “AI has allowed to open a range of infinite possibilities today, when a few years ago the only chance of survival for many companies was to make an alliance. Not today.”

Table 6 Redefinition of the traditional model of strategic alliances

<i>Text</i>	<i>Generic category</i>	<i>Subcategory</i>	<i>Number of times</i>	<i>Interviewees</i>
Partnerships are increasingly less formal and more electronic	1.4	1.4.1	7	1, 6, 9, 10, 11, 13, 16
AI mitigates the need for strategic alliances in its traditional format, due to increased ease of access to information	1.4	1.4.1	5	2, 5, 6, 12, 16
Alliances will benefit greatly from network models, which are collaborative in nature, largely facilitated by AI	1.4	1.4.1	4	1, 4, 6, 9
Alliances are no longer the only solution for survival: AI has come to allow this	1.4	1.4.1	2	3, 16
Industry 4.0 brought autonomy to solve problems in an integrated manner, reducing the need for partnerships	1.4	1.4.1	2	4, 8

However, despite the fact that this new smart wave has pointed out the need to rethink the traditional model of alliances, it does not mean that they are in danger of disappearing, but that they must adapt to a more collaborative and integrated model, “fostering a new approach much more dispersed, fast, highly flexible and with completely different needs”, says one of the respondents. “It doesn’t mean that you don’t have to have a much more sophisticated set of relationships, that is, instead of having a stable and lasting alliance, we’ll have several ‘mini alliances’ that can satisfy the needs of the market, ending up creating much more flexible and networked relationships.”

During the codification of the interviews carried out, this last subcategory was analysed, which aimed to highlight the integration of smart systems in the labour market. What consequences could the implementation of these systems have for workers? How can people adapt? What is the role of companies and governments in ensuring that there is a fair referral of these professionals? These are questions that were raised by the study participants and whose reflections are found in Table 7.

As we analyse Table 7, we can see that the implementation of smart systems comes to question the current labour paradigm, forcing society to think about factors that were previously non-existent. Most respondents believe that it is pertinent to start thinking and formulating hypotheses about the social contribution of machines, for example. Since many people will be unemployed and companies will cut costs with the use of smart systems, some opinions suggest that “the new social paradigm comprises an income distribution with a minimum level for each individual”, as stated by one of the interviewed. Additionally, it was mentioned by another participant that “all robots should pay social security, that is, each boss should pay an amount that contributes to a basic social income”, a theory that has been increasingly spoken, although it’s still just an idea. One thing is certain, as stated in an interview, “democratically elected regulators and governments are going to have to rethink how to redistribute wealth, as the use of smart systems will surely disrupt all the economic procedures we know.”

Table 7 The new social paradigm of work

<i>Text</i>	<i>Generic category</i>	<i>Subcategory</i>	<i>Number of times</i>	<i>Interviewees</i>
It is necessary to invest strongly in training people, in creating awareness and in assigning key tools to workers	1.4	1.4.2	9	1, 2, 4, 6, 8, 14, 15, 16, 17
Income distribution with a minimum level for each individual	1.4	1.4.2	8	1,3, 4, 5, 7, 8, 14, 15
Each employer has to pay an amount to the government for each robot	1.4	1.4.2	6	5, 7, 8, 13, 14, 16
Very mature organisations have to integrate security and data protection matters at the design stage	1.4	1.4.2	3	2, 3, 8
Time is becoming the most precious commodity	1.4	1.4.2	3	5, 7, 8
Many of the current jobs will disappear, but this will allow the creation of new jobs	1.4	1.4.2	3	4, 9, 13

On the other hand, and according to the information collected, it is also important to note that companies will only be able to adapt if they invest heavily in training their employees, in order to face the new challenges. This training should aim not only at assigning new professional skills, but also at raising awareness of the risks that arise from these technologies: “Unfortunately, there are many people who will actually lose their jobs and be replaced by machines, but we cannot forget the human resources that can be trained to gain new skills and perform new tasks, which can be very positive.”

In other words, the success of this technological transition will depend, in large part, on the ability of companies to quickly redirect their human resources to new tasks and functions, more linked to the intuitive and empathic component, and may even lead to the creation of new jobs. As one participant exemplifies: “In the past, when we stopped having wagons and started to have taxis, people were quickly trained to know how to drive a car. However, nowadays the gap is much larger, and this can be an added challenge. Will we be able to convert a supermarket operator into a drone pilot just as quickly? I believe so, but it is necessary to take care of several social indicators (...) namely with regard to the integration of older generations, because the younger ones will already learn this at school.” In short, the savings that the implementation of smart systems can bring to companies, as seen above, can be invested in training and qualification of these human resources, as, as stated by one of the respondents, “it is not enough to implement the systems, it is essential to constantly invest maintaining digital platforms and training people who manage those platforms.”

5 Conclusions

The main objective of this article was to investigate whether and how the implementation of smart systems can help companies to optimise their activity and mitigate the risks of failure of strategic alliances. To this end, a literature review was carried out on the themes of strategic alliances and smart systems, and subsequently, the research question of this study was elaborated: how can the implementation of smart systems help

companies to optimise their activity and to mitigate the risks of failure of strategic alliances? What are the future consequences of such an action? A qualitative approach took place through the content analysis of 17 interviews with managers and professionals familiar with the theme of smart systems.

Of the ten main causes of failure of the strategic alliances listed by the authors in this article, the results of the study show that the implementation of smart systems has the potential to mitigate 7 of them. Since these seven causes have a more operational and logistical character, it is concluded that smart systems are not the ideal tool to solve theoretical and strategic problems. That is, the use of this type of systems helps companies to streamline processes, making them more flexible; it makes communication between partners more fluid, as it uses a common language; it allows defining objectives more adjusted to the needs of the partnership, through more robust and credible data; enhances technological development so that companies have more similar levels of technologic intensity; mitigates the main cultural differences between partners, as it unifies protocols and ways of working; helps companies to generate substantial increases in value for the customer, as they open doors for information optimisation and reduction of response time; and finally, through digital channels, they also facilitate any adjustments that need to be made to the business model, especially in times of great uncertainty, such as the current moment of the pandemic in which we live.

Another relevant point of this study is related to the future of the implementation of smart systems. On the one hand, it was concluded that the traditional models of strategic alliances are being questioned regarding their effectiveness and adequacy in dealing with the new market challenges regarding technological development and should therefore be rethought and adapted to a more collaborative and integrated model. On the other hand, with regard to the labour market, it was concluded that the implementation of smart systems is questioning the current paradigm, forcing society to start thinking and formulating hypotheses regarding income redistribution and the social contribution of machines, and also making companies to invest strongly in the training and qualification of their employees, in order to face the new challenges.

6 Main contributions

This work contributes to the development of the state of the art by discussing a set of knowledge around the topic of strategic alliances and smart systems, addressing the main key factors, benefits and risks, as well as the potential consequences that these can have on performance levels and maintenance of companies' competitive advantage. As far as we know, this is the first study that addresses the applicability of these systems as a means of closing potential gaps in the formation and maintenance of strategic alliances.

In this sense, this research contributes to the development of the management field through three distinct forms:

- 1 Framing this study in an analysis perspective focused on the establishment and definition of the main advantages and risks associated to the use of smart systems.
- 2 Realising the role that smart systems can play in terms of being a good tool to bridge the gaps of failure of strategic alliances.

- 3 Seeking the main future consequences of these actions to assure that they can be recognised as an asset for companies, allowing the formulation of new questions that lead to the need for greater exploration in this area of research, applicability and results of the use of smart systems.

7 Limitations of the study

First, it is important to bear in mind that the findings presented in this article result from limitations inherent to a small research in terms of sample size (17 interviewees) and from the fact that data was collected only in a given country (Portugal). In this sense, in terms of external validity, that is, the possibility of generalising the results found to other contexts or samples, although this study has reinforced some of the existing theory regarding strategic alliances and smart systems, this was only an exploratory study that cannot be generalised or representative.

It is essential to continue to carry out in-depth research that characterises and analyses these themes in detail, in order to allow the identification of the necessary knowledge that makes it possible to better understand the new ways of implementing smart systems.

8 Suggestions for future research

First, it would be very interesting to have the opportunity to observe and talk to some strategic managers and strategic alliances' decision makers, allowing a deeper collection and analysis of valuable qualitative information. Second, data could be collected in different countries and some causality and transversality relationships may be established through the comparison of variables between geographic locations. Third, it would also be important to assess and study in more detail the need for greater investments in the small and medium sized companies, in order to foster the use of smart systems. Finally, future studies may also consider the use of a quantitative component when choosing the methodology used.

Finally, and following the questions raised during the interviews of this work, it would be extremely important to start the discussion about the relevance of traditional models of strategic alliances and their adequacy to the present moment. Technological development is changing the way we live, how we relate and how we work and there is an urgent need to rethink new, more integrated and flexible collaborative models. The same applies to the work paradigm, as the implementation of smart systems will change the way companies see their human resources, and it is crucial to start the discussion and elaboration of strategic plans in the medium/long-term capable of responding to these new needs of companies and workers.

References

- Abdallah, A.B. and Ayoub, H.F. (2020) 'Information technology drivers of supply chain agility: implications for market performance', *International Journal of Productivity and Quality Management*, Vol. 31, No. 4, pp.547–573.
- Aggarwal, V. and Kapoor, M. (2018) 'Innovation growth from knowledge transfer in international strategic alliances', *Journal of Strategy and Management*, Vol. 11, No. 4, pp.483–496.

- Aldakhil, A.M. and Nataraja, S. (2014) 'Environmental factors and measures that affect the success of international strategic alliances', *Journal of Marketing and Management*, Vol. 5, No. 1, pp.561–565.
- Amini, L., Chen, C-H., Cox, D., Oliva, A. and Torralba, A. (2020) 'Experiences and insights for collaborative industry-academic research in artificial intelligence', *AI Magazine*, Vol. 41, No. 1, pp.70–81.
- Anand, B. and Khanna, T. (2000) 'Do firms learn to create value? The case of alliances', *Strategic Management Journal*, Vol. 21, No. 3, pp.295–315.
- Antonova, A. (2014) 'Emerging technologies and organizational transformation', in *Technology, Innovation, and Enterprise Transformation*, pp.20–34, IGI Global, Hershey, PA.
- Atkinson, R. (2019) *Don't Fear AI*, European Investment Bank.
- Beamish, P. and Inkpen, A. (1995) 'Keeping international joint ventures stable and profitable', *Long Range Planning*, Vol. 28, No. 3, pp.2–36.
- Bosse, T. and Hoogendoorn, M. (2015) 'Special issue on advances in applied artificial intelligence', *Applied Intelligence*, Vol. 42, No. 1, pp.1–2.
- Carmo, H. and Ferreira, M. (2008) *Metodologia da investigação – guia para auto-aprendizagem*, Universidade Aberta.
- CEDEFOP (2018) *Insights Into Skill Shortages and Skill Mismatch: Learning from CEDEFOP's European Skills and Jobs Survey*, European Centre for the Development of Vocational Training (CEDEFOP) [online] <https://doi.org/10.2801/645011>.
- Costa, P.R., Junior, S.S.B., Porto, G.S. and Martinez, M.P. (2018) 'Relational capability and strategic alliance portfolio configuration', *International Journal of Emerging Markets*, Vol. 13, No. 5, pp.1026–1049.
- Cui, A., Calantone, R. and Griffith, D. (2011) 'Strategic change and termination of interfirm partnerships', *Strategic Management Journal*, Vol. 32, No. 4, pp.402–423.
- Cummings, M.L.M. and Stimpson, A. (2019) 'Identifying critical contextual design cues through a machine learning approach', *AI Magazine*, Vol. 40, No. 4, pp.28–39.
- da Costa, R., Miguel, J., Dias, Á., Pereira, L. and Santos, J. (2021) 'Exploring the cultural, managerial and organizational implications on mergers and acquisitions outcomes', *Organizacija*, Vol. 54, No. 1, pp.18–35.
- Dan, S.M. and Zondag, M.M. (2016) 'Drivers of alliance terminations: an empirical examination of the bio-pharmaceutical industry', *Industrial Marketing Management*, Vol. 54, No. 2, pp.107–115.
- Das, T.K. and Teng, B. (2000) 'Instabilities of strategic alliances: an internal tensions perspective', *Organizational Science*, Vol. 11, No. 1, pp.77–101.
- Day, G.S. (1995) 'Advantageous alliances', *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, Vol. 23, No. 4, pp.297–300.
- Day, G.S. (1995) 'Advantageous alliances', *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, Vol. 23, No. 4, pp.297–300.
- Evans, D. (2011) *The Internet of Things: How the Next Evolution of the Internet is Changing Everything*, Cisco.
- Ferreira, A. and Franco, M. (2019) 'The influence of strategic alliances on human capital development: a study applied to technology-based SMEs', *EuroMed Journal of Business*, Vol. 15, No. 1, pp.65–85.
- Furman, J., Holdren, J., Muñoz, C. and Smith, M. (2016) *Artificial Intelligence, Automation and the Economy*, Executive Office of the President.
- Gioia, D.A., Corley, K.G. and Hamilton, A.L. (2013) 'Seeking qualitative rigor in inductive research: notes on the Gioia methodology', *Organizational Research Methods*, Vol. 16, No. 1, pp.15–31 [online] <https://doi.org/10.1177/1094428112452151>.
- Goerzen, A. (2007) 'Alliance networks and firm performance: the impact of repeated partnerships', *Strategic Management Journal*, Vol. 28, No. 5, pp.487–509.

- Gomes, E. (2020) 'Mergers, acquisitions, and strategic alliances as collaborative methods of strategic development and change', *Strategic Change*, Vol. 29, No. 2, pp.145–148 [online] <https://doi.org/10.1002/jsc.2317>.
- Gomes, E., Weber, Y., Brown, C. and Tarba, S.Y. (2011) *Mergers, Acquisitions and Strategic Alliances: Understanding the Process*, Palgrave Macmillan, Hampshire.
- Greve, H.R., Baum, J.A.C., Mitsuhashi, H. and Rowley, T.J. (2010) 'Built to last but falling apart: cohesion, friction, and withdrawal from interfirm alliances', *Academy of Management Journal*, Vol. 53, No. 2, pp.302–322.
- Ho, M.H-W., Ghauri, P.N. and Kafouros, M. (2019) 'Knowledge acquisition in international strategic alliances: the role of knowledge ambiguity', *Management International Review*, Vol. 59, No. 3, pp.439–463.
- Huang, M.H., Rust, R. and Maksimovic, V. (2019) 'The feeling economy: managing in the next generation of artificial intelligence (AI)', *California Management Review*, pp.43–65 [online] <https://doi.org/10.1177/0008125619863436>.
- Kale, P. and Singh, H. (2009) 'Managing strategic alliances: what do we know now, and where do we go from here?', *Academy of Management Perspectives*, Vol. 23, No. 3, pp.45–62.
- Kamble, R. and Wankhade, L. (2021) 'System dynamics model to improve productivity in manufacturing industries', *International Journal of Productivity and Quality Management*, Vol. 32, No. 1, pp.23–52.
- Kogut, B. (1989) 'The stability of joint ventures', *Journal of Industrial Economics*, Vol. 38, No. 2, pp.1–16.
- Kumar, S., Tiwari, P. and Zymbler, M. (2019) 'Internet of things is a revolutionary approach for future technology enhancement: a review', *Journal of Big Data*, Vol. 6, No. 111, pp.1–21.
- Lambe, C.J., Spekman, R.E. and Hunt, S.D. (2002) 'Alliance competence, resources, and alliance success: conceptualization, measurement, and initial test', *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, Vol. 30, No. 2, pp.141–158.
- Lazzarini, S.G., Brito, L.A.L. and Chaddad, F.R. (2013) 'Conduits of innovation or imitation? Assessing the effect of alliances on the persistence of profits in U.S. firms', *Academy of Management Proceedings*, Vol. 10, No. 1, pp.1–17.
- Lee, K-F. (2018) *AI Superpowers: China, Silicon Valley, and the New World Order*, 1st ed., Houghton Mifflin Harcourt, EUA, Boston, Massachusetts.
- Li, L. and Gongming, Q. (2018) 'Strategic alliances in technology industries: a different rationale', *The Journal of Business Strategy*, Vol. 39, No. 2, pp.3–11.
- Lokshin, B., Hagedoorn, J. and Letterie, W. (2011) 'The bumpy road of technology partnerships: understanding causes and consequences of partnership mal-functioning', *Research Policy*, Vol. 40, No. 2, pp.297–308.
- Lunnan, R. and Haugland, S. (2008) 'Predicting and measuring alliance performance: a multidimensional analysis', *Strategic Management Journal*, Vol. 29, No. 5, pp.545–556.
- Makino, S., Chan, C., Isobe, T. and Beamish, P. (2007) 'Intended and unintended termination of international joint ventures', *Strategic Management Journal*, Vol. 28, No. 11, pp.1113–1132.
- Mamédo, D., Rocha, C., Szczepanik, D. and Kato, H. (2019) 'Strategic alliances and dynamic capabilities: a systematic review', *Journal of Strategy and Management*, Vol. 12, No. 1, pp.83–102.
- McAfee, R.P. (2019) 'Review of AI superpowers: China, Silicon Valley and the new world order, by Kai-Fu Lee', *Business Economics*, Vol. 54, No. 3, pp.185–190 [online] <https://doi.org/10.1057/s11369-019-00128-5>.
- McCutchen, W.W., Swamidass, P.M. and Teng, B.S. (2008) 'Strategic alliance termination and performance: the role of task complexity, nationality, and experience', *Journal of High Technology Management Research*, Vol. 18, No. 2, pp.191–202.

- Mihardjo, L.W.W., Sasmoko, S., Alamsjah, F. and Djap, E. (2019) 'Digital leadership impacts on developing dynamic capability and strategic alliance based on market orientation', *Polish Journal of Management Studies*, Vol. 19, No. 2, pp.285–297 [online] <https://doi.org/10.17512/pjms.2019.19.2.24>.
- Moon, S-M. and Huh, M-G. (2019) 'Strategic alliances and new product development in high-tech ventures: the moderating role of alliance type and alliance capability', *Journal of Applied Business Research*, Vol. 35, No. 1, pp.17–28.
- Naidoo, S. and Ramphal, R. (2020) 'Different management systems: integration or combination?', *International Journal of Productivity and Quality Management*, Vol. 30, No. 1, pp.92–106.
- Najaf, R., Najaf, K. and Shah, I.H. (2017) 'Strategic alliances for international business and global competition', *International Journal of Information, Business and Management*, Vol. 9, No. 3, pp.131–146.
- Nakamura, M., Shaver, J.M. and Yeung, B. (1996) 'An empirical investigation of joint venture dynamics: evidence from U.S.-Japan joint ventures', *International Journal of Industrial Organization*, Vol. 14, No. 4, pp.521–541.
- Pereira, L., Ferreira, S. and Santos, J. (2020) 'The main causes of risk in residential real estate projects', *Journal of General Management*, Vol. 45, No. 3, pp.152–162.
- Rahman, N. and Korn, H.J. (2014) 'Alliance longevity: examining relational and operational antecedents', *Long Range Planning*, Vol. 47, No. 5, pp.245–261.
- Reuer, J.J. and Ragozzino, R. (2014) 'Signals and international alliance formation: the roles of affiliations and international activities', *Journal of International Business Studies*, Vol. 45, No. 3, pp.321–327.
- Reuer, J.J. and Zollo, M. (2005) 'Termination outcomes of research alliances', *Research Policy*, Vol. 34, No. 1, pp.101–115 [online] <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.respol.2004.11.003>.
- Russell, S. and Norvig, P. (2010) *Artificial Intelligence: A Modern Approach*, 3rd ed., Pearson Education, Harlow, UK.
- Russell, S., Dewey, D. and Tegmark, M. (2015) 'Research priorities for robust and beneficial artificial intelligence', *AI Magazine*, Vol. 36, No. 4, pp.105–115.
- Russo, M. and Cesarani, M. (2017) 'Strategic alliance success factors: a literature review on alliance lifecycle', *International Journal of Business Administration*, Vol. 8, No. 3, p.1 [online] <https://doi.org/10.5430/ijba.v8n3p1>.
- Sadowski, B. and Duysters, G. (2008) 'Strategic technology alliance termination: an empirical investigation', *Journal of Engineering and Technology Management*, Vol. 25, No. 4, pp.305–320.
- Santoso, A.S. and Wahyuni, S. (2018) 'Maximizing strategic alliances in the multi-sided platform firms', *International Journal of Business*, Vol. 23, No. 1, pp.26–52.
- Sarkar, M.B., Echambadi, R., Cavusgil, S.T. and Aulakh, P.S. (2001) 'The influence of complementarity, compatibility, and relationship capital on alliance performance', *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, Vol. 29, No. 4, pp.358–373.
- Shah, R. and Swaminathan, V. (2008) 'Factors influencing partner selection in strategic alliances: the moderating role of alliance context', *Strategic Management Journal*, Vol. 29, No. 5, pp.471–494.
- Shah, S.T.H., Jamil, R.A., Shah, T.A. and Kazim, A. (2015) 'Critical exploration of prescriptive and emergent approaches to strategic management: a review paper', *International Journal of Information, Business and Management*, Vol. 7, No. 3, pp.91–101.
- Simon, J.P. (2019) 'Artificial intelligence: scope, players, markets and geography', *Digital Policy, Regulation and Governance*, Vol. 21, No. 3, pp.208–237.
- Stone, P., Brooks, R., Brynjolfsson, E., Calo, R., Etzioni, O., Hager, G., Hirschberg, J., Kalyanakrishnan, S., Kamar, E., Kraus, S., Leyton-Brown, K., Parkes, D., Press, W., Saxenian, A., Shah, J., Tambe, M. and Teller, A. (2016) *Artificial Intelligence and Life in 2030*, Stanford University.

- Swoboda, B., Meierer, M., Foscht, T. and Morschett, D. (2011) 'International SME alliances: the impact of alliance building and configurational fit on success', *Long Range Planning*, Vol. 44, No. 4, pp.271–288.
- Tucker, K., Bulim, J., Koch, G., North, M., Nguyen, T., Fox, J. and Delay, D. (2018) 'Internet industry: a perspective review through internet of things and internet of everything', *International Management Review*, Vol. 14, No. 2, p.26.
- Varadarajan, P.R. and Cunningham, M.H. (1995) 'Strategic alliances: a synthesis of conceptual foundations', *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, Vol. 23, No. 4, pp.282–296.
- Vilelas, J. (2009) *Investigação – o processo de construção do conhecimento*, 2nd ed., Sílabo.
- Wang, H., Wuebker, R.J., Han, S. and Ensley, M.D. (2012) 'Strategic alliances by venture capital backed firms: an empirical examination', *Small Business Economics*, Vol. 38, No. 2, pp.179–196.
- Wasilow, S. and Thorpe, J.B. (2019) 'Artificial intelligence, robotics, ethics, and the military: a Canadian perspective', *AI Magazine*, Vol. 40, No. 1, pp.37–48.
- Weller, H., Streller, A. and Purinton, E. (2019) 'Brand equity and partnership fit: strategic alliance considerations for the professional sports industry', *International Management Review*, Vol. 15, No. 1, p.19.
- Zhao, Y. and Flenner, A. (2019) 'Deep models, machine learning, and artificial intelligence applications in national and international security – part two', *AI Magazine*, Vol. 40, No. 2, pp.29–30.