International Journal of Marketing, Financial Services & Management Research________________________ ISSN 2277- 3622
Vol.2, No. 4, April (2013)
Online available at www.indianresearchjournals.com

# SUSTAINABILITY OF ORGANIZATIONAL RESOURCES IN DEVELOPMENT

**DR NEHA ARORA**

ASST PROF-SRMSCET BAREILLY

## ABSTRACT
The Topic which is gaining significant attention these days i.e.- In the era of globalization is "Sustainability"- As the level of competition is increasing day by day and the market is getting more saturated now a days. Organizational effectiveness depends on having the right people in the right jobs at the right time to meet rapidly changining environment. This paper focus on how incentives, job satisfaction, performance appraisal systems, Stress removing factors helps organization getting sustainable in the developing environment.

**KEYWORDS:** Incentives, Performance Appraisal, Job Satisfaction, Stress

## Introduction
Over the past two decades, technological developments, globalization, and competitive demands have caused dramatic changes within and across organizations, and have transformed general conditions for human resource management (HRM) strategy and decision-making. Human resources (HR), HRM practices and strategies have been identified as essential for organizational success (e.g. Wright, Gardner, Moynihan & Allen, 2005). The rise in importance of HR and correct use of organizational resources has fuelled a quickly expanding stream of research. Understanding sources of such sustained competitive advantage has become a major area of study in strategic management. The resource-based view stipulates that in strategic management the fundamental sources and drivers to firms' competitive advantage and superior performance are mainly associated with the attributes of their resources which are valuable and costly-to-copy. As such, in order to achieve a competitive advantage level that not only can at least match those of their business rivals' but also will be able to exceed the industrial performance averages, business organizations have to initially seek understanding as to the relative degree of relationship between their organizational internal resources, competitive advantage and performance
Some areas of growing importance here are:

- Competency mapping
- Succession planning,
- Mentoring,
- Career pathing,
- Change management programs,
- HRMS (human resource management system) etc.

Based on such a wide exposure the pursuit of firms' competitive advantage is indeed an idea that is at the heart of much of the strategic management literature. Understanding sources of sustained competitive advantage has become a major area of study in strategic management (Porter, 1985, 1991; Barney, 1991; Peteraf, 1993; Ma, 1999a, 1999b, 2004; Flint and Van Fleet, 2005; King, 2007). The resource-based view stipulates that in strategic management the fundamental sources and drivers to firms' competitive advantage and superior performance are mainly associated with the attributes of their resources which are valuable and costly-to-copy (Barney, 1986, 1991, 2001a; Conner, 1991; Mills, Platts and Bourne, 2003; Peteraf and Bergen, 2003). As such, in order to achieve a competitive advantage level that not only can at least match those of their business rivals' but also will be able to exceed the industrial performance averages, business organizations have to initially seek understanding as to the relative degree of relationship between their organizational internal resources, competitive advantage and performance. By having essential information on the relative internal strengths and weaknesses of their organizational resources, management can be guided in the process of making strategic business decision in order to improve their overall organizational position.

**Linkages of Sustainability and Organizational Resources Special Focus On Hr Issues In The Literature**

In this section of the paper, the evolution of different understandings of sustainability is outlined and reviewed. Current applications of sustainability in OR-related literature on both micro and macro levels are examined, and a comparison and critical analysis of the approaches identified is undertaken. Conclusions for the development of a theoretical framework linking sustainability to HRM research are drawn. Strategy and resource orientation in HRM literature have increased (e.g. Wright, Dunford & Snell, 2001), and some human resources have been identified as 'critical' for organizations (Taylor, Beechler & Napier, 1996). Examples are expatriates or highly qualified global managers, as their knowledge and competencies are regarded as essential for the realization of corporate strategies (Brewster & Suutari, 2005; Lazarova & Caligiuri, 2004). In a global economy, one of the major problems for today's HR executives is the scarcity of highly qualified and motivated HR (e.g. Thom & Zaugg, 2004). HR researchers have suggested new ways for Organizational has been changing to meet the changing needs of the environment. It can be defined as a planned effort, organization wide, managed from the top, to increase organization effectiveness and health.

**1.1 Competitive Advantage**

Building on the assumptions that strategic resources are heterogeneously distributed across firms and that these differences are stable overtime, Barney (1991) examines the link between firm's resources and sustained competitive advantage. Four empirical indicators of the potential of firm's resources to generate sustained competitive advantage — value, rareness, inimitability, and non-substitutability — are discussed. The model is applied by analyzing the potential of several firms' resources for generating sustained. competitive advantages. The article concludes by examining implications of firms' resource model of sustained competitive advantage for other business disciplines.

In Barney (1991), firms' resources include all assets, capabilities, organizational processes, firm's attributes, information, knowledge, etc. controlled by a firm that enables the firm to conceive and implement strategies to improve its efficiency and effectiveness. In this article, a firm is said to have a competitive advantage when it is implementing a value creating strategy not simultaneously being implemented by any current or potential competitors. Furthermore, a firm is said to have a sustained competitive advantage when it is implementing a value creating strategy not simultaneously being implemented by any current or potential competitors and when these other firms are unable to duplicate the benefits of this strategy (Barney, 1991). Barney (1991) further argues that to have the potential to generate competitive advantage, a firm's resource must have four attributes: (a) it must be valuable, in the sense that it exploits opportunities and/or neutralizes threats in a firm's environment; (b) it must be rare among a firm's current and potential competition; (c) it must be imperfectly imitable; and (d) there cannot be strategically equivalent substitutes for this resource.

Competitive advantage is perhaps the most widely used term in strategic management, yet it remains poorly defined and operationalized (Ma, 2000). Ma (2000) makes three observations regarding competitive advantage and conceptually explores the various patterns of relationship between competitive advantage and firm's performance, namely: (i) competitive advantage does not equate to superior performance; (ii) competitive advantage is a relational term; and (iii) competitive advantage is context-specific. In addition, Ma (2000) further examines three patterns of relationship between competitive advantage and firm's performance, namely: (i) competitive advantage leading to superior performance; (ii) competitive advantage without superior performance; and (iii) superior performance without competitive advantage. The ultimate purpose of Ma's (2000) article is to help generate a healthy debate among strategy scholars on the usefulness of the competitive advantage construct for our theory building and testing.

Ma (1999b) has also argued that competitive advantage arises from the differential among firms along any dimension of firm's attributes and characteristics that allows one firm to better create customer value than do others. Generic sources of competitive advantage include ownership of assets or position; access to distribution and supply; as well as proficiency – knowledge, competence, and capability – in business operation. It has also been further argued that in order to achieve and sustain competitive advantage, a firm needs to creatively and proactively exploit the three generic sources, preempt rivals attempt at these sources, and/or pursue any combination of proactive and preemptive effort. This paper advances an integrative framework that helps management practitioners to systematically analyze the nature and cause of competitive advantage (Ma, 1999b).

Competitive advantage is the basis for superior performance (Ma, 1999a). Understanding the anatomy of competitive advantage is of paramount importance to general managers who bear the ultimate responsibility for a firm's long term survival and success. Ma (1999a) advances an integrative framework called SELECT to help general managers systematically examine the various facets of the anatomy of competitive advantage: its substance, expression, locale, effect, cause, and time-span. It has been reasoned that by analyzing the causes of competitive advantage helps a firm create and gain advantage. Studying the substance, expression, locale, and effect of competitive advantage allows the firm to better utilize the advantage. Examining the time span of competitive advantage enables the firm to fully exploit the advantage according to its potential and sustainability (Ma, 1999a).

### 1.2. Sustainable Work Systems

Influenced by the political debate on sustainability and sustainable development, researchers from different disciplines in different countries with an interest in Sustainable Work Systems (SWS) promote an understanding of sustainability largely based on basic core integration. However, as sustainability is a very complex concept, authors do not try to offer just one truth or "one unified message, but rather, different impressions on sustainability" (Docherty et al., 2002c: 12). For example, Docherty and colleagues (2002c: 12) propose a stakeholder perspective: "Sustainability - as we understand it - encompasses three levels: the individual, the organizational and the societal. Sustainability at one level cannot be built on the exploitation of the others. These levels are intimately related to the organization's key stakeholders: personnel, customers, owners and society. A prerequisite for sustainability at the system level (individual, organizational or societal) is to achieve a balance between stakeholders' needs and goals at different levels simultaneously". An increasingly short termed profit orientation with strategies like downsizing, outsourcing, or contingent work is hold incompatible with social and long-term economic objectives (Docherty et al., 2002a). A further critical view is pursued by Moldaschl (2005: 5) who understands his sustainability perspective as consciously subjective, and value-laden: "The term sustainability does not stand for ecology, but for a general resource perspective. The prerequisites, side effects, and boundaries of economic actions in our capitalistic society are herewith discussed."

To sum up, the understanding of sustainability from proponents of SWS is largely in linem with the understanding of social responsibility in the CSR literature. It refers to those stakeholder expectations justified through ethical reasoning or through expectations of what is social equity (see also Whetten et al. 2002). This understanding follows the assumption that companies should be held responsible for negative effects of their actions on their stakeholders and on society.TPF The responsibility for side effects, HR exploitation, and development are located in organizations (e.g. Docherty et al. 2002a; Moldaschl 2005). In SWS, examples for these negative side effects are work-related stress symptoms, work dependent psychosomatic reactions, burnout, self-exploitation tendencies, increased pressure of time and work pace, increased pressure to perform, eroding trust in employment relations, and blurring boundaries between work and private life (Brödner, 2002; Docherty, Forslin, Shani & Kira, 2002c; Kira, 2002). The scholars of SWS are convinced that these phenomena appear more often than ever among highly skilled, self-determined, highly participating, and autonomously acting employees because these employees face contradictory and ambiguous demands, experience increased work-related stress, and because not all of them are able to cope with these tensions (e.g. Brödner, 2002).

Increased globalization, competition, team work, the development of information and communication technology, increased uncertainty of employment, self-organized work, and autonomy are identified as some of the causes for more intensive and flexible work systems contributing to negative outcomes for employees and to HR exploitation (Brödner & Knuth, 2002; Docherty et al., 2002a, 2002c). The concept of 'intensive work systems' (IWS) consumes human resources physically, cognitively, socially, and emotionally due to high work intensity. Contrary to this concept, SWS are proposed that prevent negative outcomes of intensive HR deployment, and allow regeneration and development of HR: "Human resources to be fostered include skills, knowledge, co-operation and trust, motivation, employability, constructive industrial relations, and also broader institutional/societal prerequisites, such as training systems"

(Docherty, Forslin, Shani & Kira, 2002c: 11).Beyond this core idea, SWS are thought to lead to a balance of working life quality and organizational performance, to 'sustainable change processes', and to employment (Docherty, Forslin, Shani & Kira, 2002c). To achieve these objectives, potential solutions are explored from several theoretical perspectives and from first empirical studies (e.g. Docherty, Forslin & Shani, 2002a; Kira, 2003).

### 1.3. Performance

Competitive advantage and firm's performance are two different constructs and their relationship seems to be complex (Ma, 2000). Studies have shown that there is a significant relationship between competitive advantage and performance (Ma, 2000; Fahy, 2000; Gimenez and Ventura, 2002; Wang and Lo, 2003; Wiklund and Shepherd, 2003; Bowen and Ostroff, 2004; Morgan et al., 2004; Ray et al., 2004). Fahy (2000) argues that the attainment of a sustainable competitive advantage position can be expected to lead to superior performance, usually measured in conventional terms such as market-share and profitability, i.e. the financial performance measurement approach. In other words, anchoring on the view that competitive advantage and performance are two different concepts and dimensions, firms should focus their managerial strategy towards attaining and sustaining competitive advantage position over their rivals. Subsequently, such a competitive advantage position will lead to superior firm's performance. Nonetheless, we should also bear in mind the existence of the other two potential relationships between competitive advantage and performance as projected by Ma (2000), namely that competitive advantage does not always lead to superior performance.

Bearing in mind the notion that competitive advantage is a relational concept and it is also context-specific, there are possibilities that competitive advantage does not result in superior firm's performance, and there are also possibilities that superior firm's performance being achieved without attaining and/or sustaining competitive advantage position.

However, more often than not, the first scenario that competitive advantage will lead to superior Performance will prevail given the fact that firms focus their competitive strategy towards enhancing their resource pool (Fahy, 2000). Indeed, as Barney (1991) has argued, firm's resources which include all its assets, capabilities, organizational processes, firm's attributes, information, knowledge, etc. owned and/or controlled by a firm will eventually enable the firm to conceive and implement strategies that will improve its efficiency and effectiveness, hence superior firm's performance. Further, Gimenez and Ventura (2002) have analyzed the relationship between internal and external integration processes, and their significant effect on firms' performance and competitive advantage. The study uses variables such as competitive advantage, firm's performance, and the internal and external integration process based on supply chain management (SCM), which is measured and operationalized in terms of absolute and relative performance in areas of teamwork, shared ideas, information, planning, objectives, responsibility; sales, logistics processes and cost efficiencies. Wang and Lo (2003) examine the important role of customer-focused performance and its significant interactive relationships with other dimensions of the overall performance system, and goes further to analyze the components and dynamics of customer-focused performance. They argue that performance should be based on a broader concept rather than just on financial performance measurement, namely, overall performance (i.e. offerings and competencies), customer-focused performance, shareholder-based performance and employee-based performance. The study measures performance in terms of products & services, internal processes, growth, capabilities & skills, quality, sacrifice, value & satisfaction, revenue, growth, return on assets, personal development, empowered teams and employee satisfaction. Wiklund and Shepherd (2003), who studied the significant relationship between resources, entrepreneurial orientation and performance, argue that firm's performance should be based and measured on a wider dimension, namely organizational & procedural knowledge; innovativeness, proactiveness, risk taking; net profit, sales growth, cash flow, product & process innovation, product & service quality & variety, and customer satisfaction. They further argue that resource-based view (RBV) research focuses mainly on the characteristics of resources, paying less attention to the relationship between these resources and the way firms are organized.

Bowen and Ostroff (2004) study the significant relationship between human resource management (HRM) system, work climate and firm's performance using measurements such as employee attributes, perceptions, utilization, participation and rating. They find a significant relationship in such that the strength of the HRM system can help explain how individual employee attributes accumulate to affect organizational effectiveness and firm's performance. In another study, Morgan, Kaleka and Katsikeas (2004) focus on the significant interaction among available resources and capabilities, competitive strategy decisions, competitive advantage and performance outcomes in the export venture. These variables are conceptualized in terms of experiential, financial, scale & physical resources; product-development, relationship-building & informational capabilities; cost leadership, marketing & service differentiation; service-based, product-based & cost-based advantage; economic, distributor & end-user.

## 2. TODAYS FACED CHALLENGE

Corporate business leaders in the 21st century face daunting, complex and unrelenting challenges. In the competitive global marketplace, business leaders must simultaneously identify new opportunities for growth and innovation to remain agile and responsive, as they continue to lead organizations in:

- Becoming global and multi-cultural;
- Developing productive, performance-based work environments;
- Building their talent and organizational capabilities to fulfill future needs;
- Accommodating new and changing external regulation;
- Leveraging and integrating new technologies to support the business; and
- Meeting increasing expectations for socially responsible and sustainable business practices.

Additionally, corporations are increasingly asked to collaborate with government, non-governmental organizations (NGOs), and non-profit efforts to support the social, economic, and natural environment – and to transform themselves into more sustainable enterprises within this larger ecosystem (Wirtenberg et al, 2007).

The key to meeting these enormous challenges lies in utilizing the knowledge, expertise, and commitment of people to enhance organizational performance. Not coincidentally, it is Organizational Development practitioners who possess the required organizational resources and competencies that can address these very issues.

A recent study found that companies that "invest in human capital, work to develop and retain valued employees, and measure and hold people accountable for that investment, have a powerful competitive advantage" (IBM, 2011). Moreover, in a recent special issue of the Journal of Applied Behavioral Science (JABS) entitled: *"Is Organization Development in Crisis?"* Bradford and Burke (2010) argue that indeed Organization Development does have much to offer in its emphasis on releasing the human potential within organizations - "It has developed many valuable approaches. It has stressed the importance of values in a time when too much behavior seems valueless."

### 3. The Wal Mart Sustainability Management

Why are milk jugs more important than people? In 2008, Doug McMillon (Colvin, 2008), the CEO of Sam‟s Club, a division of Wal-Mart, expounded on innovation in milk jugs and his company's introduction of a rectangular, and therefore, stackable jug. He proudly noted how the new design extended the shelf life of milk, reduced costs by between 10 and 20 cents, and eliminated more than 10,000 delivery trips, thereby saving the company money. Meanwhile, Wal-Mart paid its employees almost 15 percent less than other large retailers and, because of the lower pay, Wal-Mart employees made greater use of public health and welfare programs (Dube, et al., 2007).

Today there is a lot of interest in building sustainable organizations. Companies are trying to burnish their brands by building their environmental bona fides. For instance, oil companies such as British Petroleum and Chevron have run advertisements touting their conservation and alternative energy initiatives. Wal-Mart, the enormous retailer that is the largest private-sector employer in the United States, has undertaken major initiatives to make its operations greener. In 2005, Lee Scott, Wal-Mart CEO, made the first speech in the company history broadcast to all of its associates. In that speech, which was also made available to Wal-Mart‟s more than 60,000 suppliers, Scott committed the company to the goals of being 100% supplied by renewable energy, creating zero waste, and selling products that sustain resources and the environment (Plambeck and Denend, 2007). Global warming and the destruction of the natural world have garnered growing attention, with Al Gore‟s film, *An Inconvenient Truth,* winning an Academy Award and Gore himself winning the Nobel Prize. There is also growing concern about the high rate of species extinction caused by both global warming and the intrusion of human activities into rain forests, wetlands, and other natural areas. Environmental impact reports are required for construction and development projects in the U.S. and in California, water supplies to agriculture have been put at risk by efforts to protect various species of fish. There is, in short, an enormous amount of attention focused on the effects of companies and economic activity on the physical world. And there are concomitant efforts, through both government regulation and social pressure, to alter what companies and individuals do so as to diminish the adverse effects of business on the natural environment. But companies and their management practices also have profound effects on human beings and the social environment. And the evidence suggests that, in many instances, these effects are even more pervasive and more harmful than the effects on the physical world. As a few examples, companies in the United States have cut health insurance to both their active employees and retirees, causing problems in accessing health care. Many organizations have either curtailed completely or diminished their contributions to employees‟ retirement, and have thereby shifted the financial risks of having enough resources to retire to their workers. Such actions have increased financial stress. And the waves of downsizing and economic insecurity created by wage givebacks and involuntary, part-time work have had profound affects on both psychological and physical well-being. Consider the case of Wal-Mart. The company which seems very concerned about its effects on the physical environment appears much less interested in the welfare of its employees. For example, in 2005, 46 percent of Wal-Mart employees‟ children were either uninsured or on Medicaid, a state program to provide medical care to low-income people (Rosenbloom and Barbaro, 2009). The company offered health insurance to a relatively small proportion of its employees and it paid its associates so badly that many of its workers were eligible for various income supplement and social welfare programs provided by the states in which it operated. When these facts came to light, there was a public outcry that made it difficult for the company to obtain permission from local planning and zoning authorities to open new stores. Wal-Mart also suffered a loss of customers from its image as a "stingy" employer. A confidential 2004 McKinsey consulting report found that somewhere between two and eight percent of Wal-Mart shoppers had stopped using the chain because of the negative press (Rosenbloom and Barbaro, 2009). In response to the public outcry, Wal-Mart did change some of its policies, particularly with respect to offering health insurance to its workers. Nonetheless, the difference in the actions and publicity between ameliorating its effects on the social as compared to the physical environment was striking. There were also substantial differences in Wal-Mart‟s concern with its suppliers‟ compliance with labor standards versus their adherence to practices that would ensure product integrity and ameliorate adverse environmental effects. In part, these differences derived from the fact that environmental performance often entailed taking waste—and therefore costs—out of the system. There were not comparable savings and, on the contrary, often cost increases—associated with limiting Wal-Marts social pollution. Wal-Mart is not alone in this behavior. Companies seem to be interested in sustainability mostly if it can reduce their costs and with a focus primarily on physical waste and pollution; there is little focus on the social externalities created by work practices. To make what ought to be an obvious point, organizations are comprised of people, and building a sustainable company should consider the human as well as the physical dimensions of company actions. We need to be as concerned about organizational effects on the social world as we are about organizational impacts on the physical environment. Workplace stress, curtailed access to health care and insufficient vacation and sick days create externalities born by society in much the same way that pollution creates costs not born entirely by the company that creates such costs. But go to the Google Scholar website, for instance, and search under the terms "organizational sustainability" or "sustainable organizations," and virtually all of the entries deal with research and writing on organizations and their effects on the physical as contrasted with the social environment. The Harvard Labor and Work life Program notes that in the general domain of both social responsibility reporting and socially responsible investing, "the study and reporting of human rights and labor issues…are far less advanced than environmental and governance ones" (Beefman, 2008: 2).

## 4. CONCLUSION

Those organizations and individuals who are the enhancers in the sustainable development (***SD***) concentration appreciate that perhaps the greatest challenge in creating a sustainable culture is changing the organizations within that culture. And surely one of the greatest challenges to any organization is changing the patterns of behavior and practice of its members and stakeholders. Thus a change in one can effect the other significantly.

## REFERENCES

ADNER, R. and HELFAT, C.E. (2003). "Corporate Effects and Dynamic Managerial Capabilities", *Strategic Management Journal, 24,* pp.1011-1025.

AINUDDIN, R.A., BEAMISH, P.W., HULLAND, J.S. and ROUSE, M.J. (2007). "Resource Attributes and Firm Performance in International Joint Ventures", *Journal of World Business, 42,* pp. 47-60.

Appelbaum, E., T. Bailey, P. Berg, and A. Kalleberg (2000). *Manufacturing Advantage: Why High-Performance Work Systems Pay Off*. Cornell: ILR Press.

AREND, R.J. (2003). "Revisiting the Logical and Research Considerations of Competitive Advantage", *Strategic Management Journal, 24,* pp. 279-284.

BARNEY, J.B. (1986). "Strategic Factor Markets: Expectations, Luck, and Business Strategy", *Management Science, 32*(10), pp. 1231- 1241.

BARNEY, J.B. (1991). "Firm Resources and Sustained Competitive Advantage", *Journal of Management, 17*(1), pp. 99-120.

BARNEY, J.B. (1995). "Looking Inside for Competitive Advantage", *Academy of Management Executive, 9*(4), pp. 49-61.

BARNEY, J.B. (2001a). "Is the Resource-based "View" a Useful Perspective for Strategic Management Research? Yes", *Academy of Management Review, 26,* pp. 41-56.

BARNEY, J.B. (2001b). "Resource-based Theories of Competitive Advantage: A Ten-year Retrospective on the Resource-based View", *Journal of Management, 27,* pp. 643-650.

BARNEY, J.B. (2007). *Gaining and Sustaining Competitive Advantage* (3rd ed.), Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Education.

BOWEN, D.E. and OSTROFF, C. (2004). "Understanding HRM-Firm Performance Linkages: The Role of the "Strength" of the HRM System", *Academy of Management Review, 29*(2), pp. 203-221.

BRAUER, M. and SCHMIDT, S.L. (2006). "Exploring Strategy Implementation Consistency over Time: The Moderating Effects of Industry Velocity and Firm Performance", *Journal of Management and Governance, 10*(2), pp. 205-226.

BURDEN, R. and PROCTOR, T. (2000). "Creating a Sustainable Competitive Advantage through Training. *Team Performance Management, 6*(5/6), pp. 90-97.

CHAHARBAGHI, K. and LYNCH, R. (1999). "Sustainable Competitive Advantage: Towards a Dynamic Resource-based Strategy. *Management Decision", 37*(1), pp. 45-50.

CONNER, K.R. (1991). "A historical Comparison of Resource-based Theory and Five Schools of thought within Industrial Organization Economics: Do We Have a New Theory of the Firm?" *Journal of Management, 17*(1), pp. 121-154.

COUSINS, P.D. (2005). "The Alignment of Appropriate Firm and Supply Strategies for Competitive Advantage", *International Journal of Operations & Production Management, 25*(5), pp. 403-428.

DATTA, D.K., GUTHRIE, J.P. and WRIGHT, P.M. (2005). "Human Resource Management and Labour Productivity: Does Industry Matter?", *Academy of Management Journal, 48*(1), pp. 135-145.

DE PABLOS, P.O. (2006). "Transnational Corporations and Strategic Challenges: An Analysis of Knowledge Flows and Competitive Advantage", *The Learning Organization, 13*(6), pp. 544-559.

DENRELL, J. (2004). "The Performance of Performance. *Journal of Management and Governance", 8*(4), pp. 345-349.

DIERICKX, I. and COOL, K. (1989). "Asset Stock Accumulation and Sustainability of Competitive Advantage". *Management Science, 35*(12), pp. 1504-1511.

EISENHARDT, K.M. and MARTIN, J.A. (2000). "Dynamic Capabilities: What are They?", *Strategic Management Journal, 21,* pp. 1105-
1121.

FAHY, J. (2000). "The Resource-based view of the Firm: Some Stumbling-blocks on the Road to Understanding Sustainable Competitive Advantage", *Journal of European Industrial Training, 24*(2/3/4), pp. 94-104.

FAHY, J., FARRELLY, F. and QUESTER, P. (2004). "Competitive Advantage through Sponsorship: A Conceptual Model and Research Propositions", *European Journal of Marketing, 38*(8), pp. 1013-1030.

FALSHAW, J.R., GLAISTER, K.W. and EKREM, T. (2006). "Evidence on Formal Strategic Planning and Company Performance.
*Management Decision", 44*(1), pp. 9-30.

FLINT, G.D. and VAN FLEET, D.D. (2005). "*A Comparison and Contrast of Strategic Management and Classical Economic Concepts: Definitions, Comparisons, and Pursuit of Advantages",* http://www.uvsc.edu/schools/business/facultyScholar/jbi/jbi_v3.html.

FOSS, N.J. and KNUDSEN, T. (2003). "The Resource-based Tangle: Towards a Sustainable Explanation of Competitive Advantage", *Managerial and Decision Economics, 24,* pp. 291-307.

FRANCO-SANTOS, M., KENNERLEY, M., MICHELI, P., MARTINEZ, V., MASON, S., MARR, B., GRAY, D. and NEELY, A. (2007). "Towards a Definition of a Business Performance Measurement System", *International Journal of Operations & Production Management, 27*(8), pp. 784-801.

GIMENEZ, C. and VENTURA, A. (2002). « Supply Chain Management as a Competitive Advantage in the Spanish Grocery Sector",
Published Working Paper. No. 2, 04/2002, Universitat Pompeu Fabra' (UPF), Barcelona: Spain.

GOH, A. (2004). "Enhancing Organizational Performance through Knowledge Innovation: A Proposed Strategic Management Framework", *Journal of Knowledge Management Practice, October 2004.*

GOTTSCHALG, O. and ZOLLO, M. (2007). "Interest Alignment and Competitive Advantage", *Academy of Management Review, 32*(2), pp. 418-437.

GUPTA, A. and MCDANIEL, J. (2002). "Creating Competitive Advantage by Effectively Managing Knowledge: A framework for
Knowledge Management", *Journal of Knowledge Management Practice, October 2002.*

HARRISON, J.S., HITT, M.A., HOSKISSON, R.E. and IRELAND, R.D. (2001). "Resource Complementarity in Business Combinations: Extending the Logic to Organizational Alliances", *Journal of Management, 27,* pp. 679-690.

MCNAMARA, G., AIME, F. and VAALER, M. (2005). "Is Performance Driven by Industry or Firm-specific Factors? A Response to Hawawini, Subramaniam and Verdin", *Strategic Management Journal, 26,* pp. 1075-1081.

MILLER, S.R. and ROSS, A.D. (2003). "An Exploratory Analysis of Resource Utilization Across Organizational Units: Understanding the Resource-based View", *International Journal of Operations & Production Management, 23*(9), pp. 1062-1083.

MILLS, J., PLATTS, K. and BOURNE, M. (2003). "Competence and Resource Architectures", *International Journal of Operations & Production Management, 23*(9), pp. 977-994.

MORGAN, N.A., KALEKA, A. and KATSIKEAS, C.S. (2004). "Antecedents of Export Venture performance: A Theoretical Model and Empirical Assessment", *Journal of Marketing, 68,* pp. 90-108.

NEELY, A. (2005). "The Evolution of Performance Measurement Research: Developments in the Last Decade and a Research Agenda for the Next", *International Journal of Operations & Production Management, 25*(12), pp. 1264-1277.

NEWBERT, S.L. (2007). "Empirical Research on the Resource-based View of the Firm: An Assessment and Suggestions for Future Research", *Strategic Management Journal, 28,* pp. 121-146.

O'SHAUGHNESSY, N.J. (1996). "Michael Porter's Competitive Advantage Revisited", *Management Decision, 34*(6), pp. 12-20.

OLIVER, C. (1997). "Sustainable Competitive Advantage: Combining Institutional and Resource-based Views", *Strategic Management Journal, 18*(9), pp. 697-713.

PETERAF, M.A. (1993). "The Cornerstones of Competitive Advantage: A Resource-based View", *Strategic Management Journal, 14,* pp. 179-191.