

# The Compatibility of Outside-In and Inside-Out Strategic Approaches



Slobodan Adžić

**Abstract** The aim of this chapter is to reveal the compatibility of the most important strategic approaches. Moreover, through a critical discussion of the key literature relating to the issue and a business case analysis, the author will suggest a preferred flow of strategic analysis in a business case, based on the compatibility of strategic approaches. The epistemological stance of the author is critical realism. The two most important strategic approaches in strategic management are the outside-in and inside-out. The author argues that there is enough evidence as theoretical findings and practical implications that the outside-in and inside-out approach in strategy could be compatible. Among the evidence, the central point is dedicated to the business case of HIP Petrohemija, as a fine example of why the approaches are compatible, as well as the proper flow of strategic analysis. The chapter suggests that the flow of strategic analysis in strategic marketing should start with the outside-in environmental analysis, in order to understand the opportunities and boundaries of the market and discover a fit on market, and then it should continue with the inside-out internal audit, in order to find out the inner capabilities and the core competence.

**Keywords** Strategic Approaches · Outside-In Approach · Inside-Out Approach · Strategic Management

## 1 Introduction

This chapter tends to overcome a noticed problem in the strategic management literature. There is a manner among some academics to pursue just a single strategic approach, the outside-in or the inside-out. That approach is flawed in theory. A theory should be not exclusive. Especially in practice a manager or a consultant should find the solution to the problem and that approach would be deficient if it is

---

S. Adžić (✉)

Faculty of Management FAM, University Union – Nikola Tesla, Beograd, Serbia  
e-mail: [s.adzic@famns.edu.rs](mailto:s.adzic@famns.edu.rs)

based on one approach or theory only. My motivation is to give the answer in which way the outside-in and the inside-out approaches should be merged giving a business case HIP Petrohemija. Ontology of my research is that the competitions exist on every market and that two main approaches existed in explaining it: outside-in and inside-out. Those phenomena I observe as a given. Epistemology of my research is critical realism, in order to discover and critically examine the link between the two main approaches. My research strategy is a qualitative one and the tools I use are the literature review and case study analysis. Critical realist always supports an argument (Adžić 2012). I argue that it is possible to find the link and to establish the modality how to use both, on appearance opposite, outside-in and inside-out approaches in creating the winning competitive strategy.

In this chapter, after defining what strategy is, I shall present two main strategic approaches in strategic management and my view on their compatibility in strategy practice. The main theories of the outside-in approach are the Five Forces and Value Chain. After the elaboration of the other outside-in researches, the next section is devoted to the classic examples of business cases that support the outside-in approach: QWERTY typewriters and Levitt's influential article on railroads. The advantages and shortcomings of the outside-in approach are also part of this section. In the next section, I am presenting the inside-out approach and the main and supporting inside-out theories: core competence, strategic intent, strategy as stretch and leverage, distinctive capabilities, and Blue Ocean strategy. The next section is devoted to the classic inside-out business case: Matsushita Home Bakery. The pros and cons of this approach are also presented, as well as the survey with a conclusion that cost was the biggest driver among enterprises. Finally, I shall present the theories that support the usage of both approaches in practice, as well as the successful business cases, with an emphasis on HIP Petrohemija. This case is proof that a winning strategy would be impossible to generate without the application of both strategic approaches: outside-in and inside-out. I argue that focusing on only one of the approaches limits the understanding of managers. I am concluding that the flow of the strategic management analysis should start with the outside-in environmental analysis, and then it should continue with the inside-out internal audit.

The aim of this chapter is to reveal the compatibility of the most important strategic approaches. There are a number of scholars who are choosing one of them. This chapter differs as it is not pointing in one direction. Moreover, I synthesized the literature of the scholars who have the same view as I have: that both approaches are compatible. Finally, the main contribution of this work is not only a synthesis of theory but also a presentation of a business case with proof of how both inside-out and outside-in approaches could be merged in the strategic analysis successfully. After the introduction, in the first chapter, the theory of strategic management is given. In the next two chapters, the critical discussion of the key literature relating to the strategic approaches is presented. The outside-in approach is elaborated first, as an older theory, following with a newer inside-out approach. The chapter in which the evidence of the compatibility of strategic approaches has the purpose to give not just the theoretical explanation why both

of the approaches are not competitive to each other, but through a business case analysis, I will suggest a preferred flow of strategic analysis, based on the compatibility of strategic approaches. In the conclusion it is pointed out that the strategic analysis should start with the outside-in approach and it should continue with inside-out approach.

## 2 On Strategy and Strategic Approaches

The strategy is important to businesses. However, there is no consensus about its definitions, nor its processes (Mishra et al. 2015). It is necessary to emphasize that strategy is a borrowed word from military theory. The most distinguished authors who gave the immeasurable scientific contribution to the development of business economics strategy are Porter (1987, 1996, 2004a, b) from one side and Hamel and Prahalad (1996) from another one. In his main works, Porter (1987, 1996, 2004a, b) pleads for the so-called outside-in approach. That approach emphasizes the strategic environmental analysis framework, in order to help businesses to understand how to successfully fit in the present competitive market. Hamel and Prahalad (1996) plead for the so-called inside-out approach. That approach emphasizes the resource frame audit, in order to help businesses discover the distinctive and/or unique inner capabilities and how to compete successfully. Porter (1987) claims that competition occurs at the SBU level only because diversified companies do not compete; only their business units do. Hamel and Prahalad (1996) see the core competence on the corporate, not SBU level.

Porter (1987, 1996, 2004a, b) and Hamel and Prahalad (1996) are strong advocates of their approach, opposed to the contrary approach. I am debating that they are complementary and I shall argue that both approaches are useful and that businesses should use them both in a proper manner for competitive success. The business strategy of every single business will be useless if the company does not adapt to the present market situation, and if the company is not using their distinctive capabilities as a source of competitive advantage.

A sound strategy should match strengths and weaknesses, as well as opportunities and threats (Sajfert et al. 2012). This simple truth is often frustrated by the fact that a distinctive resource base and the activity of a firm are going in totally different directions compared with the development of current markets. Adaptation to the environment is a vital requirement for the success of a firm. However, building a new area of competence takes a considerable amount of time, effort, and money, and is associated with many risks, to shift the resource base and reconfigure the activity system, in order to build the successful competitive advantage. Management literature comes with strongly different views and many incompatible prescriptions. The main questions dividing the managers are: “Who should be fitted to whom?”—should an organization attempt to adapt itself to its environment or should it attempt to adapt the environment to itself, to its resources? One side of the spectrum is that market opportunity should be leading; at the other end that competition revolves

around rival resource bases. No consensus has yet developed within the field of strategic management on how to balance markets and resources (De Wit and Meyer 2004).

### 3 Outside-In Approach

Leading author of the outside-in approach is Porter (1987, 1996, 2004a, b). For him, the environment or the industry comes foremost. Porter (Porter 2004b) developed the Five Competitive Forces model and the Value Chain model (Porter 2004a). A value chain is a tool that helps to understand the linkages and interactions of a firm's activities and processes in a given competitive environment. The outside-in strategic approach emphasizes strategic environmental analysis and positioning. The main outcome should be the fit in the competitive arena (Adžić et al. 2013b). Since long-lasting profitability is not easy to gain, finding the fit is the most important strategic activity.

Thompson and Strickland (1992) vouch for the usefulness of the Five Forces model. Day (1984) argues that the outside-in approach is in accordance with the marketing concept since happy customers as one of the environment forces are the cornerstone of that concept. Also, Prahalad and Ramaswamy (2000) claimed that customer experience is critical for business success. Among corporations, satisfied customers are becoming not just the assets but also the source of competence. The evidence that market share, fit, and profitability are strongly correlated is given in the PIMS quantitative research of 3000 companies (Buzzell and Gale 1987). The most important finding is the strong connection between market share and profitability. The final advice from the PIMS research is that market leadership should be the final strategic goal of a company.

As the main flaw of the Five Forces, Hill and Jones (2001) recognized a missing force, the complementors. In economics, substitutes and complementors are related to each other in the market demand analysis. Outside-in analysis (Hill and Jones 2001) presents a static picture of the market. Porter's approach does not answer the question of why different firms perform differently in the same competitive environment (Kay 2003). Analysis cannot produce synthesis and the outside-in view of the strategy has a narrow focus (Mintzberg et al. 1998), because those strategists have in mind a generic position but companies are not competing to be the same, but different.

There are a number of articles where someone could find the analysis based on the outside-in models. Some of them are the analysis of the baking industry (Siaw and Yu 2004), the analysis of the retail industry (Dommissie and Oosthuizen 2004), the analysis of the electronic industry (Samuel and Venkataraman 2004), as well as the analysis of the Internet industry (Mo Koo et al. 2004). Levitt (1960) analyzed the strategy failure of railroads in the USA. Railroads are a model of how the absence of creative ability to see an opportunity within the market can crush the competitive position of the firm or all businesses. In an article about the QWERTY keyboard

layout, David (1985) argued on the importance of the environmental forces in strategic management. It offers an outline of how the primary development can construct a persevering competitive advantage. Although the outside-in approach puts more emphasis on the environment of the company, rather than on the company itself and the company's resources, successful companies seek to discover the best position on the market in order to compete all its rivals and probably that is the reason this approach is still so popular and successful today, and why it would be in the future, as well (Adžić et al. 2013a).

## 4 Inside-Out Approach

Hamel and Prahalad (1996) are the staunch supporters of the inside-out approach. Core competence, stretch and leverage, and intent are their much-known theories in every business school. The most important one, the core competence, is a cornerstone of a winning competitive strategy. That is a persistent pursuit of new skills and technologies to achieve strategic goals. Therefore, the resources of the company have a pivotal role, especially difficult to imitate ones (Momčilović et al. 2013). The approach that puts the assets of the company before the environment of the company, which requires that the company ought to adjust the environment to itself, is the inside-out approach.

Effective strategists should know what an organization does best and the foundation of it is the core competence (Thompson and Strickland 1992). Competence is at the core of any fruitful activity. The inside-out approach can be an incredible asset in contemplating procedures. Indeed, inside the dynamic environment companies can accomplish persevering competitive advantage if they can construct obstructions to imitation (Hill and Jones 2001). A firm should build distinctive capabilities (Kay 1995). Those capabilities are never made as to the consequence of a decision. The most significant single component in the advancement of competitive advantage is the manner in which to coordinate activities to capabilities, in order to stick to the core. Capabilities, competences, skills, strengths, intangible assets, and organizational knowledge are utilized by different authors as the comparative terms (Campbell and Sommers Luchs 1997). Common in these terms is that they characterize those unique capabilities, knowledge, and behavior that can be the wellspring of an organization's advantage. Stalk et al. (1992) contend that companies ought to not construct static market share. Organizations ought to create capabilities that enable the organization to move rapidly in and out. Any firm would profit by a precise and methodological examination of its assets, abilities, and skills (Javidan 1998). The Blue Ocean strategy (Chan Kim and Mauborgne 2004) is the most acclaimed inside-out school. The fundamental thought of Blue Ocean strategy is that the Blue Ocean is where demand is made, inverse to the Red Ocean where companies compete for a greater share of the current demand.

Simply being diverse is not a preferred strategic position itself and therefore the inside-out approach can demoralize vital change (Mintzberg et al. 1998). Likewise, it

is hazardous to liken the authoritative uniqueness with a vital favorable position. The capabilities are in every case best made inside the system of enormous firms getting a charge out of inner economies of scale and scope. Low- and medium-innovation firms, enterprises, and national economies are implanted in the system of assets claimed by others (Foss and Robertson 2000). The core of the strategy for Porter (1987) is positioning. He claims that positioning is dismissed as unreasonably static for the present powerful markets and advancements since adversaries can rapidly duplicate any market position. Those convictions are perilous misleading statements and that those misleading statements are driving progressively more organizations down the way of commonly damaging competition. For Porter (1996), the procedure is the formation of one of a kind and important position, deciding to perform unexpected exercises in comparison to adversaries or deciding to perform exercises in an unexpected way. The strategy ought not to be mistaken for operational viability, indeed despite the fact that both are essential for prevalent execution.

Lindgren et al. (2004) research contended that core competence advancement is very live inside numerous companies all through the world, but still, a core competences statement among organizations is very elusive (Campbell and Sommers Luchs 1997). Outside-in techniques could be found in numerous papers and research. Unique capabilities in the Citibank and the Shana Corp. (Miller et al. 2002) and the core competence built on the cost from the Hewitt survey (Clark 2004) are just a few of them. Matsushita Home Bakery is a genuine case of utilizing competence in building competitive advantage (Campbell and Sommers Luchs 1997). This case illustrates the significance of an organization's capacity to distinguish the sort of information required by the changing competitive environment and to improve the empowering conditions ceaselessly. The competence is at the core of any effective movement, and likely that is the reason why this approach is still so prevalent and fruitful nowadays, and why it would be within the future, as well (Momčilović et al. 2013).

## 5 Evidence of the Compatibility of Strategic Approaches

Within the single-business key examination, the two greatest situational contemplations are industry and competitive conditions, and the company's inside circumstances and resources (Thompson and Strickland 1992). The environmental school exemplified by Porter developed frameworks that helped managers to understand external opportunities and threats. The next step is to determine if the business possesses the necessary skills to implement the strategy, or if it can acquire those skills at a reasonable cost (Campbell and Sommers Luchs 1997). A successful strategy must be consistent with the characteristic of a firm's external environment, as well as the internal environment—firm's goals and values, resources and capabilities, and structure and systems (Grant 2005).

In a case that illustrates the bankruptcy of Starter Corporation, Sack and Nadim (2002) conclude that Porter's Five Forces model continues to be the necessary

starting point for analysis and research in strategic management “but no single model is sufficient to explain all facets.” The Amex case is a good example of using the framework which includes all approaches: Porter, core competences, and dynamic capabilities. After evaluation, Wonglimpiyarat (2004) concludes that Porter answers the question of why and the other two approaches to the question of how. Furthermore, neither approach can predict short- or long-term success. Yong Kim and Oh (2004) concluded that focusing on only one of the approaches limits the understanding of managers. Using Southwest Airlines Co. and Canon Inc. as the primary illustrations, Leavy (2003) concludes that for many firms the bifocal vision—inside-out and outside-in—will lead to a better result. By analyzing the firm situation from both points of view, managers can come into valuable insight.

A focus on internal resources came after an obsession with external competition—obviously, what is necessary is a sense of balance. “Should the firm really be urged to swing to one side or the other?” (Mintzberg et al. 1998). One-size-fits-all approach is not the desired approach (Homkes and Sull 2016). What is imperative is that companies discover their fit, or one of a kind execution approach, which implies understanding what blend of the arrangement, coordination, and adjustment is most basic to their strategies. Understanding the technique approaches might be basic. Expanding the effect of the corporate technique work has clear suggestions—superior choices are made, critical activities are more likely to succeed, and the technique work is way better able to meet the organization’s special requires (Brunsmann et al. 2011). Relational strategy content (Zakrzewska-Bielawska 2019) and similar new concepts would not arise if academics have advocated just one strategic approach. Strategic analysis (Adžić 2005) should start with an environmental audit. An environmental audit will give information about the present situation. But just understanding the present is not enough. Then analysis should continue with an internal audit, to obtain the information on a cornerstone for building the core competence.

I particularly emphasize a case study (Adžić and Očić 2013) of company HIP Petrohemija, Pancevo, Serbia, with the aim of generating feasible strategies for the technological and economic development of this company. Petrohemija was built as a strategic development phase of an integrated complex of the Pancevo Oil Refinery and Chemical Industry Pancevo, but their full integration has never occurred. Broken links with the Romanian petrochemical plant Soventul caused the cracking of virgin naphtha in Petrohemija at 80% capacity, and NATO bombing brought down to no more than 60% capacity. This analysis (Adžić and Očić 2013) started with the SWOT analysis and the TOWS matrix. This technique produced two practical methodologies, which were exposed to further tests. The three portfolio models: Boston Consulting Group (BCG) matrix, General Electric (GE) matrix, and Nine specimen standardized strategies clarified the current position of HIP Petrohemija, the need that HIP Petrohemija deliver more finalized items, i.e., polymers, and it requires that HIP Petrohemija diminish misfortunes, but did not offer a reply to the address which procedure is the foremost appropriate one for the company. This dilemma was solved with the help of Ansoff matrix, which showed us that for HIP Petrohemija will be more profitable to merge with, in its value chain, to the

distributor, not with to the supplier. Porter's models Five Forces and Value Chain analysis further affirmed the upside of the technique of fixing associations with a merchant in inverse to the procedure of fixing associations with providers of crude materials. The last model used in this paper was the Competitors Differentiation Iceberg model, which was used to generate the answer for the question of what is the core competence of HIP Petrohemija. The authors have found that core competence is the high quality of polymers of the company.

Adžić and Očić (2013) featured that the outcomes could not be produced without the assistance of both outside-in and inside-out thinking. Porter's contemporary models both affirmed the upside of the system of associating with a wholesaler in connection to the association with the provider of crude materials. The models indicated the high quality of polymers as the core competence of HIP Petrohemija competence and the highest quality should be strategic intent of the company, since that quality will most likely make success on the market for HIP Petrohemija. Adžić and Očić (2013) inferred that a reconciliation with the merchant for HIP Petrohemija gives collaboration, which is the best strategy, since HIP Petrohemija's business sectors could be left to the wholesaler, which is a lot more grounded in promoting and selling, while then again, HIP Petrohemija can concentrate on the generation and arrangement of long-haul nature of its polymers.

## 6 Conclusion

It is clear from earlier exposures that using one theory only has the consequence of the result not giving the complete view of all problems. The outside-in approach can give a good framework to a complete analysis, but after framing the environment it is impossible to rely much on outside-in. The inside-out approach can point perfectly on resources and competences suitable for the building of competitive advantage, but that approach is failing of the appliance of that advantage because it is not clear if the building of that competitive advantage makes a success on the market.

It is important to understand the flow of strategic analysis. It should start with an environmental audit. An environmental audit will give us information about the present situation, what is a market situation, and what trends you can expect. But just understanding the present is not enough. The understanding of the present situation is the starting point for building new competences. Then it should continue with an internal audit. An internal audit will give us the information which is the cornerstone for building the right core competence. Building competence demands time; building competence is preparation for competing for the future. In modern turbulent times, the future can happen very fast. The outside-in approach will give the direction where to aim and the inside-out approach will give the ammunition for aiming. The strategy combines those two in a powerful weapon. What you need to do is just to pull the trigger.

The environment and the company's internal situation are the two most important strategic issues for any company. I strongly support the view that *where* should be



answered before *how*. This is a logical path of human thinking; deductive reasoning always was *par excellence* reasoning in social sciences. However, an important element in that reasoning is also a status of business—is the business in a regular or changing period? Regular times are more external-centered and changing times more internal-centered. A very important issue is not to forget feedback; although the requests of logic demand thinking from outside-in to inside-out, those two activities are to some extent parallel too. The results—the strategy which leads to victory—should rely on both in-depth analyzed approaches.

The business theory has borrowed the term strategy from the military world and the military world is considering strategy as the most important tool in achieving victory. If the outside-in view is presenting direction and inside-out ammunition, the strategy is a powerful weapon. Using both approaches should build a strategy that will lead to a result. Therefore, I conclude that it is necessary to use both strategy approaches, and it should start with outside-in and continue with inside-out in order to create a winning strategy. That is the general conclusion and recommendation that follow from this work.

## References

- Adžić, S. (2005). *Outside-in and Inside-out strategy approaches: Are they incompatible?* MBA. Lancaster University, UK.
- Adžić, S. (2012). The impact of the critical realism on the research procedures in management research or My British experience on the methodology in management. In D. Ristić (Ed.), *Methodology of business research: A monograph* (pp. 15–36). Sremski Karlovci, Serbia: Fakultet za menadžment.
- Adžić, S., Doljanica, S., & Rajaković, J. (2013a, September 12–15). *Outside-in strategy approach in theory and Praxis*. In *13th International Conference Research and Development in Mechanical Industry RaDMI 2013* (pp. 299–303). Kopaonik, Serbia: RaDMI.
- Adžić, S., Marković, N., Milošević, S., & Milošević, M. (2013b). Outside-in strategy approach in theory and Praxis. *TTEM*, 8(4), 1936–1940.
- Adžić, S., & Očić, O. (2013). The feasible strategies of technological and economic development of HIP Petrohemija. *Hemijska Industrija*, 67(1), 175–186.
- Brunsmann, B., DeVore, S., & Houston, A. (2011). The corporate strategy function: Improving its value and effectiveness. *Journal of Business Strategy*, 32(5), 43–50.
- Buzzell, R. D., & Gale, B. T. (1987). The PIMS principle: Linking strategy to performance. In B. De Wit & R. Meyer (Eds.), *Strategy: Process, content, context* (2nd ed.). Belmont: Thomson.
- Campbell, A., & Sommers Luchs, K. (Eds.). (1997). *Core competency-based strategy*. Stamford: International Thomson Business Press.
- Chan Kim, W., & Mauborgne, R. (2004). Blue Ocean strategy. *Harvard Business Review*, 82(10), 76–84.
- Clark, R. (2004). Truth, lies and outsourcing. *Telecom Asia*, 15(4), 14–17.
- David, P. A. (1985). Clio and the economics of QWERTY. *American Economic Review*, 75(2), 556–561.
- Day, G. (1984). The capabilities of market-driven organizations. *Journal of Marketing*, 58(4), 34–37.
- De Wit, B., & Meyer, R. (2004). *Strategy: Process, content, context* (3rd ed.). Belmont: Thomson.

- Domisse, W. R., & Oosthuizen, H. (2004). Value chain deconstruction in the United Kingdom retail life insurance industry and resulting strategic options for new entrants to the market. *South African Journal of Business Management*, 35(4), 11–19.
- Foss, N. J., & Robertson, P. L. (Eds.). (2000). *Resources, technology and strategy: Explorations in the resource-based perspective*. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Grant, R. M. (2005). *Contemporary strategy analysis* (5th ed.). Hoboken: Blackwell Publishing.
- Hamel, G., & Prahalad, C. K. (1996). *Competing for the future*. Boston: Harvard Business School Press.
- Hill, C. W. L., & Jones, G. R. (2001). *Strategic management: An integrated approach* (5th ed.). Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company.
- Homkes, R., & Sull, D. (2016). Translating strategy into results. *London Business School Review*, 27(1), 34–37.
- Javidan, M. (1998). Core competence: What does it mean in practice? *Long Range Planning*, 31(1), 60–71.
- Kay, J. (1995). *Foundations of corporate success*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Kay, J. e. (2003). *The economics of business strategy*. Cheltenham: An Elgar Reference Collection.
- Leavy, B. (2003). Assessing your strategic alternatives from both a market position and core competences perspective. *Strategy & Leadership*, 31(6), 29–35.
- Levitt, T. (1960). Marketing myopia. *Harvard Business Review*, 38(4), 138–149.
- Lindgren, R., Henfridsson, O., & Schultze, U. (2004). Design principles for competence management systems: A synthesis of an action research study. *MIS Quarterly*, 28(3), 435–472.
- Miller, D., Eisenstat, R., & Foote, N. (2002). Strategy from the Inside-out: Building capability-creating Organizations. *California Management Review*, 44(3), 37–54.
- Mintzberg, H., Ahlstrand, B., & Lampel, J. (1998). *Strategy safari: A guided tour through the wilds of strategic management*. Upper Saddle River: Prentice Hall.
- Mishra, S. P., Mohanty, A. K., & Mohanty, B. (2015). Are there dominant approaches to strategy making? *Vilakshan: The XIMB Journal of Management*, 12(1), 1–42.
- Mo Koo, C., Koh, C. E., & Nam, K. (2004). An examination of Porter's competitive strategies in electronic virtual markets: A comparison of two on-line business models. *International Journal of Electronic Commerce*, 9(1), 163–180.
- Momčilović, O., Adžić, S., & Rajaković, J. (2013, September 12–15). *Inside-out strategy approach in theory and Praxis*. In 13th International Conference Research and Development in Mechanical Industry RaDMI 2013 (pp. 447–452). Kopaonik, Serbia: RaDMI.
- Porter, M. E. (1987). From competitive advantage to corporate strategy. *Harvard Business Review*, 65(3), 43–59.
- Porter, M. E. (1996). What is strategy? *Harvard Business Review*, 74(6), 61–78.
- Porter, M. E. (2004a). *Competitive advantage*. New York, NY: Free Press.
- Porter, M. E. (2004b). *Competitive strategy*. New York, NY: Free Press.
- Prahalad, C. K., & Ramaswamy, V. (2000). Co-opting customer competence. *Harvard Business Review*, 78(1), 79–87.
- Sack, A. L., & Nadim, A. (2002). Strategic choices in a turbulent environment: A case study of starter corporation. *Journal of Sport Management*, 16(1), 36–53.
- Sajfert, Z., Adžić, S., & Cvijanović, J. M. (2012). *Corporate leadership*. Zrenjanin: Tehnički fakultet Mihajlo Pupin Univerziteta u Novom Sadu.
- Samuel, B., & Venkataraman, S. (2004). Not walls, windows: Capturing value in the digital age. *Journal of Business Strategy*, 25(3), 15–25.
- Siaw, I., & Yu, A. (2004). An analysis of the impact of the Internet on competition in the Banking Industry, using Porter's Five Forces Model. *International Journal of Management*, 21(4), 514–523.
- Stalk, G., Evans, P., & Shulman, L. E. (1992). Competing on capabilities. *Harvard Business Review*, 70(2), 57–69.
- Thompson, A. A., & Strickland, A. J. (1992). *Strategic management: Concept and cases* (6th ed.). New York, NY: Irwin.

- Wonglimpiyarat, J. (2004). Amex's strategies for launching the smart card innovation. *Technovation*, 24(10), 773–777.
- Yong Kim, B., & Oh, H. (2004). How do hotel firms obtain a competitive advantage? *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 16(1), 65–71.
- Zakrzewska-Bielawska, A. (2019). Recognition of relational strategy content: Insight from the managers' view. *Eurasian Business Review*, 9(2), 193–211.