Macrothink Institute™

Journal of Management Research
ISSN 1941-899X
2015, Vol. 7, No. 4

Strategic Organizational Factors Evaluation Method

Rogério dos Santos Morais

Universidade Metodista Piracicaba, Rodovia do Açúcar

Piracicaba - SP, 13423-170, Brazil

Tel: 12-997-683-420 E-mail: rogeriosmorais@uol.com.br

Carlos Roberto Camello Lima

Universidade Metodista Piracicaba, Rodovia do Açúcar

Taquaral Piracicaba - SP, 13423-170, Brazil

Received: May 15, 2015 Accepted: July 9, 2015 Published: July 9, 2015

doi:10.5296/jmr.v7i4.7614 URL: http://dx.doi.org/10.5296/jmr.v7i4.7614

Abstract

Strategic success requires a sound, firm structure and an effective system with which to analyze the competition, suppliers, and consumers, including structured and non-structured data (or "Big Data").The more detailed the profiles of those players, the more useful the analyses will be to managers who ordinarily do not use a model to assess competition factors. This paper proposes a method of evaluating organizational strategic factors based on data concerning suppliers, consumers, and contenders in a strong competition sector. The methodology was based on a literature review, supplemented by a case study of the model's application to a telecommunication services provider. The results, detailed in tables, are proven to enable the quantitative measurement of the strategic factors needed to support decision making.

Keywords: Firm strategy, Model evaluation, Empirical analysis, Competition, Decision making

Introduction

The "competitive strategy" concept is not new, yet managers generally define "competition" narrowly rather than holistically, focusing on competitors (Singhet al., 2008). Competition involves more than traditional market opponents.

Kluyver and Pearce (2010) argue that six strategic factors must be evaluated to guarantee output reliability: i) international competition; ii) current and potential customers linked to market share; iii) market positioning; iv) concentration of activities; v)adoption of corporate strategies in the supply chain and technological innovation administration; and vi) market-independent factors such as social, political, and legal aspects.

The literature lists additional strategic factors, such as the business environment, business organization, and managers (Wang, 2009; Lee, 2012), business manager leadership (Wang, 2009),development of hi-tech innovation potential in products and processes(Camison & Villar-Lopes, 2014), competitive positioning(Hooley et al., 2011)and supply chain administration(Samuel, 2011).

The management of strategic forces has a direct link with business performance. Important strategic factors include the power, bargaining power, peer rivalry, the competitiveness of substitute products, positioning, supply chain management, and technological innovation (Kluyver &Pearce, 2010).

Employing a structured method of analysis that considers broader strategic factors has become essential (Singh et al., 2008). When a market analysis detects a shift in competitive strategic actions, the whole enterprise must be reassessed (Zaccarelli, 2012). A framework that includes quantitative factors can also be useful in identifying strategic priorities for managers (Morgan, 2012).

Singhet al.(2008) claim that few of the holistic approaches to analyses of the business sector provide strategic assessments for continuous improvement.

One of the major problems in evaluating strategic factors is the need of a measurement and evaluation method that can provide managers with the critical assistance required.

This paper proposes a method of assessing firms' strategic factors to support managers' decision making.

Literature review

Strategy concepts and competition

The vast strategy literature has been growing exponentially since around 1980. The discipline is generally thought to have begun in the mid-1960s, but the military strategy literature is much older; Sun Tzu wrote the *Art of War* in the fourth century BC (Mintzberg et al., 2010). However, the theme has greatly evolved over the past five decades (Zaccarelli, 2012).

Leading companies must nurture good management practices through strategic thinking in order to fight against shrinkage and acquire sustainable growth. A competitive strategy is a plan to win while competing differently from one's market opponents; it resolves strategic problems by using a creative process to find better ways to compete (Rajasekar & Raee, 2013).

To be competitive, a company must establish strategic actions for the local, regional, or global market. The wider the sphere of action, the greater must be the firm's ability to compete(Martins & Laugeni,2011) a mid competitors' strategic maneuvering dynamics. Competition can employ high financial reserves informing alliances to create even greater reserves and thereby increase a firm's power of intervention, handling, decision making, and action (Kluyver& Pearce, 2010). Strategic frequency, boldness, and aggressiveness can accelerate imbalances and change(D'Aveni, 2010).

The importance of analyzing a sector to develop strategies

The strategic analysis of a sector is fundamental. No organization should think that it is the only one in business or that its customers are unique. A pioneer may enjoy a period of competitive tranquility, but history shows that this will not last. Imitators will appear, especially if the sector is thriving. Even if competitors fail to gain a foothold in the market, they create a disturbance throughout the system, causing the need to both maintain old and develop new strategies (Costa, 2009).

An important part of a competitive analysis is precisely defining the limits of each competitor. The boundaries of an industry are composed of two dimensions: the scope of its goods or services and its geographical sphere of action. The defined limits of each competitor directly impact strategic analysis and underpins business strategies (Rajasekar &Raee, 2013).

A firm's competitive advantage consists of what it offers that competitors do not, such as client advantages or shareholder satisfaction (Ferrell, 2009). The pursuit of competitive advantage must necessarily follow an industry analysis during the development of the main and secondary strategies. Strengths and weaknesses significantly change over time, especially in increasingly competing environments, which can compromise the longevity of a competitive advantage (Sirmon et al., 2010). Firms must learn about the competition (Kotler &Armstrong, 2011) and continuously compare their products and marketing strategies, while identifying advantages and disadvantages.

The strategic logic line defines the structure–conduct–performance position according to which companies must adjust their strategies to suit their environment and thus achieve superior performance (Han et al.,2012).

Porter's "five forces" model

The nature of competitive interactions is shaped by five strategic factors: the menace of new competitors, the strength of customers' and suppliers' negotiations, the challenge of replacement products, and the competition offered by contenders (Porter, 2009). These external strategic factors determine competitive intensity and directly influence market attractiveness through the ability to generate profit(Lillis &Mike, 2013). These forces comprise the competitive environment that continuously reduces the rate of return on invested assets (Cecconello & Ajzental, 2008).

The five forces model illustrates the competitive factors that pressure prices, costs, investment rates, and other strategies required to compete in a sector (Rajasekar & Raee, 2013).

New incoming market threats

Degen (2009) claims that all apparently successful businesses attract new competitors. Businesses tend to lose profitability if there are no barriers to new competitors due to the increased competition. The lower the financial cost to market entry, the easier the new competitor' sentry(Porter, 2009).

Many large organizations have entered a sector and promoted a competitive revolution, leaving forerunners in a difficult position. Michael (2011) describes the case of Apple, which regained profitability in the 1990s with the return of Steve Jobs to the company and the implementation of a new strategic management model focused on the development of research and technology.

Markets that do not serve customers properly represent an invitation to new entrants, who will take advantage of the deficiency of the current players. However, the resulting growth in organizational complexity caused by the increase in the number of new entrants negatively impacts organizational performance (Caldart & Oliveira, 2010).

Clients' trading power

Strategic negotiation skills are becoming increasingly in dispensable to businesses. Bargaining power is a negotiator's ability to alter other peoples' results (Thompson, 2009).Porter's second force (2009) posits that customers can be more concentrated in their negotiations, have several purchase choices, and look for lower costs of switching suppliers.

Customers with bargaining power interfere with a firm's competitiveness. Customers tend to have more negotiating power in markets where there is little or no differentiation between vendors, where they are financially powerful, where they have more negotiating power than sellers do, where there are many competitors available to serve them, where costs are low, and where there are many sellers to switch to(Hooley et al.,2011).

Suppliers' trading power

Suppliers' trading power can interfere directly with a sector's competitiveness. A powerful supplier will charge its customers more or less depending on the current strategic intent (Warren&Shore, 2007).

The level of competition among suppliers also interferes in the business relationship between buyer and supplier. Suppliers in an industry with weak competition tend to have greater bargaining power than their buyers (Han et al., 2012). Strategic customers of powerful suppliers will be well-positioned, while weaker and less strategic customers will have their profit margins squeezed. Providers charge a sector's weakest clients higher prices by transferring costs (Porter, 2009).

Threats from substitute products and/or services

Substitute products can replace existing ones by holding the same value for customers and offering some better purchase conditions (Cecconello & Ajzental, 2008).A sector's competitive level may increase if new entrants use already committed technology or if they improve existing products(Hooley et al.,2011).

A sector's profitability suffers when the threat of substitutes is high because the higher the competition, the greater the pressure on prices(Porter,2009).

Rivalry among current competitors

Porter's fifth force theory posits that industry competitors will struggle to sustain and improve their market share, profitability, and image. This rivalry limits the profitability of an industry (Rajasekar & Raee, 2013).

Firms cannot survive amid this intense competition unless they develop differentiated cost-reduction strategies, improve quality, and increase productivity. The challenge is managing compensation, as low-cost strategies usually negatively affect quality and/or production (Elgazzar et al., 2012).

When the rivalry among competitors is balanced in terms of size and/or market share, the competitive level is more intense (Hooley et al., 2011). Economic conditions can also profoundly affect strategic management; during periods of low economic growth, for example, competitiveness may intensify(Ferrell, 2009).

International product management rivalry

Fierce global competition has forced companies to rethink their strategies—for instance, whether it is more strategically sound to manufacture a certain product domestically or import it (Martins & Laugeni, 2011).Companies focus on marketing products abroad for many reasons: to a) pursue growth opportunities; b) obtain higher profit margins; c) acquire ideas about products, services, and ways of working; d) better serve strategic customers; e) stay closer to the sources of supply; f) obtain production information; g) develop economies of scale in procurement, production, and marketing; h) deal with international competition; or i)invest in relationships. Companies generally seek foreign markets to increase their business and profits (Cavusgil et al., 2010).

Virtually all companies are affected by globalization. The maturity of most Western markets has forced the international expansion of business (Cavusgil et al., 2010). In the global economy, all companies can become more competitive and productive through strategic and sophisticated investments in modern technologies (Greckhamer, 2010).

The success of a company is directly related to its ability to meet and even exceed customer expectations for products and services. However, customers have different needs, and companies vie to fulfill them—hence the importance of planning for the best strategic positioning (Martins & Laugeni, 2011).

The strategic positioning of the product, brand, and/or company is extremely important because it is crucial to properly choose the operational segment, select the method of creating differentiated value in the target segment, and define the placement to be occupied. These issues are driven by the fact that consumers are motivated by the subjective value of a product or service (Kotler &Armstrong, 2011).

The global market's fierce competition, the appearance of products and services with short life cycles, and higher customer expectations are forcing organizations in the production sector to invest in and focus on supply chain administration, demanding an approach to cost reduction and service enhancement consistent with organizational goals (Simchi-Levi et al., 2010).

Several companies have won competitive advantage or solved complicated problems because they knew how to manage their supply chain strategically (Barnes &Liao,2012). Supply chain management is the new business frontier.

Technology management is attracting increasing attention from academia and industry; its importance has turned it into a self-sustaining discipline (Cetindamara et al., 2009).

The management of technological innovation concerns a group of operations that enable a company to choose, acquire, and trade new products at tuned to organizational goals, enhancing competitiveness, profitability, and long-term growth (Linda et al. 2011).

Innovation scholars such as Hitt et al. (2001), Hoskisson et al. (1999), and Priem et al. (2012) have debated whether technological innovations are driven by technological advances or by strategic management intended to differentiate firms from competitors and improve market demand; technological innovation is important in both scenarios.

Di Stefano et al. (2012) highlight the importance of entrepreneurship in the management of technological innovation, noting that innovation and entrepreneurship are often developed in different fields. However, entrepreneurship and innovation are closely linked.

To support decision making, companies are investing in data warehouses (DWs) to deal with big data. A DW can organize data to obtain subsidies to aid the administration of decision requirements (Chen et al., 2000; March & Hevner, 2007).

Alhyasat & Al-Dalahmeh (2013) propose a framework for examining information system (IS) measures. Their research highlights the relevance of IS factors in evaluating the success of a DW project. Their framework reflects the importance to companies of properly managing data assets when adopting an evaluation method based on strategic organizational factors.

Supporting decision-making models that use huge volumes of data, cloud computing is a tool for storing information that can shelter outsourced or integrated outsourcing information technology (IT) projects to produce accurate strategic organizational factor analysis.

Gholami (2011) examines several risk factor categories for the outsourcing of IT projects. The identified critical risk factors "lead to undesirable outcomes such as the enhanced cost of services, costly contractual changes, disputes and litigation, unexpected transition and management expenditure, and loss of company competencies."

Since evaluating strategic organizational factors depends on an improved IT project serving as internal or outsourced support, the risks must be well-scored.

Methodology

This paper used a literature review and exploratory field research to analyze competitors' strategies and create a method of quantifying them. Using the classic literature was fundamental to an understanding of the appropriate strategies and quantification methodology. The exploratory research was intended to advance the knowledge of and create ananalytical model for competitive strategies. A primary quantitative method was developed to identify each strategic factor and thus support the decisions of strategic management.

The notion of the "quality of the methodology of a business" as posited by Zaccarelli (2012) was used as a reference for the creation and development of this study's proposal. This methodology, similar to the notion of "competitive forces" in Porter (2009), involves a qualitative and representative analysis of the particularities of a given time point, using a scale from 1 ("very easy") to 5 ("very difficult").

Our analysis includes four other strategic factors mentioned in Kluyver and Pearce (2010):i) international competition; ii) market positioning; iii) the adoption of corporate strategies for the supply chain; and iv)technological innovations. These, along with the abovementioned factors, are essential to the effective development of an industry analysis.

This paper discusses existing strategies and creates an evaluation method based on classics of the discipline, a survey of which is fundamental to an understanding of the proposed strategy and its design methodology.

This research was developed with three corporate-level business managers, each with more than four years of experience in the strategic management of Oi,a Brazilian telecommunication services provider.

Discussion and findings

Drawing from classical texts and to facilitate an understanding of the literature review's results, Table 1summarizes the ma in strategies described by each author, organized by topic and year of publication.

Table 1. Key strategic factors cited by authors

	Strategy	Author(s)	Overview	Year
01	Entry barrier	Porter Zaccarelli	The higher the input difficulty in a business, the less the competition.	2009 2012
02	Output power	Porter Zaccarelli	The ease of sales indicates that the business and its products are good, as many people want to buy them.	2009 2012
03	Bargaining power of suppliers	Porter Zaccarelli	The stronger the supplier's power, the fewer will be the special conditions of the purchasing company.	2009 2012
04	Customer bargaining power	Porter Zaccarelli	The stronger the customers' bargaining power, the worse for business, as they can impose their purchase price.	2009 2012
05	Rivalry among the same products	Porter Zaccarelli	The greater the number of similar products competing in the same market, the higher the competition.	2009 2012
06	Rivalry among substitute products	Porter Zaccarelli	The greater the number of substitute products, the greater the competition.	2009 2012
07	Rivalry among international products	D'Aveni	The stronger the international competition, the higher the competitiveness.	2010
08	Market positioning	Mintzberg et al. Hooley et al.	The better positioning of the product, the less competitive in that position.	2011
09	Management of the supply chain	Bowersox et al.; Samuel	The better the management strategy for the supply chain, the higher the competitiveness.	2007 2011
10	Technological innovation	D'Aveni	The higher the technological innovation capacity, the higher the profitability.	2011

Source: Author, 2014.

Preliminary measurement method of each strategic factor

The proposed method of assessing strategic factors is intended as a tool for achieving greater precision concerning the value of each competitive factor. The scores range from 1to 5 and are used to evaluate aspects relating to the final median composition for each competitive factor.

This guide will help managers quantify the composition of each strategic factor, the values of which will depend on field research.

A valueof1 means that the strategic factor has little intensity or may even reflect a strategic vulnerability for the business. A value of 5 means that it is a strong factor. A value of 3 means that the factor neither benefits nor harms the organization's competitiveness.

Table 2 illustrates the method of evaluating the competitive entry barrier strategic factor.

Table 2. Quantification of entrance barrier factor

	Related terms	Detailed description of every aspect linked to strategic factor	Quantification (1 to 5)
1	Investment	The greater the investment, the greater the difficulty of new competitors, the higher the score.	
2	Strong brand	Acquiring renowned brand facilitates the entry of new competitors. The larger the user, the lower the score.	
3	Bureaucratic rulesfor entry into business	The easier the solution to the bureaucracy, the greater the ease of entry of new competitors. The more bureaucratic the business, the higher the score.	
4	Switching supplier	The easier it is to change suppliers, the lower the score.	
5	Specific aspects	The more peculiar aspects there are that make it difficult to enter the business, the higher the score.	
		End result: average	

Source: Based on Porter (2009) and Zaccarelli (2012).

Table 3 shows the method of evaluating the competitive output barrier strategic factor

Table 3. Quantification of exit barrier factor

	Related terms	Detailed description of every aspect linked to strategic factor	Quantification (1 to 5)
1	Number of competitors	A high number of competitors in a sector may hinder sales. The lower the competition in the industry, the higher the score.	
2	Investment recovery time	The easier the recovery of investments, the higher the score.	
3	Financial difficulties in company closure	The lower the difficulty of assuming costs, the higher the score.	
4	Legal and social restrictions on company closure	The fewer restrictions, the higher the score.	
5	Emotional aspects of owner	Emotional aspects of owner during company closure. The greater the emotional aspects, the higher the score.	
		End result: average	

Journal of Management Research
ISSN 1941-899X
2015, Vol. 7, No. 4

Source: Based on Porter (2009) and Zaccarelli(2012).

Table 4 shows the measurement of the market positioning strategic competitive factor.

Table 4. Quantification of market positioning factor

	Related terms	**Detailed description of every aspect linked to strategic factor**	**Quantification (1 to 5)**
1	Large number of competitors in the same position	The greater the number of competitors in the same position, the lower the score.	
2	Best current position in relation to competitors	The score should be higher.	
3	High potential to meet positioning	The score should be higher.	
4	Low number of competitors	The fewer the competitors in the same position, the higher the profit margins. The score should be higher.	
5	Growth market	Growth helps assert this position. The highest score.	
6	Protected technological leadership	If leadership is protected, the score is high.	
		End result: average	

Source: Based on Hooley et al.(2011).

Table 5 presents the measurement of the customer power in business strategic competitive factor.

Journal of Management Research
ISSN 1941-899X
2015, Vol. 7, No. 4

Table 5. Quantification of customers' trading power factor

	Related terms	Aspects related to the composition of customers' bargaining power factor	Quantification (1 to 5)
1	Customer choice options	The fewer the companies, the lower the customer's negotiating power because of lack of options. The fewer the customers' options, the higher the score.	
2	Companies with short deadlines for negotiation	Companies' products have short trading time frames or can not be stored, and the corporation is in the position to negotiate quickly, which is bad for the business. The more the company can negotiate quickly, the lower the score.	
3	Low purchasing power of client	The entrepreneur is in a good situation if the customer's power is weak in relation to the selling company. The customer cannot afford to impose terms. The weaker the customer's power, the higher the score.	
4	Customer's bluff possibility due to competition	Strong competition can facilitate customer bluffing in negotiations. The more likely customer bluffing is, the lower the score.	
5	Client costs renegotiation	The higher the client costs renegotiating, the worse for business. The higher the customer costs of renegotiating, the lower the score.	
		End result: average	

Source: Based on Porter (2009) andZaccarelli(2012).

Table 6 shows the method of evaluating the competitive rivalry strategic factor among equals in the market.

Table 6. Quantification of rivalry factor

	Related terms	**Aspects related to the current rivalry factor**	**Quantification (1 to 5)**
1	Balance in competition	The more balanced the competitors, the greater the competition and the less attractive the business. The more balanced the competition, the lower the score.	
2	Stagnant market	Stagnant markets and slow growth tend to produce more competition. The higher the stagnation or the slower the growth, the lower the score.	
3	Overhead costs	High fixed costs in relation to net income signal increased competition in the sector. The higher the costs of profits, the lower the score.	
4	Differentiation	Little differentiation between competitors increases competition. The smaller the differentiation, the lower the score.	
5	Company idleness	The higher the idle capacity of enterprises, the larger the demand, the greater the rivalry and thus the greater the competition. The higher the idleness, the lower the score.	
		End result: average	

Source: Based on Hooley et al. (2011) e Zaccarelli (2012).

Table 7 illustrates the measurement of the rivalry with international products strategic competitive factor.

Table7. Quantification of rivalry among international products factor

	Related terms	Aspects related to the rivalry with international products factor	Quantification (1 to 5)
1	Natural and technological resources	Natural and technological resources are factors for development. If the features and enhancements are unique, the higher the score.	
2	Delivery time	The longer the delivery time for international rivals' products, the higher the score.	
3	Relationships with channels and representatives	Success in international transactions is dependent on strong relationships with distribution channels and sales representatives. The better those relationships, the higher the score.	
4	Number of competitors	The more international rivals there are, the more complicated the achievement of goals. The greater the number of competing international products, the lower the score.	
5	Tax regulations	Tax regulations can hinder negotiations. The more difficult the adjustment for the industry, the lower the score.	
6	Guarantees	The greater the supply guarantees and development of rivals' international products, the lower the score.	
		End result: average	

Source: Based on Cavusgil et al. (2010) and Hooley et al. (2011).

Table 8shows the measurement of the supplier's bargaining power strategic competitive factor.

Table 8. Quantification of Suppliers' Bargaining Power Factor

	Related terms	Aspects related to the supplier's bargaining power factor	Quantification (1 to 5)
1	Many suppliers and few buyers	The fewer the vendors offering similar conditions to a small number of competing buyers, the higher the score.	
2	Payment term supplier	If suppliers' payment terms are short and make it hard to close the deal, the firm's negotiation power will be low. The lower the company's power, the lower the score.	
3	Delivery time supplier	The more the supplier sells to its rivals and has short-term delivery, the lower the score.	
4	Enterprise power	If the company's purchasing power is large in relation to the supplier, the company will be in a better trading position. The greater the company's power, the higher the score.	
5	Transaction costs	The higher the costs of the negotiation, the greater the effort needed to gain advantage over suppliers. The greater the cost, the lower the score.	
6	Partnership supplier	Does the company have partnerships with strategic suppliers, giving it privileges relative to competitors? The greater the company's privileges in partnerships with strategic suppliers, the higher the score.	
7	Bluffs in trading	The more the company is likely to bluff in negotiations, the higher the score.	
		End result: average	

Source: Based on Kluyver and Pearce (2010);Porter (2009); Zaccarelli (2012).

Table 9 shows the method of evaluating the supply chain management in relation to competitors competitive strategic factor.

Table 9. Quantification of supply chain management factor

	Related terms	Aspects related to the management of the supply chain factor	Quantification (1 to 5)
1	Inventory costs	The lower the inventory costs relative to competitors, the better the contribution margin. The lower the costs of stock, the higher the score.	
2	Suppliers' delivery time	The shorter the delivery time from suppliers and the exact amount needed by the company in relation to its competitors, the higher the score.	
3	Transportation costs	Transport costs can provide a competitive edge over competitors. The lower these costs, the higher the score.	
4	Management of transportation	The higher the efficiency of transport management relative to competitors, the higher the score.	
5	Customer satisfaction	How are customers satisfied with your company's products compared to your competitors? The higher the customer satisfaction with your company, the higher the score.	
		End result: average	

Source: Based on Calixto et al. (2011); Hooley et al. (2011); Kluyver and Pearce(2010).

Table 10 shows the measurement of the technological innovations management relative to competitors strategic competitive factor.

Table 10. Quantification of technology innovation factor

	Related terms	Aspects related to technological innovation factor	Quantification (1 to 5)
1	Development time	The shorter the time needed to develop and market new products relative to the competition, the higher the score.	
2	Frequency of new product launches	Frequency in product launches may contain the competition and create or maintain market leadership. The higher the frequency, the higher the score.	
3	Innovation cost	The costs of innovation should be lower than those of competitors. If cost is reduced, the score increases.	
4	Risk	The higher the risk to the business, the lower the ability of the entrepreneur. The lower the risk, the higher the score.	
5	Innovation programs	Development and innovation should be planned and supported by top management. The better development and innovation are structured relative to competitors, the higher the score.	
6	Developing for market	If more the company develops what the market wants better than the competitors, the higher the score.	
7	Relationship between strategy and engineering	The better the relationship between engineering innovation and the strategic sector of the organization, the higher the score.	
		End result: average	

Source: Based on Porter(2009); Hooley et al. (2011); Kotler and Armstrong (2011).

Table 11 shows the measurement of the number of substitute products interfering with the competitive level.

Journal of Management Research
ISSN 1941-899X
2015, Vol. 7, No. 4

Table 11. Quantification of substitute product factor

	Related terms	**Aspects related to competition from substitute products**	**Quantification (1 to 5)**
1	The price	The price of the rival's replacement product is more strategic than the main product of the company. The more attractive the price of the replacement product, the lower the score.	
2	Benefits	The more attractive are the benefits offered with the substitute product by the competition, the lower the score.	
3	Customer acceptance	The higher the customer acceptance of the costs of the replacement product, the lower the score.	
4	Reliability	The higher there liability and replacement of the competing product's functionality, the lower the score.	
5	Customer satisfaction	The lower the customer satisfaction with the replacement of the competing product, the higher the score.	
		End result: average	

Source: Based on Porter (2009) and Zaccarelli (2012).

The data obtained and compiled from the field research provide the scores by which administrative priorities may be established.

Overview

Table 12 shows an overview of the preliminary tables with each strategic factor of the telecommunications operator Oi.

Table 12. Summary of the results of each factor

N	**Strategic factors**	**Oi**
1	Entry barrier	4
2	Exit barrier	2
3	Market positioning	4
4	Customer purchasing power	4
5	Rivalry of equals	2
6	Rivalry of international products	3
7	Power supplier	4
8	Supply chain management	4
9	Technological innovation	4
10	Substitute products	3
Median result		3

The dangers and opportunities for Oi based on the research are listed below:

a) Entry barrier shows a good result(4). Thus, barriers to entry should be strengthened because this would reduce the competitive set prices and optimize competitive advantage.

b) Output barrier has a poor result (2). The results show that employers have difficulty exiting or selling their businesses, but managers said that mergers are inevitable because operator revenues are falling.

c) Market positioning has a good result (4).Good positioning helps attract investment and business and should be strengthened to optimize competitive advantage.

d) The power of customers shows a good result (4). Customers can use their bargaining power to pull down the prices of entrepreneurs' products and play competitors against each other.

e) Product rivalry has an average result (2). This is a cause for concern, as the high number of identical and competing products affects profitability.

f) The rivalry of international products has an average result (3), which should concern entrepreneurs.

g) The power of suppliers has a good result (4). Powerful suppliers can squeeze profitability, which firms may not be able to recover through costs or prices.

h) Management of the supply chain has a good result (4).Supply chain management has taken a leading position in the organizational strategic landscape.

i) Technological innovation has a good result (4).The telecommunications sector requires investment in network technology, which can be a competitive advantage.

j) Replacement products has an average result (3). Polls showed many substitute products competing for success. This is a cause for concern because the presence of many substitutes limits the estimated return of an organization by limiting price levels.

Conclusion

The literature review produced a method of evaluating strategic organizational factors; accurately scaling each factor should allow managers to assess their business.

Few managers employ evaluation techniques, though their importance and efficiency are well-known, as seen above. A diligent, organized, and methodical assessment of an environment, including the organization and its weaknesses and strengths, is crucial to success. A detailed profile of competitors, the market, and consumers based on structured and non-structured data is required, along with a big data analysis, for managerial decision making.

Regular use of this strategic factor assessment tool will offer entrepreneurs important insights that will help them understand how industry is evolving relative to the strategic moves of competitors and systemic changes in the environment. The tool also enables entrepreneurs to measure the intensity of each strategic factor and thus plan strategically.

This study advances the knowledge of strategic analysis across diverse sectors by quantifying the most compelling decisions entrepreneurs must make and assisting them in developing strategic actions.

The field research shows that Oi's level of competitiveness, attractiveness, and relative ability to generate profits in the telecommunications industry is average, as indicated by the strategic factors considered most significant.

The key strategic factors for telecom operators are entry barriers and threats from new competitors. Operating in this sector is not easy, and heavy investment is required to stay competitive.

Limitations and future research

The main limitation of this study is that its model is applied to a single company. A wider application would provide clearer results. As more managers begin to use the model, it will become possible to improve it and obtain useful feedback on its performance. The observed need to quantify the predominant strategic factors and the competitive level through a framework proved crucial to managers.

Further experimental research is needed to determine the effectiveness of the tables' results and produce a relevant organizational strategic factor evaluation method to promote competitiveness and success.

Further research with a quantitative focus could transfer the measurements of the frames of each strategic factor into a single tool that quantifies the intensity of the level of competitiveness and business attractiveness.

Future studies could also develop analytical frameworks for the strategic factors that determine the competitive level of a sector to support SWOT analyses in strategic organizational planning; this would facilitate and advance the analysis of firms' strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats.

Managers of organizations can use the analytical frameworks of strategic factors to see where these factors can be best exploited, offensive and defensively, as well as where weaknesses leave them vulnerable to the actions of competitors.

Future research can take advantage of the proposed method, as it can be applied to companies with special knowledge of competitors, including in the big data analyses that are so crucial in this "information age."

References

Alhyasat, E.B., & Al-Dalahmeh, M. (2013). Data warehouse success and strategic oriented business intelligence: a theoretical framework. *Journal of Management Research, 5*(3), 169-184. http://dx.doi.org/10.5296/jmr.v5i3.3703

Barnes, J., & Liao, Y. (2012). The effect of individual, network, and collaborative competencies on the supply chain management system. *International Journal of Production Economics, 140*(2), 888-899. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.ijpe.2012.07.010

Bowersox, D. J., Closs, D. J., & Cooper, M. B. (2007).*Supply chain and logistics management*. Rio de Janeiro: Elsevier

Caldart, A. A., & Oliveira F. (2010).Analyzing industry profitability: a complexity as causes perspective. *European Management Journal, 28*(2), 95-107. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.emj.2009.04.004

Calixto, F., Formigoni, A., & Stettiner, C. F. (2011).*Logistics: a practical approach*. São Paulo: Saraiva.

Camison, C., & Villar-Lopes, A. (2014). Organizational innovation as an enabler of technological innovation capabilities and firm performance. *Journal of Business Research, 67*(1), 2891-2902. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2012.

Cavusgil, S. T., Knight, G., & Riesenberg, J. R. (2010).*International business: strategy, management and new realities*. São Paulo: Pearson.

Cecconello, A. R., & Ajzental, A. (2008).*The business plan of construction*. São Paulo: Saraiva.

Cetindamara, D., Waste, S. N., Andale, H., & Behan, B. (2009).Does technology management research diverge or converge in developing and developed countries? *Technovation, 29*(1), 45-58. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.technovation.2008.04.002

Costa, E. A. (2009).*Strategy and competitive dynamics*. São Paulo: Saraiva.

D'Aveni, R.A. (2010). The age of temporary advantage. Strategic Management Journal. *31*(13), 1371-85. http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/smj.897

Degen, R. J. (2009).*The entrepreneur: take as a career option*. São Paulo: Pearson.

Di Stefano, G., Gambardella, A., & Verona, G. (2012).Technology push and demand pull perspectives in innovation studies: Current findings and future research directions. *Research Policy, 41*(8), 1283-95. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.respol.2012.03.021

Elgazzar, S. H., Tipi, N. S., Hubbard, N. J., & Leach, D. J. (2012). Linking supply chain processes performance to a company's financial strategic objectives. *European Journal of Operational Research, 223*(1), 276-89. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.ejor.2012.05.043

Ferrell, O. C. (2009).*Marketing strategy*. São Paulo: Cengage.

Greckhamer, T. (2010).The stretch of strategic management discourse: a critical analysis. *Organization Studies, 31*(7), 841-871. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0170840610373196

Gholami, S. (2012). Critical risk factors in outsourced support projects of IT. *Journal of Management Research, 4*(E5), 1-13. http://dx.doi:10.5296/jmr.v4i1.939

Han, C., Portinfiel, T., & Li, X. (2012). Impact of industry competition on contract manufacturing: an empirical study of U. S. manufacturers. *International Journal of Economics, 138*(1), 159-69. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.ijpe.2012.03.015

Hitt, M., Bierman, L., Shimizu, K., & Kochhar, R (2001) Direct and moderating effects of human capital on strategy and performance in professional service firms: a resource-based perspective. *Academy of Management Journal, 44*, 13-28. http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/3069334

Hoskisson, R., Hitt, M., Wan, W., & Yiu, D. (1999). Theory and research in strategic management:swings of a pendulum, *Journal of Management, 25*(3), 417-56.http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/014920639902500307

Hooley, G., Piercy, N., & Nicouland, B.(2011).*Marketing strategy and competitive positioning*. São Paulo: Pearson.

Kotler, P., & Armstrong, G. (2011).*Princípios de marketing*. São Paulo: Pearson.

Kluyver, C. A., &Pearce, J. A. (2010).*Strategy: an executive view*. (3rd ed.). São Paulo: Pearson, 2006.

Lee, H. (2012). An analytic network process approach to operationalization of five forces model. *Applied Mathematical Modelling, 36*(4), 1783-1795. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.apm.2011.09.012

Linda, K., Abbie, G., JannE. H., & Lauche, K. (2011).Exploring portfolio decision-making processes. *Journal of Product Innovation Management, 28*(5), 641-661. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-5885.2011.00832.x

Lillis, B., & Mike, S (2013). Managing the fit between the views of competitive strategy and the strategic role of service operations. *European Management Journal, 31*, 564-590. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.emj.2012.10.001

Martins, P.G., & Laugeni, F.P.(2011).*Production management and operations*. São Paulo: Saraiva.

Michael, M. (2011). *The fascinating empire Steve Jobs* (2nd ed.). São Paulo: Universo dos Livros.

Mintzberg, H., Ahlstrand, B., & Lampel, J. (2010).*Strategy safari* (2nd ed.). Porto Alegre: Bookman.

Morgan, Neil.(2012). Marketing and business performance. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science, 40*(1), 102 -119. http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s11747-011-0279-9

Porter, M. E. (2009).*Competition: on competition*. Rio de Janeiro: Elsevier.

Priem, R.L., Li, S., Carr, J.C. (2012).Insights and new directions from demand-side approaches to technology innovation, entrepreneurship, and strategic management research. *Journal of Management, 38*(1), 346-74. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0149206311429614

Rajasekar, J., & Raee, M.A. (2013).An analysis of the telecommunication industry in the sultanate of man using Michael porter's competitive strategy model. *Competitiveness Review Business Journal*, *23*(3), 234-259. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0149206311429614

Samuel, K.E. (2011). Knowledge management in supply chain: an empirical study from France. *Journal of Strategic Information Systems, 20*(3),283-306. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jsis.2010.11.001

Singh, R.K., Garg, S.K., Deshmukh, S.G. (2008). Strategy development by SMEs for competitiveness: A review. *Benchmarking: An International Journal, 15*, 525-547. http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/14635770810903132

Sirmon, D.G., Hitt, M., Areegle, J-L., & Tochman, J.(2010). The dynamic interplay of capability strengths and weaknesses: investigating the bases of temporary competitive advantage. *Strategic Management Journal, 31*, 1386-409. http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/smj.893

Simchi-Levi, D., Kaminski, P., & Simchi-Levi, E. (2010).*Supply chain design and management: concepts, strategies and case studies*. Porto Alegre: Bookman.

Thompson, L. L. (2009). The negotiator. São Paulo: Pearson, 359.

Wang, W. (2009). Entrepreneurship and strategy in China: why "Porter's five forces" may not be. *Journal of Chinese Entrepreneurship, 1*(1), 53-64. http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/17561390910916886

Warren, B., & Shore B. (2007). Competitive analysis of enterprise integration strategies. Industrial *Management & Data Systems, 107*(7), 925-935. http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/02635570710816676

Zaccarelli, S. B. (2012).*Strategy and success in business* (2nd Ed). São Paulo: Saraiva.