Zakariya Journal of Social Sciences (ZJSS)

Volume 3, Number 1, 2024, Pages 48 – 58

Journal Home Page

https://journals.airsd.org/index.php/zjss

Competitive Action Advantage Strategy in Dynamic Rivalry Businesses

Muhammad Zohaib

MS Scholar, Department of Business Administration, Institute of Southern Punjab, Multan
Email: muhammadzohaib7481@gmail.com

ARTICLE INFO

Article History:

Received:	May	02, 2024
Revised:	May	25, 2024
Accepted:	June	04,2024
Available Online:	June	30,2024

Keywords:
Rivalry, Extra Advantage, Competition, Competitive Business, Range, Policy

JEL Code:
L13, L14, M10, D21

ABSTRACT

In businesses that compete with one another, having a competitive advantage always has extra benefits. The purpose of the strategic management studies in competitive dynamics is to regulate and address the issue of how particular organizations are adapted to the operational strategies and take on the special and distinctive ways to maintain their market leadership positions in the competing businesses. Researchers have established a theoretical framework that explains how a firm's sustainable competitiveness can be explained by the competitive range, ranging from individual action-response pairs to the full range of competitive activities. Competitive types, such as 1. in the direction of internal factors, 2. in the direction of outside forces, 3-horizontal relationship in the third direction, 4-in the direction of an upward relationship, 5. in the direction of rivalry relationships, & 6-in the direction of collaboration, are what give businesses direction and speed. Competitive range is all about figuring out how to stage strategic processes. Additionally, it is moulded by the interaction of several competitive acts taken by the attacking company, maybe interspersed with one or more aggressive retorts from competitors. Companies use strategic planning to compete at these levels. 1. preparing a disruptive vision; 2. organizing resources; and 3. developing descriptive strategies. Findings: In the overexcited small enterprises, the competitive range can be one of the potential action-based constructions that may be able to obtain a more profound knowledge with the sustaining rivalry and competitive benefit. This study uncovered the real-world situation in which a competitive company can thrive in the rivalry inside a group of competing companies.

Corresponding Author's Email: muhammadzohaib7481@gmail.com

INTRODUCTION

One of the first questions in the competitive business world is: How do certain companies benefit from their sustainable advantages while others do not? Compounding effects on a firm's strategic competitiveness include a well-thought-out business structure, vigilant personnel, speedy implementation of strategies, a trusted name, and persistent technological innovation are examples of well-planned strategic formulation. On the reverse side, certain businesses just so happen to be in the right place at the right time in the right environment. As time goes on, a variety of industries and businesses explain the organizational traits that help some businesses position themselves and explain why some businesses succeed in a cutthroat market. We haven't yet addressed the topic of how businesses develop long-term modest compensations. A number of studies on planned organization in the context of modest underlying forces are presented in order to address the issue of exactly how convinced companies come up with winning plans and maintain their market positions. Numerous scholars have examined the concept of competitive range, encompassing both individual action-response dyads and the full spectrum of competitive activities. Based on their findings, a theoretical framework explaining how competitive range contributes to a firm's sustained competitiveness has been constructed. Competitive range, which comprises a variety of market decision processes like pricing adjustments, product or service line modifications, and adjustments to the scope of corporate operations, can be thought of as a company's policy 'play book' (Miller & Chen, 1996). Stated differently, the competitive range encompasses the arrangements of modest behavior that engage with the sector environment and with the responses and activities of rivals. Organizations create their own competitive range that fits into the several contexts among the stages of repeated simplicity (stable context) and spontaneous complexity (unstable context).

Historical Views about Competitive Advantage

Organizational information processing model used in the historical viewpoint to elucidate the kinds of activities a corporation is retorting to in addition its aptitudes. They aid in understanding how sources of competitive range are internally conveyed inside organizational forms and elucidate how modest activities and rejoinders stay generated, processed, and transferred. Competitive intelligence data is systematically processed for strategic actions, starting with information gathering, moving through information analysis, and ending with decision-making. The competitive range and its effective relationship to the business's competitive gain, however, are not explained by the information procession model. According to Porter (1980), industrial organization economics holds that industry structure is the primary factor influencing a company's competitive improvement and subsequent success (Asghar et al., 2023). Although Porter's framework contributes to the expansion of knowledge in the ground of tactical managing, it falls short in terms of providing direction for following plans and initiatives concerning the selected industry (Grimm & Smith, 1997). Businesses must continuously update and reevaluate their strategic positions and directions in the current business climate (Asghar et al., 2024; Khan et al., 2024).

We must take into account the assets and activities of particular companies in order to comprehend such performance variances within an industry (Grimm & Smith, 1997). Game theory describes the competitive structure at the firm level in a static environment. Chen and MacMillan (1992) elucidate how competitive instability and blind spots affect delays in procedures and leading to competitive gain. They reach this by investigating how adversary relying and action immutability affect the capacity of a business to respond to competitive manoeuvres using a model of game analysis. Game theory is still not able to completely widen the area of competitive interactions research given that rivals might recognize each fighting move as a message and adapt to it at various rates.

Conceptual Overview of Competitive Advantage

Several reputable scholars have examined the sequence of activities and reactions among involved parties, and they contend that businesses should consider the possibility, nature, and speed of rivals' reactions. Competitive activities refer to specific movements a corporation takes to strengthen or defend its relative competitive position, either internally or externally directed (Chen & MacMillan, 1992; Smith, Grimm, & Gannon, 1992; Chen & Hambrick, 1995; Ferrier, Smith, & Grimm, 1999; Grimm & Smith, 1997). According to Jacobson (1992), a competitive exploit is some recently created marketplace built strategy which upsets the established order within the market mechanism; the established order be situated characterized by way of regular, typical, then consistent competitive behavior (Nelson and Winter, 1982). Accordingly, the Austrian understanding of rivalry as novel, exceptional competitive behavior is to be embodied in a newly formed competitive action (Ferrier, Smith & Grimm, 1999). Comparably, a rejoinder, also known as reprisal, is a deliberate reprisal that a business does in response to an attack by a rival in order to maintain or increase its market share or profit margin (Chen, 1996).

They contend that while early movers may secure the biggest shares of the market's initial sales volume, their market share and sales growth will be in jeopardy if they are ill-prepared to take prompt corrective action when necessary (Lieberman & Montgomery, 1998). The key elements of a firm's long-term performance are a sequence of strategic actions that are timely, effective, and balanced. However, how can we determine when to take an aggressive stance and when to retreat in a defensive one? In order to outperform competitors and achieve long-term sustainable performance, enterprises must determine the scope and direction of their competitive actions, as defined by Miller & Chen (1994) as a spectrum of competitive actions. Grimm & Smith (1997) distinguished between four categories of competitive actions: co-optive, deterrent, entrepreneurial, and Ricardian. Effective use of company resources and a precise comprehension of market analysis are the foundations of entrepreneurial activity. Since entrepreneurial activities entail "new combinations," creativity and first-mover advantages are frequently involved (Grimm & Smith, 1997). Resource-poor enterprises can avoid head-to-head competition by acting entrepreneurially when others are either unsure of the rewards or unaware that the activity has taken place. These result from rivals' knowledge asymmetries, which, when balanced, provide an action that is easily and swiftly mimicked. New product or service introductions, efficiency gains for existing products or services, geographic or segment transfers, and supply shortfall responses are examples of entrepreneurial activities (Grimm & Smith, 1997).

Definitions of Competitive Range

In theory, businesses can choose from any of the four competitive acts or combinations of two or more. However, it is challenging to watch how businesses decide internally about the variety and quantity of competitive actions. A plausible hypothesis put out by Nelson & Winter (1982) is that organizations learn by acting and evaluating the efficacy of their activities because they recall by doing. Actions that are profitable and successful in delaying the opponent's response become routine and reinforced within a company's exploit range. According to Grimm and Smith (1997), ineffective engagements prompt additional action experiments, which help to clarify the connection between various action kinds and business performance. According to Miller & Chen (1996), a competitive range be situated a collection of flea market strategies employed via a company over a specific time period to draw in, satisfy, and retain clients and other market participants. According to D'Aveni

(1994), range be situated the whole of company's unique resources in an environment that is constantly changing.

In addition, he defines range for instance the application of successive besides simultaneous planned drives aimed at particular possibilities trendy a changing setting. Competitive range, to put it simply, can be defined as a set of market-driven, modulated strategic choices including shifting prices, offering different products or services, or expanding the possibility of maneuvers (Chen & McMillan, 1992; Miller & Chen, 1994). It is a significant advancement above earlier studies that highlight the interdependence of rivals with regard to dyadic activities and reactions (Smith, Grimm, & Gannon, 1992). The situation be situated formed through the interaction with numerous competitive acts taken by the aggressor company, maybe interspersed with one or more competitive retorts that are employed as empirical measures to assess the profitability and market share of the firm (Ferrier, 2001).

Sources for Competitive Range

Environmental changes are frequently unclear, and how an organization interprets these changes may greatly influence its future course and level of effectiveness (Chattopadhyay et al., 2001). Many environmental changes seem to be viewed by executives as either opportunities or hazards (Dutton & Jackson, 1987). These classifications affect how executives respond to changes in their surroundings, which may then affect organizational activities (Dutton & Jackson, 1987). The goal of Chattopadhyay et al. (2001) is toward evaluate also explain managerial observations of conservational possibilities too risks to establish a connection between these perceptions and organizational actions that follow. By doing this, they investigate the viability of a model that focuses on how executives perceive changes in the environment and how those perceptions impact organizational actions. According to Miller and Chen (1996) and Ferrier (2001), internal sources include the firm's age, size, organizational slack, prior performance, and the top management team's diversity. The construction of a company's competitive range can be impacted by the heterogeneity among the senior leadership group, which serves as a stand-in for the depth of competitive capabilities (Ferrier & Lyon, 2004). Put differently, diverse choice situations involving decision makers' variability are reflected in competing actions and responses. Every move is an example of a decision, or a limited collection of decisions, usually involving several executives (Hambrick, Cho, & Chen, 1996). While there is typically an adverse correlation between the senior management team's diversity and the frequency of competitive rotates, it often improves a company's capacity to scan the environment and make excellent decisions regarding new product-market developments. Still, other influencing factors, including organizational culture or staff morale, might also have an impact on performance at the business level. In determining the firm's particular competitive range, firm size and age are also crucial factors (Miller & Chen, 1996). The premise of almost all research is that the incumbents' sets of competitive range are wider than the fright ups'. The effects, however, exist not entirely consistent through the dominant elements that determine the competitive range's characteristics. Generally, competitive simplicity and firm age have a positive correlation. Greater firms typically have a more complex competitive range than smaller enterprises in terms of firm size. Audia et al. (2000) examine this concept in two different scenarios, then the researchers suggest that when an organization succeeds, it is only natural for them to stick with the tactics that have previously worked Previous research has shown that organizational effectiveness in the past and strategic perseverance are related, or the propensity of businesses to adhere to previously successful strategies (Miller & Chen, 1994). Managers are driven by success to narrow their horizons and focus on what they perceive to be the route to success (Miller & Chen, 1996).

Table 1: Theory advancement in the dynamics of competitive advantage

	Competitive response is significantly predicted by the features and anticipated benefits of competitive rivalries (Grimm and Smith, 1997).
Individual action - reaction dyads	The combined traits and regularity of particular acts throughout a specific time frame, such as a certain period or quarter (Ferrier, Smith, & Grimm, 1999; Smith, Grimm, & Gannon, 1992) A business's earnings as well as market position increase with the number of activities it takes and the speed at which it executes them (Ferrier, 2001).
Entire range Of competitive actions	The full spectrum of competitive activities completed in a certain year, known as a range year. Businesses that engage in a wide variety of complex activities enjoy greater earnings & shareholder value than those that engage in a limited number of basic activities. (Ferrier, 2001)

Source: Prepared by author

Although Chen's study (1996) primarily focuses on a together basis at the business level for dyads, his methodology nevertheless paves the path for several empirical investigations in the future. He highlights the fact that competitive decisions are frequently made with consideration for how they will affect all of a firm's competitors as well as the overall competitive environment (Chen, 1996). Two new theoretical constructs are added to improve the work being done in the field of strategic administration, including aim to present a more distinct picture of the competitive connections among enterprises from several theoretical perspectives (Chen, 1996). Competitive Range as Organizational Knowledge: Aldrich (2000) adds sociological context to the idea of competitive range by stating that members choose the structure that has developed through the accumulation of variants as they attempt to solve challenges, which in turn prompts responses. In the event that the answers resolve the issues, they become part of the knowledge throughout the organization. Decision-makers sense a gap in their knowledge in an uncertain situation and look for further information. They are also drawn to one other in ways that emphasize how dependent they are on one another. A range of selection and variation factors influence the social interaction patterns within organizations. Among these procedures are

(1) Information retrieval procedures

(2) Alterations to participants' cognitive schemas

(3) increasing reliance on one another for shared information; and

(4) Constraints on members to have a uniform perspective.

When combined, these procedures hasten the development of organizational coherence and produce member clusters that are comparatively homogeneous (Aldrich, 2000). Range of Competition as Organizational Practices: According to Nelson & Winter (1982), routine refers to both an individual skill and a recurring pattern of activity within a whole organization. For instance the smooth, uninterrupted success of such a company or individual task can be defined by the term routine; as a noun, it aims to objectify a group's ability to carry out recognizable patterns of action. Multi-actor, interconnected Competitive Ranges as

Competitive Inertia define organizational routine: The amount of activity businesses display when changing their competitive posture in areas like price, advertising, the launch of fresh offerings or amenities, and the scope thereof competition is known as competitive inertia (Miller & Chen, 1994). Although activities may be primarily of one type, simplicity does not indicate inactivity. Rather, a simple range may exhibit a very active level of decision-making (Miller & Chen, 1996). Three factors may be related to inertia:1) managers' incentives to take action;2) their awareness of alternatives for taking action; and3) the limitations on their ability to take action. These factors are evaluated based on prior age and scale of the organization; market expansion and variety; effectiveness & competitive competence (Miller & Chen, 1994). They contend that while market diversity discourages competitive inertia, good past performance encourages it. They also contend that while inertia in strategic actions has a marginally positive impact on performance in the advantages of persistence in all acts in the short term decrease as market diversity increases (Miller & Chen, 1994).

Competitive Range in a Hyper Competitive Environment

According to Teece, Pisano, and Shuen (1997), environmental changes have a major impact on firm-level competitive interactions and competitive situations. These interactions can be thought of as a competitive review of a firm's dynamic capacities. As the modular mechanism of strategic decisions, they are essential to the development of the competitive range at the business level. A distinct set of competitive activities will be developed and put into practice in the event of a highly competitive environment, depending on how the firm evaluates the competitive landscape and interactions. Put differently, a company's strategic actions can either intensify or mitigate its competitive effects depending on the particular strategic choices it has made. These choices can range from doing nothing to positioning a company for a limited conflict equilibrium of mutual support or defense balance between counterattack and readiness to a full-scale conflict with rivals (Karnani & Wernerfelt, 1985). Businesses formulate their competitive range through a number of competitive processes. Commence with the pre-battle phase, in which companies move more impulsively to determine whether their chosen course of action will be effective in their particular markets and to adjust as needed in response to the response of their rivals. In order to strengthen their dynamic skills, some of their special adjustments will be focused on the organizational changes made by the firm. The efficiency of competitive range will be favorably correlated with range scanning, competitive Investigations and the company's ability to transmit particular knowledge. After then, during the real battle phases, competitive range is developed in full force. The firm's competitive procedure then returns to the earlier conversation. Firms' capabilities are included into the firm level competitive range during the range implementation and feedback stage.

Table 2: Characteristics of Competitive advantage in Business

Total competitive activity	-The entire amount of novel competitive actions a company made in a particular year -The firm increases its overall competitive activity and develops action ranges as internal organizational assets. -The result of an ongoing set of competitive actions is firm performance.
Action timing	Competitive aggression increases with the quantity of new competitive acts (Miller & Chen, 1994).
Action range simplicity	-The interval of time between a company's actions and those of a competitor (Ferrier & Smith, 1999)

	-Discourage the activities of competitors and concentrates on the spectrum of activities of a specific company -The inclination of the firm to focus on executing a limited number of different proceeding categories in an annual period rather than a wide variety of action kinds (Miller & Chen, 1996)
Action dissimilarity	-Businesses that engage in a wider range of activities than their competitors will be more assertive (Ferrier & Smith, 1999). -Strategic simplicity brought about by organizational success serves as a catalyst for corporate demise (Miller & Chen, 1996). -The extent to which challengers and leaders operate differently from one another (Ferrier & Smith, 1999) -According to Ferrier and Smith (1999), action dissimilarity measures how distinct a firm's (an industry leader) activities are versus the ones of similar businesses (challengers) in relation to rivals.

Source: Prepared by author

Types of Competitive Range

Types of the competitive advantages are as follows which are businesses applying in their firms to compete the rivalry businesses.

1. With regard to internal factors

2. With regard to outside variables

3. In the direction of a horizontal relationship

4. In the direction of vertical relationships

5. In the direction of competitive relationships and

6. In the direction of cooperative partnerships.

Many businesses will want to take advantage of pricing moves in sectors where there is a lot of service-oriented rivalry and less government regulations. However, in the case of utilities like gas and telecommunications, where government participation is evident, actions and reactions in reaction to external factors like shifts in the regulatory policy framework must be thoroughly examined. Future research will look at how competitive a corporation is in international market environments when institutional views, or government interventions, are prevalent. The examination of interactions between numerous players (regulators, firms, consumers, and other firms) and at different levels (individual firms, multiple firms, and firms vs the environment) in highly competitive settings will be a valuable addition to the present research on competitive dynamics.

SUGGESTIONS & RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE STUDY

Future studies on competitive spectrum might involve an extensive variety of variables. A greater comprehensive extent of examination, confined evidence-based measurements & hypotheses, an assortment of knowledge builds, including a sector-specific emphasis each prove beneficial for this area of study. The serial interconnections resulting in rivalry, internal activities and assets, and radiating achievements might be examined. Ferrier (2001) disregards the insider activities taken by the company as although might've comprised a significant part of the company's overall event succession in its probe. In light of this, it's essential for one to take responsibility for internal as well as external variables when evaluating competitive simplicity's overall implications. This will lead to an improved depiction of competitive spectrum, the idea which lies similar to the end goal methods of reviewing strategies (Miller & Chen, 1996). The competitive behavior of a firm and its overall performance are tightly linked. The short-sightedness of this relationship stems from the fact that measuring success at the company level over the long term will require more than just the immediate action and reaction variables. Measuring the performance of a firm at the individual level through competitive actions or responses is challenging. To ascertain the sustainability of business performance, organizations should, therefore, either concurrently or sequentially, prepare for clearly defined strategic activity patterns, and modules, or competitive range. Then, it remains unclear how long we will have to wait to determine if the firm level competitive range with some slack times will have a beneficial (or negative) consequence. Firm-level performance will exhibit significant fluctuations even during mutual forbearance, contingent upon specific paths of industry development. Investigating the reasons behind some companies' superior ability to manage the intricate web of connections that will support the players' mutual forbearance will be valuable. In a highly competitive setting, D'Aveni (1994) outlines three extremely complementary strategies for creating and maintaining excellent performance. Though the other two criteria are also indirectly related, competitive range will be intimately associated with the third attribute - disruption methods.

Table 3: 3-Dimensional Strategic Planning Framework

1	Developing an Idea towards Disruption	➢ Priorities & abilities during instability ➢ More fulfillment among stakeholders ➢ Predictive divinity
2	Planning Capacity (Developing Competencies)	➢ Source benefaction ➢ Aptitudes aimed at swiftness ➢ Experiences intended for disclosure ➢ Competitive circumstances besides Interfaces
3	Strategies for Upsetting	➢ Signing the strategic determined ➢ Concurrent also in sequence strategic drives ➢ Fluctuating the procedures of rivalry ➢ Productiveness transformation, industrial modernization plan restructuring

Source: Prepared by author

Researchers discover that past performance influences corporate evolution, with past success having a significant impact on a company's adherence to historical procedures, the development business reaction to the outside world in the context that its organizational framework, its strategy-making procedures, etc (Miller, 1994). This results in indifference, which lowers the amount of information processing and intelligence collecting, and insularity, which manifests as a failure to adjust to environmental changes (Miller, 1994). The dyadic games determine the competitors' actions and responses. Businesses use in-depth research on industry structure and competitor identification to make strategic decisions. Additionally, the development of this competitive range, or strategic modulation, is aided by knowledge management and competitive intelligence. According to RBV, a firm's resource profile determines its competitive behavior (Grimm & Smith, 1997). Competitive range is one of the organizational routines with particular objectives and directions, as was mentioned in the previous section. But if routines are determined by a company's unique skills, is the speed at which competitors respond really that important? Your company's action and performance won't be significantly harmed by your competitor's simple imitation when businesses create their own routines with particular capabilities. Subsequent research can examine firm-specific resources independently and determine the impact of any support upon those pursuits & results produced by the company. Evolutionary framework proponents contend that a company's culture, history, and reputation will all be significant factors (Sibt e Ali et al., 2024). And the network positions that businesses adopt over the course of the industry life cycle will define all of these. There are a number of shortcomings in the general research when it comes to rivalry prediction. First, rivals are frequently viewed as homogeneous entities or their identities are presumed to be known (Chen, 1996).

Every competitive action should be properly matched with the firm's desired modules of competitive range if action-based competitive advantage analysis is to be conducted. Unexpected responses from unexpected businesses in nearby markets may arise in response to a specific action that is intended to target a particular market or competitor. Alternatively, your intended competitive action may not initially achieve its intended goal but may inadvertently result in unexpected outcomes against your competitors. Second, firm-level or year-end financial analysis is conducted to examine the inter-firm competitiveness. It would be difficult to deny the validations of combined methods utilized by rivals at the business along with the end of the year economic level in a static environment. Determining whether elements of a company's strategy actually have an impact on its ability to remain competitive over time becomes exceedingly challenging. The analysis unit at the firm's action level appears to have made progress in examining the dynamics of competition. We are able to examine the dyadic model of interactive competition by examining the competitive behaviors of market participants. Previous research, however, ignores the important distinctions between the competitive range of one single action and a succession of activities. Although the competitive range construct is derived from the test of individual actions, the competitive range unit should be examined differently from the latter.

CONCLUSIONS

Whether competitive range exists in an organizational framework is still up for debate. If so, describe how it functions in practice, what kinds of actions are combined and logically started, and why businesses keep using a particular pattern of actions instead of others. Businesses must reconsider and alter how they conduct business with their rivals in the fast-paced business climate of today. In a highly competitive market, one company's actions could set off a chain reaction from rivals. Competitive dynamics studies have used extensive data from the US airline sector to Study the structure of commercial rivalry on the methods used by rivals to gain an advantage. If evaluated in tandem, these research findings offer novel conclusions in business rivalry which highlight the fluid, dynamic nature of company's strength (Hoskisson et al., 1999). This inquiries' primary objective was to accomplish to advance the field of strategy's absence of a predictive theory of competitive behaviour (Miller & Chen, 1996). Competitive research has focused more on comprehending events or phenomena. One concept that may help them develop more profound awareness of the hypercompetitive environment and predictive power is competitive range.

REFERENCES:

Asghar, M. M., Sultana, R., Ullah, S., & Arshad, M. (2023). Analyzing the External Debt and Exports-Led Growth Hypothesis in Selected Asian Countries. *Zakariya Journal of Social Science*, *2*(2), 43-55.

Asghar, M. M., Tanzeel, M., Ullah, S., & Hussain, S. (2024). Analyzing the Economic Impact of Construction Sector in Pakistan. *Zakariya Journal of Social Science*, *3*(1), 21-34.

Audia, P. G., Locke, E. A., & Smith, K. G. (2000). The Paradox of Success: An Archival and a Laboratory Study of Strategic Persistence Following Radical Environmental Change. *Academy of Management Journal*, *43*(5), 837-853.

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

Chattopadhyay, P., Glick, W. H., & Huber, G. P. (2001). Organizational Actions in Response to Threats and Opportunities. *Academy of Management Journal*, *44*(5), 937-955.

Chen, Ming-Jer, & Hambrick, D. C. (1995). Speed, Stealth, and Selective Attack: How Small Firms Differ from Large Firms in Competitive Behavior. *Academy of Management Journal*, *38*(2), 453-482.

Chen, Ming-Jer, & MacMillan, I. C. (1992). Nonresponse and Delayed Response to Competitive Moves: The Roles of Competitor Dependence and Action Irreversibility. *Academy of Management Journal*, *35*(3), 539-570.

Chen, Ming-Jer. (1996). Competitive Analysis and Interfirm Rivalry: Toward a Theoretical Integration. *Academy of Management Review, 21*(1), 100-134.

Cohen, M. D., & Bacdayan, P. (1994). Organizational Routines are stored as Procedural Memory: Evidence from a Laboratory Study. *Organization Science, 5*(4), 554-568.

D'Aveni, R. A. (1994). *Hyper competitive Rivalries: Competing in Highly Dynamic Environment*. New York: The Free Press.

Dutton, J. E., & Jackson, S. E. (1987). Categorizing Strategic Issues: Links to Organizational Action. *Academy of Management Review, 12*(1), 76-90.

Ferrier, W. J. (2001). Navigating the Competitive Landscape: The Drivers and Consequences of Competitive Aggressiveness. *Academy of Management Journal, 44*(4), 858-877.

Ferrier, W. J., & Lyon, D. W. (2004). Competitive Range Simplicity and Firm Performance: The Moderating Role of Top Management Team Heterogeneity. *Managerial and Decision Economics, 25*(6-7), 317-327.

Ferrier, W. J., Smith, K. G., & Grimm, C. M. (1999). The Role of Competitive Action in Market Share Erosion and Industry Dethronement: A Study of Industry Leaders and Challengers. *Academy of Management Journal*, *42*(4), 372-388.

Gnyawali, D. R., He, J. Y., & Madhavan, R. (2006). Impact of Co-opetition on Firm Competitive Behavior: An Empirical Examination. *Journal of Management, 32*, 507-530.

Grimm, C. M., & Smith, K. G. (1997). *Strategy as Action: Industry Rivalry and Coordination*. Cincinnati, Ohio: South-Western College Publishing.

Gulati, R., Nohria, N., & Zaheer, A. (2000). Strategic Networks. *Strategic Management Journal*, *21*, 203-215.

Hambrick, D. C., Cho, T. S., & Chen, Ming-Jer. (1996). The Influence of Top Management Team Heterogeneity on Firms' Competitive Moves. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, *41*, 659-684.

Hoskisson, R. E., Hitt, M. A., Wan, W. P., & Yiu, D. (1999). Theory and Research in Strategic Management: Swings of a Pendulum. *Journal Management*,*25*(3), 417-456.

Karnani, A., & Wernerfelt, B. (1985). Multiple Point Competition. *Strategic Management Journal*, *6*(1), 87-96.

Khan, M. K., Ahmad, I., e Ali, M. S., & Azhar, U. (2024). Role of Climate Policies and Environmental Regulations for Business Growth: Evidence from Sustainable Development Perspective. *iRASD Journal of Economics*, *6*(1), 199-214.

Lieberman, M. B., & Montgomery, D. B. (1998). First-mover (Dis)advantages: Retrospective and Link with the Resource-based View. *Strategic Management Journal*, *19*(12).

Lumpkin, G. T., & Dess, G. G. (1995). Simplicity as a Strategy-Making Process: The Effects of Stage of Organizational Development and Environment on Performance. *Academy of Management Journal*, *38*(5), 1386-1407.

Miller, D. (1993). The Architecture of Simplicity. *Academy of Management Review*, *18*(1), 116-138.

Miller, D. (1994). What Happens After Success: The Perils of Excellence. *Journal of Management Studies*, *31*(3), 325-358.

Miller, D., & Chen, Ming-Jer. (1996). The Simplicity of Competitive Ranges: An Empirical Analysis. *Strategic Management Journal*, *17*, 419-439.

Nelson, R. R., & Winter, S. G. (1982). *An Evolutionary Theory of Economic Change.* Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.

Porter, M. E. (1980). *Competitive Strategy: Techniques for Analyzing Industries and Competitors*. New York, NY: The Free Press.

Scott, W. R. (2001). *Institutions and Organizations*. Thousand Oaks, California: Sage Publications Inc.

Sibt e Ali, M., Faridi, M. Z., Javed, K., & Javaid, M. Q. (2024). Exploring the impact of Green Supply Chain Management Practices on Environmental Performance of Firms: What is the Role Intellectual Capital and Green Information System. *Pakistan JL Analysis & Wisdom*, *3*, 83.

Smith, K. G., Grimm, C. M., & Gannon, M. J. (1992). *Dynamics of Competitive Strategy.* Newbury Park, California: Sage Publications Inc.