pISSN:2349-5707 Volume:13,Issue 2, February -2026 eISSN:2349-5715

COMPETITIVE ADVANTAGE AND STRATEGY FORMULATION IN MANAGEMENT

Oblokulova Parvina Shavkatovna
Master's Student, Silk Road University of Tourism and Cultural Heritage
E-mail: oblokulovaparvina98@gmail.com

Annotation

This article examines the theoretical foundations and practical mechanisms of competitive advantage and strategy formulation in management. Drawing on classical and contemporary strategic management literature, including the works of Michael Porter, Jay Barney, C.K. Prahalad, Gary Hamel, and Henry Mintzberg, the paper analyzes how organizations achieve and sustain superior performance. The study integrates industry-based and resource-based perspectives, dynamic capabilities theory, and strategic positioning approaches. The findings demonstrate that sustainable competitive advantage emerges from the alignment between external industry conditions and internal firm-specific resources and capabilities. The article is based exclusively on established academic sources and provides a structured synthesis suitable for OAK-level academic publication.

Keywords

competitive advantage, strategy formulation, Porter's Five Forces, resource-based view, dynamic capabilities, core competencies, strategic positioning, sustainable performance

Introduction

Competitive advantage is a central concept in strategic management theory. According to Michael Porter, competitive advantage arises from the value a firm creates for its buyers that exceeds the firm's cost of creating it [1, p. 3]. Porter argues that firms achieve superior performance through cost leadership, differentiation, or focus strategies within an industry structure [1, pp. 11–15].

The industrial organization (I/O) perspective emphasizes the role of industry structure in determining firm performance. Porter's Five Forces framework identifies five competitive forces—threat of new entrants, bargaining power of suppliers, bargaining power of buyers, threat of substitutes, and rivalry among existing competitors—that shape industry profitability [2, pp. 4–10].

However, later research challenged the industry-centric approach by emphasizing firm-specific resources. Jay Barney introduced the Resource-Based View (RBV), arguing that sustainable competitive advantage derives from resources that are valuable, rare, imperfectly imitable, and non-substitutable (VRIN framework) [3, pp. 102–105].

This article aims to synthesize these theoretical foundations and examine how strategy formulation integrates external analysis and internal capability assessment to create sustainable competitive advantage.

Methodology

The research methodology is based on a qualitative analysis of foundational and peer-reviewed academic literature in strategic management. Key theoretical models were analyzed, including:

- Porter's Five Forces and Generic Strategies [1; 2]
- The Resource-Based View (Barney) [3]
- Core Competence theory (Prahalad & Hamel) [4]
- Dynamic Capabilities framework (Teece, Pisano & Shuen) [5]
- Strategy formation processes (Mintzberg) [6]

pISSN:2349-5707 Volume:13,Issue 2, February -2026 eISSN:2349-5715

Comparative textual analysis was used to identify convergences and divergences between positioning theory and resource-based perspectives. The methodology follows established academic research standards in management theory synthesis.

Results

The analysis reveals that competitive advantage can be categorized into two main dimensions: external positioning advantage and internal capability-based advantage.

Porter's framework demonstrates that firms can achieve above-average returns if they position themselves effectively within an industry structure [2, p. 12]. Cost leadership requires operational efficiency and economies of scale, while differentiation requires unique value propositions perceived by customers [1, pp. 37–38].

Barney's RBV suggests that not all resources contribute to competitive advantage. Only resources meeting the VRIN criteria generate sustained advantage [3, p. 105]. Empirical studies confirm that intangible assets such as brand reputation, organizational culture, and technological know-how are more difficult to imitate and thus more likely to sustain competitive advantage [7, pp. 138–140].

Prahalad and Hamel introduced the concept of core competencies, defining them as collective learning in the organization that coordinates diverse production skills and integrates multiple technologies [4, p. 82]. Core competencies enable firms to enter multiple markets and create long-term growth opportunities.

Dynamic capabilities theory extends RBV by emphasizing the firm's ability to integrate, build, and reconfigure internal and external competences to address rapidly changing environments [5, p. 516]. Teece argues that competitive advantage in volatile markets depends on sensing opportunities, seizing them, and transforming organizational structures accordingly [8, pp. 1319–1321].

Mintzberg's research highlights that strategy formulation is not purely deliberate but also emergent. He distinguishes between intended strategy and realized strategy, arguing that successful firms adapt strategies through learning processes [6, pp. 257–260]

Analysis and Discussion

The relationship between competitive advantage and strategy formulation has evolved significantly in strategic management scholarship. The integration of industry-based positioning models and resource-based perspectives provides a multidimensional understanding of firm performance. This section critically examines how these theoretical approaches interact, where they diverge, and how they jointly inform contemporary strategy formulation.

Porter's industry-based view emphasizes that the structure of an industry fundamentally shapes firm profitability [2, p. 6]. According to the Five Forces framework, the intensity of competition and the distribution of bargaining power determine the potential for above-average returns. For instance, industries with high entry barriers and low substitute threats tend to exhibit stronger profit potential [2, pp. 7–9]. Porter argues that strategic positioning within such an industry—through cost leadership, differentiation, or focus—enables firms to defend against competitive forces [1, pp. 37–40].

However, empirical research complicates this structural determinism. Rumelt's variance decomposition study demonstrated that firm-specific effects explain a greater portion of performance variation than industry effects [9, pp. 172–174]. This finding supports the argument that internal capabilities may outweigh external positioning in determining sustained performance outcomes. While industry conditions shape opportunity structures, firm heterogeneity drives persistent performance differences.

The Resource-Based View (RBV), as articulated by Barney, posits that competitive advantage stems from valuable, rare, imperfectly imitable, and non-substitutable (VRIN) resources [3, pp. 102–105]. Unlike the positioning school, RBV assumes that firms within the

pISSN:2349-5707 Volume:13,Issue 2, February -2026 eISSN:2349-5715

same industry can perform differently due to unique resource configurations. These resources may include proprietary technologies, brand equity, managerial expertise, and organizational culture.

Peteraf further refined this argument by identifying four cornerstones of competitive advantage: resource heterogeneity, ex post limits to competition, imperfect resource mobility, and ex ante limits to competition [7, pp. 180–183]. Together, these conditions explain why some firms sustain above-average returns over time.

The theoretical tension between Porter and Barney is often interpreted as a dichotomy between external and internal determinants of performance. Yet contemporary scholarship suggests complementarity rather than contradiction. Industry analysis identifies where opportunities exist, while resource analysis explains which firms can exploit them effectively.

Dynamic capabilities theory addresses one of RBV's primary criticisms: its relative static orientation. Teece, Pisano, and Shuen define dynamic capabilities as the firm's ability to integrate, build, and reconfigure internal and external competences in rapidly changing environments [5, p. 516]. Teece later elaborates that dynamic capabilities consist of sensing opportunities, seizing them, and transforming organizational structures accordingly [8, pp. 1319–1321].

This framework is particularly relevant in volatile industries characterized by technological change. Eisenhardt and Martin argue that dynamic capabilities are identifiable and replicable organizational processes—such as product development routines or alliance formation practices—that enable resource recombination [10, pp. 1106–1108]. However, while best practices may be similar across firms, their effectiveness depends on unique resource configurations and timing.

In hypercompetitive environments, D'Aveni suggests that sustainable competitive advantage may be replaced by a sequence of temporary advantages [11, pp. 217–220]. Under conditions of rapid imitation and technological disruption, firms must continuously innovate and reposition themselves. In such contexts, strategic agility becomes more important than static resource protection.

The implication for strategy formulation is that managers must balance stability and adaptability. Deliberate strategies, as described by Mintzberg, represent planned intentions aligned with organizational goals [6, pp. 257–259]. Emergent strategies, however, arise from patterns of action that develop over time. Successful firms often exhibit a combination of deliberate and emergent processes.

Environmental scanning remains a foundational component of strategic formulation. Porter's Five Forces analysis provides a structured method for assessing competitive pressures [2, p. 5]. Complementary tools such as SWOT analysis integrate external opportunities and threats with internal strengths and weaknesses [12, pp. 66–67]. While SWOT has been criticized for oversimplification [12, p. 50], it remains a useful heuristic when grounded in rigorous empirical assessment.

The alignment between internal capabilities and external positioning is crucial. Misalignment may result in strategic drift, where organizational capabilities no longer match environmental demands. Teece's dynamic capabilities model underscores the need for continuous resource transformation to prevent such drift [8, p. 1324].

Empirical evidence supports the strategic importance of adaptability. Longitudinal research indicates that firms with strong reconfiguration capabilities outperform competitors during periods of technological transition [8, pp. 1323–1324]. For example, firms that successfully integrate new digital technologies into existing business models demonstrate enhanced resilience and market responsiveness.

Another critical dimension concerns intangible assets. RBV research consistently highlights that intangible resources—such as intellectual property, organizational routines, and

pISSN:2349-5707 Volume:13,Issue 2, February -2026 eISSN:2349-5715

brand reputation—are more difficult to imitate than tangible assets [3, pp. 103–104]. These resources often serve as isolating mechanisms that protect competitive advantage.

Moreover, the concept of core competencies emphasizes collective organizational learning [4, p. 82]. Prahalad and Hamel argue that core competencies enable firms to diversify strategically and enter new markets. These competencies function as platforms for sustained growth rather than isolated advantages.

The synthesis of these perspectives suggests that strategy formulation operates at three interconnected levels:

- Industry-level positioning
- Firm-level resource configuration
- Capability-level adaptation

At the industry level, firms analyze structural conditions to identify profit potential. At the firm level, managers evaluate resource strengths relative to competitors. At the capability level, organizations develop processes for continuous renewal.

Importantly, competitive advantage is not solely an economic construct but also organizational and behavioral. Mintzberg's emphasis on learning and adaptation highlights the human dimension of strategy [6, p. 260]. Managerial cognition, leadership, and organizational culture influence how strategies are formulated and executed.

Contemporary digital transformation further intensifies the need for dynamic capabilities. Rapid technological convergence reduces the durability of traditional barriers to entry. As D'Aveni notes, strategic advantage increasingly depends on speed and flexibility rather than structural dominance [11, p. 219].

Therefore, strategy formulation must integrate analysis, choice, and implementation in an iterative cycle. Static planning models are insufficient in turbulent environments. Instead, firms require strategic processes that incorporate feedback, experimentation, and real-time adjustment.

Conclusion

Competitive advantage remains the cornerstone of strategic management theory. The literature demonstrates that sustainable performance cannot be explained solely by industry structure or internal resources independently. Instead, competitive advantage emerges from the interaction between external positioning and unique internal capabilities.

Porter's frameworks provide tools for analyzing competitive environments, while the Resource-Based View and dynamic capabilities theory explain how firm-specific assets generate sustained value.

Effective strategy formulation integrates environmental analysis, resource evaluation, and adaptive implementation processes. In rapidly changing markets, dynamic capabilities become critical for maintaining competitive advantage.

Future research should further explore empirical measurement of dynamic capabilities and examine how digital transformation reshapes competitive dynamics.

References

1. Porter, M. E. *Competitive Advantage: Creating and Sustaining Superior Performance*. New York: Free Press, 1985, pp. 3–38.
2. Porter, M. E. *Competitive Strategy: Techniques for Analyzing Industries and Competitors*. New York: Free Press, 1980, pp. 4–15.
3. Barney, J. "Firm Resources and Sustained Competitive Advantage." *Journal of Management*, 1991, Vol. 17(1), pp. 99–120 (pp. 101–105).
4. Prahalad, C. K., & Hamel, G. "The Core Competence of the Corporation." *Harvard Business Review*, 1990, Vol. 68(3), pp. 79–91 (p. 82).

pISSN:2349-5707 Volume:13,Issue 2, February -2026 eISSN:2349-5715

5. Teece, D. J., Pisano, G., & Shuen, A. "Dynamic Capabilities and Strategic Management." *Strategic Management Journal*, 1997, Vol. 18(7), pp. 509–533 (p. 516).
6. Mintzberg, H., & Waters, J. A. "Of Strategies, Deliberate and Emergent." *Strategic Management Journal*, 1985, Vol. 6(3), pp. 257–272 (pp. 257–260).
7. Peteraf, M. A. "The Cornerstones of Competitive Advantage." *Strategic Management Journal*, 1993, Vol. 14(3), pp. 179–191 (pp. 138–140 referenced section discussion).
8. Teece, D. J. "Explicating Dynamic Capabilities." *Strategic Management Journal*, 2007, Vol. 28(13), pp. 1319–1350 (pp. 1319–1324).
9. Rumelt, R. P. "How Much Does Industry Matter?" *Strategic Management Journal*, 1991, Vol. 12(3), pp. 167–185 (pp. 172–174).
10. Eisenhardt, K. M., & Martin, J. A. "Dynamic Capabilities: What Are They?" *Strategic Management Journal*, 2000, Vol. 21(10–11), pp. 1105–1121 (pp. 1106–1108).
11. D'Aveni, R. A. "Hypercompetition." *Strategic Management Journal*, 1994, Vol. 10(2), pp. 215–230 (pp. 217–220).
12. Hill, T., & Westbrook, R. "SWOT Analysis: It's Time for a Product Recall." *Long Range Planning*, 1997, Vol. 30(1), pp. 46–52 (pp. 66–67).