

Practices of Competitor Accounting and its Influence on the Competitive Advantages: An Empirical Study in Jordanian Manufacturing Companies

Sliman Alsoboa¹

¹ Al-Hussein Bin Talal University

Received: 13 June 2015 Accepted: 30 June 2015 Published: 15 July 2015

Abstract

This study aims to investigate the usage of competitor accounting within the field of strategic management accounting (SMA) in the Jordanian manufacturing companies. It also aims to determine the extent to which competitor accounting influences competitive advantage of these companies. A survey on Jordanian manufacturing companies was conducted for data collection. A total of 88 questionnaires were distributed to these companies. Out of this number 62 were returned. The response rate was about 70.5

Index terms— strategic management accounting, competitor accounting, competitive advantage.

1 Introduction

any important changes have been occurred in the business environment in the last half century such as rapidly advances in the markets, constant changes in customer preferences, and the intense global competition. These changes have placed industrial companies today under diverse types of pressure requiring them to increasingly improve their competitive priorities including cost reduction, quality, delivery and rapid response to customer demand, flexibility, productivity and innovation to produce new products (Alsoboa and Alduhiate, 2013). Competitive advantage is experienced by a firm when its actions in an industry or market create economic value and when few competing firms are engaging in similar actions (Barney, 2002). In order to gain and maintain competitive advantages, firms need to manage resources effectively and efficiently. This, in turn, requires all the use of all available information.

The notion of strategic management accounting is linked with business strategy and maintaining or increasing competitive advantage (CIMA, 2008). In modern organizations, knowledge management is the fundamental basis of competition (Baporikar, 2014; Aghamirian et al., 2015). Therefore, SMA may be considered part of the resources required to sustain a competitive advantage by providing information related to important aspects in the organization including planning, control, performance measurement, strategic decision making, strategic costing, customer accounting and competitor accounting.

The objective of a company's competitive advantage is to gain superior performance over the competitors. Knowledge and information are crucial matters to sustain this advantage. As a potential part of the internal capabilities of the firm, the competitor accounting, which is one of the major themes in SMA, could provide such an opportunity.

Jordan has made many trade contracts with countries with advanced economies especially USA and EU countries. Therefore, Jordan is one of most developing countries that influenced by economic global changes. To survive in this competitive environment, Jordanian manufacturing companies should have a strong competitive position. This position has forced Jordanian companies to adopt the appropriate financial information systems including SMA.

This study contributes to current trends in SMA research in two ways. First, it explores the extent to which the competitor accounting within the area of SMA was used by the Jordanian manufacturing companies. Second,

44 it aims to examine the influence of competitor accounting on the competitive advantage of these companies. To
45 the best knowledge of researcher, this study is one of the few studies in this field.

46 2 II.

47 3 Literature Review

48 The role that SMA could play in the competitive environment has been discussed earlier at the beginning of
49 nineties of the last century. The study conducted by Rick wood et al. (1990) considers management accounting's
50 role in a company's response to the threat to its market position posed by a competitor's action. The study also
51 illustrated a management accounting approach which adopts a strategic perspective. Okoye and Akenbor (2008)
52 found that the SMA is superior to the traditional management accounting in the provision of information that
53 meet environmental demand, particularly in the area of competition. Ndwiga (2011) outline the importance of
54 management accounting practices in providing strategies that lead to the creation of a competitive advantage
55 in an organization. Hesford (2008) revealed that monitoring the competitors' financial statement has a positive
56 effect on return on investment, economic value-added, innovation, market share, service quality, efficiency and
57 customer satisfaction. Akenbor and Okoye (2012) revealed that SMA enhances competitive advantage although
58 several factors bedevil its adoption in Nigerian manufacturing firms.

59 Concerning the application of SMA techniques, competitor accounting has an important practices in this
60 context. In inquiring about the incidence, use and perceived utility of strategic management accounting, Cravens
61 and Guilding (2001) found that competitor accounting is regarded as the prevalent topic and the most heavily used
62 method of SMA. Hesford (2001) suggested that accountants within the firm should extend their work beyond
63 traditional, internally focused activities to contribute to the firm's competitive intelligence effort, providing
64 assistance with competitor cost assessment and financial statement analysis. Nik Hassan et al. (2011) found that
65 Malaysian manager did practice SMA in their organization focusing on the information pertaining to competitor's
66 position, competitor's cost and competitor's financial condition but not competitor's appraisal. Alsoboa et al.
67 (2015) found that 12 out of 19 SMA techniques were adopted by JPIC including competitor cost assessment and
68 competitor position monitoring. The study conducted by Chiekezie et al. (2014) revealed that the mean financial
69 performance of full adopters of competitor focused accounting (CFA) was greater than that of partial adopters
70 and non-adopters. Chiekezie et al. (2014) suggested that Manufacturing firms should give priority to SMA and
71 it sub-divisions especially CFA to enhance its competitive edge over competitors.

72 Competitive advantage has been studied for a long time. It has also been linked to different aspects at
73 the different organizations. Narasimhan and Schoenherr (2012) suggested supply management practices and
74 environmental management practices as key strategic drivers aiding in the further differentiation of firms. Forsman
75 (2013) demonstrated how the competitive advantage was enhanced along the successful environmental innovation
76 process. Breznik and Lahovnik (2014) pointed out that firms with a stronger commitment to deploying dynamic
77 capabilities are more successful and hold the potential for a sustained competitive advantage. Ashrafi and Mueller
78 (2015) suggested that while tangible IT resources offer little competitive advantage, intangible IT resources are
79 positively associated with IT capabilities that ultimately lead to IT competitive advantage and the improved
80 financial performance of the organization. Woodruff (1997) argued that the next major source for competitive
81 advantage likely will come from more outward orientation toward customers, as indicated by the many calls
82 for organizations to compete on superior customer value delivery. Kumar et al. (2011) pointed out that the
83 sustained advantage in business performance from having a market orientation is greater for the firms that
84 are early to develop a market orientation. Qun and Sousa (2015) revealed that competitive advantage has an
85 important mediating role in the relationship between marketing capabilities and export performance. In addition,
86 prior studies have addressed many indicators which considered sources of achieving and sustaining competitive
87 advantage such as organizational culture (Barney, 1986); knowledge (Buchnowska, 2011); customer knowledge
88 (Aghamirian et al., 2015); organizational knowledge (Popovski & Nikolic, 2014); human capital (Coff, 1997);
89 employee mobility constraints (Campbell et al., 2012).

90 4 III. Strategic Management Accounting

91 SMA has been defined as "the provision and analysis of financial information on the firm's product markets
92 and competitors' costs and cost structures and the monitoring of the enterprise's strategies and those of its
93 competitors in these markets over a number of periods" (Bromwich, 1990; ??8). It has an important role to play
94 in providing information about the major sources of competitive advantage of an enterprise. In

95 5 Global Journal of Management and Business Research

96 Volume XV Issue III Version I Year () D increasingly dynamic environment the provision of strategically relevant
97 information is of paramount importance for the formulation and execution of business strategies (Dunkovi? et
98 al., 2009).

99 SMA is an externally oriented approach that entails the collection of data on costs, processes, sales volumes,
100 market shares, cash flows and resource utilization for both a business and its competitors (Akenbor and
101 Okoye, 2012). According to Roslender and Hart's (2003) definition of SMA, the new techniques often relate to

external factors such as customers, markets and competitors, as well as to non-financial and internally generated information, and attempt to integrate insights from disciplines such as marketing management and management accounting within a strategic management framework. Based on the previous definitions of SMA, we can say the competitor accounting is an important aspect of this new discipline.

IV.

6 Competitor Accounting

According to Lord (1996), the SMA consists of three elements. The first one of these elements is the information on competitors which include competitor's price, costs and sales volume. Competitor accounting comprises the analysis of information from accounting relating to competitors. It is thereby supposed to gain detailed insight into their present cost and finance situation, to determine one's own competitive position and to predict the future strategic behavior of the competitors (Heinen and Hoffjan, 2005). The competitor's autonomous policies and reactions to market developments have a big influence on each organization's freedom of action and ultimately on its profitability. Hence, a sound knowledge of competitors and understanding their competitive position may ensure that an organization's existence and profitability are maintained in order to create a sustainable competitive advantage (BPP, 2005). On the basis of factor analysis of the application frequency of twelve instruments within strategic management accounting, Guilding et al. (2000) attributed the following three methods to competitor accounting: a) Competitor cost assessment Management accounting provides important and useful techniques in analyzing how the cost structure of competitors influences an organization's options and in modeling the impact of different strategies (BPP, 2005). Competitor cost assessment includes a regularly updated forecast of competitors' costs per item (Guilding, 1999). All easy accessible sources like direct observation, mutual suppliers, mutual customers, former employees and published accounting data should be used to analyze competitor's costs (Heinen and Hoffjan, 2005).

7 b) Competitive position monitoring

Competitor analysis is the identification and quantification of relative strengths and weaknesses (compared with competitors or potential competitors) which could be of significance in the development of a successful competitive strategy. Organizations should analyze their competitors and build models of how they might react based on their future goals, assumptions, capability and their current situation (BPP, 2005). Monitoring the competitive position entails extensive analysis of the competition which, beside market share, also includes turnover, return on sales, volume and cost per item, price per item and cash flow, capacity utilization, liquidity and availability of resources for essential competitors (Simmonds, 1986)

8 c) Competitor appraisal based on published financial statements

The competitor appraisal based on published financial statements is the numerical analysis of published financial information as a part of the assessment of sources of competitive advantages of competitors (Guilding, 1999). The organizations have to evaluate the degree of their success in implementation of their strategies based on the analysis of trends and ratios derived from financial statements, and the implications of this evaluation for customers, competitors and suppliers.

9 V.

10 Competitive Advantage

A firm is said to have a competitive advantage when it enjoys greater success than current or potential competitors in its industry, suggesting that superior firm performance serves as a key indicator of competitive advantage (Ghemawat and Rivkin, 1999). Though there isn't one clear definition of competitive advantage, the creation of value is the milestone of any definition of the concept (Pilinkiene, et al., 2013). Competitive advantage is experienced by a firm when its actions in an industry or market create economic value and when few competing firms are engaging in similar actions (Barney, 2002). Different theoretical approaches addressed the value creation in competitive advantage, beginning with industrial structural analysis which developed in 1960's by Boston Consulting Group. This approach linked the growth of a market to the firm's relative market share focusing on the external environment of the corporation (Sorensen, 2006).

Another important approach developed by Porter (1980), where he suggested that competitive advantage may be regarded as the function of the industry attractiveness and company's competitive position in the market. In Porter's approach, five forces were identified, forming firm's competitive advantage: threat of new entrants, threat of substitutes, bargaining power of suppliers, bargaining power of buyers and competition between competitors. Later on, Porter Resource based view approach is another important approach addressed the value creation. This approach emphasizes the firm's resources as the fundamental determinants of competitive advantage and performance. It focuses on the internal environment of the corporation, i.e. resources and capabilities. Barney (1991) derives sustained competitive advantage from the resources and capabilities that must have four attributes:

158 valuable, rare, imperfectly imitable and not substitutable. Avella et al. (2001) consider that the emphasis on
159 certain manufacturing competitive priorities or capabilities and decisions or practices on the key decision areas
160 and their internal coherence can be the base for achieving sustainable or lasting advantage over competitors, thus
161 producing superior business performance. However, it argued that competitive advantages cannot be sustained
162 in dynamic, rapidly changing markets (Eisenhardt and Martin, 2000;Fiol, 2001).

163 11 VI.

164 12 Methodology

165 This study aims to explore the extent to which the competitor accounting within the area of SMA was used by
166 the Jordanian manufacturing companies. It also aims to examine the influence of competitor accounting on the
167 competitive advantage of these companies. A total of 88 questionnaires were distributed to company managers
168 or financial managers in these companies.

169 Out of this number, 62 were returned and used. The response rate was about 70.5%, which is considered high.
170 The questionnaire consisted of two main parts. The first part contained 17 items aimed at examining the extent
171 of usage of competitor accounting techniques implemented by Jordanian manufacturing companies over the past
172 five years. The Likert scale was used to measure the usage of variables, ranging from minimum of 1= "not used
173 at all" to the maximum of 5= "greatly used".

174 In the second part of questionnaire, competitive advantage was measured through manager's perceptions of the
175 company's success in comparison to major competitors. Multi-items scale adopted from Li, et al., 2006; Talaja,
176 2012; Anatan, 2014; and Schilke, 2014) was used to measure competitive advantage through four dimensions,
177 namely, financial performance dimension, product dimension, customer dimension, and general performance
178 dimension. The respondents were asked to rate the status they see their company is better than the competitors
179 in these dimensions ranking from "much worse =1" to "much better =5".

180 The methods of analysis employed in the study were descriptive statistics, test of homogeneity of variance, the
181 variance inflation factor test (VIF), one sample t-test, and multiple regressions. In addition, Cronbach's alpha
182 test of internal consistency of competitor accounting techniques was used to test reliability of instrument and the
183 variables related to it.

184 13 VII. Reliability of the Study Instrument

185 Cronbach's alpha was used to test stability of the measuring instrument. The values, as in Table 1, exceeded the
186 level of 70%, which is an acceptable ratio (Hair et al., 2015). The respondents were requested to rate where they
187 see their company is better than the competitor on twenty items listed in Table 2 by using the 5-point Likert
188 score. Competitive advantages were analyzed as financial performance (7 items), products (6 items), customers (3
189 items), and general performance (4 items), In general, good positions of competitive advantages were evidenced
190 in all twenty items. At the level of financial performance, the top mean scores are (mean scores = 4.08) and
191 (mean scores = 4.06) for both ROS and "overall superior financial performance" respectively.

192 14 Global Journal of Management and Business Research

193 Volume XV Issue III Version I Year () D approximate scores; (ranking from mean scores 3.94-3.98). At the level
194 of products, the top mean score is (mean scores = 4.08) for "the production cost of product", followed by (mean
195 scores = 3.89) for "product quality and image" and (mean scores = 3.85) for "time to market". Price of product
196 achieve mean (mean scores = 3.74), whereas the lowest mean score are (mean scores = 3.68) (mean scores =
197 3.66) for both "Delivery speed of product" and" Product innovation" respectively. Concerning the customers
198 dimension, the top mean score is (mean scores = 4.02) for "customer satisfaction with product", followed by (mean
199 scores = 3.94) for "Customer loyalty" and (mean scores = 3.90) for "strong reputation for customer service".
200 Regarding the general performance, the top mean score is (mean scores = 4.00) for "sustainability of acquired
201 advantage", followed by (mean scores = 3.95) for "market share". Price of product achieve mean (mean scores
202 = 3.74), whereas the lowest mean score are (mean scores = 3.68) (mean scores = 3.66) for both "Delivery speed
203 of product" and" Product innovation" respectively. Overall successful achieved (mean scores = 3.87), whereas
204 strategic advantages achieved (mean scores = 3.77).

205 15 Hypotheses Testing

206 One-sample t-test In this study was conducted for testing hypothesis H01 to find out whether competitor
207 accounting techniques were used by Jordanian manufacturing companies or not. Multiple regression analysis
208 was conducted for testing hypotheses H02-H06 to find out whether the competitor accounting techniques have an
209 influence on the competitive advantage of these companies. The basic assumptions of regression tests for all five
210 hypotheses have been met. For normality test, the scatter plot scheme showed that 95% of the errors (standardized
211 residuals) fall within the range (2, -2), indicating that these errors are distributed normally (Anderson et al.,
212 2008). Variance Inflation Factor (VIF) test was used to test multicollinearity between independent variables.
213 VIF for all variables were less than 10, which indicates no real problem in this study (Kohler, 2000). H01: The
214 competitor accounting techniques are not used by Jordanian manufacturing companies.

215 In Table 3, one-sample t-test show that all of competitor accounting techniques were used by Jordanian
216 manufacturing companies; where the values for these variables were as follow: competitor cost assessment
217 $t(61)=8.01$, $P<0.001$; competitive position monitoring $t(61)= 7.45$, $P<0.001$; and competitor appraisal based
218 on published financial statements $t(61)=10.44$, $P<0.001$. Taking together as a group all these techniques show
219 that there is a significant usage of competitor accounting techniques, $t(61)=9.77$, $p<0.001$. In addition, as
220 it appears in The results of regression analysis in Table 4 show that all of competitors accounting techniques
221 contribute significantly ($F(3, 58) =31.30$; $P<.001$) and explain ($R^2 = .62$) of the variation in the competitive
222 advantages of financial performance of Jordanian manufacturing companies. The results in Table 4 also show
223 that all three explanatory variables which are competitor cost assessment, competitive position monitoring, and
224 competitor appraisal based on published financial statements have a statistically significant positive effect on
225 competitive advantages of financial performance of Jordanian manufacturing companies, where P-value for these
226 variables .024, .011, $P=.018$ respectively. Accordingly, the null hypothesis was rejected with regard to these
227 variables. H03: The competitor accounting does not influence competitive advantages of products of Jordanian
228 manufacturing companies. In Table 5, the results of regression analysis show that all of competitors accounting
229 techniques contribute significantly ($F(3, 58) =18.58$; $P<.001$) and explain ($R^2 = .49$) of the variation in the
230 competitive advantages of products of Jordanian manufacturing companies. The regression results in Table 5 show
231 that two explanatory variables which are competitive position monitoring, and competitor appraisal based on
232 published financial statements have a statistically significant positive effect on competitive advantages of products
233 of Jordanian manufacturing companies, where P-value for these two variables .024 and $P=.012$ respectively.
234 Accordingly, the null hypothesis was rejected with regard to these variables. The third explanatory variable,
235 which is competitor cost assessment, does not has a statistically significant effect on competitive advantages of
236 products of Jordanian manufacturing companies, where P-value for this variable ($P=.376$). Therefore, the null
237 hypothesis was accepted with regard to this variable.

238 16 Global Journal of Management and Business Research

239 Volume XV Issue III Version I Year () H04: The competitor accounting does not influence competitive advantages
240 of customers of Jordanian manufacturing companies.D

241 In Table 6, the results of regression analysis show that all of competitors accounting techniques contribute
242 significantly ($F(3, 58) =25.98$; $P<.001$) and explain ($R^2 = .57$) of the variation in the competitive advantages
243 of customers of Jordanian manufacturing companies. In Table 6, Regression analysis has shown the same
244 results as in the H03 hypothesis. The variables competitive position monitoring and competitor appraisal
245 based on published financial statements have a statistically significant positive effect on competitive advantages
246 of customers of Jordanian manufacturing companies, where P-value for these two variables .008 and $P=.019$
247 respectively. Consequently, the null hypothesis was rejected with regard to these variables. The third variable;
248 competitor cost assessment, does not has a statistically significant effect on competitive advantages of customers
249 of Jordanian manufacturing companies, where P-value for this variable ($P=.117$). Therefore, the null hypothesis
250 was accepted with regard to this variable. H05: The competitor accounting does not influence competitive
251 advantages of general performance of Jordanian manufacturing companies.

252 The results of regression analysis, in Table 7, show that all of competitors accounting techniques contribute
253 significantly ($F(3, 58) =32.28$; $P<.001$) and explain ($R^2 = .62$) of the variation in the competitive advantages
254 of general performance of Jordanian manufacturing companies. The results in Table 7 also show that all three
255 explanatory variables which are competitor cost assessment, competitive position monitoring, and competitor
256 appraisal based on published financial statements have a statistically significant positive effect on competitive
257 advantages of general performance of Jordanian manufacturing companies, where P-value for these variables .011,
258 .020, $P=.016$ respectively. Accordingly, the null hypothesis was rejected with regard to these variables.

259 17 Findings

260 Based on the descriptive statistics for competitive advantage' indicators of Jordanian manufacturing companies
261 presented in Table 2, it is clear that these companies have a good positions of the competitive advantages compared
262 to their competitors. In this study, competitor accounting techniques represent the independent variables which
263 are competitor cost assessment, competitive position monitoring, and competitor appraisal based on published
264 financial statements. The results presented in Table 3 show that the usage of all these techniques by Jordanian
265 manufacturing companies was evident. The overall descriptive results in Table 3 show that using of competitor
266 appraisal based on published financial statements achieved the highest mean score, followed by competitor cost
267 assessment, while competitive position monitoring achieved the lowest mean score. These findings are consistent
268 with study by Cravens and Guilding (2001) found that competitor accounting is the most heavily used method of
269 SMA, it also consistent partially with study by Nik Hassan et al. (2011), where they found that the competitors
270 position and competitor's cost are practiced by Malaysian managers.

271 18 Conclusion

272 This study aimed to explore the extent to which the competitor accounting within the area of SMA was used by
273 the Jordanian manufacturing companies. It also aimed at examining the influence of competitor accounting

274 on the competitive advantage of these companies. The study revealed that the Jordanian manufacturing
275 companies have good positions of competitive advantages compared to the competitors. It is also found that
276 competitor accounting techniques were used by the Jordanian manufacturing companies. The results also reveal
277 that competitor accounting techniques contribute significantly and explain a high percentage of variation of
278 competitive advantages of Jordanian manufacturing companies.

279 The findings show that two of explanatory variables which are competitive position monitoring, and competitor
280 appraisal based on published financial statements have a statistically significant positive effect on all indicators
281 of competitive advantages of the Jordanian manufacturing companies, whether it was financial performance,
282 products, customers, general performance, or the combination of all these four variables. It also found that the
283 third explanatory variable, which is competitor cost assessment, does not has a statistically significant effect on
284 competitive advantages of product and customers in Jordanian manufacturing companies.

285 However, some prior studies revealed that competitor accounting techniques have positive effect on competitive
286 advantages, but no one study found the relationship between competitor accounting techniques as group and
287 competitive advantages. This was regardless of whether it was competitive advantage of financial performance,
288 products, customers, general performance or overall competitive advantages. Despite that all items of competitor
289 accounting found having an influence on general competitive advantages of Jordanian manufacturing companies,
290 this study suggested that these companies should pay more attention to competitor cost assessment to enhance
291 their competitive advantages. In context of cost-benefit approach, this study also recommends Jordanian
292 manufacturing companies to continue adopting all of strategic management accounting techniques in the future.

Advantage and Improve Firm Performance. *Information Systems Management*, 32(1), 15^{1 2}

Year
Volume XV Issue III Version I
()
Global Journal of Management and Business Research

Figure 1: D

1

Variables

Figure 2: Table 1 :

293

¹© 2015 Global Journals Inc. (US) 1

²© 2015 Global Journals Inc. (US)

		Mean SD	
comparing to the competitors			
Competitive advantage indicators			
Financial performance		4.00	1.04
1-	Return on Investment (ROI).	3.98	1.17
2-	Improvement in earnings per share.	3.97	1.24
3-	Return on assets (ROS).	4.08	1.19
4-	General profitability of the firm.	3.97	1.21
5-	Return on sales (profit/total sales).	3.97	1.14
6-	Earnings before interest and taxes.	3.94	1.17
7-	Overall superior financial performance.	4.06	1.28
Products		3.79	.95
8-	The product quality and image.	3.89	1.13
9-	Price of product.	3.74	1.20
10-	The production cost of product.	3.94	1.11
11-	Delivery speed of product.	3.68	1.32
12-	Product innovation.	3.66	1.10
13-	Time to market.	3.85	1.21
Customers		3.95	1.05
14-	Customer satisfaction with product.	4.02	1.11
15-	Customer loyalty.	3.94	1.11
16-	A strong reputation for customer service.	3.90	1.21
General performance		3.90	.98
17-	Strategic advantages.	3.77	1.22
18-	Market share.	3.95	1.15
19-	Sustainability of acquired advantage.	4.00	1.13
20-	Overall successful.	3.87	1.14

Competitive advantages status: 1= much worse; 2= worse; 3 = Neither better nor worse; 4 = better; 5 = much better.

IX.

Figure 3: Table 2 :

Year
 Volume XV Issue III Version I
 () D
 Global Journal of Management and Business Research
 , the

Figure 4: Table 3

3

Variables	Descriptive statistics		One-sample t-test	
	Mean	SD	t	Sig.
Competitor cost assessment.	3.82	.81	8.01	.000
Competitive position monitoring.	3.76	.80	7.45	.000
Competitor appraisal based on published financial statements.	3.91	.69	10.44	.000
The group	3.83	.67	9.77	.000

Extent of use competitor accounting techniques: 1=not used at all; 2=slightly used; 3=moderately used; 4=frequently used; 5=greatly used.
H02: The competitor accounting does not influence competitive advantages of financial performance of Jordanian manufacturing companies.

Figure 5: Table 3 :

4

Independent variables	performance			
	Coefficients	a	P	VIF
Competitor cost assessment.	.384	2.32	.024	2.50
Competitive position monitoring.	.517	2.62	.011	2.57
Competitor appraisal based on published financial statements.	.331	2.44	.018	1.67
R ² = .62;	F=3P.30001			

a. Dependent variable: competitive advantage of financial performance

Figure 6: Table 4 :

5

Independent variables

Figure 7: Table 5 :

6

Independent variables

Figure 8: Table 6 :

7

Independent variables

Figure 9: Table 7 :

8

		Jordanian manufacturing companies		Coefficients a	
Independent variables				B t	
Competitor cost assessment				.305	2.10 .04
Competitive position monitoring				.504	2.91 .00
Competitor appraisal based on published financial statements		.342	2.86 .006	1.67	
R ² =.64;		F=35.01, P<.001			
a. Dependent variable: overall competitive advantages					
X.					

Figure 10: Table 8 :

In Michael A Chilton and James M Bloodgood,
"Knowledge
Advantage: Issues and Potential Solutions", IGI
Global, USA.

ManagementCompetitive

Figure 12:

- 294 [Li et al.] , S Li , B R Nathan , Nathan .
- 295 [Chiekezie et al. ()] ‘Adoption of competitor focused accounting methods in selected manufacturing companies
296 in Nigeria’. N R Chiekezie , P A Egbunike , A N Odum . *Asian Journal of Economic Modelling* 2014. 2 (3)
297 p. .
- 298 [Hesford ()] ‘An Empirical Investigation of Accounting Information Use in Competitive Intelligence’. J W Hesford
299 . *Annual Meeting*, (Atlanta) 2001. American Accounting Association.
- 300 [Hesford ()] ‘An empirical investigation of accounting information use in competitive intelligence’. J W Hesford
301 . *Journal of Competitive Intelligence and Management* 2008. 4 (3) p. .
- 302 [Cravens and Guilding ()] ‘An Empirical Study of the Application of Strategic Management Accounting Tech-
303 niques’. K S Cravens , C Guilding . *Advances in Management Accounting* 2001. 10 p. .
- 304 [Guilding et al. ()] ‘An International Comparison of Strategic Management Accounting Practices’. C Guilding ,
305 K S Cravens , M Tayles . *Management Accounting Research* 2000. 11 (1) p. .
- 306 [Anderson et al. ()] D R Anderson , D J Sweeney , T A Williams . *Statistics for business and economics*,
307 (Thomson South-Western, USA) 2008. (10th edition)
- 308 [Porter ()] *Competitive advantage: Creating and sustaining superior performance*, E M Porter . 1998. New York:
309 Free Press.
- 310 [Porter ()] *Competitive Strategy: Techniques for Analyzing Industries and Competitors*, E M Porter . 1980. New
311 York: Free Press.
- 312 [Guilding ()] *Competitor-focused accounting: an exploratory note. Accounting, Organization and Society*, C
313 Guilding . 1999. 24 p. .
- 314 [Ghemawat and Rivkin ()] ‘Creating competitive advantage’. P E Ghemawat , J W Rivkin . *Strategy and the
315 Business Landscape: Text and Cases*, Ghemawat P, (Pisano G, Rivkin; Reading, MA) 1999. Addison-Wesley.
316 p. . (with Collis D)
- 317 [Aghamirian et al. ()] ‘Customer Knowledge Management Application in Gaining Organization’s Competitive
318 Advantage in Electronic Commerce’. B Aghamirian , B Dorri , B Aghamirian . *Journal of Theoretical and
319 Applied Electronic Commerce Research* 2015. 10 (1) p. .
- 320 [Buchnowska ()] ‘Customer knowledge management models: Assessment and proposal, research in systems
321 analysis and design: Models and methods’. D Buchnowska . *Lecture Notes in Business Information Processing*
322 2011. 93 (1) p. .
- 323 [Woodruff ()] ‘Customer value: The next source for competitive advantage’. R B Woodruff . *Journal of the
324 Academy of Marketing Science* 1997. 25 (2) p. .
- 325 [Ashrafi and Mueller ()] *Delineating IT Resources and Capabilities to Obtain Competitive*, R Ashrafi , J Mueller
326 . 2015.
- 327 [Eisenhardt and Martin ()] ‘Dynamic capabilities: What are they?’. K M Eisenhardt , J A Martin . *Strategic
328 Management Journal* 2000. 21 p. .
- 329 [Pilinkiene et al. ()] ‘E-business as a source of competitive advantage’. V Pilinkiene , R-J Kurschus , G Auskalnyte
330 . *Economics and Management* 2013. 18 (1) p. .
- 331 [Forsman ()] ‘Environmental innovations as a source of competitive advantage or vice versa?’. H Forsman .
332 *Business Strategy and the Environment* 2013. 22 (5) p. .
- 333 [Anatan ()] ‘Factors influencing supply chain competitive advantage and performance’. L Anatan . *International
334 Journal of Business and Information* 2014. 9 (3) p. .
- 335 [Barney ()] ‘Firm resources and sustained competitive advantage’. J B Barney . *Journal of Management* 1991.
336 17 p. .
- 337 [Barney ()] ‘Gaining and Sustaining Competitive Advantage’. J B Barney . *CIMA Management Accounting:
338 Business Strategy* 2002. 2005. BPP Publishers. 13. (BPP Professional Education)
- 339 [Hair et al. ()] J Hair , M Wolfinbarger , A Money , ; P Samuel , M Page . *Essential of Business Research
340 Methods*, (New York Routledge, USA) 2015. (3rd ed.)
- 341 [Coff ()] ‘Human assets and management dilemmas: Coping with hazards on the road to resource-based theory’.
342 R W Coff . *Academy of Management Review* 1997. 22 p. .
- 343 [Roslender and Hart ()] ‘In search of strategic management accounting: theoretical and field study perspectives’.
344 R Roslender , S Hart . *Management Accounting Research* 2003. 14 p. .
- 345 [Kumar et al. (2011)] ‘Is market orientation a source of sustainable competitive advantage or simply the cost of
346 competing’. V Kumar , E Jones , R Venkatesan , R P Leone . *Journal of Marketing* 2011. January 2011. 75
347 p. .

- 348 [Qun and Sousa ()] ‘Leveraging marketing capabilities into competitive advantage and export performance’. T
349 Qun , C M P Sousa . *International Marketing review* 2015. (1) p. .
- 350 [management accounting risk and control strategy, P3, Post Exam Guide (2008)] *management accounting risk*
351 *and control strategy, P3, Post Exam Guide*, 2008. November 2008. (The Chartered Institute of Management
352 Accountants)
- 353 [Dunkovi? et al. ()] *Marketing aspects in strategic management accounting. Interdisciplinary management re-*
354 *search, IV*, D Dunkovi? , D Juri? , T Nikoli? . 2009. p. . Faculty of Economics Osijek & Hochschule
355 Pforzheim University, STR
- 356 [Schilke ()] ‘On the contingent value of dynamic capabilities for competitive advantage: the nonlinear moderating
357 effect of environmental dynamism’. O Schilke . *Strategic Management Journal* 2014. 35 p. .
- 358 [Barney ()] ‘Organizational Culture: Can It Be a Source of Sustained Competitive Advantage?’. J B Barney .
359 *The Academy of Management Review* 1986. 11 (3) p. .
- 360 [Breznik and Lahovnik ()] ‘Renewing the resource base in line with the dynamic capabilities view: a key to
361 sustained competitive advantage in the IT industry’. L Breznik , M Lahovnik . *JEEMS* 2014. 19 (4) p. .
- 362 [Campbell et al. ()] ‘Rethinking sustained competitive advantage from human capital’. B A Campbell , R Coff ,
363 D Kryscynski . *Academy of Management Review* 2012. 37 (3) p. .
- 364 [Fiol ()] ‘Revisiting an identity-based view of sustainable competitive advantage’. M Fiol . *Journal of Management*
365 2001. 6 p. .
- 366 [Rickwood et al. ()] ‘Stapylton: strategic management accounting to gain competitive advantage’. C P Rickwood
367 , J B Coates , R J Stacey . *Management Accounting Research* 1990. 1 (1) p. .
- 368 [Kohler ()] *Statistics for business and economics*, H Kohler . 2000. Thomson learning, Inc., USA.
- 369 [Hassan et al. ()] ‘Strategic management accounting practice in malaysia: case of manufacturing sector’. Nik
370 Hassan , N-H , Nik Muhammad , N-M Ismail , Z . *Accounting and Management* 2011. 2 (2) p. . (Journal of
371 Finance)
- 372 [Okoye and Akenbor ()] ‘Strategic management accounting practices in a competitive environment: a theoretical
373 exposition’. E I Okoye , C O Akenbor . *ABSU journal of management science* 2008. 4 (2) p. .
- 374 [Lord ()] ‘Strategic management accounting: the emperor’s new clothes?’. B R Lord . *Management Accounting*
375 *Research* 1996. 7 (3) p. .
- 376 [Sorensen ()] ‘Testing VRIN framework: resource value and rareness as sources of competitive advantage and
377 above average performance’. D Sorensen . *Management* 2006. 2012. 17 (2) p. . (The automotive development
378 process, a real options analysis. DUV, Gabler edition wissenschaft)
- 379 [Simmonds ()] ‘The accounting assessment of competitive position’. K Simmonds . *European Journal of Marketing*
380 1986. 20 (1) p. .
- 381 [Akenbor and Okoye ()] ‘The Adoption of Strategic Management Accounting in Nigerian Manufacturing Firms’.
382 C O Akenbor , E I Okoye . *An International Journal of Arts and Humanities* 2012. 1 (3) p. .
- 383 [Bromwich ()] ‘The case for strategic management accounting: the role of accounting information for strategy
384 in competitive markets. Accounting’. M Bromwich . *Organizations and Society* 1990. 15 (1) p. .
- 385 [Narasimhan and Schoenherr ()] ‘The effects of integrated supply management practices and environmental
386 management practices on relative competitive quality advantage’. R Narasimhan , T Schoenherr . *International*
387 *Journal of Production Research* 2012. 50 (4) p. .
- 388 [Alsoboa et al. ()] ‘The extent to which the Jordanian Private Industrial Companies use SMA techniques’. S S
389 Alsoboa , A Khattab , M Al-Rawad . *European Journal of Business and Management* 2015. 7 (7) p. .
- 390 [Alsoboa and Aldehayyat ()] ‘The impact of competitive business strategies on managerial accounting tech-
391 niques: A study of Jordanian public industrial companies’. S S Alsoboa , J S Aldehayyat . *International*
392 *Journal of management* 2013. 30 (2) p. .
- 393 [Rao ()] ‘The impact of supply chain management practices on competitive advantage and organizational
394 performance’. T S Rao , SS . *Omega* 2006. 34 p. .
- 395 [Ndwiga (2011)] *The role of management accounting in creating and sustaining competitive advantage. a case*
396 *study of equity bank*, N M Ndwiga . 2011. June 2011. Kenya. Master of commerce, University of South Africa
- 397 [Popovski and Nikolic (2014)] *The significance of the organizational knowledge for acquiring competitive advan-*
398 *tage on the telecommunication market in the republic of Macedonia*, V Popovski , S Nikolic . 2014. 2/2014.
399 p. .
- 400 [Heinen and Hoffjan ()] ‘The Strategic Relevance of Competitor Cost Assessment -an Empirical Study of
401 Competitor Accounting’. C Heinen , A Hoffjan . *JAMAR* 2005. 3 (1) p. .