

**POSSIBLE DIFFERENCES DETERMINATION REGARDING
SERVICE COMPANIES BY APPLYING THE STRATEGIC
PLANNING MODEL IN MANUFACTURING COMPANIES**

UDC 658.5

Jelena Borocki, Rado Maksimović

Faculty of Technical Sciences, Novi Sad, Serbia

E-mail: jelena.borocki@gmail.com

Abstract. *In the turbulent world of innovative economy, companies are facing entirely new problems they have to solve if they want to achieve favorable positions in the competitive market. Strategic planning has evolved: nowadays it is used for changing and continuously improving the company's strategic position. The application of one strategic planning model to manufacturing and services companies is presented in this paper. The research results (126 companies, three countries in the region) show some differences existing between manufacturing and service companies.*

Key Words: *Production Companies, Strategic Planning, Innovativeness, Discriminative Analysis*

1. INTRODUCTION

In the turbulent world of innovative economy, management processes may not be any longer estimated in terms of the complexity of possibilities and the demands for creating a new value. Companies are facing completely new problems; thus, completely new solutions are required which demand the transformation of management, values, and other basic success indicators. Innovation becomes priority (not only in manufacturing companies): it is even more important than costs decrease for long-term success in operation. Every company should consider how to shift from the position of "competitiveness for the survival sake" to the position of "competitiveness for the sake of favorable position resulting from the definition of the future innovative value" which includes new business, economic, and social-cultural models. This is the main reason why companies should continually use some of the strategic planning models for defining strategic position and strategy, at the company level as well as at the functional level.

The external environment that the company operates in and for which it creates, implements and controls certain activities, has been affected by significant changes; namely,

the traditional economic and business way of thinking as well as management are not the same as they used to be some twenty or thirty years ago (Antić, Sekulić, 2006). The changes in the external environment require the company to foresee the lack of balance and threats in the external environment, to respond and adjust to the changes that quickly appear, anticipate or foresee new development forms – trends – and to actively impact its environment and/or even to impact its creation (i.e. to create changes within it).

The definition of company, the character of its operation and values, all has changed as well. Companies may still achieve a competitive advantage through better information on customers or for customers or through price advantages, but the information basis is not such a valid one and it is not as significant as it used to be. The stimulus to innovation is very important within the innovative economy, where knowledge, as the primary resource, becomes the basis of the company's competitive advantage.

The majority of companies in the Republic of Serbia do not apply or apply only scarce tools of the strategic management, and these are only individual cases (like company's vision and mission statement for the application of which much time has to pass to become acceptable, and even more to be applied on a regular basis). The moment when the strategic planning, as the best ranked strategic management tool for several years now, will begin to be applied in the majority of companies in this area is not so far away. Perhaps, the situation is somewhat better regarding the customer-oriented strategic management tools (mostly applied in service companies) – still, customer may not be ignored (for example, CRM method, as well as some other tools for sales improvement).

For an effective and efficient company operation, adequate application of modern strategic management tools is significant without any doubt, especially in the turbulent market environment. The selection of the tools and of their application directly impacts the company's performances, competitive advantage acquisition and maintenance, as well as their further growth and development. This is true for manufacturing as for service companies.

2. STRATEGIC PLANNING MODELS

Strategic planning, as the process of defining strategic plan i.e. strategy focusing the company on its future is the management tool which has been affected by many changes. Even today, within the innovative economy, the strategic planning has found its place – but not without some significant changes in its essence.

The strategic planning has got a discipline as a standard management tool, but its new purpose is to change the method of creating the company's operating strategy, to change basic strategic assumptions and methods of their achievement. Effective business strategy requires effective innovations, and, in such a way that the innovations must be seen as the critical component in any form of strategic way of thinking, planning, activity; and as anything resembling "strategic", it is challenging.

Though the strategic planning by itself may not foresee the direction of the development of the market i.e. all vital components of the external environment impacting the company's competitiveness with high certainty, strategic innovations and strategic plan improvements, and the methods used in the strategic planning need to be the basis of the strategy of the company that wants to survive in the time of a complex business climate (Boročki, Maksimovic, 2008). Various models of operation analysis are used in the strategic planning, including SWOT and PEST analysis, SPACE analysis, portfolio methods,

BSC, and other numerous analyses which almost have the same objective – to analyze the current situation in the company and its environment as perfectly as possible and to propose the strategies/objectives/measures to increase company competitiveness. Each of such methods has got its advantages and disadvantages, as well as the time moment in which it is quite appropriate to use this model. It is certain that there is no universal model which would eliminate all failures of the strategic planning and be universally applicable to any situation, to any company.

The company's strategic position determines the method in which the company will mobilize its advantages in the market competition and define its competitive advantage. Therefore, it is very important to know the current strategic position by applying one of the strategic planning models - for instance Strategic Position and Action Evaluation Model (Rowe, J.A., et. al., 1994; Borocki, J., 1998.) as well as the dynamic factors which could impact not only its application but also the quality of the development processes at the company, company innovation level, i.e. its competitiveness. The success of a business depends heavily on its strategic positioning in the market (Porter, 1985).

This paper deals with studying the differences between production and service companies in terms of the key factors determining the company's strategic position by applying the modified SPACE analysis, within the domain of the significance of these factors. The identified similarities and differences result from the implemented research.

3. METHOD

The research covered 126 companies from Serbia, Bosnia and Herzegovina and Montenegro. With the aim of having as a representative sample as possible, the companies different in their size, legal form of organization, economic branch (economic sector), location, activity, and ownership are selected. The research of the strategic commitment of the selected companies is made in line with the expanded and modified SPACE questionnaire (Borocki, J., 2009) to evaluate the company's strategic position. Since the questionnaire covers 80 hierarchical structural factors and/or indicators which are individually evaluated in terms of their level of importance and value for the respondents (for the selected main product/service, target customer, and geographic area), which include various operation areas, it is necessary to complete the questionnaire by several employees from various areas (functional units of the company), whose competences, knowledge, and experience in certain fields are used to get as objective evaluation as possible i.e. significance of a factor and/or indicator from the questionnaire. The survey has been implemented for three years on the territory of Serbia. In the final sample of the entities, after the exclusion of the companies and factors with more than 5% of the missing answers, 116 companies are kept in the further analysis. Presentation of the sample structure is given in the tables below.

Table 1 Sample Structure - activity

Serbia	No	%
Manufacturing companies	47	40.52
Services companies	69	59.48
Total number of companies in the sample	116	100.00

Table 2 Sample Structure – manufacturing companies (company size)

Company size	No	%
Small and medium enterprises	31	70.69
Big companies	16	29.31
Total number of production companies	47	100.00

Table 3 Sample Structure - manufacturing companies (legal form of organization)

Legal form of organization	No	%
Corporation	17	36.17
Ltd	24	51.06
Entrepreneurs	4	8.51
Public companies	0	0.00
Others	2	4.26
Total number of production companies	47	100.00

The questionnaire developed through the revision of the modified SPACE analysis covers seven metrical scales in its final version (instead of four in the modified SPACE model), and the characteristics of the metrical scales including the brief description and the value of the Alpha coefficient are given in Table 4.

Due to the need for reducing the number of the factors in the existing analysis for the evaluation of the strategic approach of company as well as the need to decrease the complexity of the existing model, such data analysis methods are selected which ensured this. The data are processed in the statistic program packages Statistica and SPSS.

The analysis includes the answers to 51 items of the modified SPACE questionnaire (instead of original 80) (Borocki, 2009), within the domain of its significance. After the initial exclusion of individual variables, some measuring characteristics of the newly formed scales are checked. The significance domain is selected as the decisive aspect for the model modification primarily because of its orientation to the variables which may be significant for the respondents in the future. Latent structure of the significance domain space measurement and of the values of the modified SPACE model is reviewed in the analysis of major components. Such process is selected due to the mostly explorative nature of the study and the tendency to avoid the risk of excluding the potentially useful variability from the analysis. With the aim of determining the latent structure of the common space of the summation scores in the scales of the modified SPACE model, the analysis of the major components was implemented. The main kept components were rotated in Promax position. Promax rotation was made and the most interpretable solution was selected (solution with 7 main components).

Metrical characteristics of the scales formed on the basis of the matrices of the set of the rotated main components within the value and significance domain were reviewed by applying macro program RTT9S, intended for SPSS environment. The program authors are Konstantin Momirović and Goran Knežević, while the modifications were made by Stanislav Fajgelj.

Table 4 Metrical scales developed by the revision of the modified SPACE model (Borocki, 2009) - significance domain

No.	Scale name	Brief scale description	Alpha*
1	Company innovation from product/service aspect	Factors relating to innovation and development processes at company, as well as the operating and development aspects of relation with clients (e.g. product development, operating and human resources technologies). Product quality and originality, product delivery dates, available know-how, etc.	,9276
2	Client orientation and reputation in external environment	Factors including operating activities of client relations evaluate company acceptance by clients and business partners (timely taking of corrective activities, flexibility in relation to client requirements, company image, product/service prices in relation to major competitors, credibility with business partners, etc.)	,8623
3	Market growth potential	Factors relating to the characteristics of the market the company operates on: market growth rate, market size, product demand, possibility of opening new markets, demand stability, possibility of placing the same type of service in high number	,7743
4	Company operation financial potential	Factors relating to company operation financial aspects which describe the internal components of company financial potential: costs stability, assets turnover coefficient, timeliness of payment of short-term liabilities, cash flow level in terms of self-finance	,7894
5	General characteristics of economic segment	Factors relating to the character of the economic segment i.e. economic/industrial branch company operates in: energy price change, economic segment energy dependence, raw material availability, possibility of production in high batches, etc.	,7415
6	Economic segment profitability (Competition aspects / economic segment volatility)	Factors relating to the company's competition for the selected major product i.e. market: Number of competitors within the economic segment, pressure of competition within the economic segment, number of product variants within the economic segment, changes of competitive product prices, etc.	,7677
7	Political-legal aspects of external environment	Factors relating to the environment components determined through the impact of government and operating rules set out at the national level, which may not be impacted or controlled by company: changes of regulations, laws, relation of government to the economic branch, economic growth rate in the country, tax liabilities, inflation rate, etc.	,7638

**(Alpha = Reliability Kronbah coefficient in line with the internal consistency model)*

With the aim of determining the structure of the differences between the manufacturing and service companies in the dimensions of the modified SPACE model, canonical discriminative analysis was applied. Grouping (criterion) variable was the belonging to the group of the manufacturing i.e. service companies, and the set of the quantitative (predictor) variables included the summation scores on the scales of the modified SPACE questionnaire.

4. RESULTS

First, differences between the manufacturing and non-manufacturing companies were tested in t-tests for independent samples within the SPACE model dimensions. Independent variable in all analyses includes the belonging to the group of the manufacturing i.e.

non-manufacturing companies, while the dependent variables were the scores on the scales of the modified SPACE questionnaire.

The results of t-tests (Table 5) suggest that the manufacturing and non-manufacturing companies have significant statistical differences in the scores achieved on the **fifth** dimension of the modified SPACE model – Economic Segment General Characteristics, and in terms of the scores on the *Market* dimension (Market Growth Potential). The manufacturing companies achieve higher scores.

Within the defined sample, where 40.517% are manufacturing companies, the discriminative function was applied, the results of which are presented in Tables 5, 6, 7, and 8. The aggregation variable was recognition of the group of production companies or service companies, and group of quantitative variables was made of scores on modified SPACE model's dimensions.

Table 5 Results of t-test

	Levene F	P	t	df	p	Mean (services)	Mean (prod.)
Innovativeness	3,395	0,068	-1,910	114,000	0,059	44,276	47,859
Clients	1,548	0,216	-0,327	114,000	0,745	28,507	28,835
Market	0,491	0,485	-1,979	114,000	0,050	21,046	22,521
Industry segment	11,148	0,001	-4,990*	113,855	0,000	10,821	14,337
Volatility	0,098	0,754	-1,587	114,000	0,115	19,182	20,532
Finance	3,564	0,062	-0,973	114,000	0,333	23,989	24,872
Political and legal aspects	0,003	0,953	0,760	114,000	0,449	15,039	14,340

* t-test for non-homogenous variances

Table 6 Discriminative function characteristics

Function	Eigenvalue	% of Variance	Cumulative	Canonial Correlation
1	,256 ^a	100,0	100,0	,467

Table 7 Testing discriminative function significance

Function	Wilks Lambda	Chi-square	df	Sig.
1	,782	25,188	7	,001

(df = freedom degree level, Sig. = significance level)

Table 8 Discriminative function significance matrix – significance domain

	Function
The name of the function (Borocki, 2009)	1
General characteristics of industrial segment	0,819
Market growth potential	0,351
Political and legal aspects of external environment	0,339
Company innovativeness (product/service aspects)	0,281
Financial potential of the company	0,172
Profitability of industrial segment (competitor's aspects, volatility)	-0,135
Client orientation and reputation in the external environment	0,058

Table 9 Centroids of groups

	Function
Companies	1
Service companies	-,432
Product companies	,635

The discriminative function is statistically significant at the level of $p < 0.01$. Canonical correlation coefficient ($R_c = 0.467$) indicates that the intensity of differences between the groups is modest (the groups include manufacturing and service companies). Variable discriminative intensity is presented through Wilks-Lambda test which amounts to 0.782 for the first discriminative function, which indicates its statistical significance in explaining the total variance of the differences between the groups. The score on the scale of the *Market Segment General Characteristics* (Table 4 – metrical scale no. 5) has got a significant and high correlation with the discriminative function, and significantly but with substantially lower coefficient, scores on the scales *Market Growth Potential* (Table 4 – metrical scale no. 3) and *Company Innovation from the Product/Service Aspect* (Table 4 – metrical scale no. 1). Other dimensions of the modified SPACE model do not provide significant contribution to the discriminative function structure.

The discriminative function significance relates to the impacts of general market characteristics to the production process, starting from the production process input components (energy sources availability, energy cost and its impact to manufacturing, raw material necessary for product manufacturing, etc.) up to uncontrollable factors: market growth rate, market size, product demand, etc., which define market potential. In line with the characteristics and content, the discriminative function may be named as *Market and Economic Characteristics*.

It is also significant that the controllable factor (something which may be controlled and impacted by company) called: Company Innovation from Product/Service Aspect is also included in the structure (content) of the discriminative function. This factor relates to the elements of company development, quality, deadlines, available know-how, originality and completeness of product assortment, etc. This indicates that the manufacturing companies are aware of the significance of the internal factors impacting company competitiveness, and these are innovation factors from product aspect. Although not all innovation factors of a manufacturing company were included in the modified SPACE model (which is one of the major failures of this model of the strategic planning in the process of creating company innovation which should dynamically follow the change of the value and significance of the innovation factor), the observed set of the key factors may yet be defined in this manner.

The group of the **manufacturing companies** achieves **high**, and the group of the non-manufacturing companies achieves lower scores on the discriminative function (Table 8). Service companies place lower significance to the structure of the market and economic segment (to general characteristics of the economic segment, market growth potential, and innovation) than the manufacturing companies do. The result indicates that there is the tendency within the group of the manufacturing companies to use the potential of the market and economic segment which is significantly more distinguished, while the service companies evaluate the significance of these aspects of the strategic performance as significantly lower. The fact that the manufacturing companies place more significance to

product innovation, while this is not the case with the service companies, should certainly not be neglected. This results is entirely expected due to obviously present awareness and traditional view of innovation with the manufacturing companies: acquiring of competitive advantage is possible through continuing designing of new products contrary to the service companies which may design their competitiveness in a different manner more frequently: through the innovation in processes, organization, or somewhat differently, and less through new service introduction.

The group centroids which are the arithmetic mean of the groups may be seen in the Table 9, which indicates that their distance (discrimination) is significant. The results of service companies are on the negative pole of the discriminative function, and the results of the manufacturing companies are on the positive. This means that the service companies give less significance to the structure of the market and commercial segment than the manufacturing companies do. The group of the manufacturing companies achieves high, and the group of non-manufacturing companies low scores on the discriminative function. The result indicates that there is a tendency within the manufacturing companies to use the potential of the market and commercial segment which is significantly more distinguished, while the service companies evaluate the significance of these scales as significantly lower.

4.1 Differences in the Structure of Correlation Matrices

Box test was made on the selected research sample. Since Box test of homogeneity of the matrix of covariances is marginally statistically significant (Box $M=51,213$, $F_{(28, 34125.066)}=1,73$, $p<0,05$), the matrices of inter-correlations were compared among the scores on the modified SPACE scales in the groups of the manufacturing and service companies. The Box test checks whether the matrices among the variables (in this case, SPACE dimension) are equal in groups; i.e. whether the pattern of the relation is equal in the groups i.e. whether there are indications that the groups are potentially qualitatively different.

Table 10 Matrix of intercorrelations of the scores in the scales of the modified SPACE model within the group of non-manufacturing companies (N=69)

	Innovativeness	Clients	Market	Ind. Segment	Volatility	Finance
Clients	,6862 p=,000					
Market	,1991 p=,101	,4216 p=,000				
Ind. segment	,3490 p=,003	,2759 p=,022	,3633 p=,002			
Volatility	,4614 p=,000	,6074 p=,000	,6037 p=,000	,4468 p=,000		
Finance	,5481 p=,000	,5330 p=,000	,3874 p=,001	,4198 p=,000	,5135 p=,000	
Political/ legal aspects	,2331 p=,054	,2311 p=,056	,2245 p=,064	,3879 p=,001	,2263 p=,062	,3917 p=,001

Table 11 Matrix of intercorrelations of the scores in the scales of the modified SPACE model within the group of manufacturing companies (N=47)

	Innovativeness	Clients	Market	Ind. Segment	Volatility	Finance
Clients	,8052 p=,000					
Market	,2379 p=,107	,2123 p=,152				
Ind. segment	,2977 p=,042	,3098 p=,034	,4087 p=,004			
Volatility	,2847 p=,052	,3400 p=,019	,4135 p=,004	,3902 p=,007		
Finance	,4644 p=,001	,6319 p=,000	,3982 p=,006	,5143 p=,000	,3452 p=,017	
Political/ legal aspects	,2086 p=,159	,1926 p=,195	,3117 p=,033	,1816 p=,222	,4237 p=,003	,2751 p=,061

Within the group of the non-manufacturing companies, in the matrix of the intercorrelations of the dimensions of significance from the area of the SPACE model, 16 correlation coefficients are statistically significant in relation to 14 within the group of the manufacturing companies. The consideration of the intercorrelation matrices indicates that there are no differences in the signs of the correlation coefficients (all coefficients in both matrices have got positive sign); however, the differences in the intensity of the individual bivariate relations between the SPACE model dimensions are visible.

The correlation between the second and third variable (*Clients orientations* and *Market Growth Potential*) within the space of *importance* of the modified SPACE model is statistically significant and it has got moderate intensity within the group of the non-manufacturing companies, while it is not statistically significant within the group of manufacturing companies.

Correlation between the **first and the second dimensions** (*Company Innovation from Product/Service Aspect* and *Client Orientation and Reputation in External Environment*) is high in both groups, **and it is somewhat higher in the group of the manufacturing companies**. Correlation between the **first and the sixth dimensions** (*Company Innovation from Product/Service Aspect* and *Economic Segment Profitability – Aspects of Competition – Economic Segment Volatility*) is significant, positive, and of moderate intensity within the group of the non-manufacturing companies, **while it is not significant in the group of the manufacturing companies**. Drastic difference is seen with the correlation between the **second and the sixth dimensions** (*Client Orientation and Reputation in External Environment* and *Economic Segment Profitability – Aspects of Competition – Economic Segment Volatility*) where the correlation is significant and of high intensity in the group of the non-manufacturing companies, while **it is insignificant in the group of the manufacturing companies**. Situation is also similar with the correlation between the **second and the third dimensions** (*Client Orientation and Reputation in External Environment* and *Market Growth Potential*): it is statistically significant and of moderate intensity in the group of the non-manufacturing companies, while **it is insignificant in the group of the manufacturing companies**. Also, in the group of the non-manufacturing companies, the relation between the **third and the sixth dimensions** (*Market Growth Po-*

tential and Economic Segment Profitability) is of high intensity and it is of moderate intensity in the group of the manufacturing companies. The correlation between the **sixth and the fourth** dimensions in the group of the non-manufacturing companies is of moderate intensity, and it is of low intensity in the group of the manufacturing companies. **The sixth and the seventh** dimensions (*Market Segment Profitability* and *Political-legal Aspects of Business Environment*) do not correlate significantly in the group of the manufacturing companies, while they correlate in a significant and moderate manner in the group of the non-manufacturing companies. The correlation between the **third and the seventh dimensions** (*Market Growth Potential* and *Political-legal Aspects of External Environment*) **is significant** (though of low intensity) in the **group of the manufacturing companies**, while it is not significant in the group of the non-manufacturing companies. The correlations between the fifth and the seventh, that is, the fourth and the seventh dimensions (market segment general characteristics and political-legal aspects of environment i.e. company financial potential) are significant in the group of the non-manufacturing companies, and they are not significant in the group of the manufacturing companies.

Differences in the structure of the correlation matrices evidence that the interaction patterns among the dimensions of the modified SPACE model, most probably, differ in the groups of the manufacturing and non-manufacturing companies. Besides, the patterns of the relation of the **sixth dimension** and other dimensions differ most. This means that it seems that the difference is the most distinguished in terms of relation between the economic segment profitability (i.e. its volatility) and other aspects of the modified SPACE model.

5. DISCUSSION

If the sample is considered as a whole (service and manufacturing companies), the structure matrix is such that the following dimensions, above all, significantly correlate with the discriminative function: Economic Segment General Characteristics (fifth), Market Growth Potential (third), Company Innovation from Product/Service Aspect (first). By comparing the results on the sample discriminative function as a whole and of the manufacturing companies, it was seen that the manufacturing companies do not place high significance to certain competitive advantage elements: Company Operation Financial Potential (fourth), Political-legal Aspects of External Environment (seventh), Client Orientation and Reputation in External Environment (second). This could indicate that the manufacturing companies, in the process of acquiring competitiveness, place more significance to their competitors, their behavior, general economic branch aspects which directly impact manufacturing process (and indirectly – the financial results) which they may not completely impact or control, and they place less significance to the impact of government to operation and key financial indicators of operation. To some extent, there is a concern that the manufacturing companies do not deem significant the factors which are the content of the aspect of *Client Relation and Reputation in External Environment* (which include the elements like: level of impact to customers; flexibility to customers in terms of deadlines, payment methods, change requests, image and credibility with business partners; market share; return of investments, etc.). This only indicates that the selected manufacturing companies still acquire their competitiveness in a traditional manner: through maximum use of important elements of the external environment for the manufacturing process quality, through the innovation of only and exclusively products,

and through the monitoring of key competition activities. The experiences of the service companies could, perhaps, be useful in the process of acquiring a better strategic position of the manufacturing companies, due to the obvious fact that the service companies pay higher attention to some competitiveness elements which are neglected by the manufacturing companies. The advantage of the service companies is that the innovation in the service activities does not require high research and development costs, as it is the case with the manufacturing companies.

If the average values of each relevant factor for the companies in the sub-sample were observed, and if these values were included in the modified SPACE model to determine an "average" strategic posture of the manufacturing companies, the standard of such a company would indicate the fact that the company has got a competitive strategic posture (Borocki, 2009). With the service companies, aggressive strategic posture is predominant. Aggressive strategic posture means that company has at the same time excellent financial and competitive potential.

The characteristics of the competitive strategic posture include a relatively attractive economic branch in the unstable external environment. The critical factor is the company financial potential. The manufacturing companies are more focused on the manufacturing in high quantities and lower input manufacturing costs, and the cause of this may primarily be the lack of the financial potential to ensure the innovation within all company segments (and not only through product innovation). In such conditions, the companies should obtain additional financial resources (if they want to improve their strategic approach), to improve the productivity, expand and/or supplement the assortment of individual products, and protect their competitive advantage.

6. CONCLUSION

In the sample of 116 companies, the sub-sample is observed, which is comprised of 47 manufacturing companies, with the objective of determining differences between the strategic position factors of manufacturing and non-manufacturing companies. To determine the differences, discriminative analysis is used, Box test and t-test.

The results show that the service and manufacturing companies demonstrate certain differences in the process of applying the modified SPACE model for evaluating the company strategic position within the significance domain. With the service companies, the correlation of the dimension Economic Segment Profitability is significant with the elements: service innovation, client orientation, company financial potential, and market growth potential, though they place less significance to the scales of the economic segment profitability, service innovation, and market growth potential. Such correlations are not achieved with the manufacturing companies, and they are not of the same intensity. The highest correlation level with the manufacturing companies includes the dimension of innovation from product aspect and client orientation, while the economic segment profitability and market growth potential are in correlation with the political-legal aspects of the external environment. There is an obvious perception of the manufacturing companies regarding the significance of the role of the government for the economic segment profitability and the possibility of using the market growth potential. The manufacturing companies should obviously include the strategic planning process in the standard processes, i.e. apply the model for the strategic position evaluation to follow the contemporary flows

and include all key elements resulting in the company innovation in the manufacturing strategy. This is the only way of achieving a certain competition level.

Further research should cover a higher number of the companies in the sample, which would ensure a more precise analysis by various economic segments.

REFERENCES

1. Adizes, I., 1998, *The Pursuit of Prime*, Santa Monica, CA: Knowledge Exchange, 284 pp.
2. Antic, Lj., Sekulic, V., 2006, *New paradigm of business performance measurement in contemporary business conditions*, Facta Universitatis: Economics and organization Vol. 3, No 1, 2006, pp. 69 - 77
3. Bains&Company Survey, 2007.
4. Borocki, J., Maksimovic, R., 2008, *Strategic planning in a function of organizational innovativeness*, International Conference on INDUSTRIAL SYSTEMS IS'08, Novi Sad: University of Novi Sad, Faculty of Technical Sciences, 02-03. October, 2008, pp. 415- 420, UDK: 658.5(082), ISBN 978-86-7892-135-3
5. Rowe, J.A., Mason, O.R., Dickel, E.K., 1998, *Computer models for strategic management*, Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, Reading, MA, 84 pp.
6. Rowe, J.A., Mason, O.R., Dickel, E.K., Mann, B.R., Mockler, J.R., 1994, *Strategic Management - A Methodological Approach*, 4th Edition, Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, Reading, MA
7. Borocki J., 1998, *Determining strategic posture of the company*, MSc Thesis, University of Novi Sad, Faculty of Technical Sciences, Novi Sad
8. Porter, M.E., 1985, *Competitive Advantage - Creating and Sustaining superior Performance*, The Free Press, New York, 356 pp.
9. Borocki, J., 2009, *Developing strategic planning model in function of company's innovativeness*, PhD Thesis, University of Novi Sad, Faculty of Technical Science, Novi Sad
10. Knežević, G.D., Momirović, K., 1996, RTT9G i RTT10G: *Dva programa za analizu metrijskih karakteristika kompozitnih mernih instrumenata*. in: Kostić Petar (ed.) *Merenje u psihologiji*, Beograd: Institut za kriminološka i sociološka istraživanja, br. 2, pp. 37-56
11. Chapman R., Hyland P., 2000, *Strategy and continuous improvement in small-to-medium Australian manufacturers*, *Integrated Manufacturing Systems* 11/3, pp. 171-179
12. Hamel, G., Prahalad, C.K., 1996, *Competing for the future*, Harvard Business School Press, Boston
13. Zott, Christoph, 2003, *Dynamic Capabilities and the Emergence of Intra-industry Differential Firm Performance: Insights from a Simulation Study*, *Strategic Management Journal*, 24: 97-125.

UTVRĐIVANJE MOGUĆIH RAZLIKA U ODNOSU NA USLUŽNA PREDUZEĆA PRIMENOM MODELA STRATEGIJSKOG PLANIRANJA U PROIZVODNIM PREDUZEĆIMA

Jelena Borocki, Rado Maksimović

U turbulentnom svetu inovativne privrede preduzeća se suočavaju sa potpuno novim problemima koji zahtevaju potpuno nova rešenja, način poslovanja, ukoliko se želi postići dobra pozicija na konkurentskom tržištu. Strategijsko planiranje je evoluiralo: danas se ono koristi kako bi promenilo i kontinuirano pratilo poboljšanje strategijske pozicije preduzeća i/ili jednog njenog dela. U ovom radu će biti predstavljeni rezultati primene jednog modela strategijskog planiranja u istraživanju koje je obuhvatilo 126 preduzeća iz tri zemlje u regionu. Rezultati istraživanja pokazuju da postoje određene razlike između proizvodnih i uslužnih preduzeća po pitanju primene modifikovanog SPACE modela.

Ključne reči: proizvodna preduzeća, strategijsko planiranje, inovativnost, diskriminativna funkcija