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Abstract: Achieving a competitive advantage position relative to their competitors are the main objectives that business organizations in particular should strive to attain. This research empirically examines the importance and emphasis placed on organizational resources, capabilities and systems in their relationships with competitive advantage. This research is conducted among manufacturers listed in the Federation of Malaysian Manufacturers Directory 2008. A cross-sectional study using structured questionnaire is used to obtain responses from the manufacturers. A pilot study is initially conducted to establish the reliability of the questionnaire scales and measurements. From the subsequent actual survey, 127 respondents replied and completed the questionnaire (12.7% response rate). The overall findings indicate a significant positive effect of organizational resources, capabilities and systems collectively on competitive advantage, providing support and extension to the Resource-Based View (RBV). The total variance in competitive advantage accounted for by the Multiple Linear Regression (MLR) Model is 56.2%. In short, the findings from this study have not only contributed to the body of knowledge or literature on the subject or issue of the relationship between organizational resources, capabilities, systems and competitive advantage but also provided vital information to both practitioners and policy makers on the subject matter.

Key words: Organizational resources, capabilities, systems and competitive advantage, Resource-Based View (RBV), pilot study, Malaysia

INTRODUCTION

Achieving a competitive advantage position relative to their competitors are the main objectives that business organizations in particular should strive to attain. In order to attain a competitive advantage level that can match those of their business rivals, business organizations have to initially understand the internal strengths and weaknesses of the organization and their potential effects on the firm’s competitive advantage. By having information on the relative internal strengths and weaknesses of their organization, management can be guided in the process of making strategic business decision to improve their overall position. This research will empirically examine the importance and emphasis placed on organizational resources, capabilities and systems in their relationships with competitive advantage.

Literature review

Competitive advantage: The pursuit of competitive advantage is indeed an idea that is at the heart of much of the strategic management literature (Burden and Proctor, 2000; Fahy, 2000; Ma, 2000, 2004; Barney, 2001a, b, 2006; Lin, 2003; Fahy et al., 2004; Cousins, 2005; Porter and Kramer, 2006; Liao and Hu, 2007). Understanding sources of sustained competitive advantage has become a major area of study in strategic management (Porter, 1985, 1991; Barney, 1991; Peteraf, 1993; Ma, 1999a, b, 2004; Flint and Van Fleet, 2005; King, 2007). The resource-based-view stipulates that in strategic management, the fundamental sources and drivers to firms’ competitive advantage and superior performance are mainly associated with the attributes of their resources and capabilities which are valuable and costly-to-copy (Barney, 1986, 1991, 2001a, Conner, 1991; Mills et al., 2003; Peteraf and Bergen, 2003). Furthermore, other studies support the importance of having a good strategy to attain competitive advantage from the resource-based view (Hult and Ketchen, 2001; Ramsay, 2001; Foss and Knudsen, 2003; Gottschalg and Zollo, 2007). A well formulated and implemented strategy can have significant effect on the attainment of competitive advantage level (Richard, 2000; Arend, 2003; Powell, 2003; Porter and Kramer, 2006). The resource-based view provides an avenue for organizations to plan and execute their organizational strategy by examining the position of their internal resources and capabilities.
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towards achieving competitive advantage (Kristandl and Bottis, 2007; Sheehan and Foss, 2007). In this research, specific focus will be given to competitive advantage from the dimension of value and quality, the main elements of which consist of cost-based, product-based and service-based. Other previous studies have shown that there is a significant relationship between cost-based advantage and the performance of organizations. Firms that enjoy cost-based competitive advantage over their rivals for example in terms of relatively lower manufacturing or production costs, lower cost of goods sold and lower-price products have been shown to exhibit comparatively better performance (Gimenez and Ventura, 2002; Morgan et al., 2004). Furthermore, it has also been identified that there is a significant relationship between product-based advantage and performance of organizations. Firms that experience product-based competitive advantage over their rivals for example in terms of better and/or higher product quality, packaging, design and style have been shown to achieve relatively better performance (Gimenez and Ventura, 2002; Morgan et al., 2004). Similarly, research has further illustrated that there is a significant relationship between service-based advantage and performance of organizations. Firms that benefit from service-based competitive advantage compared to their rivals, for example in terms of better and/or higher product flexibility, accessibility, delivery speed, reliability, product line breadth and technical support have accomplished comparatively better performance (Gimenez and Ventura, 2002; Morgan et al., 2004).

Organizational resources: As mentioned, the Resource-Based View (RBV) of the firm predicts that certain types of resources owned and controlled by firms have the potential and promise to generate competitive advantage which eventually leads to superior firm’s performance (Wernerfelt, 1984, 1995; Dierickx and Cool, 1989; Barney, 1991, 1995, 2001a, b; Peteraf, 1993; Chaharbaghi and Lynch, 1999, Fahy, 2000; Priem and Butler, 2001a, b; Miller and Ross, 2003; Morgan et al., 2004; King, 2007; Simon et al., 2007; Aminuddin et al., 2007). Eisenhardt and Martin (2000), Hoopes et al. (2003), Ireland et al. (2003), Mills et al. (2003) and Morgan et al. (2004) following Wernerfelt (1984, 1995) and Barney (1986, 1991) have examined and categorized resources into tangible resources i.e., human, physical organizational, financial and intangible resources i.e., reputational, regulatory, positional, functional, social and cultural.

From the categories of resources cited above, the human resources (Adner and Helfat, 2003; Datta et al., 2005; Abdullah et al., 2007; Haslinda et al., 2007; Rose and Kumar, 2007) and the intangible resources (Oliver, 1997; Makadok, 2001) are deemed to be the more important and critical resources in attaining and sustaining competitive advantage position because of their nature being not only valuable but also hard-to-copy relative to the other types of tangible resources (i.e., physical and financial resources). In short, conceptually and empirically, resources are the foundation for attaining and sustaining competitive advantage and eventually superior firm’s performance.

In this study, particular attention will be afforded to resources from the dimension of tangible and intangible, the main elements of which consist of physical, financial, experiential and human. The Resource-Based View (RBV) of the firm predicts that certain types of resources owned and controlled by firms have the potential and promise to generate competitive advantage which eventually leads to superior firm’s performance. Physical resources such as the plant, machinery, equipment, production technology and capacity have contributed positively towards organizational competitive advantage and eventually result in superior firm’s performance (Morgan et al., 2004; Aminuddin et al., 2007). In addition, financial resources such as the cash-in-hand, bank deposits and/or savings and financial capital (stocks and shares) have also contributed positively towards organizational competitive advantage and eventually result in superior firm’s performance (Morgan et al., 2004; Aminuddin et al., 2007). Further, experiential resources such as product reputation, manufacturing experience and brand-name have contributed positively towards organizational competitive advantage and eventually result in superior firm’s performance (Morgan et al., 2004; Aminuddin et al., 2007).

Human resources such as the top and middle management, administrative and production employees also contribute positively towards organizational competitive advantage which eventually result in superior firm’s performance (Adner and Helfat, 2003; Morgan et al., 2004; Datta et al., 2005; Aminuddin et al., 2007; Abdullah et al., 2007; Rose and Kumar, 2007).

Organizational capabilities: Studies have shown that there is a significant relationship between capabilities and competitive advantage (Prahalad and Hamel, 1990; Grant, 1996; Maccarone et al., 1998; Ma, 1999b; Barney, 2001a, b; Colotla et al., 2003; Wang and Lo, 2003; Morgan et al., 2004; Ray et al., 2004; King, 2007; Perez-Freije and Enkel, 2007; Simon et al., 2007). Following Prahalad and Hamel (1990), Stalk et al. (1992), Cockburn et al. (2000), Eisenhardt and Martin (2000), Helfat and Peteraf (2003), Hoopes et al. (2003), Mills et al. (2003), Peteraf and Bergen (2003),
Morgan et al. (2004) and Mayer and Salomon (2006), capabilities are conceptualized and categorized as inter alia, organizational skills and collective learning, core competencies, resource development competence, organizational integration, strategic decision making and aligning, product-development, relationship-building and informational and technological capabilities.

With excellent strategic manufacturing practices and strategic integration and deployment of resources and capabilities, competitive advantage and better performance will be attainable to firms (Schroeder et al., 2002; Ketokivi and Schroeder, 2004; Congden, 2005; McEvily and Marcus, 2005; Swink et al., 2005; Santhapparaj et al., 2006; Phusavat and Kanchana, 2007; Prajogo, 2007; Prajogo et al., 2007; Salaheldin and Eid, 2007).

In short, capabilities are a vital cog in the relationship between resources, competitive advantage and firm’s performance because capabilities enhance the resource elements in attaining competitive advantage position and better performance. Organizational capabilities are indeed an important element in a firm’s strategy (Singh et al., 2003; Ljungquist, 2007; Pryor et al., 2007) and firms’ knowledge is one of the vital ingredients to attain competitive advantage and good performance (Kogut and Zander, 1992; Grandori and Kogut, 2002; Szulanski et al., 2004; Van de Ven and Johnson, 2006; Felin and Hesterly, 2007).

For this particular research, much attention will be given to capabilities from the dimension of knowledge, skill and ability, the main elements of which consist of informational, product-development and relationship-building. Previous studies have illustrated that there is a significant relationship between informational capabilities and competitive advantage of organizations where informational capabilities are measured in terms of human resources training programmes, contact and job rotation among employees (Morgan et al., 2004; Ray et al., 2004).

On the other hand, research have also exhibited that there is a significant relationship between product-development capabilities and competitive advantage of organizations where product-development capabilities are measured in terms of the research and development capacity, adoption of new methods in manufacturing process and product promotional and marketing activity (Morgan et al., 2004; Ray et al., 2004).

Indeed, studies have also shown that there is a significant relationship between relationship-building capabilities and competitive advantage of organizations where relationship-building capabilities are measured in terms of the networking and relationship between the firms and their suppliers, distributors and customers (Morgan et al., 2004; Ray et al., 2004; Aimuddin et al., 2007).

**Organizational systems:** Systems can be defined as business processes and procedures (Ray et al., 2004). According to Ray et al. (2004), business processes are actions that firms engage in to accomplish some business purpose or objective. Further, business processes can be thought of as the routines or activities that a firm develops in order to get something done (Porter, 1991). Studies have shown that systems play a significant and vital role in the ensuing resources, capabilities, competitive advantage and performance relationship (Porter and Millar, 1985; Gimenez and Ventura, 2002; Wiklund and Shepherd, 2003; Winter, 2003; Bowen and Ostroff, 2004; Ray et al., 2004; Voss, 2005; Neely, 2005; Franco-Santos et al., 2007; Perez-Freije and Enkel, 2007).

Critics of resource-based view have pinpointed that studies on resource-based view have been concentrating more on the attributes of resources and capabilities to build competitive advantage. RBV study has been paying less attention on the study of the relationship between firms’ resources and capabilities and the way firms are organized. As far as organizational systems are concerned, this creates an opportunity for an empirical study. As such, it will be potentially beneficial to examine the ensuing relationship between these variables (organizational resources, capabilities and systems) and competitive advantage that has been lacking in empirical research. Studies have shown the importance of organizational strategy for attaining good performance for the firm (Thomson and Ramaswamy, 1994; Hall, 1995; Kim and Mauborgne, 2005; Rose et al., 2007, 2008; Elamin, 2008).

Excellent strategies can be implemented with good organizational systems that will bind and coordinate the organizational resources and capabilities towards attaining competitive advantage and performance for the firm. This is an area that is explored in this study as far as organizational systems are concerned.

This research pays specific attention to systems from the dimension of internal and external, the main elements of which consist of process and interactions. Process plays a significant role in harnessing organizational resources, capabilities, competitive advantage and performance relationship where process is measured in terms of the emphasis on company vision, mission, policy and procedure deployment (Gimenez and Ventura, 2002; Ray et al., 2004). Moreover, interactions also play significant and vital roles in the development of
organizational resources, capabilities, competitive advantage and performance relationship where interactions are measured in terms of the emphasis on team work approach, company procurement and logistic efficiency, networking and relationship between the firms and their suppliers, distributors and customers (Gimenez and Ventura, 2002; Ray et al., 2004).

**Hypotheses:** This study advances the following hypotheses:

H\(_1\): There is a significant positive relationship between organizational resources, capabilities, systems and competitive advantage

H\(_2\): There is a significant positive relationship between organizational resources and competitive advantage

H\(_3\): There is a significant positive relationship between organizational capabilities and competitive advantage

H\(_4\): There is a significant positive relationship between organizational systems and competitive advantage

**MATERIALS AND METHODS**

This research is conducted among manufacturers listed in the Federation of Malaysian Manufacturers (2008). A cross-sectional study using structured questionnaire is used to obtain responses from the manufacturers.

Specifically, this particular research questionnaire is developed based on a modification, extension and combination of past studies on organizational resources (Morgan et al., 2004; Aminuddin et al., 2007), capabilities (Morgan et al., 2004; Ray et al., 2004; Aminuddin et al., 2007), systems (Gimenez and Ventura, 2002; Ray et al., 2004) and competitive advantage (Gimenez and Ventura, 2002; Morgan et al., 2004; Ray et al., 2004). A pilot study is initially conducted to establish the reliability of the questionnaire scales and measurements.

For this particular study, 1000 manufacturers or samples are randomly selected from the FMM Directory 2008 (the sampling frame) to be the effective unit of analysis on the basis of being convenient, offering unrestricted choice having the least bias and offering the most generalizability (Sekaran, 2005).

As for the simple random sampling procedure or method, its choice is justified since such a sampling method has been adopted and applied previously in other earlier empirical studies concerning manufacturers in particular (Morgan et al., 2004; Jusoh et al., 2008; Jusoh and Parnell, 2008).

In short, given the financial and time constraints faced by the researcher in conducting this study, the choice of the sampling frame and the simple random sampling procedure can be justified. From the subsequent actual survey, 127 respondents replied and completed the questionnaire (12.7% response rate).

**RESULTS**

A standard Multiple Linear Regression (MLR) is used to assess the ability of three variables (resources, capabilities and systems) to predict levels of competitive advantage. Preliminary analyses are conducted to ensure there is no violation of the assumptions of normality, linearity, multicollinearity and homoscedasticity. The model is able to explain 56.2% (Table 1) of the variance in perceived competitive advantage, \( F (3, 123) = 52.61, \) \( p<0.001 \) (Table 2). As shown in Table 3, only two variables (systems and capabilities) are statistically significant with systems recording a higher beta value (\( \beta = 0.40, p<0.001 \)) than capabilities (\( \beta = 0.30, p<0.05 \)).

Table 1-4 and Fig. 1-3 show the detail results of the multiple linear regression analysis.

Table 3 shows that from collinearity statistics there is no problem of multicollinearity among the predictor variables as the tolerance values are all above the minimum 0.10 level and the VIF statistics are all below the 10.0 critical level (Pallant, 2007). As for the outliers among the predictor variables, Table 4 shows that the Mahalanobis distance maximum value of 10.69 is below the critical value of 16.27 at an alpha level of 0.001 as per the guidelines recommended by Tabachnick and Fidell (2007) for detecting critical value for outliers (i.e., critical value of 16.27 for three independent variables). This means that there is no problem of outliers among the independent variables that might affect the result of the regression analysis.

Figure 1 (histogram) shows that the regression standardized residual for competitive advantage is normally distributed (a bell-shaped distribution line or curve).

Figure 2 (normal P-P plot of regression standardized residual for competitive advantage) further illustrates that all the points lie in a reasonably straight diagonal line from bottom left to top right. This suggests that there are no major deviations from normality. Figure 3 (Scatterplot of the standardized residuals) also suggests that the residuals are roughly rectangularly distributed with most of the scores concentrated in the centre (along the zero point).

As such from the above results, they indicate that there are no problems or violation of the assumptions of multicollinearity, normality, linearity, homoscedasticity and equality of variance. Hence, it is reasonable to state
Table 1: Model summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>Adjusted R²</th>
<th>SE of the estimate</th>
<th>R² change</th>
<th>F change</th>
<th>df₁</th>
<th>df₂</th>
<th>Sig F change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.75*</td>
<td>0.562</td>
<td>0.551</td>
<td>0.30526</td>
<td>0.562</td>
<td>52.607</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: ANOVA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Models</th>
<th>Sum of square</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean of square</th>
<th>F-value</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>14.706</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.902</td>
<td>52.607</td>
<td>0.000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>11.461</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>0.093</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>26.168</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Predictors: (Constant), systems, resources, capabilities; Dependent variable: Competitive advantage

Table 3: Coefficients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Models</th>
<th>Unstandardized coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized coefficients</th>
<th>t-value</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>95% confidence interval for B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>(β)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lower bound</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>1.414</td>
<td>0.219</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6.443</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resources</td>
<td>0.114</td>
<td>0.093</td>
<td>0.115</td>
<td>1.235</td>
<td>0.219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capabilities</td>
<td>0.243</td>
<td>0.087</td>
<td>0.295</td>
<td>2.782</td>
<td>0.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Systems</td>
<td>0.274</td>
<td>0.071</td>
<td>0.399</td>
<td>3.864</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dependent variable: Competitive advantage

Table 4: Residuals statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameters</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean±SD</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Predicted value</td>
<td>-2.83097</td>
<td>4.57140</td>
<td>3.73(5)</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std. predicted value</td>
<td>-2.63300</td>
<td>2.46200</td>
<td>0.000(0)</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard error of</td>
<td>0.02700</td>
<td>0.09300</td>
<td>0.05200</td>
<td>0.01600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted predicted</td>
<td>2.79110</td>
<td>4.62520</td>
<td>3.72(86)</td>
<td>0.34398</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>-0.81915</td>
<td>0.66997</td>
<td>0.000(0)</td>
<td>0.30460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std. residual</td>
<td>-2.68300</td>
<td>2.19500</td>
<td>0.000(0)</td>
<td>0.38800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stud. residual</td>
<td>-2.77300</td>
<td>2.28600</td>
<td>0.00100</td>
<td>1.00560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deleted residual</td>
<td>-0.87447</td>
<td>0.69181</td>
<td>0.006(4)</td>
<td>0.3123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stud. deleted residual</td>
<td>-2.85200</td>
<td>2.26700</td>
<td>0.00100</td>
<td>1.01300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mahal. distance</td>
<td>0.00500</td>
<td>10.68700</td>
<td>2.97600</td>
<td>2.47200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cook’s distance</td>
<td>0.00000</td>
<td>0.13000</td>
<td>0.00500</td>
<td>0.01700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centered leverage</td>
<td>0.00000</td>
<td>0.08500</td>
<td>0.02400</td>
<td>0.02600</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dependent variable: Competitive advantage

Fig. 1: Histogram (Dependent variable: Competitive advantage)

Fig. 2: Normal P-P plot of regression standardized residual (Dependent variable: Competitive advantage)

Fig. 3: Scatter plot (Dependent variable: Competitive advantage)

that the standard multiple regression model above is stable and good to explain the variance in competitive advantage. The model implies that there is a significant positive relationship between organizational resources, capabilities, systems and competitive advantage. The total variance in competitive advantage explained by the model as a whole is 56.2% (Table 1), F (3, 123) = 52.61, p < 0.001 (Table 2). These findings support hypothesis 1. As for the individual dimension as shown in Table 3, only two independent variables (systems and capabilities) are statistically significant with systems recording a higher beta value (β = 0.40, p < 0.001) than capabilities (β = 0.30,
p<0.05). This means only hypothesis 1, that there is a significant positive relationship between organizational capabilities and competitive advantage and hypothesis 1c that there is a significant positive relationship between organizational systems and competitive advantage are fully supported. The individual dimension result does not provide full support for hypothesis 1, which means there is no significant relationship between organizational resources and competitive advantage. Nonetheless, the beta value or direction of the regression coefficient is positive (β = 0.12, p>0.05) suggesting a partial support. As such in mathematical terms, the MLR Model equation can be shown as follows:

\[ Y (CA) = a + b_{1}X_1 + b_{2}X_2 + b_{3}X_3 + e \]

Where:

- \( Y \) = Competitive Advantage (CA)
- \( X_1 \) = Organizational resources
- \( X_2 \) = Organizational capabilities
- \( X_3 \) = Organizational systems
- \( a \) = Constant
- \( e \) = Error terms

Based on the MLR result (Table 3), the estimated MLR equation is as:

\[ CA = 1.414 + 0.243 (X_1) + 0.274 (X_2) + e \]

The MLR equation implies that one standard deviation increase in capabilities (\( X_2 \)), holding systems (\( X_3 \)) constant will result in 0.243 standard deviation increase in competitive advantage. Also, one standard deviation increase in systems (\( X_3 \)), holding capabilities (\( X_2 \)) constant will result in 0.274 standard deviation increase in competitive advantage. The result for the regression coefficient for resources (\( X_2 \)) is not statistically significant (\( \beta = 0.12, p>0.05 \)).

**DISCUSSION**

The findings from this study are parallel to those of Santhapparaj et al. (2006) which analyze the competitive factors of semiconductor manufacturers in Malaysia. Data are collected and analyzed from self-administered questionnaires distributed to a total of 200 managers from ten different companies operating within two Free Trade Zones (FTZ) located in Ulu Klang and Sungei Way, Malaysia, respectively. Their study observes that there is a significant relationship between organizational resources, capabilities, systems and competitive advantage. Organizational resources (human capital development and manufacturing flexibility), capabilities (product quality improvement and technical skill development) and systems (integrated network and efficient daily operations) are identified as critical factors towards achieving competitive advantage.

In another study by Phusavat and Kanchana (2007) on the issue of competitive priorities of manufacturing firms in Thailand, it is discovered that there is a significant relationship between organizational resources, capabilities, systems and competitive advantage. Ten manufacturers respond to a survey which finds that resources (product quality and flexibility), capabilities (know-how and innovativeness) and systems (customer service and delivery) are the major priorities to attain competitive advantage. The result of the study is also in tandem with that of Morgan et al. (2004). They discover that the available resources (\( \beta = 0.26, t\)-value = 2.69, p<0.05) and capabilities (\( \beta = 0.56, t\)-value = 4.63, p<0.05) are significantly and positively related to competitive advantage. As far as the independent variable’s individual dimension is concerned, only two independent variables (organizational systems and capabilities) are found to be statistically significant in the study. The results indicate that systems register a higher beta value (\( \beta = 0.40, p<0.001 \)) compared to capabilities (\( \beta = 0.30, p<0.05 \)). This result supports the finding of the study by Morgan et al. (2004) as far as the significant positive relationship between capabilities and competitive advantage is concerned.

However, the individual dimension’s result of the study does not provide full support for the study by Morgan et al. (2004) which means there is no significant relationship between organizational resources and competitive advantage. Nonetheless, the beta value or direction of the regression coefficient registers a positive value (\( \beta = 0.12, p>0.05 \)). This result suggests partial support for the study by Morgan et al. (2004) where they discover that the available resources are significantly and positively related to competitive advantage (\( \beta = 0.26, t\)-value = 2.69, p<0.05).

A reasonable explanation that can be given for this inconsistent finding is that when these three independent variables (resources, capabilities and systems) are pooled together, their separate individual effects are somewhat obscured relative to the aggregate effects. The resources’ individual statistical significance relative strength seems to be reduced when it is examined together with the other two variables (capabilities and systems). This is understandable because although all the independent variables register positive beta values, the relative strength of their coefficients vary from one variable to another. The results indicate that systems register a higher beta value (\( \beta = 0.40, p<0.001 \)) compared to
capabilities (β = 0.30, p<0.05) and resources (β = 0.12, p<0.05) in their relationship with competitive advantage. This implies that when the independent variables (resources, capabilities and systems) are pooled together in the MLR model, they generate significant overlapping effects collectively. However, when examined individually, possibly there is a lot of shared variance that is statistically removed and thus reducing the variable’s individual statistical significance. Overall, the result of this study provides empirical support for other previous studies (Barney, 2001a, b, 2007; Priem and Butler, 2001a, b; King, 2007; Sirmon et al., 2007) on the notion of the significant positive relationship between organizational resources, capabilities, systems and competitive advantage.

CONCLUSION

The overall findings indicate a significant positive effect of organizational resources, capabilities and systems collectively on competitive advantage, providing support and extension to the Resource-Based View (RBV). The total variance in competitive advantage accounted for by the MLR model is 56.2%. As such, the overall contribution of this research to the literature is that it has managed to further extend and strengthen the theoretical discourse on the RBV of competitive advantage in particular by empirically illustrating the extent or magnitude of the relationship between the organizational resources, capabilities, systems and competitive advantage as perceived by Malaysian manufacturers. In other words, this study shows the relative effects of organizational resources, capabilities, and systems on competitive advantage.

From the practical aspect, the findings from this research have contributed to the management of organizations in terms of providing valuable input and awareness on the factors or variables to consider as far as attaining competitive advantage is concerned. The research illustrates with empirical evidence that it is vital for organizations to have sound work systems to organize both their internal capabilities and resources towards achieving competitive advantage. In other words, to attain competitive advantage firms need to improve their R&D and product promotion capabilities and also enhance their work systems in terms of the manufacturing process and Standard Operating Procedures (SOP). In addition, organizations need to further enhance their aggregate resources, especially physical and human resources as well as to encourage healthy teamwork among their employees and adopt Key Performance Indicators (KPI) in their operation and also strengthen their networking or interactions with their suppliers and distributors. In terms of the firm’s policy, the findings from this study could help policy makers in making decisions concerning the firm’s internal attributes that should be given more attention or priority relative to the others. For example, the firm needs to enhance their work systems, manufacturing or production systems and HRM policies relative to their organizational financial policy in order to improve their overall organizational competitive advantage and performance. Further, firms also need to strengthen their R&D policy and public relation exercise to attain a better competitive advantage position compared to their business rivals.

IMPLICATIONS

The theoretical implication of this study is that it supports and extends the RBV of competitive advantage by illustrating the need for systematic management of resources and capabilities towards attaining competitive advantage. While supporting the significance of the organizing factor in the VRIO (Value, Rareness, Inimitability and Organization) framework of the RBV of competitive advantage.

The research illustrates that by examining these variables (resources, capabilities, and systems) in aggregate, their individual statistical significance might diminish in their relationships with competitive advantage (resources was found to be statistically non-significant). However, the implications of these findings do not mean that the organizational resources are not important factors and/or elements towards attaining competitive advantage.

It specifically reflects the perceived priorities of the Malaysian manufacturers as far as the importance and ranking of these particular variables (resources, capabilities, and systems) individually towards achieving competitive advantage is concerned. In other words, it illustrates the magnitude of importance placed upon the organizational resources, capabilities, and systems in their relationship with competitive advantage.

In short, the findings from this study have not only contributed to the body of knowledge or literature on the subject or issue of the relationship between organizational resources, capabilities, systems, and competitive advantage but also provided vital information to both practitioners and policy makers on the subject matter. Nonetheless, other future research might want to consider examining the relationship between other potential exogenous variables (for example organizational structure and/or strategy) and their probable effects on the firm’s competitive advantage and performance. Furthermore,
adopting a longitudinal study and/or a qualitative research approach using other potential sampling frame (for example the service sector industry directory) to address and examine competitive advantage might be another future empirical research direction to be considered.

This course of action will have a potential not only to further extend and expand the literature on competitive advantage from the RBV but also to generate more input towards the practical aspect of the strategic management of organizations.
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