STRATEGIC PLANNING TOOLS AND TECHNIQUES IN JORDAN: AWARENESS AND USE

Jehad S. Aldehayyat
College of Business and Economics
Al-Hussein Bin Talal University, Jordan
Maan PO Box 149
Jordan
Tel: + 962 3 2135516
dr.j.aldehayyat@ahu.edu.jo

and

John R. Anchor
Business School
University of Huddersfield, UK
Queensgate
Huddersfield HD1 3DH
Tel: + 44-1484-472462
j.r.anchor@hud.ac.uk

Biographical Note

Jehad S Aldehayyat is Assistant Professor in Strategic Management within the College of Business and Economics at Al-Hussein Bin Talal University, Jordan. He has an MBA from Al-Albait University and a PhD from the University of Huddersfield, UK. His interests include strategic planning, strategic decision making and strategic information systems.

John R Anchor is Head of the Department of Strategy and Marketing within the Business School, University of Huddersfield, UK. He has a Bachelor degree and a PhD from the University of Manchester, UK. His interests include strategy and policy in a variety of organisational and geographical contexts. He has published in journals such as Risk Management: an International Journal and International Journal of Project Management.
(He is the corresponding author)

Summary

• The paper aims to explore the awareness and use of strategic planning tools and techniques by Jordanian publicly quoted companies in the financial, service and industrial sectors. A cross sectional survey was employed rather than in depth, case study type analysis. Single respondents, rather than multiple respondents, participated in the study for each company. This is the first study of the use of strategic planning tools and techniques in Jordan and one of the first in the Middle East as a whole.

• The main findings of this research are that the most used techniques by Jordanian companies are financial analysis (for own business), PEST or STEP analysis, Porter's five-forces analysis and analysis of key (critical) success factors; that the managers of these companies have an awareness of most of the techniques surveyed; and that the use of strategy tools and techniques relates more to the size of company and less to the age and nature of business.

Strategic Planning Tools and Techniques in Jordan: Awareness and Use

Introduction

The process of strategic planning has been investigated in some detail during the last thirty years. However, although strategy scholars advocate the use of strategic planning tools as an important element of the strategic planning process, there has been limited research to date on strategic planning tool usage. Most of the empirical studies reporting tool usage have included tools as part of a wider study of strategic planning processes (Elbanna, 2007; Koufopoulos *et al.*, 2005; Stonehouse and Pemberton, 2002; Glaister and Falshaw, 1999; Athiyaman and Robertson, 1995; Koufopoulos and Morgan, 1994(.

The research of Hamami and Al-Shaikh, 1995; and Al-Shaikh and Hamami, 1994 indicated that Jordanian firms make use of strategic planning. However, these studies did not identify the strategic planning tools and techniques used in the process. Consequently, this study aims to: find out a) to what extent there is an awareness and usage of strategic planning tools and techniques; and b) explore the relationship between certain organisational factors (size, age, and nature of business) and the use of strategic planning tools and techniques in the context of Jordanian publicly quoted companies. This is the first study to examine the relationship between the awareness and use of strategic planning tools and techniques and organisational characteristics in Jordan and one of the first in the Middle East.

Literature review

Strategic Planning

Although there are several definitions of strategic planning, there is no commonly accepted and universal definition of it (Quinn, 1980; Brews and Purohit, 2007).

For the purpose of this paper strategic planning will be defined as "the devising and formulation of organisational level plans which set the broad and flexible objectives, strategies and policies of a business, driving the organisation towards its vision of the future" (Stonehouse and Pemberton, 2002, p. 854).

In the 1980s strategic planning was criticised in terms both its concept and its effectiveness (e.g. Mintzberg 1990, 1994). The main criticisms were as follows: management creativity may be affected negatively by 'rigid' strategic planning.; planning is often performed by planners instead of by managers who would be affected by the result of the plans; planners and top management take charge and isolate the planning process from the people whose commitment is needed to carry it through; strategic planning processes are bureaucratic and rigid activities, used for financial control and do not encourage the setting of new strategic directions; strategic planning prevents strategic thinking.

Partly as a result of these contributions, strategic planning has undergone substantial changes since the 1980s. There is now less bureaucracy with more emphasis on implementation and innovation; a reduction in the number of staff planners with more participation of line managers and teams of employees; more sophisticated planning techniques such as scenario planning; and increased attention to changing markets, and the competitive and technological environment (e.g. Bonn and Christodoulou, 1996; Clarke, 1997; Taylor, 1997).

The benefits of strategic planning are potentially many and various but they include: enhancing co-ordination, (e.g. bringing together all business unit strategies within an overall corporate strategy); controlling by reviewing performance and progress towards objectives; identifying and exploiting future marketing opportunities; enhancing internal communication between personnel; encouraging personnel in a favourable attitude to change; improving the corporate performance of companies (Koufopolous and Morgan, 1994). Although, the extent to which strategic planning contributes to improvement of corporate performance is still a matter of controversy, a number of empirical studies have identified a positive relationship between them (e.g. Greenley, 1994; Miller and Cardinal, 1994; Fossen *et al.*, 2006).

Strategic planning tools and techniques

A variety of tools and techniques have been developed to help managers to identify and deal with strategic decisions (Ramanujam *et al.*, 1986). These techniques help managers to change valuable data into forms suitable for decision-making and action (Fleisher and Bensoussan, 2003). It also helps to increase awareness, which helps reduce the risk involved in making certain decisions, to establish priorities in large complex companies and to provide a framework for evaluating the relative importance of different business portfolios. Furthermore, these tools and techniques may aid the presentation of complex issues, and may be seen as a valuable communication device, in addition to their analytical role (Frost, 2003).

Several strategy scholars have presented a listing of strategic planning tools and techniques. For instance, Webster *et al.* (1989) presented a set of 30 strategic planning tools and techniques. More recently, Lisinske and Saruckij (2006) have classified 28 tools of strategic planning. However, the literature (e.g. Al Ghamdi, 2005) indicates that not all these tools and techniques are used by firms operating in the countries surveyed.

This paper will focus just on the tools and techniques most commonly identified in the literature. These techniques include: SWOT analysis, Porter's five-forces analysis, financial analysis for competitors, financial analysis for own business, value chain analysis, portfolio analysis (e.g. BCG: growth- share), strategic planning software, core capability/ competence analysis, scenario construction, human resource analysis, analysis of organisational culture, PEST or STEP analysis, analysis of key (critical) success factors, experience curve analysis.

Most of the empirical studies reporting tool usage have been as part of studies of strategic planning processes. However, a few scholars have studied the use of strategy tools and techniques exclusively. For instance, Kan and Albiraki (1992) investigated the use of strategic planning tools and techniques in Bahraini companies. They found that 22% of companies were using tools and techniques regularly; these techniques included financial analysis and SWOT analysis followed by gap analysis and SPACE (Strategic Position and Action Evaluation) analysis. Al Ghamdi (2005) highlighted the importance of strategic planning tools and techniques in Saudi Arabian organisations. He found that 10% of organisations were using tools and techniques regularly. The most regularly used tool was analysis of critical success factors, followed by benchmarking, and then what if analysis, while SWOT analysis, product life cycle, and stakeholder analysis were used only moderately. Experience curve, portfolio analysis, value chain analysis, Delphi, cognitive mapping, and Porter's five-force analysis were found to be the least used tools.

A recent study of Egyptian companies (Elbanna, 2007) revealed that the most commonly used tools were pro forma financial statements, cost benefit analysis, portfolio analysis, benchmarking, SWOT analysis, competitor analysis, analysis of critical success factors, gap analysis and product life cycle analysis. Less commonly used were experience curve analysis, value chain analysis, Porter's 5-forces analysis, PEST analysis, balanced scorecard and cognitive mapping.

A recent study of a range of organisations in one region of the UK (Gunn and Williams, 2007) found that three tools – SWOT, bench marking and critical success factor analysis -were used more extensively than any other.

Research population and respondents

The population of this research was all companies that were registered on the Amman Stock Exchange (ASE), according to its guide of Jordanian shareholding (publicly quoted) companies. The categorisation of these companies according to the ASE, was:
  • 52 financial companies (banks, financial and insurance companies),
  • 64 service companies,
  • 87 industrial companies.

This study followed the same categorisation as that adopted by the ASE. The rationale for

choosing the 203 companies listed by the ASE was that these companies contributed over 75 per cent of Jordan's GDP and also the absence of a database for the companies that were not classified in this market. The data collection instrument was sent to the whole population in view of its size.

Questionnaires were sent to the chief executive or general manager (top management) of each company, since it was believed that this would be the most appropriate person to provide a valid response to questions related to strategy (Bart *et al.*, 2001; Conant *et al.*, 1990). After data were obtained via the questionnaire, they were edited, coded and categorised.

A total of 203 questionnaires were distributed to a population of 203 companies and 83 valid responses were received – the response rate was, therefore, 40.9%, which is considered a good rate compared to other similar studies. The response rate when questionnaires are delivered and collected by hand typically is between 30% and 50%.

The characteristics of the responding managers were classified into five groups: age, gender, education level, experience in current position and total working experience.

44.5 % of the 83 respondents were under 40 years of age and 100% of the respondents were male. The latter finding is typical of the situation in Jordan more generally.

79.6 % of respondents had a Bachelor's degree or above. 91.6% of respondents had been in their current position for more than 10 years. Just 14.4% of respondents had less than five years' experience.

The characteristics of responding companies were classified into three groups: nature of business, age of company and size of company. 61.4% of the respondents and 57.1% of the whole population represented both the service and financial sectors, which reflects the fact that Jordan's economy is mainly service oriented. However, the fact that 38.6% of respondents and 42.8% of the whole population were in the industrial sector emphasises that Jordan has been increasingly focusing on manufacturing industries due to its lack of natural resources. 73.5% of the responding companies were established after 1975. In this period two events could have been influential in the establishment of many new companies. The first of these was the benefit from increased Arab aid during the oil boom of the late 1970s to mid-1980s; this period was considered as a rapid economic growth period (Kanaan and Kardoosh, 2002). The second is an economic reform programme, which started in 1999 and which aims to liberalise and modernise the Jordanian economy (Embassy of Jordan, 2004).

Table 2 shows that 60.2% of the respondents' companies and 71% of the whole population had less than 200 employees. The companies' size distribution is influenced by the fact that Jordan is a small country with a population of 5.4 million.

Research findings
The respondents were asked to indicate the techniques which they were aware of and then indicate if these techniques were used by their companies.

Table 1 shows the awareness, and use of strategic tools and techniques. The most used technique was financial analysis for own business. This was followed by PEST or STEP analysis, Porter's five-forces analysis and analysis of key (critical) success factors, which reflects the interest in external analysis by these companies. External analysis was considered to be a part of SWOT analysis, ranked sixth. There was a focus on the use of scenario construction by these companies.

Table 1 here
Table 2 shows the strategic tools and techniques which respondents were aware of but which were not used by their companies. This identifies relatively little use of internal analysis techniques, such as core capability/ competence analysis, human resource analysis and value chain analysis as well of portfolio analysis, strategic planning software, experience curve analysis and organisational culture.

Table 2 here

Table 3 shows the strategic tools and techniques which respondents were unaware of. The technique which respondents were least aware of was analysis of organisational culture, followed by core competence analysis and strategic planning software which both received the same ranking.

Table 3 here

For further analysis, Spearman's correlation was conducted to assess the relationships between the size and the age of the company and the use of strategic techniques. The test was performed for each of the fourteen techniques. Table 4 shows that the correlation between size of company and the use of strategic tools/techniques is statistically significant for most strategy techniques except for three of them; namely, financial analysis for competitors, financial analysis for own business and analysis of organisational culture.

Table 4 shows that the relationship between the age of the company and the use of strategy techniques is statistically significant for four techniques; namely, industry attractiveness analysis, value chain analysis, scenario construction and experience curve analysis.

Table 4 here

A Kruskal–Wallis analysis, Table 5, was undertaken to determine whether any significant differences existed between the three sectors (industrial, service, financial) regarding the use of strategy tools and techniques. The test was performed for each of the fourteen techniques. The results of this test indicate statistically significant differences between the three sectors in the use of one technique, namely PEST analysis (p= .048). It was identified, by using the Mann-Whitney test (P=.016), that this technique is used more by the industrial sector than by the service sector.

Table 5 here

Respondents were asked also to indicate the tools and techniques which were of most importance to them. Table 6 shows that the five most important techniques for respondents were financial

analysis for own business, PEST or STEP analysis, scenario construction, analysis of key (critical) success factors and core capability/ competence analysis. The least important techniques for them were value chain analysis, portfolio analysis, experience curve analysis, strategic planning software and analysis of organisational culture.

Table 6 here

Spearman's correlation was conducted to assess the relationships between the size and age of company and the most important techniques for respondents (Table 7). The correlation between size of company and the most important techniques is statistically significant for SWOT analysis (correlation .345 at .01 level) and significantly negative for value chain analysis (correlation -.198 at.05 level). The correlation between age of company and the most important techniques is statistically significant for SWOT analysis (correlation .208 at .05 level) and for analysis of key success factors (correlation .245 at .05 level).

Table 7 here

A Kruskal–Wallis analysis was undertaken to determine whether any significant differences exist between the three sectors (industrial, service, financial) regarding the most important techniques for respondents. The results of this test indicate no statistically significant differences between the three sectors for all techniques.

Discussion
The findings indicate that the most commonly used technique is financial analysis for own business. The use of financial techniques has been found to be common among companies in different countries. For example, this technique has been found to be popular in UK companies (Stonehouse and Pemberton, 2002), in Greek companies (Koufopoulos and Morgan, 1994) and in Bahraini companies (Kan and Alburki, 1992), as well as in Egypt (Elbanna, 2007). Gunn and Williams (2007) did not measure the use of this tool in their UK study. This popularity is not surprising because financial analysis is considered to be one of the most visible methods to assess the strength of an organisation and is used by a multiplicity of stakeholders in financially related decision making.

The research findings indicate also that techniques such as PEST or STEP analysis, Porter's five-forces analysis and analysis of key (critical) success factors, received a high ranking. This reflects the interest in external analyses by these companies. The importance of the external environment to these companies could be affected by a number of factors, such as the level of technological development, entry to new markets in the USA and Europe, as well as Arab countries, numerous new laws and increases in the number of international investors in Jordan recently. These results are consistent with Glaister and Falshaw's (1999) study which indicated that UK companies give greater consideration to external factors. However, their study found relatively less use of Porter's five-force analysis and PEST analysis. Elbanna (2007) found that in Egypt SWOT analysis was extensively used but that PEST was not. Gunn and Williams (2007) found that SWOT was the most commonly used tool in their UK study; however they did not investigate the use of PEST analysis.

The research findings indicate extensive use of scenario construction by these companies. This result differs from Glaister and Falshaw's (1999) study which found little use of scenario construction by UK companies. Gunn and Williams (2007) also found relatively little use of scenario planning by UK companies. However, this result is consistent with the study of Koufopoulos and Morgan (1994) which identified the popularity of the scenario analysis technique among Greek manufacturers. The authors explained the extended use of scenarios by the high uncertainty which existed in the Greek economic environment at the time of the study. Hence, it is worth noting the possible similarity between the situation in Jordan now and the situation in Greece at that time, since Jordan is now facing uncertainty, especially in its external environment. The high level of uncertainty in business has made it difficult to predict the future. In these circumstances, scenarios become a useful technique for an organisation. The use of this technique could provide these companies with an approach to flexible planning by developing several alternative views of the future (Phelps *et al*., 2001). However, Elbanna's (2007) Egyptian study found scenario analysis to be little used and also unfamiliar to many respondents.

The research findings show relatively less focus on the use of internal analysis techniques such as core capability/ competence analysis, human resource analysis and value chain analysis. Also, the findings show little use of portfolio analysis, strategic planning software and experience curve analysis. The findings indicate that companies did undertake the analysis of organisational culture, although strategy formulation and implementation was strongly affected by the culture of an organisation. Ultimately, strong cultures can either enhance or inhibit the ability of organisations to develop and execute effective strategies, depending on the compatibility of culture with the chosen strategic directions. The research found that the technique which respondents were most unaware of is analysis of organisational culture.

The research findings show that the managers of the companies had an awareness of most of the techniques but did not necessarily use them all. The high level of education of Jordanian managers and the fact that many gained their education in developed countries such as the USA and the UK (countries which have a long experience of strategic planning) could be the cause of the keen awareness by those managers of strategy tools and techniques.

The results show that the use of strategy tools and techniques was more common in the larger companies. This could be explained by the greater financial and human capability of larger companies. The same findings are reported in Stonehouse and Pemberton's (2002) study which indicated that these techniques are used more in larger UK companies than in small ones.

The findings indicate relatively little difference between the three sectors regarding the use of strategy techniques, except in the case of PEST analysis, which was used more by the industrial sector. The same results were found in earlier studies. For instance, Glaister and Falshaw (1999) and Stonehouse and Pemberton (2002) found no significant difference between the UK manufacturing sector and the service sector regarding the use of strategy techniques. Similarly, Athiyaman and Robertson (1995) found no significant difference between tourism companies and manufacturing companies in Australia with regard to the use of strategy techniques. Elbanna (2007) found little variation in rank order and the mean of the tools between manufacturing and service firms. However, the percentage of respondents in the manufacturing sector who were not

familiar with the listed tools was lower than those of the respondents in the service sector which was explained by their greater experience in using them.

The findings indicate that the age of the company does not affect significantly the use of strategy tools and techniques. This result is consistent with Abdul Moyeen (1997) who found no relationship between strategic planning processes and the age of small companies. On the other hand, the result contrasts with Lindsay and Rue (1980) who found a positive relationship between strategic planning and the age of the company. The possible explanation for this result is that while the ability of a company to scan the environment and to forecast may well depend on its age, the newest companies recruit personnel who have long experience. In addition, knowledge of strategic management has advanced worldwide.

Conclusions
Although the literature advocates the use of strategic planning tools as an important element of the strategic planning process, strategy scholars have given relatively little attention to the study of strategic planning tool usage. Instead they have incorporated tool usage as a small part of their investigations of both developed and emerging market contexts. In this paper an attempt has been made to shed more light and fill the gap in the literature about this important element of the strategic planning process through providing relevant information about its use, awareness and its relationship with certain organisational factors.

It is clear that there is a gap between the use of strategy tools and techniques and managers' awareness of them. Managers were aware of most strategy tools and techniques but they did not always use them. Therefore, it is suggested that the managers of these firms need to enhance their knowledge about these techniques and how to use them by attending specialised training courses and programs; thereby enhancing the strategic change process within these organisations.

Although the findings of this research have some generality; they do have two limitations. First of all, the nature of this research is descriptive and the method used is a cross-sectional survey. Secondly single respondents, rather than multiple respondents participated in the survey. Multiple respondents could not be obtained because of the wishes of some companies to receive just one questionnaire.

Therefore, future research could be conducted on a small number of these companies by using an in-depth type of study. Future research should also include line managers, such as marketing, financial, planning and administrative managers, to get a clearer picture about the situation inside the company.

Table 1 Tools/techniques that respondents were aware of and used

Techniques	Frequency	Rank
Financial analysis for own business	56	1
PEST or STEP analysis	39	2
Porter's five-forces analysis	38	3
Analysis of key (critical) success factors	36	4
Core capability/ competence analysis	35	5
SWOT analysis	35	5
Scenario construction	35	5
Value chain analysis	33	8
Human resource analysis	33	8
Portfolio analysis (e.g. BCG: growth-share)	25	10
Financial analysis for competitors	25	10
Strategic planning software	22	12
Experience curve analysis	21	13
Analysis of organisational culture	18	14

Table 2 Tools/techniques that respondents were aware of but were not used

Techniques	Frequency	Rank
Value chain analysis	35	1
Experience curve analysis	35	1
Portfolio analysis (e.g. BCG: growth-share)	33	3
Strategic planning software	33	3
SWOT analysis	31	5
Financial analysis for competitors	31	5
Analysis of organisational culture	29	7
PEST or STEP analysis	29	7
Scenario construction	28	9
Human resource analysis	27	10
Analysis of key (critical) success factors	26	11
Core capability/ competence analysis	20	12
Porter's five-forces analysis	19	13
Financial analysis for own business	18	14

Table 3 Tools/techniques that respondents were not aware of

Techniques	Frequency	Rank
Analysis of organisational culture	36	1
Core capability/ competence analysis	28	2
Strategic planning software	28	2
Financial analysis for competitors	27	4

Experience curve analysis	27	4
Porter's five-forces analysis	26	6
Portfolio analysis (e.g. BCG: growth-share)	25	7
Human resource analysis	23	8
Value chain analysis	21	9
Analysis of key (critical) success factors	21	9
Scenario construction	20	11
SWOT analysis	17	12
PEST or STEP analysis	15	13
Financial analysis for own business	8	14

Table 4 Correlation between size of company and use of strategy techniques and age of company and use of strategic tools/techniques

Strategic techniques		Size of Firm	Age of firm
SWOT analysis	Correlation Coefficient	.252*	.134
		.011	.114
	Sig. (1- tailed)		
Porter's five-forces analysis	Correlation Coefficient	.245*	.194*
		.013	.040
	Sig. (1- tailed)		
Financial analysis for competitors	Correlation Coefficient	.079	-.010
		.249	.463
	Sig. (1- tailed)		
Financial analysis for own business	Correlation Coefficient	.073	.006
		.259	.478
	Sig. (1- tailed)		
Value chain analysis	Correlation Coefficient	.290**	.220*
		.004	.023
	Sig. (1- tailed)		
Portfolio analysis (e.g. BCG: growth- share)	Correlation Coefficient	.204*	.052
		.032	.321
	Sig. (1-tailed)		
Strategic planning software	Correlation Coefficient	.300**	.025
		.003	.411
	Sig. (1- tailed)		
Core capability/ competence analysis	Correlation Coefficient	.303**	.162
		.003	.073
	Sig. (1- tailed)		
Scenario construction	Correlation Coefficient	.428**	.284**
		.000	.005
	Sig. (1- tailed)		
Human resource analysis	Correlation Coefficient	.615**	.206
		.000	.031
	Sig. (1- tailed)		
Analysis of organisational culture	Correlation Coefficient	.032	. 098
		.386	.189
	Sig. (1-taiteld)		
PEST or STEP analysis	Correlation Coefficient	.255*	.049
		.010	.330
	Sig. (1- tailed)		
Analysis of key (critical) success factors	Correlation Coefficient	.334**	.174
		.001	.058
	Sig. (1- tailed)		
Experience curve analysis	Correlation Coefficient	.542**	.278**
		.000	.006
	Sig. (1- tailed)		

*Correlation is significant at the .05 level (1- tailed); ** correlation is significant at the .01 level (1- tailed).

Table 5 Kruskal Wallis test: use of strategy techniques vs. nature of business

Testing Criteria	Chi-square	df	Asymp. Sig.
SWOT analysis	4.688	2	.030
Porter's five-forces analysis	2.250	2	.134
Financial analysis for competitors	3.296	2	.19
Financial analysis for own business	.625	2	.429
Value chain analysis	1.686	2	.430
Portfolio analysis (e.g. BCG: growth- share)	1.574	2	.455
Strategic planning software	1.004	2	.605
Core capability/ competence analysis	.845	2	.655
Scenario construction	3.152	2	.207
Human resource analysis	1.240	2	.533
Analysis of organisational culture	1.59	2	589
PEST or STEP analysis	6.094	2	.014
Analysis of key (critical) success factors	1.240	2	.533
Experience curve analysis	5.120	2	.077

Table 6 The most important techniques for respondents* (n=83)

Techniques	Mean	SD
Financial analysis for own business	3.74	1.104
PEST or STEP analysis	3.63	1.161
Scenario construction	3.63	1.306
Analysis of key (critical) success factors	3.56	1.358
Core capability/ competence analysis	3.51	1.572
Porter's five-forces analysis	3.19	1.334
SWOT analysis	3.18	1.030
Human resource analysis	3.03	1.130
Financial analysis for competitors	2.83	.9946
Value chain analysis	2.71	.8099
Portfolio analysis (e.g. BCG: growth- share)	2.54	1.358
Experience curve analysis	2.54	1.419
Strategic planning software	2.42	1.286
Analysis of organisational culture	2.19	1.572

*The mean is an average of scale of 1= not important at all to 5= extremely important.

Table 7 Correlation between size of company and the most important techniques for respondents and age of company and the most important techniques for respondents

Strategic techniques		Size of Firm	Age of firm
Financial analysis for own business	Correlation Coefficient	.026	.072
		.409	.260
	Sig. (1- tailed)		
PEST or STEP analysis	Correlation Coefficient	.160	-.179
		.047	.054
	Sig. (1- tailed)		
Scenario construction	Correlation Coefficient	.032	-.023
		.389	.417
	Sig. (1- tailed)		
Analysis of key (critical) success factors	Correlation Coefficient	-.160	.245*
		.074	.013
	Sig. (1- tailed)		
Core capability/ competence analysis	Correlation Coefficient	-.147	-.080
		.092	.237
	Sig. (1- tailed)		
Porter's five-forces analysis	Correlation Coefficient	-.097	-.013
		.242	.454
	Sig. (1-tailed)		
SWOT analysis	Correlation Coefficient	.345**	.208*
		.001	.030
	Sig. (1- tailed)		
Human resource analysis	Correlation Coefficient	-.074	.099
		.254	.186
	Sig. (1- tailed)		
Financial analysis for competitors	Correlation Coefficient	.080	-.044
		.237	.348
	Sig. (1- tailed)		
Value chain analysis	Correlation Coefficient	-.198*	-.080
		.038	.237
	Sig. (1- tailed)		
Portfolio analysis (e.g. BCG: growth- share)	Correlation Coefficient	-.187*	-.179
		.045	.053
	Sig. (1-taiteld)		
Experience curve analysis	Correlation Coefficient	-.050	.094
		.328	.199
	Sig. (1- tailed)		
Strategic planning software	Correlation Coefficient	.046	-.102
		.341	.181
	Sig. (1- tailed)		
Analysis of organisational culture	Correlation Coefficient	-.017	.100
		.440	.183
	Sig. (1- tailed)		

*Correlation is significant at the .05 level (1- tailed); ** correlation is significant at the .01 level (1- tailed).

References

Abdul Moyeen A. 1997. Strategic Planning and Strategic Awareness in Small Enterprises-a Study of Small Engineering Firms in Bangladesh. Ph.D. Thesis, Stirling University.

Al Ghamdi S. 2005. The use of strategic planning tools and techniques in Saudi Arabia: an empirical study. International Journal of Management 22 (3): 376-395.

Al-Shaikh F, Hamami Y. 1994. Strategic Planning in Jordan Business Organisations. International Journal of Management 11 (4): 982-939.

Athiyaman A, Robertson R. 1995. Strategic planning in large tourism firms: an empirical analysis. Tourism Management 16 (3): 199-205.

Bart C, Bontis N, Taggar S. 2001. A model of the impact of mission statements on firm performance. Management Decision 39 (1): 19-35.

Bonn I, and Christodoulou, C. 1996. From strategic planning to strategic management. Long Range Planning 24 (4) 543-551.

Brews P, Purohit D. 2007. Strategic Planning in Unstable Environments. Long Range Planning 40 February: 64-80.

Clarke C. 1997. The strategic planning society-the first 30 years. Long Range Planning 30 (3) 327-333.

Conant J, Mokwa M, Varadarajan R. 1990 Strategic types, distinctive marketing competencies and organisational performance: a multiple measures-based study. Strategic Management Journal 11 (5): 365-383.

Elbanna S. 2007. The nature and practice of strategic planning in Egypt. Strategic Change 16: 227-243

Embassy of Jordan. 2004. Economic and Commerce Bureau, Washington DC

Fleisher G, Bensoussan B. 2003. Strategic and competitive analysis. New Jersey: Prentice Hall.

Fossen R, Rothstein H, and Korn, H. 2006. Thirty-five years of strategic planning and performance research: a meta-analysis. Academy of Management Best Conference Paper BPS: M1.

Frost F. 2003. The use of strategic tools by small and medium-sized enterprises: an Australasian study. Strategic Change 12. 49-62.

Glaister K, Falshaw R. 1999. Strategic planning: still going strong?. Long Range Planning 32 (1): 107-116.

Greenley G. 1994. Strategic planning and company performance: an appraisal of empirical evidence. Scandinavian Journal of Management 10 (4) 383-96.

Gunn R, Williams W. 2007. Strategic Tools: an empirical investigation into strategy in practice in the UK. Strategic Change 16: 201-216.

Hamami Y, Al-Shaikh F. 1995. Strategic planning as perceived by managers of Jordanian business organisations. Mu'tah for Research and Studies 10 (6): 123-143.

Kan G, Alburki E, 1992. Strategic planning in Bahrain. Management Decision 30 (5):3-9.

Kanaan H, Kardoosh M. 2002. Employment and the labour market in Jordan, Available from:
http://www.worldbank.org/wbi/mdf/mdf4/papers/kanaan.pdf

Koufopoulos D, Logoudis I, Pastra A. 2005. Planning practices in the Greek ocean shipping industry. European Business Review 17 (2): 151-176.

Koufopoulos D, Morgan N. 1994. Competitive pressures force Greek
entrepreneurs to plan. Long Range Planning 27 (4): 112-124.
Lindsay W, Rue L. 1980. Impact of the organisation environment on
the long range planning process: a contingency view. Academy of
Management Journal 23 (3): 385-404.
Lisinski M, Aruckij M. 2006. Principles of the application of
strategic planning methods. Journal of Business Economics and
Management 7 (2): 37-43

Miller G, Cardinal L. 1994. Strategic planning and firm performance: a synthesis of more than two decades. Academy of Management Journal 37: 1649-65.

Mintzberg H, 1990. The design school: reconsidering the basic premises of strategic management. Strategic Management Journal 1 (3):171-195.

Mintzberg H, 1994. The Rise and Fall of Strategic Planning. New York: Free Press and Prentice Hall International.

Phelps R, Chan C, Kapsalis S. 2001. Does scenario planning affect performance? Two exploratory studies. Journal of Business Research 51 (3): 223-232.

Quinn J. 1980. Strategies for Change: logical incrementalism. Homewood: Irwin, IL.

Ramanujam V, Venkatraman, N, Camillus, J. 1986. Multi-objective assessment of effectiveness of strategic planning: a discriminant analysis approach. Academy of Management Review 29 (2): 347-372.

Stonehouse G, Pemberton, J. 2002. Strategic planning in SMEs-some empirical findings. Management Decision 40 (9) 853-861.

Taylor B. 1997. The return of strategic planning once more with feeling. Long Range Planning 30 (3) 334-344.

Webster, J.; Reif, W. and Bracker, J. 1989. The manager's guide to strategic planning tools and techniques. Planning Review 17 (6): 4-13.