

**THE IMPORTANCE AND STATE OF GENERAL RESOURCES:
THE ANALYSIS OF HOUSING COOPERATIVES
FROM ŚWIĘTOKRZYSKIE AND MAŁOPOLSKIE VOIVODESHIPS
FROM POLAND**

Izabela KONIECZNA

Jan Kochanowski University in Kielce; izabela.konieczna@ujk.edu.pl, ORCID: 0000-0002-3632-3245

Purpose: The main aim of the article is to determine the influence of the assessment of validity and actual state of individual resources and competences in the sphere of general resources on competitive potential. Additional aim is a comparison of these resources/competences taking into account housing cooperatives from Świętokrzyskie and Małopolskie voivodeships.

Design/methodology/approach: The research was conducted among cooperatives' executives who were asked to assess the validity and state of resources and competences in the sphere of general resources. All housing cooperatives from the Świętokrzyskie and Małopolskie voivodeships were asked to take part in the research, however, because of the tendency of the representatives of cooperatives to participate in the research, the research had been conducted on a sample of 27 housing cooperatives of which 7.6% from Świętokrzyskie Voivodeship and 21% from Małopolskie voivodeship, using an interview questionnaire.

Findings: Analysis of conducted research show that there is a positive correlation between the assessment of the importance of resources in the sphere of general resources and the competitive potential of the enterprise. The findings also show that the state of resources is not a moderator (a factor that determines whether or not there is a relationship) of the relationship between the importance of resources and the competitive potential. Moreover, voivodeship of the enterprise does not differentiate its competitive potential and the state of its resources in comparison to its competitors.

Practical implications: The study shows that it is very important for managers to know all general resources and competences due to the fact that the understanding of the validity of general resources and competences allows to create the competitive potential. At the same time the knowledge of the state of general resources and competences in comparison to the competition allows the company to do everything to keep up with the competition and then outrun it. It shows what resources/competences are better than competitor's and what need to be improved.

Originality/value: The article theoretically describes general resources/competences of the company and empirically analyses the importance of having the knowledge of possessed resources/competences and its influence on competitive potential. The value of the research is that it confirms what appears to be obvious but in fact is not taken into account by most enterprises.

Keywords: General resources/competences, competitive potential, housing cooperatives.

Category of the paper: Research Paper.

1. Introduction

The literature on the concepts of resources and competences is countless and includes many different approaches. Generally speaking the resource based view explains how a company is able to gain a competitive edge using available resources and competences (Kabue, Kilika, 2016), which eventually lead to superior organizational performance (Ismail, Rose, Uli, Abdullah, 2012). While resources are firm-specific assets whose value is context dependent, competences are resources, which result from activities that are performed repetitively in a firm (Del Río, Carrillo-Hermosilla, Könnölä, Bleda, 2016). As writes Prahalad (1994) *to get to the future first, top management must either see opportunities not seen by other top teams or must be able to exploit opportunities, by virtue of preemptive and consistent capability-building, that other companies can't copy*. Thus every company should know which resources and competences are important for its development and competitiveness. It seems obvious, but it is not always the case. The awareness of the general resources / competences held is the basis for the assessment of other resources/competences from various spheres of the company's activity. It is important, because resources and competences contribute to the company's competitive potential. Therefore, the aim of the article is to determine the influence of the assessment of validity and actual state of individual resources and competences in the sphere of general resources on competitive potential and to compare them taking into account housing cooperatives from Świętokrzyskie and Małopolskie voivodeships from Poland.

Accordingly, the article is organized as follows. The next section briefly describes key general resources and competences of a company. Section 3 develops research methodology. In section 4 descriptive statistics of tested variables are highlighted. Finally in section 5 results of own research are presented. The last section presents conclusions.

2. General resources/competences

General resources/competences are the minimum resources/competences required to withstand competition. They are based on such factors as available resources and competencies to undertake activities. The company general resources/competences are basic building blocks of company and can be used to achieve its objective and target.

The general resources/competences, developed by Stankiewicz (2002), can be detailed as follows.

The reliability of the enterprise

One way to gain an advantage over competitors is to build customers' trust in a company and the credibility of the company. The quality of information about a company and its offer, which largely shapes trust in the company, determines whether it is perceived as credible or not. Non-economic criteria are of great importance here – intangible values of the company, such as reputation, social responsibility and sustainable development to improve the quality of life of stakeholders (Badzińska, Gołąb-Andrzejak, 2017). And from the point of view of economic reliability of an enterprise the following elements take part: reliability of management system, technical development, conservation activities, human resources management, financial and economic development, marketing activities, and in case of industrial enterprise - the production management (Timofeev, Shlychkov, Nestulaeva, 2017).

Organizational culture of the enterprise

Enterprise culture has been defined as encompassing the values, rules, beliefs and assumptions in the handling and behavior of an enterprise's (especially internal) stakeholders, which reflects internally as well externally the behavior of an enterprise (Belak, Milfelner, 2012). According to Schein (1985, p. 17) it is *a pattern of shared basic assumptions that was learned by a group as it solved its problems of external adaptation and internal integration that has worked well enough to be considered valid and, therefore, to be taught to new members as the correct way to perceive, think, and feel in relation to those problems.*

Cumulative knowledge

Cumulative knowledge is the legally owned resource of the enterprise – intellectual property. These are sources of future benefits for the enterprise based on explicit knowledge (Urbanek, 2007), i.e. tangible and intangible resources in the part that can be covered by property rights, such as: brands, registered trademarks, patents, utility models, licenses, programs, databases, intellectual rights, but also purchased external services: opinions, expert opinions, audits, research results, problem solutions and the effects of consulting activities, etc. (Sopińska, 2008).

The enterprise's ability to retain customers

The customer retention is critical to increase the overall value of company's customer base and to withhold its customers for a long time. The loyalty and retention is built by customer relationship management (CRM), i.e. all of the activities, strategies and technologies that companies use to manage their interactions with their current and potential customers (Kulpa, 2017). It relies on *identifying, winning and educating customer loyalty, and in particular on collecting, integrating, processing and disseminating customer information in all the involved organizational units through possible information distribution channels* (Frąckiewicz, Rudawska, 2004).

Having regular customers

The possession of regular customers is based on loyalty, which is according to Oliver (1999) *a deeply held commitment to rebuild and re-patronize a preferred product or service in the future despite situational influences and marketing efforts having the potential to cause switching behaviors*. Generally speaking it is the intention of repurchasing products and services. It is the fidelity to the brand, which is based on a strong emotional foundation and which is followed by repeated and conscious choices – as a consequence, it makes enterprises less susceptible to incentives directed by competitors. Thanks to loyal customers, the company will not have to acquire a large number of new customers (and, as it is known, acquiring a new customer is extremely expensive), which can clearly reduce sales and marketing costs (Stachowicz-Stanusch, 2007).

The reputation of the company's brand and the reputation of the product brand

The importance of a brand for a buyer is determined by a large number of factors, the most important of which are probably the following two indicated by Cheverton (2002): first, the number and type of interactions with the customer – the more complex is the relationship between the customer and the brand, the greater the chance of building long-term loyalty; second, the degree of brand identification with issues that absorb consumers' attention – brand loyalty increases if it manages to reach the issues that are important to the audience. Strong customer loyalty to the brand makes it easier for the brand to find a place on store shelves. Distributors are more likely to buy recognized brands that enjoy customer loyalty than new ones (Urbanek & Kosińska, 2002).

The ability of the enterprise to learn

Learning enables organizations to remain or achieve competitive advantage. Organizations need to learn more than ever as they confront such factors as intensifying competition, advances in technology, and shifts in customer preferences (Gavin, Edmondson, Gino, 2008). Without learning the companies repeat the old practices and when there is no change in process or actions the success is either fortuitous or short-lived (Farrukh, Waheed, 2015). We can distinguish three building blocks of a learning organization that was proposed by Garvin, Edmondson, Gino (2008): the first, a supportive learning environment, comprises psychological safety, appreciation of differences, openness to new ideas, and time for reflection; the second, concrete learning processes and practices, includes experimentation, information collection and analysis, and education and training. These two complementary elements are fortified by the final building block: leadership that reinforces learning.

The speed of adapting to market changes

Adaptation, which is very essential for an organization to survive and prosper into today's business environment, is the way to respond quicker than competitors to market changes. It allows to improve performance through greater co-ordination of operating the business and drives to improve business performance. The company needs to act flexibly, to recognize and accept very early the need for change and attach high importance to change management and

its processes through their involvement in the strategic decision-making processes (Mehedintu, Munteanu, 2016). Only such action will allow the enterprise to overtake competitors and gain a competitive advantage

Tendency to active competition (not avoiding competition)

The ability to compete, and therefore to act and survive in a competitive environment, is called competitiveness. Companies should constantly strive to improve competitiveness, because the modern ease of communication means that no company can feel isolated, secure and free from tension market (Bramham, 2004). Therefore, companies should do everything to survive in the conditions of competition, by proving products and services that meet high quality standards at competitive prices, both nationally and internationally, in relation to the possibilities and performance of other companies (Comănescu, Ponea, Petre, Ponea, 2018). Companies should be aware that there can be three levels of competition: from firm to market and industry level, from location through the region to country level, and from firm through clusters to the level of countries (Listra, 2015). Therefore, they need to decide on which level or levels they want to compete.

Knowledge of legal regulations

The knowledge of legal regulations is very crucial for companies as norms can come from different sources, and many them are updated constantly. Therefore, companies have lawyers in their structures or use their services because that laws must be interpreted and adapted to the specific business processes of the organization.

Convenience of location in terms of local legal norms and economic operating conditions

Location plays an important role in shaping the position of enterprises on the market. Traditional location factors include: locating the company where production costs, i.e. raw materials, materials and other production factors, are lower for a given volume, proximity to sales markets, lower taxes, the issue of increasing productivity and achieving high quality, integration with other units of the organization, convenient transport, availability of properly qualified workforce and its quality, availability of social infrastructure amenities, capital costs, economic infrastructure, availability of transport routes, availability of supplies, availability of utilities, space for expansion, safety requirements, availability of climatic conditions and land characteristics, plot costs and the level of political risk, cultural and economic situation, special subsidies, local regulations and taxes, and export and import barriers (Kasiewicz, 2002; Muhlemann, 1997).

The ability to create company-friendly informal relations with decision-making centers in the environment

Informal relations according to Hayek (1988) are norms of behavior, conventions, and self-imposed codes of conduct, which generally underlie and supplement formal constraints. By reducing uncertainty, informal relations naturally become an instrument that increases the economic value of planned projects, and thus a generator of increased effectiveness of

undertaken initiatives. This in turn increases the availability of both equity and return capital (Kosiń, 2016).

The ability to create a lobby supporting the activities of the enterprise

Lobbying is the attempt to affect legislative policy for the benefit of special interests of the enterprise. According to Peterson & Pfitzer (2009) lobbying for good is an innovative way to reduce the negative value chain impacts of products and services, and the company that pushes for improved standards can create competitive advantage for itself and safer, more environment- and consumer-friendly products and services.

Participation in strategic alliances

Strategic alliance is a partnership between two or more enterprises that concentrate resources and coordinate efforts for better results to achieve strategic goals, but they remain independent after alliance formation and they share benefit created by the strategic activity (Yoshino and Rangan, 1995; Dussauge and Garrette, 1995). The motives of the strategic alliance are comprised of possibilities related to better and faster access to technologies, ability to establish in new markets, reduce financial and political risk, form added value and derive profit (Kinderis, Jucevičius, 2013). Creating an alliance with an external partner allows to solve many problems consisting in the lack of adequate resources and competitive characteristics. The use of this variant makes it possible to make a marriage between new products of one company and the unused potential of sales services of another company, and very seriously shorten the time that elapses from the creation of the product to its introduction to the market (Faulkner, 1996).

3. Research Methodology

The research was conducted among cooperatives' executives who were asked to assess the validity and state of resources and competences in the sphere of general resources. All housing cooperatives from the Świętokrzyskie and Małopolskie Voivodeships were asked to take part in the research, however, because of the tendency of the representatives of cooperatives to participate in the research, the research had been conducted on a sample of 27 housing cooperatives from Świętokrzyskie Voivodeship, i.e. 7.6% and Małopolskie voivodeship, i.e. 21% of cooperatives functioning in the year of conducting research. There was used an interview questionnaire, which was structured.

As it was showed in the introduction, every company should know which resources/competences are important for its development and competitiveness. The knowledge of the importance of resources and competences in the sphere of general resources should be associated with the competitive potential of the enterprise. To confirm it, there was formulated the first research hypothesis, H1 as follows:

H1. There is a positive relationship between the assessment of the importance of resources/competences in the sphere of general resources/competences and the competitive potential of the enterprise.

The relationship is true, when various factors strengthen, weaken, moderate, or mediate its intensity. It is assumed that the state of general resources/competences is a mediator and it is contained in the second hypothesis H2 as follows:

H2. The state of resources moderates the relationship between the assessment of the importance of resources/competences in the sphere of general resources/competences and the competitive potential of the enterprise.

Due to the fact that cooperatives operate in different voivodeships there can be differences in assessing the importance of resources and competences in the sphere of general resources that constitute the competitive potential. Therefore, there is proposed the following hypothesis H3:

H3. There are differences in terms of the competitive potential depending on the voivodeship.

Basing on the assumption that cooperatives, which operate in different voivodeships differently assess the state of resources/competences there was stated the following hypothesis H4:

H4. There are differences in the state of general resources/competences depending on the voivodeship.

In order to verify the research hypotheses, analyzes were performed in the IBM SPSS Statistics 27 statistical program. First, the descriptive statistics of the tested variables were calculated along with the Shapiro-Wilk distribution normality indicators to determine the applicability of parametric methods. Then, correlation analyzes and difference tests were performed to verify the hypotheses. The threshold $\alpha = 0.05$ was adopted as the level of significance in this article.

4. Descriptive statistics of the test variables

Table 1 presents descriptive statistics along with Shapiro-Wilk distribution normality tests for all questions posed in the survey and the calculated general results of each part of the self-questionnaire. Analyzing the results of the test, it must be noted statistically significant deviation from the normal distribution ($p < 0.001$) in all tested indicators. In addition, observing skewness indicators (Sk.) and kurtosis indicators (Kurt.) must be noted significant deviations from the zero value, both in the case of aspects of the competitive potential, as well as in the state of resources. According to the guidelines of Georg and Mallery (2019), the absolute value of $|1|$ should be taken as the limit, which in most cases was exceeded towards the left-skewed distribution. Based on the presented empirical evidence and the researchers' suggestions, it was

decided to use in statistical analyzes the non-parametric Spearman's rho correlation and the Welsh difference test, which shows greater resistance to the assumptions of normality of distributions and equality of the studied groups and is more powerful than the Mann-Whitney U test (Derrick, Toher, White, 2016).

Table 1.

Descriptive statistics of indicators of variables tested with Shapiro-Wilk distribution normality tests (N = 27)

	<i>M</i>	<i>Me</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>Sk.</i>	<i>Kurt.</i>	<i>Min.</i>	<i>Maks.</i>	<i>W</i>	<i>p</i>
Competitive potential of the company									
1. The reliability of the enterprise	4.33	5.00	0.78	-0.69	-0.99	3.00	5.00	0.75	<0.001
2. Organizational culture of the enterprise	4.30	5.00	0.82	-0.62	-1.23	3.00	5.00	0.75	<0.001
3. Cumulative knowledge (patents, trade secrets, databases, etc.)	3.56	4.00	1.50	-1.44	1.54	0.00	5.00	0.78	<0.001
4. The enterprise's ability to retain customers	3.74	4.00	1.26	-1.34	2.09	0.00	5.00	0.83	<0.001
5. Having regular customers	3.56	4.00	1.31	-1.40	2.41	0.00	5.00	0.82	<0.001
6. The reputation of the company's brand	3.56	4.00	1.50	-1.44	1.54	0.00	5.00	0.78	<0.001
7. The reputation of the product brand	3.52	4.00	1.53	-1.26	1.10	0.00	5.00	0.81	<0.001
8. The ability of the enterprise to learn	3.59	4.00	1.53	-1.42	1.44	0.00	5.00	0.78	<0.001
9. The speed of adapting to market changes	3.56	4.00	1.45	-1.59	2.17	0.00	5.00	0.75	<0.001
10. Tendency to active competition (not avoiding competition)	3.63	4.00	1.45	-1.77	2.65	0.00	5.00	0.71	<0.001
11. Knowledge of legal regulations	3.48	4.00	1.50	-1.28	1.21	0.00	5.00	0.81	<0.001
12. Convenience of location in terms of local legal norms and economic operating conditions	3.22	4.00	1.60	-1.06	0.23	0.00	5.00	0.82	<0.001
13. The ability to create company-friendly informal relations with decision-making centers in the environment	3.30	4.00	1.64	-1.09	0.21	0.00	5.00	0.82	<0.001
14. The ability to create a lobby supporting the activities of the enterprise	3.22	4.00	1.63	-0.97	0.08	0.00	5.00	0.84	<0.001
15. Participation in strategic alliances	3.30	4.00	1.71	-1.00	-0.15	0.00	5.00	0.82	<0.001
Competitive potential	3.59	4.00	1.19	-1.21	1.23	0.53	5.00	0.88	0.004
The company's resources/competences in comparison to the competition									
1. The reliability of the enterprise	1.81	2.00	0.48	-0.53	0.74	1.00	3.00	0.65	<0.001
2. Organizational culture of the enterprise	1.89	2.00	0.42	-0.77	2.67	1.00	3.00	0.57	<0.001
3. Cumulative knowledge (patents, trade secrets, databases, etc.)	1.70	2.00	0.82	-0.72	0.32	0.00	3.00	0.81	<0.001
4. The enterprise's ability to retain customers	1.81	2.00	0.62	-0.90	2.11	0.00	3.00	0.73	<0.001
5. Having regular customers	1.81	2.00	0.68	-1.33	2.68	0.00	3.00	0.68	<0.001
6. The reputation of the company's brand	1.67	2.00	0.73	-1.26	1.19	0.00	3.00	0.69	<0.001
7. The reputation of the product brand	1.63	2.00	0.69	-1.66	1.42	0.00	2.00	0.58	<0.001

Cont. table 1.

8. The ability of the enterprise to learn	1.56	2.00	0.70	-1.31	0.47	0.00	2.00	0.66	<0.001
9. The speed of adapting to market changes	1.67	2.00	0.73	-1.26	1.19	0.00	3.00	0.69	<0.001
10. Tendency to active competition (not avoiding competition)	1.78	2.00	0.80	-1.02	1.08	0.00	3.00	0.75	<0.001
11. Knowledge of legal regulations	1.67	2.00	0.73	-1.26	1.19	0.00	3.00	0.69	<0.001
12. Convenience of location in terms of local legal norms and economic operating conditions	1.52	2.00	0.75	-1.24	0.03	0.00	2.00	0.65	<0.001
13. The ability to create company-friendly informal relations with decision-making centers in the environment	1.52	2.00	0.75	-1.24	0.03	0.00	2.00	0.65	<0.001
14. The ability to create a lobby supporting the activities of the enterprise	1.52	2.00	0.75	-1.24	0.03	0.00	2.00	0.65	<0.001
15. Participation in strategic alliances	1.67	2.00	0.83	-1.01	0.46	0.00	3.00	0.73	<0.001
The state of resources	1.68	1.93	0.56	-1.57	1.36	0.27	2.20	0.74	<0.001

Source: own work.

5. Results of own research an disussion

Table 2 presents the correlation coefficients between the importance of individual resources and the company's competitive potential. The correlations obtained indicate that there is a sufficient relationship between the variables. The borderline result was obtained in the case of organizational culture ($p = 0.053$). This means that the H1 hypothesis: *There is a positive relationship between the assessment of the importance of resources/competences in the sphere of general resources/competences and the competitive potential of the enterprise*, has been confirmed. As the importance of resources increases, so does the competitive potential of companies. The dependencies range from a moderate correlation ($r = 0.38$) to a very strong one ($r = 0.92$). However, it should be noted that the competitive potential is the general result of all resources, which allows to specify a resource hierarchy for the competitive potential, from the strongest to the weakest correlations.

Table 2 also shows the correlation coefficients between the importance of general resources and the competitive potential that interacts with the state of resources. Due to the small sample size ($N = 27$), the classic moderation approach would not bring significant effects. Therefore, the quotient of importance and possession of resources was calculated, considering it as a partial effect of moderating the competitive potential by the state of owned resources. Then, the obtained correlation coefficients for the interactions of variables were compared with the use of Fisher's Z test to the competitive potential without the state of owned resources, in order to determine the significance of the change of correlation coefficients. This approach made it possible to verify the H2 hypothesis: *The condition of resources/competences*

moderates the relationship between the assessment of the importance of resources/competences in the sphere of general resources/competences and the competitive potential of the enterprise. When analyzing the results of the Fisher test, it was found that significant differences can only concern the company's brand reputation ($p = 0.052$) and the ability to create company-friendly relations ($p = 0.048$). In both cases, the currently available resources weaken slightly the relationship between competitive potential and the importance of the reputation of the brand and the ability to create relationships. However, taking into account the number of comparisons and using the Bonferroni significance correction for multiple comparisons ($\alpha = p / \text{number of comparisons}$), it should be assumed that to confirm the H2 hypothesis, the significance of the differences should exceed the threshold $\alpha = 0.003$, which was not obtained in the case of this research. Therefore, it should be assumed that statistically significant differences are the result of chance, and the H2 hypothesis has not been confirmed. The state of resources is not a moderator (of the relationship between the importance of resources and the competitive potential).

Table 2.

Analysis of the relationship between the importance of resources/competences and the competitive potential along with the potential moderation of the state of the owned resources/competences

	Competitive potential		Competitive potential x The state of resources		Fisher test	
	Spearman rho	<i>p</i>	Spearman rho	<i>p</i>	<i>Z</i>	<i>p</i>
1. The reliability of the enterprise	0.50	0.008	0.51	0.007	-0.05	0.964
2. Organizational culture of the enterprise	0.38	0.053	0.45	0.019	-0.30	0.768
3. Cumulative knowledge (patents, trade secrets, databases, etc.)	0.79	<0.001	0.70	<0.001	0.71	0.478
4. The enterprise's ability to retain customers	0.65	<0.001	0.62	0.001	0.18	0.856
5. Having regular customers	0.66	<0.001	0.62	0.001	0.28	0.776
6. The reputation of the company's brand	0.92	<0.001	0.76	<0.001	1.94	0.052
7. The reputation of the product brand	0.88	<0.001	0.85	<0.001	0.43	0.670
8. The ability of the enterprise to learn	0.86	<0.001	0.72	<0.001	1.32	0.188
9. The speed of adapting to market changes	0.81	<0.001	0.71	<0.001	0.80	0.426
10. Tendency to active competition (not avoiding competition)	0.69	<0.001	0.55	0.003	0.83	0.409
11. Knowledge of legal regulations	0.88	<0.001	0.75	<0.001	1.34	0.180
12. Convenience of location in terms of local legal norms and economic operating conditions	0.90	<0.001	0.78	<0.001	1.52	0.129
13. The ability to create company-friendly informal relations with decision-making centers in the environment	0.92	<0.001	0.78	<0.001	1.98	0.048
14. The ability to create a lobby supporting the activities of the enterprise	0.85	<0.001	0.82	<0.001	0.40	0.692
15. Participation in strategic alliances	0.90	<0.001	0.85	<0.001	0.71	0.476

Source: own work.

In order to verify the hypotheses H3: *There are differences in the competitive potential depending on the voivodeship*, and H4: *There are differences in the state of resources/competences depending on the voivodeship*, the Welsch test was used to compare the averages for both voivodeships (Table 3). The obtained results indicate no statistically significant differences, which indicates that the H3 and H4 hypotheses were not confirmed. The voivodeship of the enterprise does not differentiate its competitive potential and the state of its resources in comparison to the competition.

Table 3.

Analysis of differences using the Welsch test in terms of competitive potential and the state of resources/competences of enterprises depending on the voivodeship

	Małopolskie (n = 20)		Świętokrzyskie (n = 7)		t	p	95% CI		Cohen's d
	M	SD	M	SD			LL	UL	
Competitive potential	3.63	1.30	3.49	0.84	0.27	0.792	-0.95	1.23	0.12
The state of resources/commences	1.88	0.68	2.05	0.47	-0.60	0.555	-0.75	0.41	0.26

Source: own work.

In order to verify the hypotheses H3: *There are differences in the competitive potential depending on the voivodeship*, and H4: *There are differences in the state of resources/competences depending on the voivodeship*, the Welsch test was used to compare the averages for both voivodeships (Table 3). The obtained results indicate no statistically significant differences, which indicates that the H3 and H4 hypotheses were not confirmed. The voivodeship of the enterprise does not differentiate its competitive potential and the state of its resources in comparison to the competition.

6. Conclusions

As it was proved in the empirical analysis of collected data there is a positive correlation of the assessment of validity and actual state of individual resources and competences in the sphere of general resources on competitive potential. A very strong correlation occurs in case of the convenience of location in terms of local legal norms and economic operating conditions, the reputation of the company's brand, the ability to create company-friendly informal relations with decision-making centers in the environment, the participation in strategic alliances, cumulative knowledge (patents, trade secrets, databases, etc.), the reputation of the product brand, the ability of the enterprise to learn, the speed of adapting to market changes, tendency to active competition (not avoiding competition), knowledge of legal regulations, and the ability to create a lobby supporting the activities of the enterprise. Furthermore, competitive potential of companies increases with the increasing importance of resources.

When taking into account the comparison between Świętokrzyskie and Małopolskie voivodeships it was proved that the enterprise's voivodeship does not differentiate its competitive potential and the state of its resources in comparison to its competitors. This statement comes from the fact that the obtained results indicate no statistically significant differences.

The way of analysis of the topic covered in the research is novel and has practical implications, because it is very important for managers to know all general resources and competences due to the fact that the understanding of the validity of general resources and competences allows to create the competitive potential.

References

1. Badzińska, E., Gołąb-Andrzejak, E. (2017). Zaufanie i wiarygodność w komunikacji rynkowej jako podstawa budowania kapitału przedsiębiorstwa. *Handel Wewnętrzny, Vol. II, 3(368)*, pp. 227-239.
2. Belak, J., Milfelner, B. (2012). Enterprise Culture as One of the Enterprise's Key Success Factors (Integral Management Approach): Does the Internal and External Cultural Orientation Matter? *Acta Polytechnica Hungarica, Vol. 9, No. 3*, pp. 27-44.
3. Bramham, J. (2004). *Benchmarking w zarządzaniu zasobami ludzkimi*. Kraków: Oficyna Ekonomiczna.
4. Cheverton, P. (2002). *Jak skutecznie wykorzystać potencjał Twojej marki*. Gliwice: Onepress.
5. Comănescu, E.L., Ponea, I.A., Petre, C., Ponea, M.G. (2018). Competitiveness of Companies in the Competitive Environment – The Essential Question of Performance Management. *International Conference KNOWLEDGE-BASED ORGANIZATION, Vol. XXIV, No. 1*, pp. 273-278.
6. Del Río, P., Carrillo-Hermosilla, J., Könnölä, T., Bleda, M. (2016). Resources, capabilities and competences for eco-innovation. *Technological and Economic Development of Economy, 22(2)*, pp. 274-292.
7. Derrick, B., Toher, D., White, P. (2016). Why Welch's test is Type I error robust. *The Quantitative Methods in Psychology, 12(1)*, pp. 30-38.
8. Dussauge, P., Garrette, B. (1995). Determinants of success in international strategic alliances: Evidence from the global aerospace industry. *Journal of International Business Studies, 26*, pp. 505-530.
9. Farrukh, M., Waheed, A. (2015). Learning Organization and Competitive Advantage – An Integrated Approach. *Journal of Asian Business Strategy, 5(4)*, pp. 73-79.
10. Faulkner, D. (1996). *Strategie konkurencji*. Warszawa: Gebethner & Ska.

11. Frąckiewicz, E., Rudawska, E. (2004). Zarządzanie relacjami z klientem z wykorzystaniem koncepcji Customer Relationship Management. *Przegląd Organizacji*, No. 7-8, pp. 65-68.
12. Gavin, D.A., Edmondson, A.C., Gino, F. (2008). Is Yours a Learning Organization? *Harvard Business Review*, March, pp. 109-116.
13. George, D., Mallery, P. (2019). *IBM SPSS statistics 26 step by step: A simple guide and reference*. New York: Routledge.
14. Hayek, F. (1988). *The Fatal Conceit. The Errors of Socialism*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
15. Ismail, A.I., Rose, R.C., Uli, J., Abdullah, H. (2012). The Relationship Between Organisational Resources, Capabilities, Systems And Competitive Advantage. *Asian Academy of Management Journal*, Vol. 17, No. 1, January, pp. 151-173.
16. Kabue, L.W., Kilika, J.M. (2016). Firm Resources, Core Competencies and Sustainable Competitive Advantage: An Integrative Theoretical Framework. *Journal of Management and Strategy*, Vol. 7, No. 1, pp. 98-108.
17. Kasiewicz, S. (2002). *Zarządzanie operacyjne w dobie globalizacji*. Warszawa: Difin.
18. Kinderis, R., Jucevičius, G. (2013). Strategic Alliances – Their Definition and Formation. *Latgale National Economy Research* 1(5), October, pp. 106-128.
19. Konieczna, I. (2014). Znaczenie ogólnych zasobów organizacji dla spółdzielni mleczarskich z województwa świętokrzyskiego. *Prace Naukowe Uniwersytetu Ekonomicznego we Wrocławiu – Zarządzanie strategiczne w teorii i praktyce*, nr 366, A. Kaleta, K. Moszkowicz, L. Sołducho-Pelc (eds.), pp. 258-268.
20. Kosiń, P. (2016), Percepcja funkcjonowania instytucji nieformalnych nadzoru korporacyjnego przez inwestorów mniejszościowych. *Studia Ekonomiczne. Zeszyty Naukowe Uniwersytetu Ekonomicznego w Katowicach*, 263, pp. 50-60.
21. Kulpa, J. (2017). Why Is Customer Relationship Management So Important? *Forbes*, Oct. 24.
22. Kwiatkowski, M., Symela, K. (2001). *Standardy kwalifikacji zawodowych. Teoria, metodologia, projekty*. Warszawa: Instytut Badań Edukacyjnych.
23. Listra, E. (2015). The concept of competition and the objectives of competitors. *Procedia – Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 213, pp. 25-30.
24. Matuska, E. (2012). Human Resources Management System Based on Competences – Scania Case Study. *Human Resources Management & Ergonomics*, Vol. VI, 2, pp. 130-144.
25. Muhlemann, A. (1997). *Zarządzanie: produkcja i usługi*. Warszawa: PWN.
26. Munteanu, A., Mehedintu, G. (2016). Adaptation and Progress through Change Management, *Annals of Spiru Haret University. Economic Series*, December, 16(4), pp. 19-27.
27. Oliver, R.L. (1999). Whence consumer loyalty. *Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 63, pp. 33-44.
28. Peterson, K., Pfitzer, M. (2009). Lobbying for Good. *Stanford Social Innovation Review*. Winter, pp. 44-49.

29. Schein, E.H. (1985). *Organizational Culture and Leadership*, San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
30. Sopińska, A. (2008). *Wiedza jako strategiczny zasób przedsiębiorstwa. Analiza i pomiar kapitału intelektualnego przedsiębiorstwa*. Warszawa: Szkoła Główna Handlowa.
31. Stachowicz-Stanusch, A. (2007). *CRM przewodnik dla wdrażających*. Warszawa: Placet.
32. Stankiewicz, M.J. (2002). *Konkurencyjność przedsiębiorstwa. Budowanie konkurencyjności przedsiębiorstwa w warunkach globalizacji*. Toruń: TNOiK Dom Organizatora.
33. Timofeev, R.A., Shlychkov, V.V., Nestulaeva, D.R. (2017). Methods of economic reliability assessment for industrial enterprise in the market economy conditions. *SHS Web of Conferences*, 35, 01125, pp. 1-4.
34. Urbanek, G. (2007). Wycena aktywów niematerialnych przedsiębiorstwa metodą Strumieni wartości intelektualnej. *Problemy Zarządzania*, nr 2, pp. 128-145.
35. Urbanek, G., Kosińska, E. (Eds.) (2002). *Zarządzanie marką*. Warszawa: PWE.
36. Yoshino, M.Y. Rangan, U.S. (1995). *Strategic Alliances: An Entrepreneurial Approach to Globalization*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.