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Abstract

A new study by the IfB-HSG and Roland Berger Strategy Consultants reveals how chief strategy officers deal with the current uncertainty. A leaner strategy process, long-term strategic planning, and cross-functional collaboration are particularly important.
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I. Study Overview

Purpose, method, and sample
Report of the CSO Survey 2012

Study overview

Joint Study by the Institute of Management at the University of St. Gallen and Roland Berger Strategy Consultants

PURPOSE
> Understanding of role, background, behavior, agenda, and benefits of CSOs
> Identifying current developments and major changes compared to 2011 study
> Building/further strengthening CSO-Community

PARTICIPANTS
> Targeted at the strategy heads of the 250 largest companies in DACHLI
> 54 CSOs participated in the study (22 % response rate)

Source: University of St. Gallen; Roland Berger Strategy Consultants (CSO Survey 2012)
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II. The Role of Chief Strategy Officers

Key insights of the study
Development of the CSO Role – Firms are seeking outsiders with direct CEO access

- **CSOs firm-specific experience**
  - Outsider (<2 yrs): 7%
  - Insider (2-5 yrs): 25%
  - Insider (6-10 yrs): 27%
  - Insider (>10 yrs): 43%

- **CSOs are primarily reporting to..**
  - ..to the CEO: 76%
  - ..to an executive one level below the CEO: 17%
  - ..to an executive two levels below the CEO: 7%

- **No. of employees in the strategy department**
  - Fewer than 5: 8%
  - 5 to 9: 31%
  - 10 to 19: 13%
  - 20 to 49: 3%
  - 50 to 99: 42%
  - More than 100: 3%

Source: University of St. Gallen; Roland Berger Strategy Consultants (CSO Survey 2012)
Chief Strategy Officer Survey 2012: Six Insights

**Insight 1** Although **uncertainty** is **increasing**, CSOs require for a **leaner** strategy process.

**Insight 2** High performing firms see **megatrends** primarily as an **opportunity**.

**Insight 3** **Shifting tasks** in times of economic downturns are one of the pain points in strategic decision-making.

**Insight 4** Importance of almost all CSO tasks has **significantly increased** compared to last year.

**Insight 5** High performing firms focus their **collaboration** efforts to **selected functions**.

**Insight 6** Standard approach for **measuring impact** of strategic decisions is not yet established.

Source: University of St. Gallen; Roland Berger Strategy Consultants (CSO Survey 2012)
Although uncertainty is increasing, CSO's require for a leaner strategy process

Uncertainty’s effect on the CSO role

Identifying and analyzing changes in the environment is an important part of the CSO role

Cross-functional collaboration is important to effectively address the increased uncertainty

The increasing uncertainty/volatility requires an increased collaboration of the strategy department with other functions

The increasing uncertainty/volatility leads to an increased importance of the CSO role

The CSO role has changed over the past few years

The increasing uncertainty/volatility requires an increase in the number of strategy staff

### TAKEAWAYS

> The increasing uncertainty and complexity has substantial implications for the CSO role

> Particularly, it requires both analyzing environmental changes and cross-functional collaboration

> While the CSO role’s importance is likely to increase due to the increased uncertainty, this will not affect much the size of strategy departments
One implication of uncertainty is the closer collaboration between strategic and operative planning as well as with risk management.

Uncertainty’s effect on the strategy process:

- There is a regular exchange with external experts on future industry/regional developments: 3.80
- The development of my firm depends also on short-term, macro-economic events: 3.71
- The strategy process is sufficiently flexible to be able to react to unforeseen events: 3.67
- A higher degree of uncertainty requires a closer collaboration between strategic planning and operational planning: 3.64
- A higher degree of uncertainty requires a closer collaboration between strategic planning and risk management: 3.56
- To be able to address the uncertainty, there is a need for a leaner and more focused strategy process: 3.56
- The strategy process has been adjusted to be able to anticipate extreme events early on: 3.27
- To be able to address the uncertainty, the strategy process requires more sophisticated tools and supportive methods\(^1\): 2.80
- To be able to address the uncertainty, there is a need for a more complex strategy process: 2.20

TAKEAWAYS:

- There is a high level of consensus regarding the impact of uncertainty on the firm’s development.
- The collaboration of strategic planning with risk management and operative planning will be critical.
- The increased uncertainty and complexity requires a more focused and thereby leaner strategic planning process.

Source: University of St. Gallen; Roland Berger Strategy Consultants (CSO Survey 2012)
Insight 2

High performing firms see **megatrends** primarily as an opportunity

The influence of megatrends on the strategy process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>High performing firms</th>
<th>Low performing firms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Megatrends offer new opportunities for our firm</td>
<td>4.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Megatrends will play an important role for our firm in the future</td>
<td>4.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our firm does actively identify and investigate megatrends</td>
<td>3.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Megatrends are highly complex and have multiple influences on our firm</td>
<td>3.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Megatrends are fully integrated in our firm's strategic planning process</td>
<td>3.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Megatrends threaten our firm's strategic business model</td>
<td>2.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Megatrends are still far in the future and not yet a strategic issue for our firm</td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TAKEAWAYS

> High performing firms have a **longer-term orientation** and a **more optimistic picture** of the future than low performing firms

> High performing firms see megatrends as an **opportunity** more than low performing firms do (whereas low performing firms see megatrends as a **threat** more than high performing firms do)

> High performing firms **integrate** megatrends more in the **strategic planning process** than low performers

Source: University of St. Gallen; Roland Berger Strategy Consultants (CSO Survey 2012)
Insight 3

Shifting tasks in times of economic downturns are one of the pain points in strategic decision making process.

**Hurdles and pain points of the strategy process**

![Bar chart showing the level of agreement on various hurdles and pain points in strategy process.](chart)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hurdle/Point</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The strategy department gets different tasks in times of economic down-turns (e.g. cost reduction)</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>2.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Success of strategy development cannot be measured accurately</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>3.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operational units do not follow strategic directives</td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td>2.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of support from management board</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>2.14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

KEY QUESTIONS

- Do you frequently experience that predefined responsibilities are adjusted in the short run?
- Does your organization have a standardized approach to measure the success of strategy development accurately? If yes, how does it work?
- Do these hurdles and pain points reflect your own experience? Do you see additional hurdles and pain points in the strategic decision-making process?

Source: University of St. Gallen; Roland Berger Strategy Consultants (CSO Survey 2012)
**Importance of almost all CSO tasks has substantially increased compared to last year**

**Importance of CSO’s activities**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>2012 Results</th>
<th>2011 Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strategy formulation/planning</td>
<td>4.65</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic initiatives and programs</td>
<td>4.57</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategy implementation (incl. monitoring)</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New business (model) development</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sounding board for CEO or Board of Directors</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competitive analysis/market research</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategy communication to internal and external stakeholders</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance evaluation of strategic projects</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mergers &amp; acquisitions</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic alliances</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordination across-businesses (synergy management)</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divestitures</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Functional strategies (e.g., IT, marketing, sales, etc.)</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>2.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investor relations</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 = To no extent 5 = To a very great extent

**TAKEAWAYS**

> While almost every activity gained **relevance** compared to last year’s survey, **M&A tasks** are considered less relevant for the CSOs.

> Firms **optimize** the value captured from their existing portfolios by **coordinating activities across businesses** to realize synergies or by **divesting businesses**.

> In 2012, CSOs tend to focus more on activities related to the **strategy process**, particularly on **strategy implementation**.

Source: University of St. Gallen; Roland Berger Strategy Consultants (CSO Survey 2012)
Besides corporate development, **process management** is a key focus of the CSO role.

% CSOs considering activity important

**"CORPORATE DEVELOPMENT"**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Important</th>
<th>Very Important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strategy formulation/planning</td>
<td>25.7%</td>
<td>68.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic initiatives and programs</td>
<td>22.9%</td>
<td>65.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sounding board for CEO</td>
<td>48.6%</td>
<td>34.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New business (model) development</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
<td>42.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**"PORTFOLIO MANAGEMENT"**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Important</th>
<th>Very Important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strategic alliances</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mergers &amp; acquisitions</td>
<td>22.9%</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divestitures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordination across-businesses (synergy management)</td>
<td>25.7%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic alliances</td>
<td>45.7%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**"PROCESS MANAGEMENT"**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Important</th>
<th>Very Important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strategy implementation (incl. monitoring)</td>
<td>37.1%</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance evaluation of strategic projects</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competitive analysis/market research</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**"CEO ASSISTANCE"**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Important</th>
<th>Very Important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strategy communication to stakeholders</td>
<td>45.7%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investor relations</td>
<td></td>
<td>11.4% 2.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Functional strategies (e.g. IT, marketing, sales)</td>
<td>25.7%</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: University of St. Gallen; Roland Berger Strategy Consultants (CSO Survey 2012)
High performing firms focus their collaboration efforts to **selected functions**

**Collaboration with centralized corporate-level functions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function</th>
<th>High performing firms</th>
<th>Low performing firms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Controlling</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>1.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>2.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>2.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications/PR</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>2.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human resources</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>2.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>2.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>2.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supply chain mgmt.</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>2.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compliance</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>2.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk management</td>
<td>2.39</td>
<td>2.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate (social) responsibility</td>
<td>2.39</td>
<td>2.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate affairs</td>
<td>2.28</td>
<td>2.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounting</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>2.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal audit</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>2.33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TAKEAWAYS**

- High-performing firms focus their cross-functional collaboration efforts much more on certain **selected functions** than low-performing firms.
- Strategy departments of high performing firms collaborate more with functions that are **top-line** oriented (e.g., marketing); vice versa do the low-performing firms concentrate on **bottom-line** functions (e.g., risk management, accounting).

Source: University of St. Gallen; Roland Berger Strategy Consultants (CSO Survey 2012)
Insight 6

Standard approach for measuring impact of strategic decisions is not yet established

Measurement of the department’s value creation

- Measuring the value creation of the strategy department is difficult (4.21)
- The value creation of the strategy department is mainly the CEO’s perception of its value creation (3.95)
- Measuring the value creation of the strategy department is important (3.36)
- The value creation of the strategy department is measured by relying on the judgment of key stakeholders other than the CEO (e.g., divisional heads) (3.07)
- The value creation of the strategy department is regularly measured in our firm (1.98)
- The value creation of the strategy department is measured transparent and quantifiable (1.74)

TAKEAWAYS

> Value creation is currently primarily measured by the CEO’s perception
> The need for a standardized way of measuring the strategy department’s value creation is clearly addressed, but seen as a highly difficult task
> Most firms currently fail in establishing a transparent and quantifiable way of measuring the impact of strategic decisions on value creation

Source: University of St. Gallen; Roland Berger Strategy Consultants (CSO Survey 2012)
III. Chief Strategy Officer Survey 2012

Complete overview of study results
### Detailed overview of the study method

**Sample 2012: 54 respondents** (2011: 90 respondents)

**Sample analysis:**
- Comparison of the 2012 results with the previous year
- Analyses of subgroups of the 2012 sample (where applicable):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Industry subgroups</th>
<th>Firm performance subgroups</th>
<th>Strategic decision quality subgroups</th>
<th>Organization design subgroups</th>
<th>Firm size subgroups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Classification of the sample into five industry groups: Financial services, retail &amp; consumer products, industrial sector, life sciences, services</td>
<td>Multi-item average of CSO's assessment of their firm's performance in 2011 relative to their competitors (growth in sales, growth in profitability, EBIT, ROE, and financial gearing)</td>
<td>Multi-item average of CSO's assessment of their firm's quality of strategic decisions</td>
<td>Multi-item CSO's assessment of their firm's centralization of strategic decision-making</td>
<td>Classification of the sample into large (&gt;25,000 employees), medium (5,001 to 25,000 employees) and small (5,000 and less employees) companies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classification of high vs. low performers (median split)</td>
<td>Classification of high vs. low performers (median split)</td>
<td>Classification of companies with high vs. low strategic decision quality (median split)</td>
<td>Classification of companies with centralized vs. decentralized strategic decision-making</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Profile of the participants: **Industries**

**Sample distribution: Industry sectors 2012**
- Financial Services: 24%
- Retail and Consumer Products: 12%
- Industrial Sector: 33%
- Life Sciences: 10%
- Services (Media, Comm., Transportation, Logistics): 6%

**Sample distribution: Industry sectors 2011**
- Financial Services: 24%
- Retail and Consumer Products: 12%
- Industrial Sector: 39%
- Life Sciences: 6%
- Services (Media, Comm., Transportation, Logistics): 10%
Sample distribution: Firm size (No. of employees)

2012:
- Fewer than 2,500: 23.9%
- 2,500 - 49,999: 54.3%
- More than 50,000: 21.7%

2011:
- Fewer than 2,500: 22.3%
- 2,500 - 49,999: 58.5%
- More than 50,000: 19.1%

Mean: 20'904 employees (2012), 33'103 employees (2011)
Profile of the participants: No. of employees in the strategy department

### No. of employees in the strategy department 2012

- **Fewer than 5**: 14.0%
- **20 to 49**: 7.0%
- **50 to 99**: 0.0%
- **10 to 19**: 4.7%
- **More than 100**: 39.5%
- **5 to 9**: 34.9%

### No. of employees in the strategy department 2011

- **Fewer than 5**: 16.0%
- **20 to 49**: 2.0%
- **50 to 99**: 8.0%
- **10 to 19**: 2.0%
- **More than 100**: 40.0%
- **5 to 9**: 32.0%

General aspects of the CSO role

What is your level of hierarchy (CEO = 1)?

**CSO's level of hierarchy 2012**
- 73.6%
- 5.7%
- 20.8%
- 0.0%

**CSO's level of hierarchy 2011**
- 72.5%
- 0.9%
- 26.6%

1 (e.g., CSO is also CEO)
2 (e.g., reporting to the CEO)
3 (e.g., reporting to an exec. one level below the CEO)
4 (e.g., reporting to an exec. two levels below the CEO)
General aspects of the CSO role

To whom do you report directly/indirectly

CSO's reporting line(s) 2012

- CEO: 35 directly, 14 indirectly
- CFO: 6 directly, 4 indirectly
- Other Executives: 8 directly, 10 indirectly
- BoD: 18 directly, 3 indirectly
General aspects of the CSO role: All Firms

Do you lead a department dedicated for strategy/development/etc.?

**Strategy department leader 2012**
- Yes: 86.8%
- No: 13.2%

**Strategy department leader 2011**
- Yes: 90.9%
- No: 9.1%
General aspects of the CSO role: Various Industries

Do you lead a department dedicated for strategy/development/etc.?

**Strategy department leader 2012**

- **Retail**: 100% Yes, 0% No
- **Life Science**: 100% Yes, 0% No
- **Financial Services**: 77.8% Yes, 22.2% No
- **Services**: 90.0% Yes, 10.0% No
- **Industrial**: 71.4% Yes, 28.6% No
General aspects of the CSO role: Firm size

Do you lead a department dedicated for strategy/development/etc.?

**Strategy department leader 2012**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Firm Size</th>
<th>Yes (%)</th>
<th>No (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Small</td>
<td>72.2</td>
<td>27.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>92.3</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large</td>
<td>91.7</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
General aspects of the CSO role: All Firms

How many people are working in this department (FTEs end of 2011)?

Mean: 11.2 employees (2012), 16.4 employees (2011); Median: 6 employees (2012), 7 employees (2011)
General aspects of the CSO role: Various Industries

How many people are working in this department (FTEs end of 2011)?

**Median of employees in the strategy department 2012**

- Financial Services: 6.0
- Retail: 8.0
- Industrial: 11.5
- Life Science: 7.0
- Services: 4.5
General aspects of the CSO role: Firm size

How many people are working in this department (FTEs end of 2011)?

Median of employees in the strategy department 2012

- Small: 4.5
- Medium: 7.5
- Large: 10.0

# of employees
General aspects of the CSO role

How many full-time strategists/corporate developers are working else-where/additionally in your firm (FTEs end of 2011)?

No. of employees in the strategy department 2012

- 34.1%
- 20.5%
- 13.6%
- 11.4%
- 20 to 50
- 5 to 9
- Fewer than 5
- 0
General aspects of the CSO role: All Firms

How many years of experience in the focal firm did you have when assuming the CSO role?

CSO’s firm-specific experience in 2012

- Outsider (<2 yrs): 21.6%
- Insider (2-5 yrs): 25.5%
- Insider (6-10 yrs): 7.8%
- Insider (>10 yrs): 45.1%
How many years of experience in the focal firm did you have when assuming the CSO role?

**CSO’s firm-specific experience in 2012**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Industry</th>
<th>Outsider (&lt;2 yrs)</th>
<th>Insider (2-5 yrs)</th>
<th>Insider (6-10 yrs)</th>
<th>Insider (&gt;10 yrs)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Financial Services</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>55.6%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>42.9%</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life Science</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
General aspects of the CSO role: High vs. Low Performer

How many years of experience in the focal firm did you have when assuming the CSO role?

**CSO’s firm-specific experience in 2012**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experience Level</th>
<th>Outsider (&lt;2 yrs)</th>
<th>Insider (2-5 yrs)</th>
<th>Insider (6-10 yrs)</th>
<th>Insider (&gt;10 yrs)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>54.2%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>38.9%</td>
<td>27.8%</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Legend:
- Outsider (<2 yrs)
- Insider (2-5 yrs)
- Insider (6-10 yrs)
- Insider (>10 yrs)
General aspects of the CSO role: **Quality of Strategic Decisions**

How many years of experience in the focal firm did you have when assuming the CSO role?

**CSO’s firm-specific experience in 2012**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experience Level</th>
<th>&lt;2 yrs</th>
<th>2-5 yrs</th>
<th>6-10 yrs</th>
<th>&gt;10 yrs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>53.6%</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Outsider (<2 yrs)**
- **Insider (2-5 yrs)**
- **Insider (6-10 yrs)**
- **Insider (>10 yrs)**
How many years of experience in the focal firm did you have when assuming the CSO role?

**CSO's firm-specific experience in 2012**

- **Small**
  - Outsider (<2 yrs): 55.6%
  - Insider (2-5 yrs): 33.3%
  - Insider (6-10 yrs): 5.6%
  - Insider (>10 yrs): 5.6%

- **Medium**
  - Outsider (<2 yrs): 46.2%
  - Insider (2-5 yrs): 30.8%
  - Insider (6-10 yrs): 15.4%
  - Insider (>10 yrs): 7.7%

- **Large**
  - Outsider (<2 yrs): 33.3%
  - Insider (2-5 yrs): 16.7%
  - Insider (6-10 yrs): 33.3%
  - Insider (>10 yrs): 16.7%
Activities: All Firms (I/V)

For each of the following activities, please indicate their importance as part of your job

**Importance of CSO's activities**

- Strategy formulation/planning.
- Strategic initiatives and programs.
- Strategy implementation (incl. monitoring).
- New business (model) development.
- Sounding board for CEO or Board of Directors.
- Competitive analysis/market research.
- Strategy communication to internal and external stakeholders.
- Performance evaluation of strategic projects.
- Mergers & acquisitions.
- Strategic alliances.
- Coordination across-businesses (synergy management).
- Divestitures.
- Functional strategies (e.g., IT, marketing, sales, etc.).
- Investor relations.

Mean values: 1: not important, 5: very important
For each of the following activities, please indicate their importance as part of your job

% of CSOs considering activity "important" or "very important" 2012

Strategy formulation/planning: 72.5% Very important, 23.5% Important
Strategic initiatives and programs: 66.7% Very important, 25.5% Important
New business (model) development: 43.1% Very important, 25.5% Important
Sounding board for CEO or Board of Directors: 39.2% Very important, 23.5% Important
Strategy implementation (incl. monitoring): 43.1% Very important, 33.3% Important
Competitive analysis/market research: 39.2% Very important, 33.3% Important
Strategy communication to internal and external stakeholders: 29.4% Very important, 41.2% Important
Performance evaluation of strategic projects: 21.6% Very important, 45.1% Important
Mergers & acquisitions: 13.7% Very important, 31.4% Important
Coordination across-businesses (synergy management): 13.7% Very important, 35.3% Important
Strategic alliances: 15.7% Very important, 43.1% Important
Divestitures: 11.8% Very important, 25.5% Important
Functional strategies (e.g., IT, marketing, sales, etc.): 11.8% Very important, 25.5% Important
Investor relations: 7.8% Very important, 13.7% Important

Important □ Very important □
Activities: All Firms (III/V)

For each of the following activities, please indicate their importance as part of your job

% of CSOs considering activity "important" or "very important" 2012 vs. 2011

- Strategy formulation/planning: 96.08% (2012), 92.16% (2011)
- Strategic initiatives and programs: 85.45% (2012), 84.31% (2011)
- New business (model) development: 84.08% (2012), 82.35% (2011)
- Sounding board for CEO or Board of Directors: 75.45% (2012), 78.43% (2011)
- Strategy implementation (incl. monitoring): 77.27% (2012), 75.45% (2011)
- Competitive analysis/market research: 71.82% (2012), 72.55% (2011)
- Strategy communication to internal and external stakehold: 66.67% (2012), 60.78% (2011)
- Performance evaluation of strategic projects: 57.27% (2012), 55.45% (2011)
- Mergers & acquisitions: 56.36% (2012), 58.82% (2011)
- Coordination across-businesses (synergy management): 56.86% (2012), 55.45% (2011)
- Strategic alliances: 56.08% (2012), 58.82% (2011)
- Divestitures: 55.45% (2012), 50.98% (2011)
- Functional strategies (e.g., IT, marketing, sales, etc.): 54.55% (2012), 46.36% (2011)
- Investor relations: 46.36% (2012), 37.25% (2011)
- New business (model) development: 33.33% (2012), 27.27% (2011)
- Strategy formulation/planning: 16.36% (2012), 15.69% (2011)
### Classification of four activity clusters

#### Corporate Development
- Multi-item average of:
  - New business (model) development
  - Sounding board for CEO or Board of Directors
  - Strategic initiatives and programs
  - Strategy formulation/planning

#### Portfolio Management
- Multi-item average of:
  - Coordination across-businesses (synergy management)
  - Divestitures
  - Mergers & acquisitions
  - Strategic alliances

#### Process Management
- Multi-item average of:
  - Competitive analysis/market research
  - Performance evaluation of strategic projects
  - Strategy implementation (incl. monitoring)

#### CSO Assistance
- Multi-item average of:
  - Functional strategies (e.g., IT, marketing, sales, etc.)
  - Investor relations
  - Strategy communication to internal and external stakeholders
Activities: All Firms (V/V)

For each of the following activities, please indicate their importance as part of your job

% of CSOs considering activity "important" or "very important"

Corporate Development: 88.7% (2012), 81.6% (2011)
Process Management: 70.6% (2012), 61.8% (2011)
Portfolio Management: 51.0% (2012), 43.9% (2011)
CEO assistance: 38.6% (2012), 35.5% (2011)
Activities: High vs. Low Performer

For each of the following activities, please indicate their importance as part of your job

**Average importance of CSO activity cluster 2012**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Low</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Corporate Development</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>4.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process Management</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>4.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portfolio Management</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>3.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEO assistance</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>2.90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean values: 1: not important, 5: very important
Activities: Quality of strategic decision

For each of the following activities, please indicate their importance as part of your job

Average importance of CSO activity cluster 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Mean Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Corporate Development</td>
<td>4.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process Management</td>
<td>4.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portfolio Management</td>
<td>3.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEO assistance</td>
<td>3.06</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean values: 1: not important, 5: very important
Activities: Organization design

For each of the following activities, please indicate their importance as part of your job

**Average importance of CSO activity cluster 2012**

- Corporate Development
  - Decentralized: 2.87
  - Centralized: 4.45
  - Mean: 3.65

- Process Management
  - Decentralized: 3.22
  - Centralized: 3.93
  - Mean: 3.65

- Portfolio Management
  - Decentralized: 2.86
  - Centralized: 4.00
  - Mean: 3.93

- CEO assistance
  - Decentralized: 2.87
  - Centralized: 3.65
  - Mean: 3.34

Mean values: 1: not important, 5: very important
For each of the following activities, please indicate their importance as part of your job.

**Average importance of CSO activity cluster 2012**

- **Corporate Development**
  - Large: 4.56
  - Medium: 4.24
  - Small: 4.46

- **Process Management**
  - Large: 3.80
  - Medium: 4.18
  - Small: 3.83

- **Portfolio Management**
  - Large: 3.52
  - Medium: 3.46
  - Small: 3.27

- **CEO assistance**
  - Large: 3.08
  - Medium: 2.91
  - Small: 2.67

Mean values: 1: not important, 5: very important.
Cross-functional collaboration: All Firms

For each of the following centralized corporate-level functions, please indicate (a) their importance for your firm’s value creation and (b) the extent of collaboration on strategic projects of your department with them:

Importance of and collaboration with centralized corporate-level functions 2012

- Controlling: Importance 4.10, Collaboration 3.94
- Finance: Importance 3.67, Collaboration 3.67
- Marketing: Importance 3.33, Collaboration 3.31
- Legal: Importance 3.35, Collaboration 3.33
- Human resources: Importance 3.18, Collaboration 3.14
- IT: Importance 3.14, Collaboration 3.14
- Risk management: Importance 3.05, Collaboration 3.05
- Communications/PR: Importance 3.07, Collaboration 3.07
- Compliance: Importance 2.98, Collaboration 2.98
- Supply chain management: Importance 2.94, Collaboration 2.94
- Accounting: Importance 2.71, Collaboration 2.71
- Corporate affairs: Importance 2.64, Collaboration 2.64
- Corporate (social) responsibility: Importance 2.63, Collaboration 2.63
- Internal audit: Importance 2.63, Collaboration 2.63

Mean values; 1: to no extent, 5: to a very great extent
Cross-functional collaboration: High vs. Low Performer

For each of the following centralized corporate-level functions, please indicate (a) their importance for your firm’s value creation and (b) the extent of collaboration on strategic projects of your department with them:

**Importance of centralized corporate-level functions 2012**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function</th>
<th>High Mean</th>
<th>Low Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Controlling</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>3.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>3.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>2.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human resources</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td>2.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications/PR</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>2.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>2.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>2.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supply chain management</td>
<td>2.09</td>
<td>2.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compliance</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>1.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk management</td>
<td>1.89</td>
<td>1.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounting</td>
<td>1.96</td>
<td>1.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate affairs</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>1.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate (social) responsibility</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td>1.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal audit</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>2.52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Collaboration with centralized corporate-level functions 2012**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function</th>
<th>High Mean</th>
<th>Low Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Controlling</td>
<td>4.38</td>
<td>3.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>3.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>2.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human resources</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>2.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications/PR</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>2.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>2.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>2.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supply chain management</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>2.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compliance</td>
<td>2.54</td>
<td>2.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk management</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td>2.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounting</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>2.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate affairs</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>2.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate (social) responsibility</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>2.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal audit</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>2.30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean values; 1: to no extent, 5: to a very great extent
Cross-functional collaboration: Quality of strategic decisions

For each of the following centralized corporate-level functions, please indicate (a) their importance for your firm's value creation and (b) the extent of collaboration on strategic projects of your department with them:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Importance of centralized corporate-level functions 2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Controlling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications/PR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supply chain management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compliance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate (social) responsibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal audit</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Collaboration with centralized corporate-level functions 2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Controlling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications/PR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supply chain management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compliance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate (social) responsibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal audit</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Cross-functional collaboration: Organization design

For each of the following centralized corporate-level functions, please indicate (a) their importance for your firm’s value creation and (b) the extent of collaboration on strategic projects of your department with them:

### Importance of centralized corporate-level functions 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Controlling</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td>2.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human resources</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>3.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications/PR</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>3.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>3.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk management</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supply chain management</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compliance</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate affairs</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounting</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal audit</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate (social) responsibility</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Collaboration with centralized corporate-level functions 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Controlling</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>3.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>3.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human resources</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>3.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>3.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>3.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications/PR</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>3.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>3.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk management</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>3.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supply chain management</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>3.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compliance</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>3.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate affairs</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>3.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounting</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>3.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal audit</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>3.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate (social) responsibility</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>3.17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean values; 1: to no extent, 5: to a very great extent
Cross-functional collaboration: Firm size

For each of the following centralized corporate-level functions, please indicate (a) their importance for your firm’s value creation and (b) the extent of collaboration on strategic projects of your department with them:

### Importance of centralized corporate-level functions 2012

- Controlling: 4.00
- Finance: 3.76
- Marketing: 3.61
- IT: 3.48
- Human resources: 3.33
- Communications/PR: 3.17
- Legal: 3.08
- Risk management: 2.92
- Supply chain management: 2.77
- Compliance: 2.67
- Accounting: 2.50
- Corporate affairs: 2.28
- Corporate (social) responsibility: 2.13
- Internal audit: 2.08

### Collaboration with centralized corporate-level functions 2012

- Controlling: 3.77
- Finance: 3.61
- Marketing: 3.46
- IT: 3.22
- Human resources: 3.17
- Communications/PR: 3.08
- Legal: 3.00
- Risk management: 2.94
- Supply chain management: 2.89
- Compliance: 2.85
- Accounting: 2.77
- Corporate affairs: 2.72
- Corporate (social) responsibility: 2.64
- Internal audit: 2.56

Mean values; 1: to no extent, 5: to a very great extent
Please assess the extent to which the following aspects increase your strategic decisions' complexity:

Factors affecting strategic decisions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unstable and dynamic environment.</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>3.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambiguity of available information.</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>3.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflicts concerning the outcomes of decisions among interested parties</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>3.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of complete information</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>3.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Numerous complicated among organizational and environmental elements</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>3.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regulated environment.</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>3.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High level of related diversification of the business portfolio</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>3.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High level of unrelated diversification of the business portfolio</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean values; 1: to no extent, 5: to a very great extent
Factors affecting strategic decisions: High vs. Low Performer

Please assess the extent to which the following aspects increase your strategic decisions' complexity:

Factors affecting strategic decisions 2012

- Unstable and dynamic environment: 3.72 (2012), 3.83 (2011)
- Ambiguity of available information: 3.61 (2012), 4.00 (2011)
- Conflicts concerning the outcomes of decisions among interested parties: 3.33 (2012), 3.54 (2011)
- Numerous complicated among organizational and environmental elements: 3.28 (2012), 3.46 (2011)
- High level of related diversification of the business portfolio: 3.22 (2012), 3.04 (2011)
- High level of unrelated diversification of the business portfolio: 3.46 (2012), 3.00 (2011)

Mean values; 1: to no extent, 5: to a very great extent
Factors affecting strategic decisions: Quality of strategic decisions

Please assess the extent to which the following aspects increase your strategic decisions' complexity:

Factors affecting strategic decisions 2012

- Unstable and dynamic environment.
- Ambiguity of available information.
- Conflicts concerning the outcomes of decisions among interested parties.
- Lack of complete information.
- Numerous complicated among organizational and environmental elements.
- High level of unrelated diversification of the business portfolio.
- High level of related diversification of the business portfolio.
- Regulated environment.

Mean values; 1: to no extent, 5: to a very great extent

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspect</th>
<th>Mean Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unstable and dynamic environment.</td>
<td>3.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambiguity of available information.</td>
<td>3.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflicts concerning the outcomes of decisions among interested parties</td>
<td>3.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of complete information</td>
<td>3.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Numerous complicated among organizational and environmental elements</td>
<td>3.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High level of unrelated diversification of the business portfolio</td>
<td>3.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High level of related diversification of the business portfolio</td>
<td>3.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regulated environment</td>
<td>3.39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Factors affecting strategic decisions: Organization design

Please assess the extent to which the following aspects increase your strategic decisions' complexity:

**Factors affecting strategic decisions 2012**

- Conflicts concerning the outcomes of decisions among interested parties
- Ambiguity of available information
- Unstable and dynamic environment
- Lack of complete information
- Numerous complicated among organizational and environmental elements
- Regulated environment
- High level of unrelated diversification of the business portfolio
- High level of related diversification of the business portfolio

Mean values; 1: to no extent, 5: to a very great extent

- Conflicts concerning the outcomes of decisions among interested parties: 3.48 (Decentralized) 3.87 (Centralized)
- Ambiguity of available information: 3.61 (Decentralized) 3.91 (Centralized)
- Unstable and dynamic environment: 3.57 (Decentralized) 4.13 (Centralized)
- Lack of complete information: 3.39 (Decentralized) 3.57 (Centralized)
- Numerous complicated among organizational and environmental elements: 3.52 (Decentralized) 3.39 (Centralized)
- Regulated environment: 3.39 (Decentralized) 3.39 (Centralized)
- High level of unrelated diversification of the business portfolio: 3.09 (Decentralized) 3.09 (Centralized)
- High level of related diversification of the business portfolio: 2.95 (Decentralized) 3.57 (Centralized)
Factors affecting strategic decisions: Firm size

Please assess the extent to which the following aspects increase your strategic decisions' complexity:

**Factors affecting strategic decisions 2012**

- Ambiguity of available information
- Unstable and dynamic environment
- Conflicts concerning the outcomes of decisions among interested parties
- Regulated environment
- High level of related diversification of the business portfolio
- Numerous complicated among organizational and environmental elements
- Lack of complete information
- High level of unrelated diversification of the business portfolio

![Bar chart showing mean values for different firm sizes](image)
Involvement in strategic decisions: All Firms

Please indicate the extent to which the following persons/groups are involved in strategic decisions of your firm:

Who's involved in strategic decisions?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CEO</td>
<td>4.89</td>
<td>4.92</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board of directors</td>
<td>4.44</td>
<td>4.24</td>
<td>0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSO</td>
<td>4.44</td>
<td>4.39</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFO</td>
<td>4.29</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other top management team members</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>-0.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divisional managers</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle managers</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean values; 1: to no extent, 5: to a very great extent
Involvement in strategic decisions: High vs. Low Performer

Please indicate the extent to which the following persons/groups are involved in strategic decisions of your firm:

Who's involved in strategic decisions?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Mean Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CEO</td>
<td>4.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board of directors</td>
<td>4.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSO</td>
<td>4.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFO</td>
<td>4.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other top management team members</td>
<td>3.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divisional managers</td>
<td>3.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle managers</td>
<td>2.59</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Low vs. High

Mean values; 1: to no extent, 5: to a very great extent
Involvement in strategic decisions: Quality of strategic decisions

Please indicate the extent to which the following persons/groups are involved in strategic decisions of your firm:

Who's involved in strategic decisions?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Mean Value</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CEO</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>4.81</td>
<td>4.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSO</td>
<td>4.39</td>
<td>4.59</td>
<td>4.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board of directors</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>4.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFO</td>
<td>4.44</td>
<td>4.41</td>
<td>4.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divisional managers</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>2.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other top management team members</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>2.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle managers</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>2.26</td>
<td>2.26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean values; 1: to no extent, 5: to a very great extent
Involvement in strategic decisions: Organization design

Please indicate the extent to which the following persons/groups are involved in strategic decisions of your firm:

Who's involved in strategic decisions?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Centralized</th>
<th>Mean Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Middle managers</td>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>3.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divisional managers</td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td>3.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other top management team members</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>3.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFO</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>4.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSO</td>
<td>4.23</td>
<td>4.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEO</td>
<td>4.77</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board of directors</td>
<td>4.57</td>
<td>4.32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean values; 1: to no extent, 5: to a very great extent
Involvement in strategic decisions: Firm size

Please indicate the extent to which the following persons/groups are involved in strategic decisions of your firm:

Who's involved in strategic decisions?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Large</th>
<th>Medium</th>
<th>Small</th>
<th>Mean values</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CEO</td>
<td>4.85</td>
<td>4.82</td>
<td>4.69</td>
<td>4.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSO</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>4.38</td>
<td>4.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFO</td>
<td>4.23</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>4.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board of directors</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td>4.69</td>
<td>4.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divisional managers</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>3.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other top management team members</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle managers</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>2.35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean values; 1: to no extent, 5: to a very great extent
Centralization of strategic decision-making: All Firms (I/II)

Please indicate the extent to which your firm delegates strategic decision-making authority to the business units concerning the following issues:

Decentralization of decision-making?

- Choosing employee assignments for projects
- Promoting business unit staff
- Making minor non-capital expenditures
- Choosing business unit projects to work on
- Hiring and firing business unit staff
- Allocating salary raises
- Administering the salary administration systems
- Making major non-capital expenditures
- Making major capital expenditures

Mean values; 1: to no extent, 5: to a very great extent
Centralization of strategic decision-making: All Firms (II/II)

Please indicate the extent to which your firm delegates strategic decision-making authority to the business units concerning the following issues:

### Decentralization of decision-making?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>3.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>3.46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean values; 1: to no extent, 5: to a very great extent
Centralization of strategic decision-making: Various industries

Please indicate the extent to which your firm delegates strategic decision-making authority to the business units concerning the following issues:

**Decentralization of decision-making?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Industry</th>
<th>Mean Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Life Science</td>
<td>4.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail</td>
<td>3.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Services</td>
<td>3.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services</td>
<td>3.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>3.25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean values; 1: to no extent, 5: to a very great extent
Centralization of strategic decision-making: High vs. Low Performer

Please indicate the extent to which your firm delegates strategic decision-making authority to the business units concerning the following issues:

**Decentralization of decision-making?**

- Choosing employee assignments for projects: Mean values; 1: to no extent, 5: to a very great extent
- Making minor non-capital expenditures: Mean values
- Promoting business unit staff: Mean values
- Hiring and firing business unit staff: Mean values
- Choosing business unit projects to work on: Mean values
- Allocating salary raises: Mean values
- Making major capital expenditures: Mean values
- Making major non-capital expenditures: Mean values
- Administering the salary administration systems: Mean values

[Bar chart showing mean values for each decision-making task, with 'High' and 'Low' labels for decision level.]
Quality of strategic decisions: All Firms (I/II)

Please indicate the extent to which the following is true for your firm's strategic decisions:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quality of strategic decisions</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strategic decisions make sense in light of the firm's current financial position</td>
<td>4.22</td>
<td>4.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic decisions are consistent with corporate goals</td>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>4.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic decisions are made based on the best available information</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>4.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic decisions are made based on valid assumptions</td>
<td>4.07</td>
<td>3.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic decisions contribute to the overall effectiveness of the firm</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>4.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic decisions make sense with respect to the environment</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>3.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic decisions are made through a clearly defined process of strategic planning</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>3.81</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean values; 1: to no extent, 5: to a very great extent
Quality of strategic decisions: All Firms (II/II)

Please indicate the extent to which the following is true for your firm's strategic decisions:

Overall high quality of strategic decisions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Mean Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>4.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>3.95</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean values: 1: to no extent, 5: to a very great extent
Quality of strategic decisions: Various industries

Please indicate the extent to which the following is true for your firm's strategic decisions

Overall high quality of strategic decisions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Industry</th>
<th>Mean Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Life Science</td>
<td>4.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services</td>
<td>4.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Services</td>
<td>4.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail</td>
<td>3.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>3.80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean values; 1: to no extent, 5: to a very great extent
Quality of strategic decisions: High vs. Low Performer

Please indicate the extent to which the following is true for your firm's strategic decisions:

**Overall high quality of strategic decisions**

- **High**: Mean = 4.11
- **Low**: Mean = 3.87

Mean values; 1: to no extent, 5: to a very great extent.
Quality of strategic decisions: Organization design

Please indicate the extent to which the following is true for your firm's strategic decisions.

**Overall high quality of strategic decisions**

- **Decentralized**: Mean value of 4.07
- **Centralized**: Mean value of 3.84

Mean values; 1: to no extent, 5: to a very great extent.
Quality of strategic decisions: Firm size

Please indicate the extent to which the following is true for your firm's strategic decisions:

**Overall high quality of strategic decisions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Firm Size</th>
<th>Mean Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Large</td>
<td>4.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>4.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small</td>
<td>3.67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean values: 1: to no extent, 5: to a very great extent.
Uncertainty and the CSO role: All Firms

Please indicate the extent to which you agree with the following statements regarding the uncertainty’s effect on your role:

**Uncertainty's effect on the CSO role**

- Identifying and analyzing changes in the environment is an important part of the CSO role: 4.42
- Cross-functional collaboration is important to effectively address the increasing uncertainty: 4.36
- The increasing uncertainty/volatility requires an increased collaboration of the strategy department with other functions: 4.09
- The increasing uncertainty/volatility leads to an increased importance of the CSO role: 3.78
- The CSO role has changed over the past few years: 3.57
- The increasing uncertainty/volatility requires an increased number of strategy staff: 2.64

Mean values; 1: to no extent, 5: to a very great extent
Uncertainty and the CSO role: High vs. Low Performer

Please indicate the extent to which you agree with the following statements regarding the uncertainty’s effect on your role:

**Uncertainty's effect on the CSO role**

1. Identifying and analyzing changes in the environment is an important part of the CSO role
   - Mean values: High (4.35), Low (2.54)

2. Cross-functional collaboration is important to effectively address the increasing uncertainty
   - Mean values: High (4.24), Low (2.71)

3. The increasing uncertainty/volatility requires an increased collaboration of the strategy department with other functions
   - Mean values: High (3.88), Low (2.54)

4. The increasing uncertainty/volatility leads to an increased importance of the CSO role
   - Mean values: High (3.92), Low (2.71)

5. The CSO role has changed over the past few years.
   - Mean values: High (3.59), Low (2.54)

6. Cross-functional collaboration is important to effectively address the increasing uncertainty
   - Mean values: High (3.56), Low (2.71)

Mean values; 1: to no extent, 5: to a very great extent
Uncertainty and the CSO role: Quality of strategic decisions

Please indicate the extent to which you agree with the following statements regarding the uncertainty’s effect on your role:

Uncertainty's effect on the CSO role

- Cross-functional collaboration is important to effectively address the increased uncertainty
  - Mean value: 4.44

- Identifying and analyzing changes in the environment is an important part of the CSO role
  - Mean value: 4.39

- The increasing uncertainty/volatility requires an increased collaboration of the strategy department with other functions
  - Mean value: 4.17

- The increasing uncertainty/volatility leads to an increased importance of the CSO role
  - Mean value: 4.00

- The CSO role has changed over the past few years
  - Mean value: 3.63

- The increasing uncertainty/volatility requires an increased number of strategy staff
  - Mean value: 3.42

Legend:
- High
- Low

Mean values; 1: to no extent, 5: to a very great extent
Uncertainty and the CSO role: Organization design

Please indicate the extent to which you agree with the following statements regarding the uncertainty’s effect on your role:

**Uncertainty's effect on the CSO role**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Decentralized</th>
<th>Centralized</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Identifying and analyzing changes in the environment is an important part of the CSO role</td>
<td>4.36</td>
<td>4.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross-functional collaboration is important to effectively address the increased uncertainty</td>
<td>4.32</td>
<td>4.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The increasing uncertainty/volatility requires an increased collaboration of the strategy department with other functions</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The increasing uncertainty/volatility leads to an increased importance of the CSO role</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>3.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The CSO role has changed over the past few years.</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>3.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The increasing uncertainty/volatility requires an increased number of strategy staff</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>2.57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean values; 1: to no extent, 5: to a very great extent
Uncertainty and the CSO role: Firm size

Please indicate the extent to which you agree with the following statements regarding the uncertainty’s effect on your role:

**Uncertainty’s effect on the CSO role**

- Cross-functional collaboration is important to effectively address the increased uncertainty
  - Mean values: Large: 4.42, Medium: 4.31, Small: 4.41

- Identifying and analyzing changes in the environment is an important part of the CSO role
  - Mean values: Large: 4.42, Medium: 4.54, Small: 4.29

- The CSO role has changed over the past few years
  - Mean values: Large: 3.46, Medium: 3.25, Small: 4.00

- The increasing uncertainty/volatility requires an increased collaboration of the strategy department with other functions
  - Mean values: Large: 3.92, Medium: 3.92, Small: 4.29

- The increasing uncertainty/volatility leads to an increased importance of the CSO role
  - Mean values: Large: 3.75, Medium: 3.85, Small: 3.76

- The increasing uncertainty/volatility requires an increased number of strategy staff
  - Mean values: Large: 2.08, Medium: 2.77, Small: 2.88

Mean values; 1: to no extent, 5: to a very great extent
Uncertainty's effect on the strategy process: All Firms

Please indicate the extent to which you agree with the following statements regarding the uncertainty's effect on your firm's strategy process:

Uncertainty's effect on the strategy process

- There is a regular exchange with external experts on future industry/ regional development
- The development of my firm depends also on short-term, macro-economic events
- The strategy process is sufficiently flexible to be able to react to unforeseen changes
- A higher degree of uncertainty requires a closer collaboration between strategic planning and operational planning
- A higher degree of uncertainty requires a closer collaboration between strategic planning and risk management
- To be able to address the uncertainty, there is a need for a leaner and more focused strategy process
- The strategy process has been adjusted to be able to anticipate the extreme events early on
- To be able to address the uncertainty, the strategy process requires more sophisticated tools and supportive methods
- To be able to address the uncertainty, there is a need for a more complex strategy process

Mean values; 1: to no extent, 5: to a very great extent
Uncertainty's effect on the strategy process: High vs. Low Performer

Please indicate the extent to which you agree with the following statements regarding the uncertainty’s effect on your firm’s strategy process:

**Uncertainty's effect on the strategy process**

There is a regular exchange with external experts on future industry/ regional development
The strategy process is sufficiently flexible to be able to react to unforeseen changes
The development of my firm depends also on short-term, macro-economic events
A higher degree of uncertainty requires a closer collaboration between strategic planning and operational planning
To be able to address the uncertainty, there is a need for a leaner and more focused strategy process
A higher degree of uncertainty requires a closer collaboration between strategic planning and risk management
The strategy process has been adjusted to be able to anticipate the extreme events early on
To be able to address the uncertainty, the strategy process requires more sophisticated tools and supportive methods
To be able to address the uncertainty, there is a need for a more complex strategy process

Mean values; 1: to no extent, 5: to a very great extent

- High
- Low
Uncertainty's effect on the strategy process: Quality of strategic decisions

Please indicate the extent to which you agree with the following statements regarding the uncertainty’s effect on your firm’s strategy process:

**Uncertainty’s effect on the strategy process**

- There is a regular exchange with external experts on future industry/ regional development
- The strategy process is sufficiently flexible to be able to react to unforeseen changes
- The development of my firm depends also on short-term, macro-economic events
- A higher degree of uncertainty requires a closer collaboration between strategic planning and operational planning
- A higher degree of uncertainty requires a closer collaboration between strategic planning and risk management
- The strategy process has been adjusted to be able to anticipate the extreme events early on
- To be able to address the uncertainty, there is a need for a leaner and more focused strategy process
- To be able to address the uncertainty, the strategy process requires more sophisticated tools and supportive methods
- To be able to address the uncertainty, there is a need for a more complex strategy process

Mean values; 1: to no extent, 5: to a very great extent
Uncertainty's effect on the strategy process: Organization design

Please indicate the extent to which you agree with the following statements regarding the uncertainty’s effect on your firm’s strategy process:

**Uncertainty's effect on the strategy process**

- A higher degree of uncertainty requires a closer collaboration between strategic planning and operational planning
- A higher degree of uncertainty requires a closer collaboration between strategic planning and risk management
- There is a regular exchange with external experts on future developments
- The development of my firm depends also on short-term, macro-economic events
- The strategy process is sufficiently flexible to be able to react to unforeseen changes
- To be able to address the uncertainty, there is a need for a leaner and more focused strategy process
- The strategy process has been adjusted to be able to anticipate the extreme events early on
- To be able to address the uncertainty, the strategy process requires more sophisticated tools and supportive methods
- To be able to address the uncertainty, there is a need for a more complex strategy process

Mean values; 1: to no extent, 5: to a very great extent

Decentralized  Centralized

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Mean Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A higher degree of uncertainty requires a closer collaboration...</td>
<td>3.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A higher degree of uncertainty requires a closer collaboration...</td>
<td>3.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is a regular exchange with external experts on future developments</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The development of my firm depends also on short-term, macro-economic</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The strategy process is sufficiently flexible to be able to react...</td>
<td>3.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To be able to address the uncertainty, there is a need for a leaner...</td>
<td>3.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The strategy process has been adjusted to be able to anticipate...</td>
<td>3.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To be able to address the uncertainty, the strategy process requires...</td>
<td>2.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To be able to address the uncertainty, there is a need for a more...</td>
<td>2.45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Uncertainty's effect on the strategy process: Firm size

Please indicate the extent to which you agree with the following statements regarding the uncertainty’s effect on your firm’s strategy process:

**Uncertainty's effect on the strategy process**

- There is a regular exchange with external experts on future industry/ regional development
- A higher degree of uncertainty requires a closer collaboration between strategic planning and operational planning
- The development of my firm depends also on short-term, macro-economic events
- To be able to address the uncertainty, there is a need for a leaner and more focused strategy process
- A higher degree of uncertainty requires a closer collaboration between strategic planning and risk management
- The strategy process is sufficiently flexible to be able to react to unforeseen changes
- The strategy process has been adjusted to be able to anticipate the extreme events early on
- To be able to address the uncertainty, the strategy process requires more sophisticated tools and supportive methods
- To be able to address the uncertainty, there is a need for a more complex strategy process

Mean values; 1: to no extent, 5: to a very great extent
Megatrends and the strategy process: All Firms

Please indicate the extent to which you agree with the following statements regarding the management of megatrends as part of your firm’s strategy process:

The influence of megatrends on the strategy process

Megatrends offer new opportunities for our firm.
Megatrends will play an important role for our firm in the future
Our firm does actively identify and investigate megatrends
Megatrends are highly complex and have multiple influence on our firm
Megatrends are fully integrated in our firm’s strategic planning process
Megatrends threaten our firm’s strategic business model.
Megatrends are still far in the future and not yet a strategic issue for our firm

Mean values; 1: to no extent, 5: to a very great extent
Megatrends and the strategy process: High vs. Low Performer

Please indicate the extent to which you agree with the following statements regarding the management of megatrends as part of your firm’s strategy process:

**The influence of megatrends on the strategy process**

- Megatrends offer new opportunities for our firm.
- Megatrends will play an important role for our firm in the future.
- Our firm does actively identify and investigate megatrends.
- Megatrends are fully integrated in our firm’s strategic planning process.
- Megatrends are highly complex and have multiple influence on our firm.
- Megatrends threaten our firm’s strategic business model.
- Megatrends are still far in the future and not yet a strategic issue for our firm.

Mean values; 1: to no extent, 5: to a very great extent.

**Legend:**
- **High**
- **Low**

---

Mean values:

- Megatrends offer new opportunities for our firm: 4.26
- Megatrends will play an important role for our firm in the future: 4.13
- Our firm does actively identify and investigate megatrends: 3.72
- Megatrends are fully integrated in our firm’s strategic planning process: 3.67
- Megatrends are highly complex and have multiple influence on our firm: 3.56
- Megatrends threaten our firm’s strategic business model: 3.57
- Megatrends are still far in the future and not yet a strategic issue for our firm: 2.83

---

**Note:**

Mean values for High and Low performers are represented in the table above. The values range from 1 to 5, with 1 indicating no extent and 5 indicating a very great extent.
Megatrends and the strategy process: Quality of strategic decisions

Please indicate the extent to which you agree with the following statements regarding the management of megatrends as part of your firm’s strategy process:

**The influence of megatrends on the strategy process**

- Megatrends offer new opportunities for our firm.
- Megatrends will play an important role for our firm in the future.
- Megatrends are highly complex and have multiple influence on our firm.
- Our firm does actively identify and investigate megatrends.
- Megatrends are fully integrated in our firm’s strategic planning process.
- Megatrends threaten our firm’s strategic business model.
- Megatrends are still far in the future and not yet a strategic issue for our firm.

Mean values; 1: to no extent, 5: to a very great extent

- Megatrends offer new opportunities for our firm: 4.26
- Megatrends will play an important role for our firm in the future: 4.06
- Megatrends are highly complex and have multiple influence on our firm: 3.94
- Our firm does actively identify and investigate megatrends: 3.83
- Megatrends are fully integrated in our firm’s strategic planning process: 3.66
- Megatrends threaten our firm’s strategic business model: 3.59
- Megatrends are still far in the future and not yet a strategic issue for our firm: 1.85
Megatrends and the strategy process: Organization design

Please indicate the extent to which you agree with the following statements regarding the management of megatrends as part of your firm’s strategy process:

The influence of megatrends on the strategy process

- Megatrends offer new opportunities for our firm.
- Megatrends will play an important role for our firm in the future.
- Our firm does actively identify and investigate megatrends.
- Megatrends are highly complex and have multiple influence on our firm.
- Megatrends are fully integrated in our firm’s strategic planning process.
- Megatrends threaten our firm’s strategic business model.
- Megatrends are still far in the future and not yet a strategic issue for our firm.

Mean values; 1: to no extent, 5: to a very great extent
Megatrends and the strategy process: Firm size

Please indicate the extent to which you agree with the following statements regarding the management of megatrends as part of your firm’s strategy process:

The influence of megatrends on the strategy process

- Megatrends offer new opportunities for our firm.
- Megatrends will play an important role for our firm in the future.
- Our firm does actively identify and investigate megatrends.
- Megatrends are highly complex and have multiple influence on our firm.
- Megatrends are fully integrated in our firm’s strategic planning process.
- Megatrends threaten our firm’s strategic business model.
- Megatrends are still far in the future and not yet a strategic issue for our firm.

Mean values; 1: to no extent, 5: to a very great extent.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Large</th>
<th>Medium</th>
<th>Small</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Megatrends offer new opportunities for our firm</td>
<td>4,42</td>
<td>4,36</td>
<td>4,11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Megatrends will play an important role for our firm in the future</td>
<td>4,36</td>
<td>4,17</td>
<td>3,89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our firm does actively identify and investigate megatrends</td>
<td>3,89</td>
<td>4,33</td>
<td>4,33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Megatrends are highly complex and have multiple influence on our firm</td>
<td>4,08</td>
<td>4,08</td>
<td>3,58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Megatrends are fully integrated in our firm’s strategic planning process</td>
<td>3,83</td>
<td>3,83</td>
<td>3,83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Megatrends threaten our firm’s strategic business model</td>
<td>3,75</td>
<td>3,42</td>
<td>2,72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Megatrends are still far in the future and not yet a strategic issue for our firm</td>
<td>2,72</td>
<td>3,00</td>
<td>2,50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Tools/methods in the strategic planning process: All Firms

Please indicate the extent to which you agree with the following statements regarding the management of megatrends as part of your firm’s strategy process:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tools and methods in the strategy planning process</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tools to implement strategic plans (e.g., strategy roadmap)</td>
<td>4.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scenario-based planning including an identification of trends and uncertainties</td>
<td>3.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rolling adjustments of the strategic plans under consideration of recent developments</td>
<td>3.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consistency checks of alternative scenarios (checking for (in)eligible combinations</td>
<td>3.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simulation and business intelligence tools to support decision making</td>
<td>3.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tools to analyze strategic issues and to analyze the ability to react to these issues</td>
<td>3.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Definition and measurement of “early warning indicators” of potential threats on strategic plans</td>
<td>3.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real option valuation to consider flexibility in investment decisions</td>
<td>2.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wargaming</td>
<td>1.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monte Carlo analysis and other stochastic modeling techniques</td>
<td>1.74</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean values; 1: to no extent, 5: to a very great extent
Tools/methods in the strategic planning process: High vs. Low Performer

Please indicate the extent to which you agree with the following statements regarding the management of megatrends as part of your firm’s strategy process:

**Tools and methods in the strategy planning process**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tools and methods</th>
<th>High Performer</th>
<th>Low Performer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monte Carlo analysis and other stochastic modeling techniques</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>1.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wargaming</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>1.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real option valuation to consider flexibility in investment decisions</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>1.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scenario-based planning including an identification of trends and uncertainties</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>2.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rolling adjustments of the strategic plans under consideration of recent developments</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>1.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Definition and measurement of “early warning indicators” of potential threats on strategic plans</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>1.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tools to analyze strategic issues and to analyze the ability to react to these issues</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>2.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consistency checks of alternative scenarios (checking for (in)eligible combinations)</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>3.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simulation and business intelligence tools to support decision making</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>3.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tools to implement strategic plans (e.g., strategy roadmap)</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>4.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rolling adjustments of the strategic plans under consideration of recent developments</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>3.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Definition and measurement of “early warning indicators” of potential threats on strategic plans</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>3.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tools to analyze strategic issues and to analyze the ability to react to these issues</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>2.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consistency checks of alternative scenarios (checking for (in)eligible combinations)</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>3.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simulation and business intelligence tools to support decision making</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>3.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tools to implement strategic plans (e.g., strategy roadmap)</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>4.04</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean values; 1: to no extent, 5: to a very great extent
Tools/methods in the strategic planning process: Quality of strategic decisions

Please indicate the extent to which you agree with the following statements regarding the management of megatrends as part of your firm’s strategy process

### Tools and methods in the strategy planning process

- Tools to implement strategic plans (e.g., strategy roadmap)
- Scenario-based planning including an identification of trends and uncertainties
- Rolling adjustments of the strategic plans under consideration of recent developments
- Consistency checks of alternative scenarios (checking for (in)eligible combinations
- Definition and measurement of “early warning indicators” of potential threats on strategic plans
- Tools to analyze strategic issues and to analyze the ability to react to these issues
- Simulation and business intelligence tools to support decision making
- Real option valuation to consider flexibility in investment decisions
- Wargaming
- Monte Carlo analysis and other stochastic modeling techniques

![Mean values scale](chart.png)

Mean values; 1: to no extent, 5: to a very great extent
Tools/methods in the strategic planning process: Organization design

Please indicate the extent to which you agree with the following statements regarding the management of megatrends as part of your firm’s strategy process:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tools and methods in the strategy planning process</th>
<th>mean values (5-point scale)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scenario-based planning including an identification of trends and uncertainties</td>
<td>3.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tools to implement strategic plans (e.g., strategy roadmap)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rolling adjustments of the strategic plans under consideration of recent developments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simulation and business intelligence tools to support decision making</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consistency checks of alternative scenarios (checking for (in)eligible combinations)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tools to analyze strategic issues and to analyze the ability to react to these issues</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Definition and measurement of “early warning indicators” of potential threats on strategic plans</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real option valuation to consider flexibility in investment decisions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wargaming</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monte Carlo analysis and other stochastic modeling techniques</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean values; 1: to no extent, 5: to a very great extent.
Please indicate the extent to which you agree with the following statements regarding the management of megatrends as part of your firm’s strategy process.

**Tools and methods in the strategy planning process**

- Tools to implement strategic plans (e.g., strategy roadmap)
- Scenario-based planning including an identification of trends and uncertainties
- Rolling adjustments of the strategic plans under consideration of recent developments
- Simulation and business intelligence tools to support decision making
- Tools to analyze strategic issues and to analyze the ability to react to these issues
- Definition and measurement of “early warning indicators” of potential threats on strategic plans
- Consistency checks of alternative scenarios (checking for (in)eligible combinations
- Real option valuation to consider flexibility in investment decisions
- Monte Carlo analysis and other stochastic modeling techniques
- Wargaming

Mean values; 1: to no extent, 5: to a very great extent
Managing strategic initiatives and programs: All Firms

Please indicate the extent to which you agree with the following statements regarding your firm’s strategic initiatives and programs activity:

Management of strategic initiatives and programs

- Strategic initiatives and programs are an important tool for strategy implementation
  - Mean: 4.20

- Strategic initiatives and programs have become increasingly important over the past few years
  - Mean: 4.11

- Strategic initiatives and programs are a critical part of the firm’s strategic leadership efforts
  - Mean: 3.82

- Strategic initiatives and programs are actively managed.
  - Mean: 3.77

- Strategic initiatives and programs enable our firm’s constant renewal
  - Mean: 3.72

- Our firm maintains a standardized process for managing strategic initiatives and programs
  - Mean: 3.05

Mean values; 1: to no extent, 5: to a very great extent
Managing strategic initiatives and programs: High vs. Low Performer

Please indicate the extent to which you agree with the following statements regarding your firm’s strategic initiatives and programs activity:

Management of strategic initiatives and programs

1. Strategic initiatives and programs are an important tool for strategy implementation
2. Strategic initiatives and programs have become increasingly important over the past few years
3. Strategic initiatives and programs enable our firm’s constant renewal
4. Strategic initiatives and programs are actively managed.
5. Strategic initiatives and programs are a critical part of the firm’s strategic leadership efforts
6. Our firm maintains a standardized process for managing strategic initiatives and programs

Mean values; 1: to no extent, 5: to a very great extent
Managing strategic initiatives and programs: Quality of strategic decisions

Please indicate the extent to which you agree with the following statements regarding your firm’s strategic initiatives and programs activity:

Management of strategic initiatives and programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Mean Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strategic initiatives and programs are an important tool for strategy implementation</td>
<td>4.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic initiatives and programs enable our firm’s constant renewal</td>
<td>4.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic initiatives and programs have become increasingly important over the past few years</td>
<td>4.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic initiatives and programs are a critical part of the firm's strategic leadership efforts</td>
<td>4.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic initiatives and programs are actively managed.</td>
<td>4.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our firm maintains a standardized process for managing strategic initiatives and programs</td>
<td>3.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Low  High

Mean values; 1: to no extent, 5: to a very great extent
Please indicate the extent to which you agree with the following statements regarding your firm’s strategic initiatives and programs activity:

**Management of strategic initiatives and programs**

- Strategic initiatives and programs are an important tool for strategy implementation: 4.45
- Strategic initiatives and programs have become increasingly important over the past few years: 3.74
- Strategic initiatives and programs are actively managed: 3.78
- Strategic initiatives and programs are a critical part of the firm's strategic leadership efforts: 4.05
- Strategic initiatives and programs enable our firm’s constant renewal: 3.57
- Our firm maintains a standardized process for managing strategic initiatives and programs: 2.87

Mean values; 1: to no extent, 5: to a very great extent

Decentralized

Centralized
Managing strategic initiatives and programs: Firm size

Please indicate the extent to which you agree with the following statements regarding your firm’s strategic initiatives and programs activity:

Management of strategic initiatives and programs

- Strategic initiatives and programs are an important tool for strategy implementation
  - Mean values: Large 4.50, Medium 4.16, Small 2.92

- Strategic initiatives and programs have become increasingly important over the past few years
  - Mean values: Large 4.31, Medium 4.00, Small 2.83

- Strategic initiatives and programs are actively managed.
  - Mean values: Large 4.25, Medium 3.77, Small 3.61

- Strategic initiatives and programs are a critical part of the firm's strategic leadership efforts
  - Mean values: Large 4.25, Medium 3.92, Small 3.61

- Strategic initiatives and programs enable our firm’s constant renewal
  - Mean values: Large 4.25, Medium 3.85, Small 3.41

- Our firm maintains a standardized process for managing strategic initiatives and programs
  - Mean values: Large 3.67, Medium 3.61, Small 2.83

Mean values; 1: to no extent, 5: to a very great extent
Measuring strategic impact: All Firms

Please indicate the extent to which you agree with the following statements regarding your department’s value creation (if no strategy department, please refer to your individual role):

**Measurement of the department's value creation**

- Measuring the value creation of the strategy department is difficult: Mean = 4.21
- The value creation of the strategy department is mainly the CEO’s perception of its value creation: Mean = 3.95
- Measuring the value creation of the strategy department is important: Mean = 3.36
- The value creation of the strategy department is measured by relying on the judgment of key stakeholders other than the CEO (divisional heads): Mean = 3.07
- The value creation of the strategy department is regularly measured in our firm: Mean = 1.98
- The value creation of the strategy department is measured transparent and quantifiable: Mean = 1.74
Measuring strategic impact: High vs. Low Performer

Please indicate the extent to which you agree with the following statements regarding your department’s value creation (if no strategy department, please refer to your individual role):

**Measurement of the department's value creation**

- The value creation of the strategy department is mainly the CEO's perception of its value creation
- Measuring the value creation of the strategy department is difficult
- Measuring the value creation of the strategy department is important
- The value creation of the strategy department is measured by relying on the judgment of key stakeholders other than the CEO (divisional heads)
- The value creation of the strategy department is regularly measured in our firm
- The value creation of the strategy department is measured transparent and quantifiable

![Bar chart showing mean values for different statements on a scale of 1 to 5, with High and Low performers compared.](image)

- **High Performer**
  - Mean values: 1 to no extent, 5 to a very great extent
- **Low Performer**
  - Mean values: 1 to no extent, 5 to a very great extent

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>High Performer</th>
<th>Low Performer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The value creation of the strategy department is mainly the CEO's</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>3.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measuring the value creation of the strategy department is difficult</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>4.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measuring the value creation of the strategy department is important</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>3.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The value creation of the strategy department is measured by relying on</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>3.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the judgment of key stakeholders other than the CEO (divisional heads)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The value creation of the strategy department is regularly measured in</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>2.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>our firm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The value creation of the strategy department is measured transparent</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>2.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and quantifiable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Measuring strategic impact: Quality of strategic decisions

Please indicate the extent to which you agree with the following statements regarding your department’s value creation (if no strategy department, please refer to your individual role):

**Measurement of the department’s value creation**

- Measuring the value creation of the strategy department is difficult
  - Mean value: 2.13
- The value creation of the strategy department is mainly the CEO’s perception of its value creation
  - Mean value: 3.00
- Measuring the value creation of the strategy department is important
  - Mean value: 3.00
- The value creation of the strategy department is measured by relying on the judgment of key stakeholders other than the CEO (divisional heads)
  - Mean value: 3.69
- The value creation of the strategy department is measured transparent and quantifiable
  - Mean value: 1.86
- The value creation of the strategy department is regularly measured in our firm
  - Mean value: 2.13

Legend:
- High
- Low

Mean values; 1: to no extent, 5: to a very great extent
Measuring strategic impact: Organizational design

Please indicate the extent to which you agree with the following statements regarding your department’s value creation (if no strategy department, please refer to your individual role):

**Measurement of the department's value creation**

- Measuring the value creation of the strategy department is difficult
  - [ ] Decentralized
  - [ ] Centralized
  - Mean values; 1: to no extent, 5: to a very great extent
  - Value creation: 1.27

- The value creation of the strategy department is mainly the CEO's perception of its value creation
  - Value creation: 3.70

- Measuring the value creation of the strategy department is important
  - Value creation: 3.05

- The value creation of the strategy department is measured by relying on the judgment of key stakeholders other than the CEO (divisional heads)
  - Value creation: 3.05

- Measuring the value creation of the strategy department is important
  - Value creation: 3.30

- The value creation of the strategy department is mainly the CEO's perception of its value creation
  - Value creation: 4.17

- Measuring the value creation of the strategy department is difficult
  - Value creation: 4.36

- The value creation of the strategy department is regularly measured in our firm
  - Value creation: 4.05

- The value creation of the strategy department is measured transparent and quantifiable
  - Value creation: 2.26
Measuring strategic impact: Firm size

Please indicate the extent to which you agree with the following statements regarding your department’s value creation (if no strategy department, please refer to your individual role):

**Measurement of the department’s value creation**

1. Measuring the value creation of the strategy department is difficult
2. The value creation of the strategy department is mainly the CEO’s perception of its value creation
3. Measuring the value creation of the strategy department is important
4. The value creation of the strategy department is measured by relying on the judgment of key stakeholders other than the CEO (divisional heads)
5. The value creation of the strategy department is regularly measured in our firm
6. The value creation of the strategy department is measured transparent and quantifiable

![Bar chart showing mean values for different firm sizes](image)

Mean values; 1: to no extent, 5: to a very great extent
Relevance of strategic business model: All Firms

Please indicate the extent to which you agree with the following statements concerning your firm's strategic business model:

### Relevance of strategic business model

- The strategic business model is well defined and documented
  - 2012: 3.61
  - 2011: 3.94

- The strategic business model is regularly scrutinized and further developed
  - 2012: 3.71
  - 2011: 3.83

- The strategic business model is well known by management/senior management
  - 2012: 3.76
  - 2011: 3.83

- My organization sees a clear need to further develop its business model
  - 2012: 3.60
  - 2011: 3.79

Mean values: 1: to no extent, 5: to a very great extent
Relevance of strategic business model: High vs. Low Performer

Please indicate the extent to which you agree with the following statements concerning your firm's strategic business model:

Relevance of strategic business model 2012

The strategic business model is well defined and documented

The strategic business model is well known by management/senior management

The strategic business model is regularly scrutinized and further developed

My organization sees a clear need to further develop its business model

Mean values; 1: to no extent, 5: to a very great extent

High

Low

1 2 3 4 5

3.94
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3.76

3.48

3.75

3.71

3.47

3.71
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Relevance of strategic business model: Quality of strategic decisions

Please indicate the extent to which you agree with the following statements concerning your firm's strategic business model:

**Relevance of strategic business model 2012**

1. The strategic business model is regularly scrutinized and further developed
   - Mean values: 1: to no extent, 5: to a very great extent
   - High: 4.14
   - Low: 3.48

2. The strategic business model is well defined and documented
   - Mean values: 1: to no extent, 5: to a very great extent
   - High: 3.93
   - Low: 3.67

3. My organization sees a clear need to further develop its business model
   - Mean values: 1: to no extent, 5: to a very great extent
   - High: 3.87
   - Low: 3.44

4. The strategic business model is well known by management/senior management
   - Mean values: 1: to no extent, 5: to a very great extent
   - High: 3.79
   - Low: 3.52

Legend:
- **High**
- **Low**

Mean values; 1: to no extent, 5: to a very great extent
Relevance of strategic business model: Organizational design

Please indicate the extent to which you agree with the following statements concerning your firm's strategic business model:

**Relevance of strategic business model 2012**

- The strategic business model is well defined and documented: 3.50
- My organization sees a clear need to further develop its business model: 3.45
- The strategic business model is regularly scrutinized and further developed: 3.45
- The strategic business model is well known by management/senior management: 3.23

Mean values; 1: to no extent, 5: to a very great extent
Relevance of strategic business model: Firm size

Please indicate the extent to which you agree with the following statements concerning your firm's strategic business model:

Relevance of strategic business model 2012

- The strategic business model is well known by management/senior management
  - Mean values: Large: 3.92, Medium: 3.67, Small: 3.35

- My organization sees a clear need to further develop its business model
  - Mean values: Large: 3.83, Medium: 3.91, Small: 3.83

- The strategic business model is regularly scrutinized and further developed
  - Mean values: Large: 3.75, Medium: 3.56, Small: 3.67

- The strategic business model is well defined and documented
  - Mean values: Large: 4.08, Medium: 3.67, Small: 3.61

Mean values; 1: to no extent, 5: to a very great extent
Hot topics related to the strategic business model: All Firms

Please indicate the extent to which the following expresses the focus/goals of your firm's strategic business model:

**Hot topics related to the strategic business model**

- Development of new innovative products/integrated solutions
- Defining and exploiting new customer segment/-groups
- Entering new, emerging regions
- Adding additional and innovative services to the organization's portfolio
- Improvement of the organization’s internal cross-selling/ generation of cross-business synergies
- Strategic partnering to complete the organization’s offerings/to share customers
- Planning a different configuration of the organization’s value chain (to improve efficiency/ effectiveness (e.g. through outsourcing of different functions))
- Use of direct channels (e.g. online) to serve the organization's customers
- Planning to change the organization’s value creation model in the future (e.g. leasing, product usage fees, free offerings combined with fees for value-added services)
- Launching e-business activities

Mean values; 1: to no extent, 5: to a very great extent
Hot topics related to the strategic business model: High vs. Low Performer

Please indicate the extent to which the following expresses the focus/goals of your firm's strategic business model:

**Hot topics related to the strategic business model**

- Development of new innovative products/integrated solutions
- Adding additional and innovative services to the organization's portfolio
- Defining and exploiting new customer segment/groups
- Entering new, emerging regions
- Planning a different configuration of the organization's value chain (to improve efficiency/effectiveness (e.g., through outsourcing of different functions))
- Strategic partnering to complete the organization's offerings/to share customers
- Improvement of the organization's internal cross-selling/generation of cross-business synergies
- Use of direct channels (e.g., online) to serve the organization's customers
- Launching e-business activities
- Planning to change the organization's value creation model in the future (e.g., leasing, product usage fees, free offerings combined with fees for value-added services)

**Mean values; 1: to no extent, 5: to a very great extent**

- Planning to change the organization's value creation model in the future: 2.91
- Entering new, emerging regions: 3.52
- Use of direct channels (e.g., online) to serve the organization's customers: 3.00
- Improvement of the organization's internal cross-selling/generation of cross-business synergies: 3.35
- Strategic partnering to complete the organization's offerings/to share customers: 3.30
- Adding additional and innovative services to the organization's portfolio: 3.22
- Defining and exploiting new customer segment/groups: 3.26
- Development of new innovative products/integrated solutions: 3.74
- Planning a different configuration of the organization's value chain (to improve efficiency/effectiveness (e.g., through outsourcing of different functions)): 4.11
Hot topics related to the strategic business model: Quality of strategic decisions

Please indicate the extent to which the following expresses the focus/goals of your firm's strategic business model:

Hot topics related to the strategic business model

- Development of new innovative products/integrated solutions
- Entering new, emerging regions
- Defining and exploiting new customer segment/-groups
- Adding additional and innovative services to the organization's portfolio
- Planning a different configuration of the organization’s value chain (to improve efficiency/ effectiveness (e.g. through outsourcing of different functions))
- Strategic partnering to complete the organization’s offerings/to share customers
- Launching e-business activities
- Improvement of the organization's internal cross-selling/generation of cross-business synergies
- Use of direct channels (e.g. online) to serve the organization's customers
- Planning to change the organization’s value creation model in the future (e.g. leasing, product usage fees, free offerings combined with fees for value-added services)

Mean values; 1: to no extent, 5: to a very great extent

- Low
- High

Mean values: 1: to no extent, 5: to a very great extent
Hot topics related to the strategic business model: Organizational design

Please indicate the extent to which the following expresses the focus/goals of your firm's strategic business model:

**Hot topics related to the strategic business model**

- Development of new innovative products/integrated solutions
- Adding additional and innovative services to the organization's portfolio
- Entering new, emerging regions
- Defining and exploiting new customer segment/-groups
- Planning a different configuration of the organization's value chain (to improve efficiency/ effectiveness (e.g. through outsourcing of different functions))
- Use of direct channels (e.g. online) to serve the organization's customers
- Improvement of the organization's internal cross-selling/ generation of cross-business synergies
- Strategic partnering to complete the organization's offerings/to share customers
- Launching e-business activities
- Planning to change the organization's value creation model in the future (e.g. leasing, product usage fees, free offerings combined with fees for value-added services)

Mean values; 1: to no extent, 5: to a very great extent
Hot topics related to the strategic business model: Firm size

Please indicate the extent to which the following expresses the focus/goals of your firm's strategic business model:

**Hot topics related to the strategic business model**

- Entering new, emerging regions
- Development of new innovative products/integrated solutions
- Defining and exploiting new customer segment/-groups
- Adding additional and innovative services to the organization's portfolio
- Launching e-business activities
- Strategic partnering to complete the organization’s offerings/to share customers
- Use of direct channels (e.g. online) to serve the organization’s customers
- Planning to change the organization’s value creation model in the future (e.g. leasing, product usage fees, free offerings combined with fees for value-added services)
- Improvement of the organization’s internal cross-selling/ generation of cross-business synergies
- Planning a different configuration of the organization’s value chain (to improve efficiency/ effectiveness (e.g. through outsourcing of different functions))

Mean values; 1: to no extent, 5: to a very great extent

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Large</th>
<th>Medium</th>
<th>Small</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Planning a different configuration of the organization’s value chain</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>3.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development of new innovative products/integrated solutions</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>3.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adding additional and innovative services to the organization’s portfolio</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>4.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving the organization’s internal cross-selling/ generation of cross-business synergies</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>3.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning to change the organization’s value creation model in the future (e.g. leasing, product usage fees, free offerings combined with fees for value-added services)</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>2.94</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Implementation of hot topics: All Firms

Please indicate the extent to which your firm uses the following means to secure the implementation of the hot topics / of the strategic business model elements:

Implementation of hot topics

- Our department is tracking/monitoring the implementation
  - Mean values: 2011 = 3.71, 2012 = 3.63

- Implementation normally delivers the expected results
  - Mean values: 2011 = 3.40, 2012 = 3.42

- Our company is good in implementing developed strategies/business models
  - Mean values: 2011 = 3.29, 2012 = 3.19

Mean values; 1: to no extent, 5: to a very great extent
Implementation of hot topics: High vs. Low Performer

Please indicate the extent to which your firm uses the following means to secure the implementation of the hot topics / of the strategic business model elements:

**Implementation of hot topics**

- Implementation normally delivers the expected results
- Our company is good in implementing developed strategies/
- Our company is good in implementing developed strategies/
  business models

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Mean values; 1: to no extent, 5: to a very great extent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Implementation normally delivers the expected results</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our company is good in implementing developed strategies/</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our company is good in implementing developed strategies/</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>business models</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Implementation of hot topics: Quality of strategic decisions

Please indicate the extent to which your firm uses the following means to secure the implementation of the hot topics / of the strategic business model elements:

**Implementation of hot topics**

- Our department is tracking/monitoring the implementation
  - Mean value: 3.56
- Implementation normally delivers the expected results
  - Mean value: 3.69
- Our company is good in implementing developed strategies/business models
  - Mean value: 3.07

Mean values; 1: to no extent, 5: to a very great extent
Implementation of hot topics: Organization Design

Please indicate the extent to which your firm uses the following means to secure the implementation of the hot topics / of the strategic business model elements:

Implementation of hot topics

- Our department is tracking/monitoring the implementation
  - Centralized: 3.39
  - Decentralized: 2.83

- Implementation normally delivers the expected results
  - Centralized: 3.60
  - Decentralized: 3.26

- Our company is good in implementing developed strategies/business models
  - Centralized: 3.90
  - Decentralized: 3.60

Mean values; 1: to no extent, 5: to a very great extent
Implementation of hot topics: Firm size

Please indicate the extent to which your firm uses the following means to secure the implementation of the hot topics / of the strategic business model elements:

**Implementation of hot topics**

- Our department is tracking/monitoring the implementation
- Implementation normally delivers the expected results
- Our company is good in implementing developed strategies/business models

Mean values; 1: to no extent, 5: to a very great extent
Please indicate the extent to which the following aspects challenge your strategy work

**Hurdles and pain points**

- The strategy department gets different tasks in times of economic downturn (e.g. cost reduction)
- Success of strategy development cannot be measured accurately
- Operational units do not follow strategic directives.
- Lack of support from management board.

Mean values; 1: to no extent, 5: to a very great extent
Hurdles and pain points: High vs. Low Performer

Please indicate the extent to which the following aspects challenge your strategy work

### Hurdles and pain points 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspect</th>
<th>Mean Value</th>
<th>High Mean</th>
<th>Low Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The strategy department gets different tasks in times of economic downturn (e.g. cost reduction)</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Success of strategy development cannot be measured accurately</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>2.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operational units do not follow strategic directives</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>2.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of support from management board</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean values: 1: to no extent, 5: to a very great extent
### Hurdles and pain points: Quality of strategic decisions

Please indicate the extent to which the following aspects challenge your strategy work.

**Hurdles and pain points 2012**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspect</th>
<th>Mean Value</th>
<th>1: to no extent</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5: to a very great extent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The strategy department gets different tasks in times of economic downturn (e.g. cost reduction)</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operational units do not follow strategic directives</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Success of strategy development cannot be measured accurately</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of support from management board</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean values; 1: to no extent, 5: to a very great extent.
Hurdles and pain points: Organizational design

Please indicate the extent to which the following aspects challenge your strategy work

**Hurdles and pain points 2012**

- The strategy department gets different tasks in times of economic downturn (e.g. cost reduction)
- Success of strategy development cannot be measured accurately
- Operational units do not follow strategic directives
- Lack of support from management board

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspect</th>
<th>Mean Value</th>
<th>Decentralized</th>
<th>Centralized</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The strategy department gets different tasks</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Success of strategy development cannot be measured accurately</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operational units do not follow strategic directives</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of support from management board</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean values; 1: to no extent, 5: to a very great extent
Hurdles and pain points: Firm size

Please indicate the extent to which the following aspects challenge your strategy work

Hurdles and pain points 2012

Operational units do not follow strategic directives

The strategy department gets different tasks in times of economic downturn (e.g. cost reduction)

Success of strategy development cannot be measured accurately

Lack of support from management board

Mean values; 1: to no extent, 5: to a very great extent
Assessment of overall economic situation: All Firms

Please indicate the extent to which you agree with the following statements concerning the development of the economy:

**Assessment of overall economic situation**

1. I expect the European sovereign debt crisis to have a severe impact on the economy in the next quarter
   - Mean value: 3.48

2. I expect the US sovereign debt crisis to have a severe impact on the economy in the next quarter
   - Mean value: 3.44

3. The demographic changes and the related lack of a skilled workforce will significantly weaken Europe's economic position
   - Mean value: 2.86

4. The crisis in Middle East and North Africa is a threat for Europe's economy and stability
   - Mean value: 2.38

5. I expect the European economy to thrive during H2/2012 (2011)
   - Mean value: 2.43

Mean values; 1: to no extent, 5: to a very great extent
Assessment of overall economic situation: High vs. Low Performer

Please indicate the extent to which you agree with the following statements concerning the development of the economy:

**Assessment of overall economic situation 2012**

- I expect the European sovereign debt crisis to have a severe impact on the economy in the next quarter
- I expect the US sovereign debt crisis to have a severe impact on the economy in the next quarter
- The demographic changes and the related lack of a skilled workforce will significantly weaken Europe's economic position
- The crisis in Middle East and North Africa is a threat for Europe's economy and stability
- I expect the European economy to thrive during H2/2012 (2011)

Mean values; 1: to no extent, 5: to a very great extent
Assessment of overall economic situation: Quality of strategic decisions

Please indicate the extent to which you agree with the following statements concerning the development of the economy:

**Assessment of overall economic situation 2012**

1. I expect the European sovereign debt crisis to have a severe impact on the economy in the next quarter
   - Mean value: 2.44

2. I expect the US sovereign debt crisis to have a severe impact on the economy in the next quarter
   - Mean value: 3.56

3. The demographic changes and the related lack of a skilled workforce will significantly weaken Europe's economic position
   - Mean value: 2.67

4. The crisis in Middle East and North Africa is a threat for Europe's economy and stability
   - Mean value: 2.81

5. I expect the European economy to thrive during H2/2012 (2011)
   - Mean value: 2.44

Mean values; 1: to no extent, 5: to a very great extent
Assessment of overall economic situation: Organizational design

Please indicate the extent to which you agree with the following statements concerning the development of the economy:

Assessment of overall economic situation 2012

I expect the European sovereign debt crisis to have a severe impact on the economy in the next quarter

I expect the US sovereign debt crisis to have a severe impact on the economy in the next quarter

The demographic changes and the related lack of a skilled workforce will significantly weaken Europe’s economic position

I expect the European economy to thrive during H2/2012 (2011)

The crisis in Middle East and North Africa is a threat for Europe’s economy and stability

Mean values; 1: to no extent, 5: to a very great extent

Decentralized  Centralized
Assessment of overall economic situation: Firm size

Please indicate the extent to which you agree with the following statements concerning the development of the economy:

### Assessment of overall economic situation 2012

- I expect the European sovereign debt crisis to have a severe impact on the economy in the next quarter
- I expect the US sovereign debt crisis to have a severe impact on the economy in the next quarter
- The crisis in Middle East and North Africa is a threat for Europe’s economy and stability
- The demographic changes and the related lack of a skilled workforce will significantly weaken Europe’s economic position
- I expect the European economy to thrive during H2/2012 (2011)

Mean values; 1: to no extent, 5: to a very great extent
Firm information: All Firms

Is your firm publicly listed?

Publicly listed companies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Yes (%)</th>
<th>No (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>75.0%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>69.9%</td>
<td>30.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Does your firm's board of directors have a strategy committee?

**Strategy committee in board of directors**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>27.8%</td>
<td>37.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>72.2%</td>
<td>62.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Firm information: High vs. Low Performer

Does your firm's board of directors have a strategy committee?

**Strategy committee in board of directors 2012**

- **2012**
  - High: 56.3%
  - Low: 43.8%

- **2011**
  - High: 57.7%
  - Low: 42.3%
Firm information: Quality of strategic decisions

Does your firm's board of directors have a strategy committee?

Strategy committee in board of directors 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Low</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>68.8%</td>
<td>31.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>59.3%</td>
<td>40.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Firm information: All Firms

How many acquisitions did your firm perform over the past three years?
In how many strategic alliances did your firm engage over the past three years?

No. of recent acquisitions

- 0: 11.6%
- 1-3: 20.9%
- 4-10: 25.6%
- More than 10: 41.9%

No. of recent strategic alliances

- 0: 29.3%
- 1-3: 24.4%
- 4-10: 43.9%
- More than 10: 2.4%