Class 1: Introduction to Competitive Intelligence (CI/MI)

Evolution of My Understanding of CI

At the outset of the course, I viewed competitive intelligence (CI) narrowly, almost as just competitor analysis or a subset of market research. After Class 1, my understanding expanded significantly: CI is not just analyzing competitors or gathering static data; it is a dynamic, continuous process that creates actionable knowledge for strategic decision-making. CI is more like an ongoing, action-oriented "film" of the environment than a one-time snapshot (Sharp 2000). I also saw that CI is more targeted and decision-driven than general environmental scanning – it filters external information into focused insight for specific strategic needs. Most importantly, I realized that CI is part and parcel of strategic planning and risk management: by sussing out competitors' actions and shifting trends in the market, CI prevents organizations from being blindsided while empowering them to grab opportunities. Indeed, SCIP emphasizes that CI is a means for decreasing strategic risk and identify areas for potential growth (SCIP 2022). At last, I found out CI is not an ad-hoc activity, it is a formal function for most companies already, because they have dedicated CI units and clearly defined processes. The class ruined any idea I had of CI being corporate espionage: CI functions well within legal, ethical frameworks using predominantly publicly information. So I've gone from thinking about CI as a narrow analysis function to seeing it as a holistic, continuous, and principled enterprise practice that converts external information into strategic insight.

Key Insights from Readings

The readings from Class 1 provided foundational perspectives that expanded and solidified my new understanding of CI:

- **Seena Sharp (2000)** – *"10 Myths of Competitive Intelligence"*: In the You10 Myths of Competitive Intelligence Sharp's article touches on great misconceptions about CI. She differentiates CI from market research by saying that market research gives static snapshots while CI is a continuous process that always turns up new questions and insights (Sharp 2000). Sharp counters the notion that CI is synonymous with spying, asserting that professional CI is not based on covert methods but on lawful, ethical information collection. Moreover, she cautions against being laser focused on direct competitors (which can lead to tunnel vision); CI also must keep an eye on customers, new entrants, and higher order market forces in order to avoid being blindsided. In the end, Sharp concludes, the goal of CI is action — intelligence is useless unless it drives informed decisions.
- **Adeline du Toit (2015)** – *"Competitive Intelligence Research: An Investigation of Trends in the Literature"*: Du Toit's study offers a meta-perspective on CI as an academic and professional field. One key finding was that "competitive intelligence" became the dominant term in the literature, overtaking older labels like "business intelligence," which signals that CI has emerged as a distinct discipline (Du Toit 2015). She also noted that CI

publications span many disciplines, indicating the field's inherently interdisciplinary nature (spanning strategy, information management, marketing, etc.). This context reinforced our class discussion that CI draws on multiple business domains. Du Toit further observed that CI knowledge had been somewhat fragmented across sources, suggesting a need for a unified framework – a gap that Madureira et al. (2021) attempt to fill. Overall, Du Toit (2015) confirmed that CI is a legitimate and valid, growing area of study and practical methods, not just a slogan but real impact.

- **Madureira, Popovič, & Castelli (2021)** – *"Competitive Intelligence: A Unified View and Modular Definition"*: This article focuses on the fragmentation in CI definitions and offers unified framework. Madureira et al. determine fundamental dimensions of CI (e.g., information scope, analytical methods, ethical principles, or organizational integration) and provide a holistic definition (Madureira et al. 2021). Their main insight is that a clear common definition clarifies CI efforts and how to shape CI as a profession, particularly during the time of information overload. This aligns with the class's expansive approach to CI and affirmed that our approach is supported by the current literature. In essence, Madureira et al. (2021) provide advice on CI as being a complex and dynamic field and emphasize that clarity in a definition of CI will aid in further developing practice.

Key Insights from Class Discussion & Lecture

The lecture and discussion in Class 1 provided the foundation by defining what CI is (and isn't) and placing it in context within the array of other business activities:

• Understanding CI: We reviewed formal definitions of CI. One description (Calof & Skinner 1998) of CI is that it is a cycle of planning, collection, analysis and dissemination of external information to lead to actionable recommendations. After all, a similar definition by SCIP highlights CI as the collection of systematic ethical intelligence activities supporting decision makers (SCIP 2022). CI is a formal business discipline, with a systematic process focused on strengthening competitiveness and these cemented this view.

• CI vs. Other Concepts: We explained how CI is distinct from and overlaps other business information activities. CI is distinct from one-off market research studies in that it is qualitative, continuous, and future-focused (Sharp 2000). We also compared CI with business intelligence (BI) — BI analyzes internal data, CI takes a look outside. Competitor analysis, we learned, is but one aspect of CI — a robust CI program also tracks customers, suppliers, technological trends and the wider environment. This perspective helped CI become a glue between different domains (marketing, strategy, risk management) giving an integrated external view.

• The Intelligence Process: We were introduced to the process of conducting effective CI as an iterative series of steps that include intelligence requirements definition (planning), information gathering (collection), making sense of it (analysis) and delivery of insights (dissemination). We observed that several firms invest far more time collecting information than planning, resulting in information overload. The takeaway from this class was that 'a lot of planning up front – like, knowing what intelligence you need – is essential to avoid running around in circles and making

sure that CI makes a difference rather than getting lost in data. This highlighted CI's proactive aspect and its connection to strategic planning cycles.

• Ethics and legality: CI highlighted that ethical behavior should be fundamental principles. We talked about which intelligence-gathering practices are acceptable and where to draw the line (e.g., about honesty of one's identity vs. lying). But, the conclusion was: CI is only valid when done ethically and in accordance to the law. This echo was also in visible in Sharp's clarification that specific covert operations are not part of CI (Sharp 2000) This was an eye-opener for me, for it dispelled any lingering notion that CI may include unethical methods: I learned that professional CI is open and ethical in nature.

• Value and Role of CI: Why do companies pay CI? This was covered in class – most importantly to get rid of blind spots in a fast-changing setting. We heard about cases where companies found themselves blindsided by competitors or changes in the market because they lacked good intelligence, highlighting CI's role as an early warning system. On the opposite side, effective CI can reveal opportunities and guide proactive moves. We talked about the CI projects that inform key strategic decisions such as market entry, new product development and M&A. This has highlighted the fact that CI actually supports to do strategic planning and innovation by providing companies with timely insights that they can use to guide business decisions.

Reflection and Integration

From Class 1, I understood foundation in CI, with lecture and readings painting a coherent picture of the field in my mind. The materials complemented each other: Sharp's practical examples and Du Toit's and Madureira's academic perspectives reinforced the same core principles of CI rather than contradicting them. Together, they strengthened my understanding of CI as a **strategic, ethical, and interdisciplinary practice**. Furthermore, I also clearly see how CI interfaces with other business functions: it extends **marketing research** by adding competitive and market foresight, and it feeds into **strategy** and **risk management** by anticipating external changes. This represents a major shift from my initial view. I now recognize that doing CI well means thinking like a strategist (focusing on what matters for the business's future), working like an analyst (systematically gathering and analyzing data), and upholding strong ethics. The first class set the stage for me to integrate these concepts in subsequent sessions.

References

Calof, Jonathan, and Sheila A. Skinner. "Competitive Intelligence: A Systematic Program for Gathering and Analyzing Information to Find New Opportunities and Remain Competitive." *Proceedings of the 3rd World Congress on Competitive Intelligence*, 1998, pp. 38–39. Du Toit, Adeline S. A. "Competitive Intelligence Research: An Investigation of Trends in the Literature." *Journal of Intelligence Studies in Business*, vol. 5, no. 2, 2015, pp. 14–21. Madureira, Luís, Aleš Popovič, and Mauro Castelli. "Competitive Intelligence: A Unified View and Modular Definition." *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*, vol. 173, 2021, p. 121086.

SCIP (Society of Competitive Intelligence Professionals). "Competitive Intelligence and Market Intelligence Basics – Topic Hub." SCIP, 2022, www.scip.org/page/CI-MI-Basics-Topic-Hub. Sharp, Seena. "Truth or Consequences: 10 Myths That Cripple Competitive Intelligence." *Competitive Intelligence Magazine*, vol. 3, no. 1, 2000, pp. 19–23.

Class 2: Information Collection in Competitive Intelligence

Evolution of My Understanding of CI

Before Class 2, my perspective of CI was basic and traditional . I knew CI includes collecting information from amny sources and direction while I understand it as traditional research – reading reports, searching online, maybe asking a few questions of some stakeholders. But after I understood that effective CI collection is not only much broader than I once thought, but also a much more skill-filled endeavor. This is by no means just a published data business; it means tracking down human sources, attending to competitors in person, and creatively discovering things hidden beneath the surface not only the obvious and accessible inforamtion in traditional arena. I learned how valuable primary sources can be: expert interviews, conversations with customers or even competitors'employees (ethically done) and direct observation at events usually deliver intelligence that doesn't make it to print. This was a revelation — I had miscalculated the on-the-ground, investigatory part of CI, which is more like journalism or detective work. I also learned to be much more critical about information credibility. In the past, if something was in print or online, I tended to accept it; now I question every source's reliability and bias. The Cornell guide's criteria (authority, accuracy, etc.) taught me how to systematically evaluate what I find. Additionally, Class 2 showed that CI collection methods must adapt to circumstances. For example, when COVID-19 shut down trade shows and face-to-face meetings, CI professionals shifted to virtual conferences, online networking, and social media listening to gather intel. I understood that CI collection is not a static routine but an evolving practice that requires flexibility and creativity that changes over time. In conclusion, my understanding evolved from seeing information collection as a routine research task to appreciating it as a multifaceted, adaptive process that mixes analytical with human intelligence skills and tool utilization .

Key Insights from Readings

The readings for Class 2 were attractive, practical and directly reinforced the class lessons on information gathering and elaborating on the first class:

• Jonathan Calof (2022) – Event Intelligence Tips: Calof's work on how to gather intelligence at any given industry event was packed with actionable advice. Through these pieces he emphasized thorough preparation for events (even virtual ones), clearly defined intelligence goals, keen observation, and working with colleagues (using "friendlies") to broaden one's reach

(Calof 2022a; 2022b; 2022c). One tip suggested planning out who you want to meet and what to ask ahead of going to a conference, while another said to take advantage of Q&A sessions or chats in webinars to extract competitor insights. These readings, in particular, illustrated how CI practitioners apply the greatest amount of intelligence collection at events through planning and smart tactical maneuvers — reinforcing what we discussed in class.

• Cornell Library (2014) & Harvard Library (2017) – Source Evaluation & Smart Searching: These guides emphasized the importance of rigorous secondary research. The Cornell guide presented a checklist approach for evaluating the quality of information (for example, checking an author's authority and potential bias), which matched the class emphasis on being skeptical about sources (Cornell University Library 2014). A guide to Google by Harvard taught me advanced search strategies and tools (specialized search operators and archives) to find things efficiently (Harvard Library 2017) Combined, they emphasized that finding and validating information is a skill in its own right. I walked away with some practical ways to excavate the internet's surface and to scrutinize a source's credibility before trusting it.

• Lebowitz & Akhtar (2019, 2020) – First Impressions & Body Language: These Business Insider articles highlighted the human portion of CI collection. They describe just how soon people make first impressions and provide advice on how to appear trustworthy (eye contact, open posture, etc.) and how to read other people's non-verbal signals. This is invaluable in a CI context: interviews and networking can hinge on a rapport and awareness of unsaid signals. These pieces made it clear that effective intelligence gathering entails not just asking questions, but emotional intelligence as well, or understanding and managing interpersonal dynamics. It was a wonderful complement to our class role-play exercises on interviewing.

Key Insights from Class Discussion & Lecture

- **Emphasis on Primary Sources & Interviewing**: A major takeaway was the value of primary information and how to obtain it through good interviewing. We discussed techniques to approach industry insiders and build trust – for example, using a friendly, honest approach and listening actively. In a class role-play, I saw how rapport and credibility can make an interview more fruitful. We also noted that CI collection can be a **team effort**: by coordinating with colleagues (the "friendlies" concept), an intelligence team can cover more ground and reach more sources than one person alone. This reinforced the message that, in addition to analytical skills, networking and people skills are important to being a CI professional.

- **Reading People & Non-Verbal Cues:** Through all of this spying on enemy combatants or agents, even going so far when interviewing terrorist leaders, we found that reading body language and other non-verbal cues is perhaps the most important thing when gathering intelligence. For example, observing whether an interviewee's enthusiasm rises or falls which leads us to wonder, guarded or enthusiastic — can shape our inquiries. We talked about things like posture, eye contact, or tone breaks and ways to manifest them. It tempered the idea that emotional intelligence is part of a CI practitioner's toolkit: what's

said is critical, but what's not said can reveal even deeper insights. The class insights here directly reflected tips from the first impression readings, reinforcing my skills in "reading" a source as well as interrogating them.

- **Secondary Research Techniques & Verifying Sources**: On the analysis end of things, we went into how to quickly find and verify published information. The trainer taught us how to use advanced Google shortcuts and specialized databases to find competitor data (like the Harvard guide). We also practiced determine the credibility of an online source, using criteria like those in the Cornell guide. The key insight was that not all information is created equal — a CI analyst must be investigating and fact-checking, rather than simply taking on faith what one reads. This approach to secondary research, skeptical and methodical, was a big learning for me.

- **Adapting Collection Methods (COVID-19 and Digital)**: We explored how CI collection must adapt to different situations, with the pandemic as a prime example. When travel and trade shows were off the table, CI practitioners turned to alternatives: attending webinars and virtual conferences (and networking through their chat functions), mining social media and online forums for industry chatter, and scheduling video calls for interviews. We also focused on utilizing digital and social platforms like LinkedIn to identify and reach out to sources remotely whenever they are convenient and related. This discussion underlined the importance of **flexibility** and creativity in CI work. The lesson was that if one channel closes, an effective CI professional will find another way to gather the needed intelligence, all while maintaining ethical standards.

Reflection and Integration

Class 2, and its readings, substantially expanded my practical understanding of CI and elaborated on my understanding to the previous classes. I was really shocked by how well the class content ("use primary sources, be ethical, verify everything") aligned with what the readings provided ("here's how to do that effectively") and they were complement to each other. The lecture gave us a framework, and the readings filled in tactical details – almost like the class told us **what** to do and why, while the readings showed **how** to do it. This integration made the lessons very concrete. I observed the amount of CI collection that is interdisciplinary. The skills involved tap into journalism (investigative interviewing), psychology (understanding and influencing people) and library science (advanced searching and source evaluation). Recognizing this link to other disciplines only reinforced my feeling that CI professionals. When I figure out the connection, connection to other fields reinforced my sense that CI professionals need a well-rounded skill set for CI Professionals. After this class, I felt more prepared and confident to conduct intelligence gathering in a real-world scenario as a student or for my career development. The gradual evolution in my understanding is clear: I moved from a somewhat narrow, academic view of information collection to a much richer, practice-oriented perspective – one that acknowledges CI collection as both an art and a science, deeply rooted in human interaction and critical thinking for all scenario.

References

Calof, Jonathan. "Collecting Information at Events – Tips from Competitive Intelligence's Best Collectors." *Gaining Market Insight from Events*, 2022, pp. 69–76.
Calof, Jonathan. "Event Intelligence During COVID-19: Top Six Tips." *Gaining Market Insight from Events*, 2022, pp. 242–245.
Calof, Jonathan. "Working with Friendlies to Broaden Your Trade Show Intelligence Reach." *Gaining Market Insight from Events*, 2022, pp. 101–106.
Cornell University Library. "Critically Analyzing Information Sources: Critical Evaluation." Cornell Library, 2014, guides.library.cornell.edu/evaluate.
Harvard Library. "A Scholar's Guide to Google." Harvard Library Research Guides, 2017, guides.library.harvard.edu/google.
Lebowitz, Shana, and Allana Akhtar. "19 Science-Backed Tricks for Reading Body Language So You Can Avoid Awkward Situations." *Business Insider*, 8 Aug. 2019, www.businessinsider.com/how-to-read-body-language-2017-5.
Lebowitz, Shana, and Allana Akhtar. "12 Things People Decide Within Seconds of Meeting You." *Business Insider*, 10 Feb. 2020, www.businessinsider.com/things-people-decide-about-you-in-seconds-2016-11.

Class 3: Designing Competitive Intelligence Projects

Evolution of My Understanding of CI

By the time, we had the third, I had go above CI fundamentals such as "what CI is" and "how to collect information" to see how to methodically frame a CI project. For Citi, and indeed for a lot of the larger corporate intelligence firms, the task of an entire CI team was almost seen as a black box – like, go get data on a competitor, or do some analysis, ad hoc. To be successful in CI itself, you have to start at the right point — CI tends to be at the end of a long path, and lots of great CI work starts with good project planning and scoping. Then I saw that CI is often structured as a set of clear-cut projects or initiatives, each focused on particular intelligence requirements related to business decisions. The main evolution in my thinking was realizing that finding the right questions to ask is most important to start with. Before you leap into data collection, you should make clear what intelligence you'll need and why. In Class 3 I learned that creating well defined intelligence objectives are essential; if needed, CI efforts can go adrift and also can provide irrelevant information. This was a departure from my earlier view – I used to believe that CI analysts just "watched everything" all the time, but I now realized that CI is actionable and directed toward strategic goals only if you have targeted planning. In summary, my worldview evolved from thinking that CI is just a permanent ongoing analysis to thinking CI is a project that begins with defining needs and ends with providing answers to decision-makers.

Key Insights from Readings

- **Adeline du Toit (2007)** – *"Understanding Key Intelligence Needs (KINs)"*: Du Toit's chapter provided a practical framework for the planning phase of CI by explaining how to derive specific intelligence needs from an organization's strategic goals. I fully understood the importance of engaging decision-makers and stakeholders to articulate their intelligence requirements and of asking probing questions to refine those needs before we started gathering information per the requirements. Du Toit outlines techniques like interviews or workshops with stakeholders to list and prioritize their key questions that needed to be answered. One of the fundamental insight that resonated with me was her advice to distinguish *needs* from *wants* – not all information that managers initially ask for is truly necessary for a decision (Du Toit 2007) since they are two different directions and directly affect the project scope. This reading reinforced our class exercise where we practiced formulating Key Intelligence Questions: it provided academic validation for that process, showing step-by-step how a CI analyst can systematically identify what the business really needs to know. Du Toit essentially gave a methodological backbone to what we did in class, and it underscored that the planning stage itself can (and should) be structured.
- **Jan Herring (2013)** – *"KITS Revisited: Their Use and Problems"*: In it, Herring shared the perspective of a seasoned practitioner regarding the management of Key Intelligence Topics (KITs) within CI programs. One of the big take-aways from Herring is that when companies contemplate sets of KITs (broad strategic areas of concern), many stumble by not revisiting them or by letting the CI efforts range outside those topics (Herring 2013). He cautions against having multiple KITs, or ones that are overly vague, which can dilute focus and overwhelm CI resources. After our class discussions, reading this made it crystal clear as to why our instructor always so heavily advocated for zeroing in on a few key topics and questions. Not only do CI teams need to communicate on a regular basis insights around each KIT to management; they must also be attuned to the relevance of their KITs over time, Herring added. This reflects class focus on keeping CI work in step with decision maker priorities. At its core, Herring's advice about common errors (such as "nice-to-know" information that doesn't meet a critical need, or failing to tailor topics to new realities) underscored the need for focus and alignment in CI projects. It added a cautionary lens to that, complementing Du Toit's more process-oriented approach: a well-designed CI plan still requires discipline and ongoing alignment to work effectively.

Key Insights from Class Discussion & Lecture

- **Defining Key Intelligence Topics (KITs)**: We learned that the first step in designing a CI project is to determine the broad topic areas on which the organization needs intelligence. These Key Intelligence Topics usually stem from strategic questions or concerns leadership has (often phrased as "What keeps our executives up at night?"). The class discussion stressed that KITs should be limited in number – focusing on a few critical domains (e.g., emerging technologies, competitor moves, regulatory changes) ensures the CI effort is concentrated where it matters most. I took away that choosing the right KITs is

foundational: if we focus on irrelevant or too many topics, even good research won't yield useful insights.

- **Formulating Key Intelligence Questions (KIQs)**: After identifying KITs, we drilled down to formulate specific intelligence questions that need to be answered under each topic. We practiced this by taking a KIT and brainstorming detailed questions a decision-maker would want answered. For example, for the KIT "Market Entry Opportunities," a KIQ might be "Which new customer segments are competitors targeting that we are not?" A key insight was that KIQs must be **clear, answerable, and tied to decisions**. The instructor emphasized making them as concrete as possible (avoiding vague questions) and involving the "clients" (the managers who need the intel) in formulating these questions. I realized that as a CI analyst, part of my role is almost like a consultant – working with stakeholders to clarify what they really need to know. A well-framed KIQ sets the direction for the entire project and prevents wasted effort.

Planning the Research & Collection Approach: Once we had solid KIQs, the class moved to planning how to answer them. We learned to map out, for each question, the likely **sources** of information and the **methods** to gather it. For instance, if one KIQ was about a competitor's product pipeline, our plan might include sources like patent databases, industry experts, and competitors' job postings, and methods like online research, expert interviews, and perhaps mystery shopping. The insight here was that different questions demand different approaches – there isn't a one-size-fits-all for data collection. We also discussed setting a timeline and milestones for the project (e.g., doing an initial findings review halfway through) to keep on track. I found it eye-opening that we were essentially creating a mini project plan for each intelligence question, complete with who would do what and by when. That level of planning was foreign to me and demonstrated how CI projects adopt traditional best practices from classic project management.

- **Templates and Examples**: Templates and Examples: Examples were provided of real CI project plans/templates were provided during the lecture to crystallize what the intelligence project looks like.. We looked at a sample case (a pharmaceutical company's CI plan) that broke down a broad intelligence need into specific sub-topics and research tasks. Seeing a template with sections like *Background, Key Intelligence Needs/Questions, Scope, Sources & Methods, Timeline*, and *Deliverables* was very helpful. It made concrete what our own plans should include. An insight I gained from discussing these examples is that a good CI plan doesn't end with collection – it also defines how findings will be delivered and used. For example, one template explicitly mentioned the format of the deliverable and the intended audience (e.g., a briefing for the product development team). That reminded me that we need not just a plan for how to collect intelligence, but also a plan for how to convert intelligence into something decision-makers can use to make decisions. In summary: Class 3 taught me that when designing a CI project, it is a systematic process of asking the right questions, creating a comprehensive plan to answer those questions, and framing your answers with an eye toward informing decisions..

Reflection and Integration

Class 3 was pivotal in advancing my understanding of CI as a planned, proactive function. The class content and readings meshed well: Du Toit's systematic approach to identifying intelligence needs and Herring's practical warnings both reinforced the importance of clear objectives and focus, which were at the heart of the class workshop. I found no real contradictions between the readings and the lecture – instead, they complemented each other, one providing process steps and the other providing real-world perspective on those steps. One point of integration is that the readings highlighted, as did the class, how closely CI planning aligns with **business strategy**. I realized that determining KITs and KIQs is essentially about ensuring the CI project is answering questions that matter to the company's strategy and avoiding extraneous data. This connects CI directly to strategic planning and even risk management (since many KITs are about anticipating threats or opportunities). I also found my view of CI broadening to include skills from other disciplines: the planning stage we learned in Class 3 felt akin to **project management** (setting scope, timeline, deliverables) and **consulting** (facilitating stakeholder input and clarifying needs). This shows how interdisciplinary CI work really is. Overall, after Class 3 my understanding evolved to see CI as something you **design** and manage deliberately, rather than something you only do reactively. I felt I could now approach a potential CI project in my own work with a much clearer roadmap – defining what is needed, planning how to get it, and integrating the effort with the company's decision-making process.

References

Du Toit, Adeline. "Understanding Key Intelligence Needs (KINs)." *Managing Strategic Intelligence: Techniques and Technologies,* IGI Global, 2007, pp. 111–121. Herring, Jan P. "KITS Revisited: Their Use and Problems." *SCIP Insight,* vol. 5, no. 7, July 2013, pp. 1–4.

Class 4: CI Project Planning and Applications

Evolution of My Understanding of CI

By Class 4, which continued the theme of CI project planning and dove into how CI is applied in practice, my understanding of CI had become much more holistic. I came to see competitive intelligence not just as a single project or process, but as an **ongoing organizational function** that can operate on multiple levels. Initially, I thought of a CI project in somewhat standalone terms (define it, execute it, deliver a report). Now I recognize that CI projects are deeply integrated with business processes and decisions, and often run in parallel. For example, a company might have several CI initiatives going at once (different projects for different strategic needs) and also maintain continuous monitoring on key topics. I learned that CI is both project-based *and* continuous: a project might conclude with actionable insights, but those insights feed into strategy and can trigger new intelligence needs, creating a continuous cycle. Another evolution in my thinking was understanding how CI adapts to various functional areas. CI is not only for competitive strategy teams – it can be tailored to support marketing, R&D, supply chain, or any

department that faces external uncertainties. In Class 4 we discussed how the focus and approach of a CI project might differ depending on who the "client" is (e.g., a tactical sales intelligence project vs. a strategic market foresight project). This broadened my perspective: I now see CI as a versatile discipline that must be customized to context and integrated across the organization. Overall, after Class 4 I view CI as an embedded capability – a continuous, proactive cycle of intelligence activities that inform and shape business strategy and operations.

Key Insights from Readings

- **Du Toit (2007) – KINs in New Contexts**: The same principles Du Toit outlined for identifying intelligence needs proved applicable as Class 4 explored different CI application areas. Her emphasis on clearly defining what decision-makers need to know holds true whether the CI project is about competitors, technologies, or even something like supply chain risks. Class 4 reinforced that no matter the domain (be it marketing, R&D, etc.), spending effort upfront to clarify the key intelligence needs is critical (Du Toit 2007). Re-reading Du Toit's guidance, I realized it provides a blueprint for engaging stakeholders in any part of the business to make sure a CI project is asking the right questions.
- **Herring (2013) – Keeping KITS Updated**: Herring's advice on managing Key Intelligence Topics resonated strongly in Class 4's discussions on building ongoing early warning systems. He reminded us that CI topics should not be static – as the business environment changes, the intelligence focus must adjust (Herring 2013). In class we talked about regularly reviewing whether our chosen topics are still the most relevant, which directly echoes Herring's point about not treating the set plan as fixed. Herring also advocated for continuously communicating findings on key topics to decision-makers, which I saw reflected in the idea of CI as a continuous monitoring system. Essentially, Herring's insights reinforced the need for **agility and alignment** in long-term CI programs – a theme that carried through Class 4.

Key Insights from Class Discussion & Lecture

- **Formalizing the CI Project Plan & Stakeholder Buy-In**: We delved into the importance of writing a clear CI project plan and securing support for it. The class outlined what a formal plan document should include (purpose, scope, key questions, methodology, timeline, deliverables, responsibilities). An insight for me was that creating this document forces clarity – it ensures the CI team and the project's sponsors agree on what will (and won't) be done. We learned that CI analysts often have to "pitch" their plan to senior management or internal clients to make sure expectations are aligned. This taught me that planning is not just an internal exercise; it's also about setting stakeholder expectations. I also realized that scoping correctly is crucial: if a proposed project is too broad or unrealistic in timeframe, it's better to adjust the scope at the planning stage than to fail later. We heard examples of teams narrowing an overly ambitious project (e.g., from analyzing an entire region to focusing on one key market) to ensure quality outcomes.
- **Applying Project Management & Agility in CI**: Class 4 highlighted that managing a CI project benefits from classic project management practices. We discussed anticipating risks in the project (for instance, what if a key interviewee isn't available, or if data sources prove

sparse?) and building contingency plans. The instructor emphasized having check-in points during the project where the team assesses progress and findings to date. A big insight was the importance of **being agile** – if early results indicate that initial assumptions were off, the CI project should pivot focus accordingly. For example, if halfway through a project we discover a different competitor is emerging as a bigger threat than the one we started analyzing, we might reallocate resources. This flexibility, balancing thorough planning with adaptability, was noted as a hallmark of successful CI projects.

- **Diverse Examples of CI Application (Strategic vs. Tactical)**: We examined case studies illustrating how CI projects can vary widely in scope and objective. One example was a strategic CI project for market entry: a telecom used CI to study local competitors' pricing and customer preferences before launching in a new country, directly informing their entry strategy. Another example was an **early warning system** project, where a tech firm set up ongoing monitoring of patents, startups, and venture investments to catch disruptive technologies early – effectively a continuous CI project with periodic alerts. We also looked at a more tactical case, like a consumer goods company doing CI on competitors' retail strategies to help their sales team adjust tactics in real time. These examples taught me that CI projects can range from one-time deep dives to continuous monitoring, and from broad strategic analyses to narrow operational insights. The key takeaway is that a CI analyst must **tailor the project approach to its purpose**: a strategic project may be longer-term and predictive, whereas a tactical project might be shorter and very immediate in its impact.

- **Organizational Integration and Collaboration**: Another insight was how CI functions within different organizational structures. We discussed how where the CI team reports (strategy vs. marketing vs. other) can influence the nature of its projects. For instance, CI under a Strategy department might focus on long-term competitive outlooks, while CI under Sales/Marketing might do more competitor battle cards and pricing intelligence. We heard that mature organizations often form cross-functional CI teams for specific projects – bringing in people from R&D, sales, or other departments to contribute expertise. The class noted that involving various departments can break down silos and make intelligence more impactful, because those stakeholders feel ownership. The insight for me was that effective CI often **cuts across functional boundaries**: a well-integrated CI project will engage the people who will act on the intelligence, throughout the process. This increases the likelihood that CI insights are actually used in decision-making.

- **Measuring CI Project Success and Value**: Finally, Class 4 tackled the challenging question of how to evaluate a CI project's success. We agreed that it's not as straightforward as measuring revenue, but there are qualitative and some quantitative indicators. The instructor suggested setting explicit goals for a project's outcomes upfront (e.g., "identify two viable acquisition targets" or "provide early warning at least 3 months ahead of a major competitor move"). If those goals are met, the project can be deemed successful. We also discussed doing post-project reviews or "after-action" evaluations: Did the intelligence get to the right people in time? Did it influence a decision? This was insightful because it closed the loop on the CI cycle – not only planning and executing, but also learning and demonstrating the value. I realized that a CI project's worth is ultimately shown by how it impacts the business (preventing a bad decision, enabling a good one, uncovering an opportunity). This reinforced the guiding principle that intelligence is only as good as its use.

Reflection and Integration

Class 4 brought together all the strands of CI learning and showed how they fit into real organizational practice. I saw clearly how each class built on the previous: initially I learned what CI is conceptually, then how to collect information, then how to plan a project, and in Class 4 how to implement and integrate that project within a business context. The cumulative effect is that I now have a coherent view of the CI process end-to-end. The readings across these classes also reflected this build-up: for example, Sharp's article (Class 1) clarified the concept and scope of CI, the Calof pieces (Class 2) gave practical collection techniques, and Du Toit and Herring (Classes 3 and 4) provided planning frameworks and cautions for execution. There's a strong consistency in the core message: competitive intelligence must be systematic, focused on decision needs, and ultimately actionable. One of my big takeaways from Class 4 (and the course as a whole) is that **CI's value is realized only when it influences decisions** – if great intelligence isn't used, its value is lost. This mindset now guides how I think about any CI effort: always plan with the end use in mind. I also appreciate how interdisciplinary CI is, even more so after Class 4. CI involves strategic thinking, project management, analytical techniques, and interpersonal collaboration. It also intersects with other business functions like strategy, risk management, marketing, and innovation – essentially serving as their "eyes and ears" in the external environment. After completing Class 4, I feel I can approach a real business challenge with a CI lens: I would know how to define the intelligence problem, design a project around it, gather and analyze information ethically, and deliver insights in a way that they get used. This final class effectively integrated everything, leaving me with both the conceptual understanding and the practical confidence to apply competitive intelligence in a business context.

References

Du Toit, Adeline. "Understanding Key Intelligence Needs (KINs)." *Managing Strategic Intelligence: Techniques and Technologies*, IGI Global, 2007, pp. 111–121.
Herring, Jan P. "KITS Revisited: Their Use and Problems." *SCIP Insight*, vol. 5, no. 7, 2013, pp. 1–4.

Class 5: Analysis and Early Insight Development

Key Insights from Readings

One key insight from the readings was the importance of **profiling key decision-makers,** and it was illustrated in the Motorola case: Through deep leadership profiles, Motorola managed to select a strategic partner that was a surprise pick, yet ultimatelyl, I realized that effective . Profiling a leader is not simply a matter of compiling biographical data; it requires analyzing a leader's behavior, philosophy, and team dynamics to infer what they might do. This technique is most

valuable for predicting how competitors will respond in the future based on careful analysis, not speculation. This understanding is what made human determinants and styles of leadership are pivotal to competitive outcomes, a nuance I hadn't really thought deeply about before. Another insight was the importance of competitor analysis in strategy. The Tutor2U article that said bombarding competitors and imitating their moves, but about educating one's own strategic planning. It cited that understanding competitors. AI Human serves various functions: it identifies our competitive strengths/weaknesses, and it predicts other players' future plans, and discerning how they might react to our actions tutor2u.net. I learned that systematic competitor analysis can be used, proactively, to shape strategy creation – such as predicting likely competitor reactions to a product launch. This reinforced the notion that competitive intelligence provides an "informed basis" for decision prospective decision making rather than merely reactive monitoring. The reading further articulated practical questions (e.g. "What are competitors' objectives? Strategies? Strengths and weaknesses?") that helped me formulate a model for profiling competitors. This above all gave me a clearer sense that competitor analysis is a cornerstone of CI that enables firms to predict and influence future competitive interactions.

Finally, the readings presented formal analytical frameworks that convert data into insight. For instance, For example, the section on CIMA Strategic Analysis Tools covered further tools such as SWOT, PEST(LE), Porter's Five Forces, and early warning systems. One particularly important idea was that of strategic early warning: establishing systems to identify weak signals of change in the competitive landscape. The guide explained that early warning systems are intended to identify emerging threats or opportunities "as early as possible," usually by keeping a constant lookout for signs of competitor activity or shifts in the market. I learned but that an effective early warning system can involve steps such as wide-ranging information capture, filtering out signals for significance, scenario-building, and ongoing monitoring. This realization taught me that CI is not analysis of what happened in the past, it's vigilance of what's going to happen in the future. The notion of constantly filtering and interpreting signals to anticipate competitors' moves really resonated with me as a disciplined approach to avoid surprises. To sum up, the readings highlighted that solid analysis risks—such as profiling individuals to horizon-scanning—are essential to translate raw data into actionable competitive intelligence

Key Insights from Class Lecture and Discussion

During our fifth class, we explored the **practice of analysis through a real-world case**, which solidified my understanding of how to apply the frameworks from the readings while we are working as an employee or having our own business. We focused on the "Embosser" case, where a Canadian company was debating entering the UK market. A big takeaway for me was the importance of *defining the intelligence problem before analysis*. Our instructor pressed us to clarify questions like: *What is different about the UK market? Who would the customers be? What information do we need to decide?*. Initially, my group jumped into gathering facts, but we soon saw that without scoping the problem (e.g. identifying competitors in the UK, understanding local customer needs), analysis could go off-track. This discussion demonstrated that choosing the right analytical approach depends on the decision context – for example, using a Five Forces analysis to assess industry attractiveness in the UK, or a customer profile to understand the UK buyer. During

the class I understand that **analysis in CI must be purpose-driven** meaning: we start with Key Intelligence Questions and then select tools to answer them from the first questions till the end. This insight from class reinforced the reading's message that analysis needs focus (via well-defined KITs) to be effective and they both highlight the importance of the listing key intelligence questions.

One of the other crucial insights I gained was how **structured analytical frameworks function in practice not only the theory**. The professor broke down techniques like SWOT or Five Forces into three levels: (1) the *framework name* (e.g. Five Forces) which yields the high-level *conclusions,* (2) the *categories* to assess (e.g. each of Porter's forces) where actual *analysis* happens, and (3) the specific *information needs* under each category (e.g. data on competitor concentration, switching costs for "Threat of new entry"). This was almost a lightbulb moment – I saw that to use a framework properly, one must systematically gather data for each category and then interpret it to draw conclusions. Skipping a category or missing data can bias the outcome, which is why the instructor noted you should only omit a framework element with good reason. During class discussion, when we attempted a quick Five Forces on the embosser market, this structure helped us stay organized: each team member focused on one "force" category's data, then we pooled insights to conclude whether the UK market was attractive. The **discipline of breaking analysis into levels** is an insight I took away – it prevents analysis from being just a jumble of facts by ensuring each piece of information has a place and purpose.

Lastly, class discussion touched on the intersection of **analysis and foresight**. The lecturer introduced the concept of *forecasting vs. foresight* to show a continuum of anticipatory thinking within CI.

 Forecasting was described as projecting future outcomes based on current trends, whereas foresight involves envisioning possible future scenarios and strategizing how to achieve or respond to them. We discussed how techniques like scenario planning or STEEP analysis (Social, Technological, Economic, Environmental, Political factors) help in identifying drivers of change in an industry. An insight I gained here was that **CI analysis can blur into foresight** when it tries to anticipate not just competitors' present actions but also emerging trends and "what-if" futures. For example, in class we considered how an early warning signal (say, a new technology adoption by a competitor) could feed into developing scenarios of how the market might evolve. This broadened my view of CI analysis: it's not only about analyzing the current state (e.g. current competitors and market forces) but also about exploring plausible futures to inform strategy. I left the class appreciating that analysis in CI has a forward-looking element, linking it to the kind of scenario thinking often seen in strategic foresight.

Reflection and Integration

The materials and the session was a turning point in my understanding of competitive intelligence for many reasons that I will explain. Previously, I had associated CI mostly with accumulating intel on your competition. I now understand that analysis is the most important element in CI — when data becomes information, information becomes insight, and insight becomes actionable knowledge. I can say the most impactful that opened my eyes were the readings and class activities

that were mentionned as they were highlighting how data alone does not signify a competitive advantage but the analysis and interpretation of that data does, it is an integral part of the process. For instance, the notion of systematically profiling a competitor's CEO or developing an early warning system caused me to view CI as more proactive and predictive than I previously imagined and thought about it. It reminded me of earlier classes we had on information collection: everything we learn through the interviews we do and open source data (from Class 2), is only of value if we are able to use an appropriate analytical lens to interpret what it means. This analytical component is now integral to my evolving definition of CI — that is, CI is not just collecting facts, but connecting dots and providing insights on competitive dynamics.

Another element of my changing perspective is realizing just how integrative CI analysis can be. The techniques of analysis that this class focused on have similarities with tools that I've seen and used in fields like strategy and marketing research. For example, I had heard of things like SWOT and PEST in the context of strategic planning, but here I was learning how to leverage these frameworks specifically to answer intelligence questions (who is my competitor, how to enter a new market, etc.). It occurred to me that part of CI analysis was akin to business analytics, or market analysis, which I've done before but a sharper focus on competitors and a need for actionable answers. CI analysis also has to blend qualitative insights (e.g. propping leadership behaviors via profiling) and qualitative data (share of market, financials, etc.) – it's truly a hybrid discipline. This realization answered a question I had at the course outset about how CI differs from general market analysis: the difference often lies in the intent and focus rather than the tools. CI analysis deliberately seeks insight that gives a decision-maker an edge over competitors, and it often synthesizes a wider array of inputs (from human intelligence to secondary data to subtle signals).

Overall, the experience from Class 5 has expanded my perspective of CI as an anticipatory analytical process. I am beginning to see CI as akin to putting together a puzzle: pieces come from various sources, and analysis is the activity of fitting them together to reveal the picture – in this case, the picture of the competitive landscape and where it's heading. This reflective insight is motivating for me, as I feel I'm moving from just learning about CI to thinking like a CI practitioner, asking "What does this information mean for our competitive position and what might happen next?" This mindset shift is a clear sign of my evolving understanding of competitive intelligence's role in strategic decision-making.

References

- Calof, J. L., Mirabeau, L., & Richards, G. (2015). **Towards an environmental awareness model integrating formal and informal mechanisms – Lessons learned from the demise of Nortel**. *Journal of Intelligence Studies in Business, 5*(1), 57–69.
- Chartered Institute of Management Accountants (CIMA). (2007). **Strategic Analysis Tools** (Topic Gateway Series No. 34). Prepared by J. Downey.
- Tutor2U. (2021). **The role of competitor analysis**. Retrieved from tutor2u.net/business.
- Weber, M. S. (2004). **Profiling for leadership**. *Competitive Intelligence Magazine, 7*(4), 6–13 (July/August).
- Weber, M. S. (2017). **Profiling updated**. Unpublished follow-up article provided for Competitive Intelligence course.

Class 6: Advanced Analytical Techniques and Big Data

Key Insights from Readings

The continuation of readings with an emphasis on analysis provided further insight into how competitive intelligence techniques evolve and expand on different contexts. One of the fundamental takeaway was from Marta Weber's updated perspective on profiling (2017), which built on her earlier work that was perfectly reflecting. Weber discusses how profiling has evolved to encompass wider themes as cultural context, team dynamics internal to an organization — whether it is for profit or non profit. It was that in the 21st century, you can't effectively profile just on single leaders, but the ever perception is the leadership team and the organizational culture itself of whatever company/organization whenever applicable, so there is a reflective aspect too for other analysis in future as well.For example, Weber noted that patterns among profiled leaders show that leadership needs are changing faster than before and that cross-cultural literacy has become crucial in global CI efforts. A specific insight I gained here is the importance of "behavioral forecasting" – using profiles to feed into scenario planning and early warning analysis. It further reminded me that profiling isn't a finished report about a person, but rather a living input into anticipatory CI processes such as war-gaming, or scenario exercises. One of the most useful things I learned was that a well-written profile can sharpen the accuracy of competitor simulations and open new avenues to leverage strategies for negotiations and mergers. What the new reading educated me in short is that CI tools such as profiling (yet along with many others) ought to adjust their procedures (e.g. uniformity of language, no relying too much on instinct) and that analysis methods are iterative hence improve with time. This helped me realize that CI is a living, breathing field — the practitioners of which share lessons learned, and "raise the standards of excellence" through the introduction of new knowledge (e.g., insights in psychology or new frameworks for analysis).

The other important insight came from CRUD into the formal analysis frameworks and its strategic value. The CIMA Tools for Strategic Analysis material, however, didn't stop at frameworks. The chapter on the "Seven Components of an Early Warning System" (which were defining the relevant field of play, remaining awake to the collection of perspective-building signals, filtering for the meaningful few signals for action, and then building predictive intelligence around the latter via scenario signposts, etc.) particularly resonated with me. It provided me with a detailed understanding of how a company might actually implement a monitoring program to forecast competitors' actions. It was fascinating to me that early warning is a circular process — not just an initial analysis, but a continuous loop of scanning and reviewing as new information comes in, and I was able to use that knowledge to look for new ways to look for problems as they arise, one such tool being war-gaming: basically doing competing role-plays in hypothetical scenarios to see what strategies hold. According to the reading, war games push organizations to think differently about competition and show fattened blind spots, or "misguided assumptions" about competitors. What struck me was how interactive and creative some CI

analysis techniques are – it's not all spreadsheets and reports; it can be immersive simulations. This broadened the way I think about my toolkit: I now realize that CI analysis can mean performing scenario exercises with stakeholders, which can provide perspective that agency data analysis cannot (i.e., competitor mindset or probable reactions in a moving environment).

Lastly, the readings also made me reflect on the role of big data and technology in analysis, and how this relationship was indirectly considered. Although none of the prescriptive literature specifically addressed big data, the use of techniques involving early warning and scenario modeling assumed dealing with large swathes of information and signals. I deduced that modern CI analysis increasingly depends on data analytics — for example, automatically compiling news or social media data for signals or applying software to model scenarios. This point was somewhat hidden in the readings but was clarified when we think of early warning as needing constant filtration of a great deal of information. The need for "expert interpretation" in culling indicates that while the tools might launder patterns, human analysts determine what matters. This mingling of data and analysis led me to be able to understand the lecture in class about big data (explained below). To summarize, the readings provided further background on a vision of CI analysis that is systematic, systematic, and increasingly enhanced by technology, with a view to foreseeing key competitive events before they occur.

Key Insights from Class Lecture and Discussion

In Class 6, we built on the previous session by applying analysis techniques and discussing **big data's impact on CI**. A key insight from the lecture was recognizing how **the scale and speed of data today are transforming analysis**. The professor noted that competitive intelligence analysts now face information from countless sources – news feeds, social media, industry reports, internal data – far more than a human can manually process in a timely way. We discussed the concept of leveraging automation and analytics tools to tackle this "firehose" of data. For example, the class talked about using text mining to scan news for competitor mentions or AI tools to detect anomalies in market metrics. The insight for me was that **while the principles of analysis (like those frameworks) remain, the methods must adapt to big data**. One classmate shared an experience from their company where they implemented a dashboard that tracks competitors' product reviews and social media sentiment. This real-world anecdote illustrated how technology can serve as an early warning system by flagging spikes in negative sentiment for a competitor (which might signal an opportunity for our company). I realized that big data analytics can enhance CI by finding patterns or weak signals that a traditional approach might overlook. However, the discussion also emphasized that human judgment is still essential: the tools can surface information, but analysts must decide what it means and what to do about it. This balanced view – **using machines for breadth and humans for depth** – was a valuable insight as I navigate how CI is practiced in the digital age.

Another insight came from a class exercise where we practiced choosing **analysis techniques for specific problems**. The instructor gave us several mini-cases (scenarios like "Competitor X just launched a new product – what analysis do we do?" and "Our company is considering entering a market with an entrenched competitor"). For each, we had to quickly decide which analytical tool or approach would yield the best insights. This exercise highlighted that there is no one-size-fits-all in CI analysis. In some situations, a simple competitor profile or SWOT analysis might suffice; in

others, we might need to build a full **Porter's Four Corners analysis** (which examines a competitor's drivers, assumptions, strategy, and capabilities). One scenario had us consider a sudden regulatory change, for which we thought an updated PESTLE analysis combined with an early warning scan for competitor responses would be appropriate. The key lesson I learned is **the importance of aligning the analysis technique to the intelligence question**. We had just read about many tools (profiling, early warning, war-gaming, etc.), and in class I started developing an intuition for which tool to pull out when. I found myself thinking along these lines: "Is this a question about a competitor's likely next move? If so, maybe build a profile and do Four Corners. Is it about general market conditions? Then do a PESTLE and maybe Five Forces." This ability to match tools to problems is an insight I'm developing, and it made me more confident that I can actually *use* what I've learned when faced with real CI challenges. The class discussion, with input from peers, also gave me a sense of how different companies might have preferred methods – one student mentioned their firm regularly does SWOTs after trade shows to analyze each competitor's apparent strengths and weaknesses. Hearing that, I realized analysis frameworks are not just academic; they're actively used in businesses, often in combination, to make sense of competitive information.

Finally, we had an illuminating discussion on **ensuring analysis leads to actionable insight**. The professor asked us, "How will you communicate your analytical findings to decision-makers?" This brought up the often overlooked step of synthesis and communication. We talked about the danger of analysis paralysis or overwhelming executives with data. A classmate suggested using succinct "insight statements" or visualizations (like a competitor positioning map) to distill the analysis. What I took away is that a CI analyst's job doesn't end at doing the analysis – the insight must be clearly articulated and timed right for it to influence decisions. For instance, if our early warning system flags something, we need a protocol for who gets alerted and how. This was tied back to the reading's emphasis that analysis must be directed toward actionable intelligence– it reminded me that the ultimate goal is decision support. So an insight I gained is to **always connect analysis back to the business decision at hand**. In class, when we reviewed our mini-case answers, the instructor would ask, "So what would you tell the product manager/CEO based on that analysis?" For one case, after doing a Five Forces on a potential new market, my answer was to advise delaying entry because our analysis showed high entry barriers (e.g. strong incumbent, high customer loyalty). The exercise of formulating that recommendation reinforced the need to translate analytical findings into plain strategic language. I'm learning that part of CI's value is in how well the insights are communicated to those who need to act on them.

Reflection and Integration

Class 6 built upon the previous session and further shaped my evolving view of competitive intelligence. One reflection I have is on the integration of technology with CI. Coming into this course, I associated CI with human-centric activities like interviews, reading reports, and manually piecing together insights. Now, especially after this class, I see CI as a field that increasingly blends human analysis with machine assistance. My understanding of CI has evolved to include data science elements: using algorithms to detect patterns in competitive data and using tools to visualize complex competitive landscapes. I find this integration particularly exciting because it

means that CI analysts will need to be savvy about technology, without losing the criticality and ethics humanity provides. The class discussion on big data showed that CI isn't nostalgic about the way things used to be; it's changing how we work to manage data overload. For my part, this makes me think about learning at least some basic data analytics skills as a complement to qualitative analysis. I've expanded my personal definition of CI from "a process of gathering and analyzing competitor information" to "a socio-technical system that harnesses data, tools, and expert insight to anticipate competitive moves." Another piece in my growing understanding is the exercises of when and how to treatment other analytical lenses. Over Classes 5 and 6, we surveyed so many techniques and frameworks that at first I felt overwhelmed. However, practicing in class helped me integrate them into a mental toolkit. I now view CI analysis somewhat like a craftsman views tools: each has a purpose, and mastery is knowing which to employ for the task. My earlier simplistic view was "collect info and do a SWOT to summarize." Now I realize that was just scratching the surface. For example, I hadn't considered something like war-gaming as part of CI before – I thought that was only for military or maybe high-level strategy retreats. Learning that businesses use war-gaming to test strategies against competitor reactions was surprising and broadened my concept of what CI can involve. It's also made me think back to previous courses (like a strategy class) and see the connections: CI provides much of the content (evidence and scenarios) that strategy formulation can use.To me, at its core CI analysis is the connector between information gathering and strategic decision – it converts facts into actionable intelligence for strategy decision makers. Understanding this bridge role has given me a clearer mental model for CI's role in an organization.

Finally, I am thinking about how CI analysis makes a company anticipatory. One theme that touches nearly all of these classes is anticipation — not waiting to react after something occurs, but rather predicting it. In Class 6, covering topics such as early warning and predictive models, I witnessed how concretely a company could get wind of a development (eg, the competitor's supply chain issue or a regulatory change) and, acting sooner rather than later, act before a lot of others do. This reinforces a broader lesson for me: competitive intelligence, done well, is a source of agility and proactive strategy. That idea has been brewing since Class 1, but now I have the analytical meat on the bones to understand how CI makes a firm proactive. It systematically reduces uncertainty by analyzing trends, patterns, and behaviors to pre-empt surprises. My evolving definition of CI now encapsulates that proactive stance. I feel that through these classes, I am increasingly thinking like an "anticipatory manager" – asking "what if" and "what's next" as second nature. In my own work, I've started informally scanning for weak signals (like minor competitor announcements that might hint at bigger plans) and considering what analysis I could do to validate their significance. This shows me that the insights from the course are sinking in and altering my approach to competitive information in real time**.**

References

- Calof, J., & Sewdass, N. (2020). **On the relationship between competitive intelligence and innovation**. *Journal of Intelligence Studies in Business, 10*(2), 32–43.
- Competitive Intelligence Council. (2017). **Competitive intelligence: A 10-year global development**. *Competitive Intelligence Magazine, 20*(2), 11–17.
- Weber, M. S. (2017). **Profiling updated**. [Class reading – unpublished manuscript].

- **CIMA Strategic Analysis Tools** – *Topic Gateway Series No. 34*. (2007). Chartered Institute of Management Accountants.
- Tutor2U. (2021). **The role of competitor analysis** (Study notes). Retrieved from tutor2u.net.

Class 7: Organizing for Competitive Intelligence

Key Insights from Readings

The provided materials for Class 7 changed to the organizational aspect of CI, and one major insight I gained is how closely competitive intelligence is linked with innovation performance and output performance within an organization as the right direction is selected. Prof. Calof and Sewdass (2020) provided empirical evidence for something that intuitively makes sense: companies that excel at CI tend to be more innovative if not immediately in the long run. Their study surveyed firms and found that a majority of CI practices (59% of the measures they looked at) showed significant correlation with the firms' innovation outcomes. Notably, aspects such as how well intelligence is integrated into decision-making and how CI's value is measured had some of the strongest links to innovation. One striking finding was that companies where intelligence efforts regularly informed business decisions, and where the company tracked CI's performance with metrics, were often more innovative (they mention "the number of decisions that utilized CI" and use of CI performance measures as positively correlated with innovation).

The insight I take from this is that **CI is not a "nice-to-have" adjunct to strategy – it can be a driver of innovation when done systematically**. Put differently, when an organization organizes its CI function well (with formal structure, management support, and integration into processes), it creates an environment where new ideas and responsive strategies flourish. This reading shifted my perspective to see CI as part of a company's innovation engine, reinforcing that building strong CI capabilities (organization, processes, culture) can pay off in the form of more innovative products, services, or business models.

Another key insight came from the **global survey of CI practices over a decade (2006–2016)** by Calof, Sewdass, and Arcos (2017). This reading contrasted how companies handled CI in 2006 versus 2016, and it revealed several trends in organizing CI. A significant point was that by 2016, CI had become *more formalized* and centralized in many organizations. More companies had dedicated CI units or structured programs, whereas a decade prior CI might have been more ad-hoc or scattered. I found it interesting that the scope of CI use had broadened globally as well – respondents in 2016 were more internationally distributed, suggesting CI is growing in importance across regions, not just in North America or Europe. The survey also looked at how CI supports decision areas; for example, CI support for functions like R&D and product development slightly increased, indicating a wider internal adoption of CI thinking. However, another insight was the **persistent challenge of demonstrating CI's value** within organizations. The study showed only

marginal improvement in how companies measure CI effectiveness (e.g., slightly fewer companies having no CI effectiveness measure in 2016 than in 2006). Metrics like ROI on CI or new revenue from CI remained low and relatively unchanged (only ~13–14% of firms used ROI in both surveys). This taught me that while companies are structurally investing more in CI, they still struggle to quantify its impact in concrete financial terms. As an insight, it underscores why organization and culture matter: CI teams need management support and patience, since the benefits of CI can be indirect or long-term (e.g., preventing a loss or guiding a strategy that pays off later). In summary, the global development reading gave me a big-picture understanding that **successful CI requires formal structure and is growing globally, but companies must also tackle the challenge of measuring and communicating CI's value internally**.

The **Nortel case study (Calof et al., 2015)** provided a cautionary tale linking organization, culture, and CI outcomes. Nortel's story – rising to a telecom giant and then collapsing – was analyzed through the lens of its competitive intelligence and "environmental awareness" capabilities. The reading's findings suggested that Nortel in the early 1990s had a robust awareness system (both formal CI units and informal intelligence gathering through industry-savvy board members, etc.), but by around 2000, it had lost much of this capability. An insight here is how **critical it is to sustain an intelligence culture and infrastructure**: Nortel's demise was attributed in part to losing touch with its environment, meaning it failed to pick up on or appropriately respond to shifts (like new technologies and competitors) despite once having the means to do so. The study identified multiple layers of effective CI practice – formal external monitoring (like a CI team), informal external listening (like leveraging networks and boards), and internal monitoring with external perspective (like using internal data to spot external trends). Nortel apparently let these mechanisms atrophy or ignored their outputs, which was a fatal mistake. The key lesson I learned is that **organizational commitment to CI must be continuous**. It's not enough to set up a CI unit; a company's leadership and culture need to remain open to intelligence and adapt as the environment changes. Otherwise, as Nortel showed, even a former "global powerhouse" can be blindsided by competitors or market shifts that a healthy CI function would have flagged. This reading really drove home the point that organizing for CI is about embedding awareness into the corporate DNA – combining formal processes with an informal culture of curiosity and vigilance.

Key Insights from Class Lecture and Discussion

In our class, we tested how organizations can build and embed a CI function, and one major insight was the concept of CI maturity levels for the organization. During the class, Professor Calof introduced a Competitive Intelligence evaluation questionnaire that organizations can use to assess themselves internally. The questionnaire essentially benchmarks a company's CI practices on a scale (Level 1 to 3) across various dimensions like awareness, culture, process, and structure to have a clear picture for their CI maturity level. One of the powerful insight for me was how this tool highlights the difference between merely recognizing CI and actually leveraging it in the business contexts. For example, a Level 1 in "CI culture" might be just having basic awareness of CI (e.g., acknowledging that watching competitors is important), whereas Level 3 would be having CI deeply ingrained in decision-making and a culture that actively encourages information sharing. In discussion, we went over sample statements from the assessment: one said "Our company

recognizes CI as a legitimate activity" – if you agree, that's basically a low maturity (everyone should at least recognize it). But a more advanced statement was along the lines of "We use CI insights regularly to influence corporate strategy" – agreeing with that indicates a high maturity. This showed me concretely what a mature CI organization looks like: executives not only support CI but expect and demand intelligence for key decisions, and employees at all levels participate in CI activities. A classmate mentioned their previous employer had quarterly "competitive reviews" where each department presented intel on their competitors – that sounded like a good Level 3 practice, embedding CI in routine. I learned several things in class, for instance, organizational support and processes need to be in tandem: you can start by creating appraised impact and enhances awareness, but ultimately competitive edge comes into play when CI itself is habitual and systemic. It left me thinking about our own organization and wondering if we are at Level 1 or possibly 2 at best – there is no formal CI unit and intelligence is truly ad-hoc for a specific context. Knowing these maturity levels is like a how-to for the improvements I can advocate (like getting CI guidelines implemented, then maybe having an analyst role, etc.)

A regurgitation of an insight gained from class discussion had to do with the significance of strong involvement of the whole company in CI. We discussed that every employee can be the "eyes and ears" of the company if they are trained and motivated appropriately. Professor Calof recounted a scenario in which a company asked all of its employees to submit all competitive information they could find, but the outcome was a deluge of irrelevant information — "crap," as he described it — because the company had not advised employees on what to look for. So, simply telling everyone, hey, just collect intel isn't going to help if there is no framework. The professor ddressed the need to clearly define intelligence needs and (employee) training should focus on who the top key intelligence topics (the key questions the company is trying to answer) are so that their efforts are directional. We have also talked about incentives and ethical constraints. A mature CI function establishes shareability incentives (such as a recognition program for valuable insights shared) and creates ethical and legal guidance so staff understand the limits. It dawned on me that organizing for CI requires just as much to do with creating the right culture as it does about structure. In class, we heard how some companies have an internal portal where staff can post intel and CI analysts curate it. That kind of infrastructure plus a supportive culture encourages participation without chaos. The insight for me was the importance of process and structure to harness informal intel: things like internal knowledge audits, defined collection processes, and feedback loops (letting people know how their intel was used) all help convert the workforce into a coordinated intelligence network. This made me realize that CI success is not a task of a small team alone – it's an organizational task, but requires careful coordination of the efforts from all the concerned   teams.

In addition, we discussed the relationship between CI and other internal functions including knowledge management and strategic planning. The point made was that CI has a considerable overlap with knowledge management (KM) – both work with the collection, storage and dissemination of information for the use of decision. Another student described how in their own company CI was not only a separate area, it was actually a group within Knowledge Management. We debated pros and cons of that: on one hand, KM infrastructure (like databases, collaboration tools) can greatly aid CI by capturing intelligence and making it searchable. On the other hand, CI has an external competitive focus and urgency that typical KM doesn't.What I learned was that CI and KM can become redundant without alignment. To illustrate, lessons learned from project work

or sales teams (frequently captured through KM) could be especially useful to CI analysts to better understand competitors shopping methods, and on the reverse side, competitor insights can be leveraged as organizational knowledge for future modality. The class agreed that whatever the organizational chart looks like, CI must have strong links to strategy formulation teams. We heard that in some firms, CI reports directly to a strategy VP or even the CEO, underlining its strategic role. Hearing these examples reinforced the idea that where CI sits in an organization sends a message – if it's under Marketing, it might focus on market/competitor research; if under Strategy, it might be more integrated into high-level planning. There isn't one right answer, but the key is that CI should not be isolated. An insight I took away is that CI needs a champion in upper management to ensure its findings actually feed into strategic decisions (otherwise you have good intel that isn't acted upon). This discussion prompted me to think about how I would implement a CI function: I'd want a direct line to the C-suite or strategy group, and I'd leverage existing knowledge-sharing systems to circulate intelligence widely.

Reflection and Integration

Class 7 significantly advanced my understanding of what it takes to embed competitive intelligence in an organization. At the start of this course, I thought of CI mostly as a set of tools and maybe a person or two doing analysis. Currently, I can recognize CI as an organizational capability that requires design and nurturing not one time effort. I am able to reflect on the maturity model and realizing that my definition of CI has grown to include elements of organizational development – such as culture building, process implementation, and performance evaluation for the organization that I work for. CI is not just about doing intelligence, but about creating an environment where intelligence is systematically produced and used. This is a big evolution from my initial viewpoint. Earlier, I might have described CI as "researching competitors to inform strategy." Now I would describe it as "a function that an organization sets up – including people, processes, and culture – to continually learn about its environment and feed insights into decision-making." The idea that CI can be measured and improved like any other business process (with KPIs, maturity stages, etc.)is something I'm new to, and it ingeniously enables me to visualize CI in more tangible ways. It's not simply an abstract practice; it can be measured and refined. I also notice that my perspective toward ethic and responsibility in CI has been sharpened by this class. In the segment of CI where we learn guidelines and company policies, I remembered way back in the beginning of the course we discussed legal/ethical boundaries. And now, being able to imagine how an organization might codify that (ie. a CI code of conduct), I see its value even more. My conceptualization of CI is evolving, but it has a very strong ethical component: to maintain a CI function, an entity must develop trustworthiness and credibility, and that means no unethical snooping or misinformation dissemination. I'm thinking about how a good CI team not only brings order but teaches colleagues about what's appropriate (for example, the difference between public information gathering and anything questionable). The reason being, one rogue incident can smear a CI program's reputation both in way and externally. Thus, part of "organizing for CI" in my mind now involves risk management and ethical training, which I hadn't originally considered.

Finally, this class made me integrate the role of leadership support into my understanding of CI. The stories and examples (positive ones where CEOs championed CI and negative ones like Nortel

where leadership lost sight) all point to the fact that CI flourishes or flounders largely due to top management attitude. I now think of competitive intelligence as more than just an analytical function — it's a strategic asset that leaders need to cultivate. If I ever take on CI practices at a company, now I know to get top down buy-in early and demonstrate quick wins or value in tangible terms to sustain that support. I go from "a smart analyst can do CI" to "a smart organization does CI". The bottom line is that my journey throughout this class demonstrated to me that in the realm of CI, people and culture are just as significant as data and tools. It's an interplay: the best analysis may never see the light of day if the organization isn't open, while a strong CI culture can even overcome resource constraints by leveraging all contributions. Integrating this insight, I feel better skill-set up to provide an evaluation of an organization's current state of CI readiness, as well as working actively to improve it. Overall, Class 7 gave me a 360 view into CI — CI as an activity to be ingrained in the organization, integrated with adjacent disciplines — innovation, knowledge management, and business strategy — and embedded under an ethical framework.

References

- Calof, J., & Bishop, P. (2020). **Guest editorial: Foresight and competitive intelligence**. *Foresight, 22*(5/6), 529–532.
- Calof, J., Sewdass, N., & Arcos, R. (2017). **Competitive intelligence: A 10-year global development**. *Competitive Intelligence Magazine, 20*(2), 20–28.
- Calof, J. L., Mirabeau, L., & Richards, G. (2015). **Integrating formal and informal mechanisms in environmental awareness – Lessons from the demise of Nortel**. *Journal of Intelligence Studies in Business, 5*(1), 57–69.
- Calof, J., & Sewdass, N. (2020). **On the relationship between competitive intelligence and innovation**. *Journal of Intelligence Studies in Business, 10*(2), 32–43.

Class 8: CI within Anticipatory Systems and Course Wrap-Up

Key Insights from Readings

The last class readings linked competitive intelligence to more general anticipatory systems and future-directed thinking. One important learning I had is how CI is merging with strategic foresight in both theory and practice. Calof and Bishop (2020), in a guest editorial in Foresight, pointed out that there has long been a trend for competitive intelligence professionals to "focus increasingly on foresight", implying a merging of the disciplines. The realization here is that CI has ceased to be a standalone concept – rather, it finds itself in a continuum of practices, all of which aim to anticipate the future (along with foresight, scenario planning, etc.). The editorial mentions, for example, that so many articles and papers are probing the integrated space of foresight and competitive intelligence (CI) that the distinctions between scanning the competitive environment vs scouting the wide future are becoming vague. It occurred to me that

CI adds a key competitor-centric perspective to antecipatory strategy and that foresight can help create methods to explore longer-term, divergent futures. Essentially, the reading confirmed that in order to comprehend the landscape of future competition you need both CI (to discover the actors and what signals they are sending today) and foresight (so you can imagine how the dynamics may change). I found it insightful that the academic and professional communities are explicitly calling for integration of these fields – meaning my future practice of CI should be comfortable with scenario analysis and trend extrapolation, not just current-state analysis.

Another important reading insight was revisiting the Nortel case (Calof et al., 2015) from a forward-looking perspective. While we discussed it for Class 7 as a lesson in organization, it also served in Class 8 to illustrate the concept of an anticipatory failure. Nortel's downfall can be seen as a failure to anticipate technological and market changes – essentially a failure of an anticipatory system. The case's proposed "environmental awareness model" is an attempt to integrate formal CI with informal scanning and internal processes, which is basically a model for a corporate anticipatory system. Reading it in the context of this class, I appreciated the point that multiple mechanisms (formal CI, informal networks, internal analysis) must work together for a company to be truly future-prepared. If any link is weak (say, you collect data but don't internally discuss what it means for strategy, or you rely only on internal gut feeling and ignore external data), the anticipatory system can break down. The insight I derived is that CI is one pillar of an anticipatory organization, alongside others like forecasting, risk management, and innovation monitoring, and they all need to be aligned. Nortel didn't have that alignment in its final years, which illustrates how even good current intelligence can't save a company if it doesn't get synthesized into a forward-looking strategy. This tied back to the bigger picture: CI needs to feed into foresight and planning processes, or its warnings could be missed.

Finally, the piece by Calof and Blakely (2023) — which I only read of — covered futures literacy and anticipatory systems in entrepreneurship. The thing I attended on it (I only had time to read summaries) focused on how organizations ranging from startups to local economic development programs are trying to become more "futures literate" — to make a habit of using tools to systematically imagine and prepare for various futures. That "anticipatory systems at the center of entrepreneurship and economic development" sounded like a marriage between competitive intelligence and other forward-looking approaches, to help even small enterprises deal with uncertainty. That may also, I hope, be a key insight for CI investment in the next decades into teaming with futurists, economists, and technologists in creating everything from access centers through predictive systems of various sorts. This reading (and class discussion around it) hinted that CI practitioners might work in teams that also handle business analytics and corporate foresight – a more interdisciplinary anticipatory function. It's insightful to think that CI's skillset (e.g., competitor analysis, early warning signal detection) can directly contribute to broader applications like identifying future market opportunities or threats beyond the immediate competitive set.

Key Insights from Class Lecture and Discussion

The class discussion in our final session was very much a capstone, bringing together all threads. One key insight was differentiating CI from other anticipatory practices and then finding their common ground. We openly compared CI with marketing research, business intelligence, and corporate foresight. A consensus emerged on differences: marketing research often looks inward from the customer's perspective (e.g. customer needs, market size), whereas CI looks outward from the competitor's perspective and the overall competitive environment. Foresight (or futures studies) deals with long-term possibilities and tends to be exploratory (e.g., scenario planning over 10+ years), whereas CI often deals with the nearer-term competitive moves and is more immediately actionable. Despite these differences, the class discussion highlighted that all these disciplines aim to reduce uncertainty for decision-makers – they are complementary pieces of an anticipatory system. An example that came up was how a company might integrate these: marketing research might tell you emerging customer preferences, CI might tell you which competitor is poised to meet those preferences first, and foresight might help envision how the market could evolve if that preference becomes dominant. In all I believe the key is integration: a new type of agency that pairs insights from CI, market research and foresight is likely to be a lot more resilient and agile. We discussed practical mechanisms, such as cross-functional teams, or a "market insights" council, where CI analysts, market researchers, and strategists regularly share findings. I understood that CI fills a critical gap between current competitive realities and future strategic possibilities — it connects the often theoretical work of foresight with grounded competitive context if we utilze the tools and invest on its practices.

A particularly interesting insight for me was the class discussion about AI and advanced analytics shaping the future of CI based on the big data topic from Class 6. We looked at some cutting-edge examples of AI in anticipatory activities. For instance, the idea of automated horizon scanning was mentioned, where AI systems continuously scrape and analyze news for weak signals of change (a new startup, a patent filing, a regulatory draft) relevant to a company's industry. We also discussed predictive analytics for demand forecasting and how those could feed into CI when predicting competitor performance or market shifts. The interplay of human and machine was a theme: AI can handle volume and detect patterns, but human insight is needed to interpret and strategize. A classmate raised the concern that AI might churn out false positives or be misled by noise if not carefully directed – reinforcing that an analyst's expertise is still crucial to validate outputs. The professor gave an example of sentiment analysis on social media: an AI could tell us that sentiment for Competitor X's new product is trending negative, but a CI analyst would need to dig in, confirm the reasons (maybe a specific flaw that our company can exploit), and then advise action. The collective insight here was that the future of CI is augmented, not replaced, by AI. We envisioned a sort of "CI dashboard" of the future where an AI flags anomalies and opportunities in real time, and the CI team spends more time on higher-level analysis, creative scenario building, and advising strategy rather than on data grunt work. This discussion made me quite excited about the prospects of CI – it's a field that will evolve with technology, possibly becoming even more influential as it gains predictive capabilities.

Finally, the wrap-up discussion had us reflect on our personal growth and remaining questions about CI. Many of us, including myself, noted how our definition of CI had expanded. One insight I shared with the class was realizing how CI ties into every level of business – from tactical (like a salesperson gathering intel on a competitor's pricing during a sales pitch) to strategic (like the CEO adjusting the company's vision after seeing a competitor's big bet on a new tech). The instructor affirmed this and added that CI professionals often act as internal consultants, connecting dots

across departments and ensuring the organization as a whole "learns" about its environment continuously. We also addressed questions such as, "How can a small company with limited resources do CI?" The answer distilled in class was to focus on building an intelligence network (even if informal) and to prioritize intelligence needs – essentially, do what large firms do but on a scale appropriate to your resources. This Q&A solidified for me the insight that CI is scalable and adaptable: even without a big budget, any organization can practice the principles of CI by being curious, systematic, and integrative in how it uses information. As the class wrapped up, I felt a strong alignment with the course's final theme: CI within an anticipatory system. The insight that will stay with me is that competitive intelligence is a critical component of being a "future-ready" organization. It anchors the organization's view of the future in reality (competitor capabilities and moves), ensuring that strategic foresight or innovation efforts are informed by the competitive context.

Reflection and Integration

Reflecting on Class 8 and the course as a whole, I am struck by how profoundly my understanding of competitive intelligence has evolved. Initially, I saw CI in somewhat narrow terms – mainly competitor research. Now I see it as **a multifaceted, future-facing discipline** that intersects with many others. One of my biggest reflective takeaways is that **CI operates on multiple time horizons**. In the early classes I learned about day-to-day tools and analyses; by this final class, I was thinking about how CI informs long-term scenarios and how it must adapt to fast-changing environments (sometimes with the help of AI). My definition of CI now would be: *the process by which an organization continuously monitors, analyzes, and anticipates its external environment (competitors, market shifts, technologies, etc.) to inform decision-making at all levels*. This is a much broader and dynamic definition than I would have given at the start of the course.

Another part of my reflection is the realization that **my mindset as a manager has shifted to be more anticipatory**. Throughout the course, and especially in this last session, I found myself connecting CI to things like risk management and strategic planning. I no longer think of CI output as just reports on competitors; I think in terms of insights that feed into bigger questions: "What if competitor A launches that new model? How would we respond? What if a new entrant changes the basis of competition? Are we prepared?" I've started to internalize the habit of asking these forward-looking questions – a clear sign of my *futures literacy* improving. The course wrap-up made me realize that this was one of the instructor's goals: to get us to approach business environments with a CI practitioner's curiosity and skepticism about the status quo. I feel that's a lasting change in me. For instance, I was reading an article about an emerging technology in our industry and I automatically thought, "Who else is investing in this? Could this disrupt our competitive landscape? Maybe I should set up a Google Alert on that technology and key players." Six weeks ago, I might have just read it and moved on; now I read it and integrate it into an intelligence-gathering routine. That personal growth is very satisfying.

Lastly, integrating everything, I see that **competitive intelligence is truly an integrative discipline**. It brings together insights from many sources (technical, market, human) and requires collaboration across different business functions. In this final reflection, I appreciate how each

class built on the previous: from defining CI and collection methods to planning CI projects, to analysis techniques, to organizational implementation, and finally to positioning CI as part of a larger anticipatory system. Each piece was necessary. My understanding of CI at the end is a synthesis of all those elements – *holistic* is the word that comes to mind. I don't view any part of CI in isolation now. For example, I understand that you can't have good analysis without good collection (Class 2's lesson), or a great CI team won't matter if management doesn't listen (Class 7's lesson). By tying CI into anticipatory systems, Class 8 taught me that even CI must not become a silo; it should inform and be informed by other forward-looking practices. This is a key integration point I'll carry forward: whether I am in a strategy role, a marketing role, or a dedicated CI role, I will aim to connect the dots between competitive insights and other strategic intel like customer trends or emerging risks. In conclusion, I feel prepared to champion CI in a broader context – not just as "our competitor analysis process," but as *a mindset and capability that will help our organization navigate the future*. This course, especially the culminating discussions, has instilled in me both the **skill set and the mindset** to do exactly that.

References

- Calof, J., & Bishop, P. (2020). **Guest editorial: Foresight and competitive intelligence**. *Foresight, 22*(5/6), 529–532.
- Calof, J., & Blakely, D. (2023). **Putting futures literacy and anticipatory systems at the center of entrepreneurship and economic development programs**. *Journal of Intelligence Studies in Business, 13*(2), 25–31.
- Calof, J. L., Mirabeau, L., & Richards, G. (2015). **Towards an environmental awareness model integrating formal and informal mechanisms – Lessons learned from the demise of Nortel**. *Journal of Intelligence Studies in Business, 5*(1), 57–69.
- Class 8 Lecture Slides (2025). **CI and anticipatory systems – O. Bondarenko**
- Class Discussions (2025). **Competitive Intelligence Course – Session 8**