



# Academic viewpoint of Strategic Management towards Applied Science: Empirical Study on Organizational Behaviour

<sup>1</sup> Dr Siew Poh Phung, <sup>2</sup> Assoc. Prof. Dr. Valliappan Raju, <sup>3</sup> Norhaniza Abdul Lattif

<sup>1</sup> Manager---Academics, Limkokwing University

<sup>2</sup> Sr. Lecturer, Limkokwing University

<sup>3</sup> Post Graduate Administrator, Limkokwing University

## Abstract

This overview paper covers the consequences on the appropriate methodology of research instruments that are used for local and internationally graduated students, from the case of Malaysian Colleges / Institutions. Results demonstrate that key the executive's apparatuses are significant by proposing a vital administration in applied science. Be that as it may, with the end goal to comprehend procedure as applied science, we have to see how and why specialists utilize procedure apparatuses as opposed to holding scholarly predispositions about the hypothetical bases and utility of those instruments. This paper clarifies why we should take a look at the utilization of key administrative hypothesis as an issue of instruments' as opposed to other hypotheses. At one point it is clarified that the examination structure and techniques for a mapping investigation of technique instruments appropriation directed with an example of residential and worldwide graduated class in nine MALAYSIA business Colleges / Institutions in 2016. The discoveries from this study are displayed regarding technique device mindfulness, rank requesting of devices inside various phases of the technique procedure by volume of utilization and by saw esteem, and some individual, hierarchical and instructive effects on methodology device reception. These outcomes are translated and examined. The paper adds to the importance by giving an assortment of proof on what vital the executives' devices are utilized, by whom, in what setting and for what errands. Such proof is fundamental to advise the continuous importance banter in two different ways. Initially, it affirms that key the executive's hypothesis is pertinent to specialists, but not really in the ways that scholastics conceptualize significance. Second, it broadens the idea of significance past essentially instrumental contemplations, as the outcomes show this isn't the main thought affecting specialist' determination of instruments.

**Keywords.** *Strategic management, Applied Science, Academic View*

## 1. Introduction

Strategic administration forms one of the most commonly utilized concepts in the contemporary world. The concept has gained interest in educational debates with the aim of seeking real-world and practical solutions to any problems that emerge (British Journal over Management, 2001; Administrative Science Quarterly, 1982; Academy on Management Journal, 2001; Academy of Management Conference, 2004). While approaching some subjects, the strategic management concept has been extended to involve imitations of issues such as conformity to how some tasks are approached (Bettis, 1991; Ghoshal, 2005; Ghoshal then Moran, 1996; Lowendahl yet Revang, 1998; Prahalad and Hamel, 1994; Baldrige, Floyd & Markoczy, 2004). Imperatively, the educational debates have been used to report coaching issues and capabilities of managers such as those in the Malaysian context (Keep yet Westwood, 2003). Particularly, strategic management has been advocated among the managers to ensure that they maintain a desirable degree of attention to detail, especially by transforming the knowledge gained theoretically into practice. the theoretical sources won beside management education. However, despite tutorial or coverage concerns, like has been, along partial exceptions (Haspeslagh, 1982; Balridge et al, 2004; Miner, 2003 Hodgkinson or Wright, 2002;), younger pilot exam regarding what principle is back within act or even much less of or that is ancient (Jarzabkowski, 2004; Whittington, 2003).

There are two fundamental issues with dissecting the employments of scholarly hypothesis practically speaking that make the discussion hard to advance hypothetically or observationally. To start with, as there is little agreement on what comprises that administration hypothesis which isn't applicable to rehearse, it is hard to operationalize an assortment of the board hypothesis for examination. Second, the ideas of reasonable significance that support the discussion are badly characterized and furthermore hard to operationalize (Baldrige et al, 2004). This paper tends to these issues by conceptualizing hypothesis by and by as the utilization of the executives devices, and writing about an experimental, study based mapping investigation of how system apparatuses are utilized by and by. It is important to characterize what establishes the hypothesis that may be utilized by experts. System hypothesis regularly experiences a procedure of separation from its hypothetical establishments, determining an arrangement of ideas, devices and methods (Worren et al, 2002; Weick, 1995; Jarzabkowski and Wilson, 2006). Constituting "instruments" in this case, they tend to be scattered among advisors and media sources, among classroom situations, and in course readings (Mazza and Alvarez, 2000; Abrahamson, 1996). For instance, Porter's Five Forces play a crucial role towards the analysis of industry structures, yet some structures remain separated from global structural lead execu-

tions. As such, the resultant disentanglement accounts for less demand for the five-force analysis, as well as the use of other strategic management tools (Worren et al, 2002; Miller, 1956; Argyres and McGahan, 2000). On the other hand, the inquisitive certainty that numerous examinations indicating to look at the down to earth significance of hypothesis have utilized scholastics to review this pertinence (Shrivastava, 1987; Miner, 2003; Dunn, 1980), which can be grounded in an observational issue. Hence, it is hard to get some information about the significance of, for instance, 'exchange cost financial matters' on the off chance that they don't utilize this hypothetical term. All together exactly to break down methodology hypothesis by and by, we suggest that it is critical to think about the utilization of system devices as opposed to technique speculations, as this all the more precisely mirrors the scattering of hypothesis to rehearse.

An essential inquiry to deliver so as to advise the importance banter in vital administration is; what, of the methodology apparatuses that experts have been presented to, do they use? That is, it profits scholastics to address whether those apparatuses normally educated in the classroom are really utilized by alumni in the working environment. From constrained observational examination, there is proof that professionals do without a doubt utilize some system instruments practically speaking (e.g. Clark, 1997; Frost, 2003; Grant, 2003; Haspeslagh, 1982; Hodgkinson et al, 2006; McCabe and Narayanan, 1991; Rigby, 2001; Stenfors et al, 2004; 2007). While these investigations are not actually tantamount on account of irregularities in technique, devices examined and inspecting criteria, they give a few bits of knowledge into potential wellsprings of variety in procedure apparatus use. In particular, reception of technique instruments fluctuates by setting (authoritative and natural), various leveled dimension of the client, phase of the methodology procedure, and highlights of hardware structure (Spee and Jarzabkowski, 2006). These discoveries from surviving writing are condensed in Table 1. Be that as it may, there has been minimal exact investigation of the run of the mill set of apparatuses spread in vital administration courses and their consequent selection by specialists. A mapping study is thusly shown, looking at the selection and adjustment of run of the mill methodology apparatuses by the individuals who have had presentation to such devices through key administration training. This paper tends to this inquiry, introducing the aftereffects of a review of system apparatus use by business college graduated class in the MALAYSIA.

## 2. Research Design

A review technique has been utilized to outline reception of commonplace methodology apparatuses by a populace of residential and global graduated class from nine of the best 30 MALAYSIA business Colleges / Institutions. Graduated class were chosen since they meet our first criteria for target populace; the individuals who have had something like an establishment course in key administration, and in this manner may be required to utilize or not utilize its items on a sensibly educated premise (Priem and Rosenstein, 2001; Westwood and Keep, 2003). Higher--positioned schools were chosen on the grounds that these schools have higher alumni business, guaranteeing the objective populace is utilized in positions where they may sensibly have a chance or need to utilize apparatuses. As the investigation does not question how institutional positioning or nature of the instructive experience shapes apparatus reception, constraining the examination to higher--positioned schools with high alumni work was felt to control for unintended instructive variety impacts. The example populace covers both undergrad and postgraduate graduated class who include graduated inside a multi-year time span to consider profession movement impacts. The confinements of studies, for instance as far as self--report inclinations, are recognized and, where conceivable, have been tended to by the overview structure.

So as to build up a rundown of devices most normally educated in establishment vital administration courses, a review of 66 system scholastics in the best 30 business Colleges / Institutions was directed, utilizing recurrence tallies to determine a rundown of 20 regularly instructed apparatuses. We at that point built up an overview instrument to delineate use as indicated by logical and singular highlights, device qualities, and processual and socio--political employments. Three pilot investigations of this overview were directed, creating 76 reactions altogether. Aftereffects of each pilot were broke down to additionally shape the survey and guarantee the inquiries gave powerful estimations. Between February and May 2007, the study was directed online. Targeting 20,108 graduates in nine out of the top 30 business institutions of higher learning or colleges in Malaysia, the inclusion criteria demanded Business College graduated class members who had gained knowledge in an establishment system course. However, a critical challenge was that in some institutions, the concept of key administration is not considered a foundation course. Despite this challenge, the reaction rate from aggregate numbers messaged, without barring non--responsive messages or non--target populace, was 14.2%. this value represented reactions from the graduated class in which members had gained knowledge about key administrative skills; from which we added 1,844 usable reactions.

As a mapping study, the study isn't guided by speculations, yet addresses a scope of inquiries, educated by the writing (see Table 1), that maylight up selection and variety being used of methodology devices. In particular, the overview addresses address logical variety in device use as indicated by: national setting of utilization (Frost, 2003; Guillen, 1994; Whittington et al, 2003); sectoralsetting (Ferlie, 2002; Haspeslagh, 1982); and hierarchical setting (Clark, 1997; Frost, 2003). Variety by individual attributes is consolidated through close to home socioeconomics, for example, age, work residency, training level and sex, and in addition work, various leveled position (Hodgkinson et al, 2006) and time since formal procedure instruction was last embraced (Priem and Rosenstein, 2000). The review at that point addresses which instruments are regularly utilized, position requesting the best three for further examination on apparatus attributes, for example, plan, usability, appropriateness to errands and explanations behind use (Stenfors et al, 2007; Worren et al, 2002). The processual and socio--political employments of these devices are likewise inspected, addressing which apparatuses are utilized in which phase of the procedure and how devices are utilized in social associations with companions, subordinates and larger amount supervisors (Grant, 2003). At last, the study addresses purposes behind non--utilization of apparatuses, setting up criteria for fulfillment or disappointment with devices. This paper displays the underlying engaging discoveries about the best apparatuses utilized, weighted frequencies for their utilization as indicated by some individual, hierarchical and instructive qualities, and connections of their volume--of--utilization to saw an incentive inside various stages in the system procedure.

## 3. Results

**Table A. Variation in strategy tool adoption according to extant literature**

(Taken from Spee and Jarzabkowski, 2006: 28)

Context – Organization & Environment	Hierarchical level	Strategy process	Tool design
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Larger firms use more tools than small ones (Frost 2003; Rigby 2001b; 2003; and Bilodeau 2005)</li> <li>- Strategy tool adoption differs by industry (Haspelslagh 1982; Rigby 2001a) and country (Clark 1997; Rigby 2001b; 2003; and Bilodeau 2005)</li> <li>- Variation of tool use according to environmental conditions (Grant 2003; Koufopoulos and Chrysochoidis 2000)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Top management uses tools more extensively than middle managers (Dyson 2004; Grant 2003; Hill and Westbrook 1997; Hodgkinson <i>et al.</i> 2006)</li> <li>- Tool adoption depends on CEO support (Hodgkinson and Wright 2002)</li> <li>- Tools are used in individual and/or during group activities (Dyson 2004; Hill and Westbrook 1997; Hodgkinson and Wright 2002)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- High tool use in situation assessment and strategic analysis phase, while low tool use in strategy implementation phase (Clark 1997; Grant 2003; Hodgkinson <i>et al.</i> 2006)</li> <li>- One tool may support different strategic tasks (Clark 1997; Webster <i>et al.</i> 1989)</li> <li>- A strategic task may be supported by several strategy tools (Clark 1997; Frost 2003)</li> <li>- Companies use more than one tool (Rigby 2001b; Stenfors <i>et al.</i> 2004)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Tools producing quantitative data tend to be used more for medium-term planning (Grant 2003)</li> <li>- Tools producing qualitative data tend to be used more for long term planning (Grant 2003)</li> <li>- Simple and transparent tools are preferred to complex ones (Clark 1997; Stenfors <i>et al.</i> 2004)</li> <li>- Mixed results for using IT to support strategy tools (Rigby and Bilodeau 2005; Stenfors <i>et al.</i> 2004)</li> </ul>

**Table B:** Tool rank order according to awareness of tool and its use

Tools	Currently used %	Used but not now %	Heard of, not used %	Never heard of %
SWOT	76%	13%	10%	1%
Key Success Factors	58%	13%	21%	8%
Core Competences analysis	47%	19%	25%	9%
Scenario Planning	45%	19%	29%	7%
Value Chain	41%	20%	34%	5%
Porter's Five Forces	39%	25%	30%	6%
Resource-Based Analysis	38%	14%	33%	18%
Industry Life Cycle	36%	21%	33%	10%
PESTLE Analysis	33%	14%	38%	30%
Portfolio Matrices, e.g. BCG or McKinsey	29%	20%	40%	13%
Porter's Generic Strategy Model	23%	19%	36%	18%
Strategic Groups Analysis	18%	12%	35%	34%
Ansoff's Product/Market Matrix	15%	14%	42%	36%
Porter's Diamond	12%	18%	40%	28%
Merger and Acquisition Matrices	8%	7%	28%	45%
Dynamic Capabilities Analysis	8%	6%	24%	59%
Globalisation Matrices	6%	7%	26%	53%
Methods of Expansion Matrices	4%	7%	26%	63%
Corporate Parenting Matrices	4%	5%	26%	65%
Bowman's Strategy Clock	3%	6%	26%	65%

Table B tends to respondents' mindfulness and utilization of instruments. It positions arranges the 20 instruments as per most astounding current use, indicating additionally those apparatuses which have been utilized yet are never again utilized, those devices which members have known about yet don't utilize and those devices of which members have not heard. Steady with different examinations, SWOT, is found to have the most noteworthy use (e.g. Clark, 1997; Frost, 2003; Stenfors et al, 2007). Different creators have remarked on the omnipresence of SWOT, which is seen as basic, down to earth and simple to utilize (e.g. Dyson, 2004; Hill and Westbrook, 1997; Pickton and Wright, 1998). In any case, different instruments demonstrate a few contrasts with these different investigations. For instance, in our examination situation arranging and esteem chain investigation rank fourth and fifth individually, while they rank seventh and fifteenth for Stenfors et al (2007). Some consideration should be taken in looking at results, as different creators don't utilize a similar rundown of devices, which may impact positioning. Strangely no apparatuses are totally unused, in spite of the fact that the last nine instruments have low appropriation with 70% or a greater amount of respondents either failing to have utilized these devices or not monitoring them. PESTLE is an exception with 30% of respondents asserting ignorance, given the generally high current use. This perhaps on the grounds that respondents perceive the device by its different names, for example, SLEPT and PEST. This thought of classification should likewise be given to different devices, which probably won't be perceived by their names in this investigation, yet that these are normal procedure course reading names for devices.

#### 4. Conclusions

This paper exhibits the starter consequences of a study into the utilization of those system apparatuses ordinarily instructed in establishment key administration courses by an example of residential and global graduated class from nine of the main 30 MALAYSIA business Colleges / Institutions. Graduated class were picked as the objective populace since they have been presented to key administration training and in this way may be required to utilize its items on a sensibly educated premise (Priem and Rosenstein, 2000). Discoveries on procedure devices mindfulness, volume of utilization and saw helpfulness in various phases of the system procedure were exhibited, trailed by results on some individual, authoritative and instructive attributes of utilization. Ramifications of the explicit outcomes and their commitments to existing examination into technique device reception are talked about in the body of the content. These outcomes illuminate the continuous importance banter in the executives in two different ways. To start with, they demonstrate that vital administration devices are utilized by specialists who have been presented to them through training. Moreover, a few apparatuses are seen by graduated class as increasing the value of their procedure forms. This proposes vital administration devices meet some professional criteria of pertinence, replying probably a portion of the institute's continuous soul---seeking about whether we have importance (e.g. Institute of Management Conference, 2004; Academy of Management Journal, 2001; Administrative Science Quarterly, 1982; British Journal of Management, 2001). A portion of the antiquities or 'items' emerging from research, which have been refined to the degree that they presently shape commonplace key administration showing instruments, methods and structures have significance. While we may not see this as especially hypothetical, comprehend that scholastics once in a while disperse hypothesis in its 'hypothetical state' into training. Or maybe, we scatter through a scope of media theresults of hypothesis, for example, systems, ideas and methods (Abrahamson, 1996; Jarzabkowski and Wilson, 2006; Mazza and Alvarez, 2000; Warren et al, 2002).

Second, our outcomes educate the risky idea of pertinence (Baldrige et al, 2004). Pelz (1978) proposes three different ways of understanding pertinence, based around the distinctive ways that professionals utilize sociology hypothesis: instrumental, which means guide use of hypothesis to rehearse; theoretical, which means utilizing hypothesis to illuminate practice; and representative, which means the stately appropriation of hypothesis with minimal critical change of training. Any of these utilizations may be important to specialists, as far as satisfying their necessities in receiving a hypothetical structure. Notwithstanding, the foundation has would in general respect just the first of these, instrumental use, as demonstrating importance (Tsoukas and Knudsen, 2002).

Elective or non---instrumental employments of hypothesis might be viewed as an issue of abnormality (Beyer and Trice, 1978; Merton, 1938), conscious mutilation (Weiss, 1979), or debasement (Lozeau et al, 2002). That is, any utilization of procedure learning other than direct instrumental application is viewed as either a disappointment of the board, who can't or reluctant to utilize the device satisfactorily, or a disappointment of the information since it can't have the ideal impact (Lozeau et al, 2002). In any case, our outcomes, especially those on the volume and saw estimation of devices to various phases of the methodology procedure, show that devices are connected, but not generally in the phases of the system procedure we should seriously mull over most appropriate, and that they keep on having high volume of utilization, even where their incentive to the undertakings of the procedure may not be very respected. It consequently creates the impression that instrumental use is just a single, and maybe not the most vital, motivation behind why experts use devices. We have hypothesized on a portion of these reasons in translating the outcomes, including individual, instructive and vocation way contemplations. Notwithstanding, social, political and emblematic factors additionally should be considered.

Further investigation is expected to make a greater amount of the outcomes exhibited in this paper, especially in looking at what different variables drive apparatus determination and use. In any case, we recommend that these outcomes educate the importance banter by showing that key administration hypothesis, as dispersed through average classroom instruments, is significant to rehearse. Moreover, the outcomes illuminate the significance banter by demonstrating that instrumental utilizations of technique devices so as to finish errands appears to direct determination. In any case, it isn't the main motivation behind why professionals use apparatuses, showing that different understandings of pertinence are fundamental. We underscore that these translations of pertinence, in the event thatthey direct professional choice and use of devices, ought to be viewed as imperative proof of scholarly importance.

#### References

- [1] Academy of Management Conference. 2004. Conference Topic: Creating Actionable Knowledge. New Orleans, August.
- [2] Academy of Management Journal. 2001. Special research forum: knowledge transfer between academics and practitioners. 44(2): 340-440.
- [3] Administrative Science Quarterly. 1982. Special Issue, Part I: The utilization of organizational research. 27(4): 587-685.
- [4] Balogun, J. 2003. From Blaming the Middle to Harnessing its Potential: Creating Change Intermediaries. British Journal of Management, 14, 1: 69-84.
- [5] Barry, D. and Elmes, M. (1997). Strategy retold: toward a narrative view of strategic discourse. Academy of Management Journal, 22(2), 429-452.

- [6] British Journal of Management (2001). Special issue in Bridging the Relevance Gap. Volume 12. Special issue 1.
- [7] Clark, D.N. (1995). Strategic level MS/OR tool usage in the United Kingdom: an empirical survey. *The Journal of Operational Research Society*, 46(9), 1041---1051.
- [8] Clark, D.N. (1997). Strategic management tool usage: a comparative study. *Strategic Change*, 6(7), 417--- 427.
- [9] Clark, D.N. and Scott, J. L. (1999). Strategic level MS/OR tool usage in the United Kingdom and New Zealand: A comparative survey. *Asia--Pacific Journal of Operational Research*, 16(1), 35---51.
- [10] Dunn, W. N. (1980). The two---communities metaphor and models of knowledge use. *Knowledge Creation, Diffusion, Utilization*. 1:515---536.
- [11] Dyson, R.G. (2004). Strategic development and SWOT analysis at the University of Warwick. *European Journal of Operational Research*, 152(3), 631---640.
- [12] Frost, F.A. (2003). The use of strategic tools by small and medium---sized enterprises: an Australian study. *Strategic Change*, 12(1), 49---62.
- [13] Ghoshal, S. & Moran, P. 1996. Bad for practice: A critique of the transaction cost theory. *Academy of Management Review*, 21.1:13---47.
- [14] Ghoshal, S. (2005). 'Bad management theories are destroying good management practices. *Academy of Management Learning and Education*, 4.1: 75---91.
- [15] Grant, R. M. 2003. Strategic Planning in a turbulent environment: Evidence from the oil majors. *Strategic Management Journal*, 24.6:491---518.
- [16] Haspeslagh, P. 1982. A survey of US companies shows how effective portfolio planning could be but often isn't. *Harvard Business Review*, 60: 58---73.
- [17] Hebb, D. O. 1949. *The Organization of Behavior*. John Wiley: New York
- [18] Hendry, J. (2000). Strategic decision making, discourse, and strategy as social practice. *Journal of Management Studies*, 37(7), 955---977.
- [19] Hill, T. and Westbrook, R. (1997). SWOT analysis: it's time for a product recall. *Long Range Planning*, 30(1), 46---52.
- [20] Hodgkinson, G. Whittington, R. Johnson, G. and Schwarz, M. (2006). The role of strategy workshops in strategy development processes: formality, communication, coordination and inclusion. *Long Range Planning*, 39(5), 479---496.
- [21] Jarzabkowski, P. 2004. 'Strategy as practice: Recursive, adaptive and practices---in---use.' *Organization Studies*, 25.4: 529---560.
- [22] Louzeau, D., Langley, A. and Denis, J.---L. (2002) The corruption of management techniques by organizations. *Human Relations* 55(5), 537---564.
- [23] Løwendahl, B. & Revang, Ø. 1998. Challenges to existing strategy theory in a post---industrial society. *Strategic Management Journal*, 19.8: 755---774
- [24] Mantere, S. 2005. 'Strategic practices as enablers and disablers of championing activity.' *Strategic Organization!* 3.2: 157---284.
- [25] Miner, B. (2003). The rated importance, scientific validity, and practical usefulness of organizational behavior theories: A quantitative review. *Academy of Management Learning and Education*, 2.3, 250---268.
- [26] Mintzberg, H. (1979). *The Structuring of Organizations*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- [27] Pelz, D.C. (1978). Some expanded perspectives on use of social science in public policy. In M. Yiner & S.J. Cutler (Eds.), *Major Social Issues: A Multidisciplinary View*(pp. 346---357). New York: Free Press
- [28] Pickton, D.W. and Wright, S. (1998). What's swot in strategic analysis?. *Strategic Change*, 7(2), 101---109.
- [29] Prahalad, C. K. & G. Hamel. 1994. 'Strategy as a field of study: Why search for a new paradigm?' *Strategic Management Journal*, 15: 5---16.
- [30] Priem, R. L. and J. Rosenstein. 2000. Is organization theory obvious to practitioners? A test of one established theory. *Organization Science*, 11.5: 509---524.
- [31] Regner, P. (2003). Strategy creation in the periphery: inductive versus deductive strategy making. *Journal of Management Studies*, 40(1), 57---82.
- [32] Rigby, D. and Bilodeau, B. (2005). The Bain 2005 management tool survey. *Strategy and Leadership*, 33(4), 4---12.
- [33] Seidl, D. (2007). General strategy concepts and the ecology of strategy discourses: a systematic---discursive perspective. *Organization Studies*, 28(2), 197---218.
- [34] Shrivastava, P. 1987. Rigor and practical usefulness of research in strategic management. *Strategic Management Journal*. 8.1: 77---92.
- [35] Stenfors, S. Tanner, L. and Haapalinna, I. (2004). Executive use of strategy tools: building shared understanding through boundary objects. *Frontiers of E---Business Research* 2004, 635---645.
- [36] Stenfors, S. Tanner, L. Syrjänen, M. Seppälä, T. and Haapalinna, I. (2007). Executive views concerning decision support tools. *European Journal of Operational Research*, 181(2), 929---938.
- [37] Tapinos, E. Dyson, R.G. and Meadows, M. (2005). The impact of performance measurement in strategic planning. *International Journal of Productivity and Performance Measurement*, 54(5/6), 370---384.
- [38] Tsoukas, H. and Knudsen, C. (2002). The conduct of strategy research. In Pettigrew, A. Thomas, H. and Whittington, R. (ed.), *Handbook of Strategy and Management*. London: Sage Publications
- [39] Whittington, R. 2003. "The work of strategizing and organizing: For a practice perspective." *Strategic Organization*, 1/1: 119---127.
- [40] Whittington, R., P. Jarzabkowski, J. Nahapiet, M. Mayer, E. Mounoud and L. Rouleau (2003) 'Taking strategy seriously: Responsibility and reform for an important social practice'. *Journal of Management Inquiry*, Dec, 12.4, 396---409.