



**ON THE RISK OF STUDYING PRACTICES IN ISOLATION:  
LINKING WHAT, WHO AND HOW IN STRATEGY RESEARCH**

Journal:	<i>Strategic Organization</i>
Manuscript ID:	SO-15-0097.R1
Manuscript Type:	Essay
Keywords:	Strategy as practice < TOPICS AND PERSPECTIVES, Strategy formulation < TOPICS AND PERSPECTIVES, Strategy process < TOPICS AND PERSPECTIVES, Qualitative methods < RESEARCH METHODS, Field research < RESEARCH METHODS
Abstract:	This paper challenges the recent focus on practices as stand-alone phenomena, as exemplified by the so-called "Practice-Based View of Strategy (PBV)" by Bromiley and Rau (2014). While the goal of "PBV" points to the potential of standard practices to generate performance differentials (in contrast to the Resource Based View), it marginalizes well-known insights from practice theory more widely. In particular, by limiting its focus to practices, i.e. "what" practices are used, it underplays the implications of "who" is engaged in the practices and "how" the practices are carried out. In examining practices in isolation, the "PBV" carries the serious risk of misattributing performance differentials. In this paper, we offer an integrative practice perspective on strategy and performance that should aid scholars in generating more precise and contextually-sensitive theories about the enactment and impact of practices as well as about critical factors shaping differences in practice outcomes.

1  
2  
3 **ON THE RISK OF STUDYING PRACTICES IN ISOLATION: LINKING WHAT, WHO**  
4  
5 **AND HOW IN STRATEGY RESEARCH**  
6  
7  
8  
9

10  
11 Paula Jarzabkowski  
12 Cass Business School, City University London  
13 106 Bunhill Row, EC1Y 8TZ London  
14 United Kingdom  
15 [paula.jarzabkowski.1@city.ac.uk](mailto:paula.jarzabkowski.1@city.ac.uk)  
16

17  
18 Sarah Kaplan  
19 University of Toronto, Rotman School  
20 105 St. George St., Toronto, ON, M5S3E6  
21 Canada  
22 [sarah.kaplan@rotman.utoronto.ca](mailto:sarah.kaplan@rotman.utoronto.ca)  
23

24  
25 David Seidl  
26 University of Zurich  
27 Universitaetsstrasse 84, 8006 Zurich  
28 Switzerland  
29 [david.seidl@uzh.ch](mailto:david.seidl@uzh.ch)  
30

31  
32 Richard Whittington  
33 Saïd Business School, University of Oxford  
34 Park End Street, Oxford OX1 1HP  
35 United Kingdom  
36 [richard.whittington@sbs.ox.ac.uk](mailto:richard.whittington@sbs.ox.ac.uk)  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43

44 **Resubmitted August 12, 2015**  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49

50  
51 Key words: practice perspective; strategy as practice; strategy formulation; strategy practitioners  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 **ON THE RISK OF STUDYING PRACTICES IN ISOLATION: LINKING WHAT, WHO**  
4 **AND HOW IN STRATEGY RESEARCH**  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9

10 This paper challenges the recent focus on practices as stand-alone phenomena, as exemplified by  
11 the so-called “Practice-Based View of Strategy (PBV)” by Bromiley and Rau (2014). While the  
12 goal of “PBV” points to the potential of standard practices to generate performance differentials  
13 (in contrast to the Resource Based View), it marginalizes well-known insights from practice  
14 theory more widely. In particular, by limiting its focus to practices, i.e. “what” practices are  
15 used, it underplays the implications of “who” is engaged in the practices and “how” the practices  
16 are carried out. In examining practices in isolation, the “PBV” carries the serious risk of  
17 misattributing performance differentials. In this paper, we offer an integrative practice  
18 perspective on strategy and performance that should aid scholars in generating more precise and  
19 contextually-sensitive theories about the enactment and impact of practices as well as about  
20 critical factors shaping differences in practice outcomes.  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36

37 **Key words:** practice perspective; strategy as practice; strategy formulation; strategy practitioners  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

## ON THE RISK OF STUDYING PRACTICES IN ISOLATION: LINKING WHAT, WHO AND HOW IN STRATEGY RESEARCH

### INTRODUCTION

Economists have recently built up a stream of research identifying best practices in management and determining the effect of their implementation (Bloom and Van Reenen 2007, 2010; Bloom et al. 2011, 2012). This work, primarily relying on survey methods and experimental manipulation of practice implementation, has highlighted the performance impacts of practice differences. It is on this basis that Bromiley and Rau (2014: 1249) have proposed their so-called “Practice-Based View of Strategy (PBV)”, focused on the “actual techniques managers might use to develop strategies or generally applicable firm practices.” Their goal is to take on the assumptions in the Resource Based View that performance differentials cannot accrue from publicly known (and therefore not rare and inimitable) techniques. Yet, in focusing on practices in isolation, the PBV neglects insights drawn from two decades of practice-theoretic and related research, notably in the field of strategy-as-practice (Golsorkhi et al. 2015). We argue that partial models that focus only on “best” practices in isolation are liable to misattribute performance effects. The aim of this paper is to build an integrative model in which the complex links between practices, the ways in which they are engaged, who engages them and their potential outcomes can be fully recognized.

In particular, this integrative model goes beyond the issue of *what* practices matter, the main focus of economists’ work on practices. Drawing on practice theory, we first introduce the issue of *who* applies and transfers practices, including middle managers and consultants as well as senior executives. We argue that without recognizing the status and backgrounds of those who

1  
2  
3 transfer and apply practices, we risk confusing effects arising from practices with effects arising  
4 from the legitimacy or skills of the practitioners involved. Second, we emphasize the importance  
5 of *how* these practices are actually enacted in the field. We argue that without close attention to  
6 the situated enactment of practices, observers are liable to overvalue formal practices, while  
7 undervaluing practice adaptations in context. In what follows, we explain the “what”, “who” and  
8 “how” (what those in the strategy-as-practice field call practices, practitioners and praxis) that  
9 underpin a practice perspective. Next we propose an integrative model that relates the what, who  
10 and how to a range of performance outcomes. We then illustrate how our integrated practice  
11 perspective can uncover surprising and significant findings for strategic management by  
12 presenting recent research that helps rethink core strategy topics. We conclude with some final  
13 reflections on the risk of misattributing performance differentials by focusing narrowly on “best”  
14 practices as proposed by Bromiley and Rau (2014). We offer general guidelines for a more  
15 comprehensive program of practice-oriented strategy research and highlight implications of this  
16 model for managers and educators.  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38

### 39 **“WHAT”, “WHO” AND “HOW” IN PRACTICE THEORY**

40  
41 There are three elements of practice theory important to the “practice turn” current within the  
42 social sciences generally: we identify them here as the what, who and how of practice (e.g.  
43 Feldman and Orlikowski, 2011; Schatzki et al., 2001; Whittington, 2006; Jarzabkowski et al.,  
44 2007). Crucially, outcomes depend on the interaction of all three aspects.  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49

50 The “what” aspect refers to those practices that are taken up within organizations.  
51  
52 Research in strategic management has already elucidated some of these practices (e.g., Bromiley  
53 and Rau, 2014; Knott 2003; Dutta et al., 2003). Other, economics-based studies have named  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 eighteen management practices and clustered them into three broad areas of monitoring, targets  
4 and incentives (as summarized by Bloom and van Reenen, 2010). In surveys across vastly  
5  
6 different contexts of firms, industries and countries, these scholars have shown that substantial  
7  
8 gains in outcomes such as profitability and sales growth are correlated with best practice  
9  
10 adoption. In short, they find that practices matter; and we agree.  
11  
12  
13

14  
15 However, from a practice theory perspective, it is important also to attend to who  
16  
17 performs particular practices. Practices are developed, transferred and enacted by practitioners,  
18  
19 for instance senior and middle managers (e.g. Floyd and Lane, 2000; Balogun and Johnson 2004)  
20  
21 or strategy consultants (McKenna, 2012). Practices and practitioners are entangled. Hence, the  
22  
23 effect of practitioners may be an important omitted variable in the evaluation of the impact of  
24  
25 practices. For example, when standard best practices are implemented in a poorly performing  
26  
27 factory in India (Bloom et al., 2011), it may matter whether the people recommending the  
28  
29 practice are prestigious international consultants (as in their study) or local middle managers.  
30  
31  
32 When attributing outcomes, therefore, it is necessary to consider how practice effects are  
33  
34 intertwined with practitioner effects.  
35  
36  
37  
38

39 The practice perspective also insists on the importance of understanding how practices  
40  
41 are enacted (i.e. praxis). Practices do not occur automatically and un-problematically. Rather,  
42  
43 they are enacted in context, often in ways that vary considerably from their espoused pattern  
44  
45 (Feldman and Pentland, 2003). Such variations are not necessarily failures of practice, but rather  
46  
47 necessary adaptations or improvisations in changing circumstances. Lozeau, Langley and Denis  
48  
49 (2002), for example, showed how public-sector organizations adapted planning practices and  
50  
51 quality management practices originating from the private sector into their specific contexts.  
52  
53  
54 Sometimes such adaptations of practices are also strategic, such as when firms deliberately  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 decouple what they say they do from what they actually do (Fiss and Zajac 2004). These  
4  
5 deviations can be enormously generative, enabling, for example, changes in firm strategy  
6  
7 (Mirabeau and Maguire, 2014). In other words, there is often a gap between apparent practice  
8  
9 and what happens on the ground, with improvisations and workarounds important for achieving  
10  
11 desired outcomes. Hence when assessing the effectiveness of espoused practices (i.e., those that  
12  
13 can be described in a survey), scholars would be well advised to include an understanding for  
14  
15 how practices are actually enacted in context.  
16  
17  
18

19  
20 A more integrated practice perspective holds that it is important to examine practices in  
21  
22 context, attending to who engages them and how they work. Such a practice perspective also  
23  
24 emphasizes that strategic outcomes depend on the interaction of the what, who and how of  
25  
26 practices. This leads us to propose an integrated model of strategy practice.  
27  
28  
29

### 30 31 32 **AN INTEGRATIVE MODEL OF STRATEGY PRACTICE**

33  
34 Figure 1 offers a model for an integrated practice-theoretic approach to strategic management  
35  
36 research. This model contrasts with the “PBV” proposed by Bromiley and Rao (2014), which  
37  
38 focuses exclusively on the existence of standard, imitable practices across firms. In that model,  
39  
40 practices are shown to mediate between frequently considered explanatory variables in strategic  
41  
42 management and firm performance. Our model separates the elements and linkages between  
43  
44 them in order to facilitate direct comparison with Bromiley and Rao’s Figure 3. As such, the  
45  
46 model is deliberately schematic. In practice, the elements are highly entangled with each other:  
47  
48 for example, practitioners are inseparably carriers of practices, while practices have only a  
49  
50 virtual existence outside of praxis. However, with this model we show that the relationship  
51  
52 between practices and economic performance cannot be understood without taking into account  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 not only “what” practices exist but also “who” implements them and “how.” By comparison with  
4  
5 earlier strategy-as-practice frameworks (Whittington, 2006; Jarzabkowski et al, 2007), our model  
6  
7 is also more explicit with regard to linkages between its elements, particularly with regard to  
8  
9 outcomes.  
10

11  
12 It is by integrating the what, who and how of practices that scholars can trace the links  
13  
14 between firm practices and heterogeneous firm performance. However, while economic  
15  
16 performance is one extremely important outcome, a practice perspective can also help us  
17  
18 understand other, often more proximate, outcomes. In particular, our model underlines potential  
19  
20 feedback effects on the practices themselves as well as on the actors and the way they enact the  
21  
22 practices. While the elements of this model are not new to the field – as they have been well-  
23  
24 documented through 20 years of strategy-as-practice research and related studies in the broader  
25  
26 strategic management field – the model does integrate the insights from practice research in a  
27  
28 manner that explicitly connects practices to performance.  
29  
30  
31  
32

33  
34 --- Insert Figure 1 about here --  
35

### 36 **What practices?**

37  
38 Our model is similar to Bromiley and Rau’s (2014) proposal in seeing practices as fundamental  
39  
40 to performance, but treats these practices differently in two key respects: in highlighting multiple  
41  
42 interdependencies between practices and in attending to non-standard, and especially new,  
43  
44 practices.  
45  
46

47  
48 Figure 1 highlights the potential for interdependency of effects between many practices  
49  
50 (Practice<sub>1</sub> to Practice<sub>n</sub>). Strategy research has long highlighted the importance of considering  
51  
52 complementarities in organizations (e.g., Teece, 1984, Whittington et al, 1999). This is equally  
53  
54 important in the domain of practices. The effects of a practice will vary according to the presence  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



1  
2  
3 or absence of other practices. Indeed, practice theory generally analyzes practices as “bundles”  
4 rather than singly (Nicolini, 2012; Seidl and Whittington, 2014). Pascale’s (1990) analysis of  
5 General Electric, while not explicitly a study of practices, highlights the kinds of  
6 interdependencies that are important. Here, he finds that the introduction of new strategic  
7 planning practices relied upon the strong financial and analytical practices that the company  
8 already had in place. Similarly, Mirabeau and Maguire (2014) show how practices of strategy  
9 articulation are entangled with mobilizing support, manipulating strategic context, and altering  
10 structural context. Moving beyond studies of isolated practices to investigate which practices are  
11 typically combined and how their interdependence shapes performance outcomes should avoid  
12 mis-attribution of the effects of any single practice.  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26

27 Further, it is important to understand not just existing “best” practices but the creation of  
28 new, non-standard strategy practices. As Ghemawat (2002) observes, the strategy field is  
29 particularly innovative in terms of practices. While there may be performance effects of the  
30 adoption of standard practices and techniques, practice innovations are potentially another source  
31 of competitive advantage. Strategy practices in particular are changing in contemporary  
32 conditions: for example, social media technologies are currently challenging old top-down  
33 strategic planning processes and generating new practices such as the strategy and innovation  
34 jams popularized by IBM (Bjelland and Wood, 2008; Whittington et al. 2011). With the decline  
35 of research on strategic planning practices (Ronda-Pupo and Guerras-Martin, 2012), such new  
36 practices are liable to be neglected.  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49

### 50 **Who engages in practices?**

51 An integrative practice perspective moves beyond practices to include the human actors who  
52 perform them (Feldman and Pentland, 2003; Feldman and Orlikowski, 2011; Whittington 2003).  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 As Figure 1 indicates, practices are strongly shaped by the practitioners who develop and  
4 advocate them. The specific characteristics of different types of practitioners – in terms of  
5  
6 cognitive traits (Powell et al., 2011), roles (Mantere, 2008) and organizational positions  
7  
8 (Balogun and Johnson, 2004) – will have strong implications for practice use in different firms.  
9  
10 This is consistent with Gavetti and Rivkin's (2007) insight that Internet company Lycos, an  
11  
12 organization dominated by engineers, had different strategy search practices to those of Yahoo,  
13  
14 an organization dominated by marketers.  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19

20 Accordingly, inferences about the relationships between practices and performance are  
21  
22 insecure if we do not account for the practitioners involved and the varying effects they can have  
23  
24 (Suddaby et al, 2013). The same practice may have different performance outcomes when  
25  
26 introduced by a prestigious consulting firm, by a powerful CEO or by a middle manager.  
27  
28 Similarly, strategy practitioners may be more or less successful in their use of particular  
29  
30 strategizing practices, according to their social skills and the contexts in which they operate  
31  
32 (Jarzabkowski, 2008).  
33  
34  
35

36 Our model also suggests certain feedback effects of the use of practices on practitioners  
37  
38 in terms of their identities, skills and career prospects. For example, Oakes, Townley, and  
39  
40 Cooper (1996) show how the introduction of planning practices in a new context can change  
41  
42 actors' professional identities, so altering their actions in successive planning episodes. Repeated  
43  
44 engagement in strategy-making may improve practitioners' skills, as they learn to perform their  
45  
46 practices more effectively (Jarzabkowski, 2008). And, some strategy practices, such as coalition  
47  
48 building around particular cognitive frames may enable some people who are quite low in an  
49  
50 organizational hierarchy to gain power and therefore shape strategic choice and action (Kaplan  
51  
52 2008; Lechner and Floyd 2012). Indeed, Mantere (2005) shows that the adaptability of practices  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 is critical in either enabling or disabling managerial attempts to influence strategy.  
4

### 5 **How are they practiced?**

6  
7  
8 As shown in Figure 1, how practices are enacted mediates between practices and outcomes. It is,  
9  
10 therefore, risky to consider practices without taking these dynamics into account. Gibbons and  
11  
12 Henderson (2013) warn that detailed observation in the field to elucidate what managers actually  
13  
14 do should be an essential complement to the Bloom and van Reenen (2010) tradition of survey  
15  
16 research on practices. The danger of superficial understandings of practices is one of  
17  
18 misattribution: espoused practices are held out as examples to imitate and adopt, when it is  
19  
20 improvisations and workarounds that are really making the practices work (e.g. Orlikowski,  
21  
22 1996). For example, the application of Total Quality Management (TQM) as a best practice has  
23  
24 been shown to vary both from its technical specifications and in its use across firms, leading to  
25  
26 varying attributions of success from practice adoption (Zbaracki, 1998; Kennedy and Fiss 2009).  
27  
28  
29  
30

31  
32 Practices are rarely blueprints that can simply be plugged into a context in unproblematic  
33  
34 ways, as their use will be shaped by practical adaptations associated with specific contexts or  
35  
36 practitioners' needs (Mantere, 2005; Seidl 2007). Moreover, close observation of practice  
37  
38 adaptation may reveal sources of potential practice innovation. If we move beyond views of  
39  
40 practices as largely transferred intact between contexts and actors, to understanding *how* those  
41  
42 practices are enacted locally in practice, often in ways that make them barely recognizable to  
43  
44 their originators, we may develop theories about the critical role of practice adaptation or even  
45  
46 practice transformation in generating performance outcomes (Jarzabkowski and Kaplan, 2015).  
47  
48  
49

### 50 **What are the outcomes?**

51  
52 Our model also would inform a wider approach to practice outcomes to allow us to consider not  
53  
54 just firm performance but also impacts on the practices themselves. That is, the enactment of  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 practices feeds back on those practices. For example, Fligstein's (1993) study shows how  
4  
5 adoption of practices of diversification and divisionalization by exemplar firms changes the stock  
6  
7 of legitimate practices in other firms' contexts, making them more likely to adopt these practices  
8  
9 in following periods. Given these self-reinforcing effects, new practices need particular scrutiny.  
10  
11 Strategy as a domain may be over-susceptible to novelty, thanks in part to consultants (McKenna  
12  
13 2012): market failures make it possible for specious or dangerous strategy practices to take hold,  
14  
15 as for example those surrounding the "dotcom" boom and bust (Ghemawat, 2002). New strategy  
16  
17 practices demand research, not only because they may be sources of advantage, but also because  
18  
19 they can quickly have damaging impacts upon the economy at large (March 2006).  
20  
21  
22  
23

24  
25 Close observation of practice enactment can also illuminate other outcomes salient to  
26  
27 both firms and individual practitioners (Jarzabkowski and Spee, 2009; Guérard et al. 2014). For  
28  
29 example, Kaplan (2011) shows how practices associated with working on PowerPoint documents  
30  
31 can shift who participates in strategy making by giving voice to people at different levels of the  
32  
33 hierarchy. Langley (1989) shows how strategic analysis practices not only assist in strategic  
34  
35 choices, but serve social and symbolic functions such as group cohesion and communications.  
36  
37 Which functions are served depends in part on how the strategic analysis practices are enacted.  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42

### 43 **RETHINKING STRATEGY FROM AN INTEGRATED PRACTICE PERSPECTIVE**

44  
45 To illustrate how the integrated practice perspective of our model can uncover surprising and  
46  
47 significant findings for strategic management, we point to recent research in leading journals that  
48  
49 helps rethink core strategy topics. For the purposes of illustration, we focus on insights for the  
50  
51 resource-based view, the gap between deliberate and emergent strategy, and the alignment  
52  
53 between corporate and business unit strategy. Each example attends to the what, who and how of  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 practices. In each case, we show how studies of strategy-as-practice call into question certain  
4 findings or suggest contextual or boundary conditions on what have been positioned as broad  
5 conclusions. We also highlight how in each case consideration of practices in isolation, as  
6  
7  
8 implied by Bromiley and Rau's (2014) "PBV", obscures important effects.  
9  
10  
11

### 12 **New ideas about the Resource-Based View**

13  
14  
15 The resource-based view of strategy assumes that initial conditions and path dependence lead to  
16 competitively distinctive capabilities across organizations (Barney, 1991; Peteraf, 1993; Amit  
17 and Schoemaker, 1993). Path dependence has traditionally been portrayed as a deterministic  
18 process (Stinchcombe, 1965) where changing paths is difficult (Dosi, 1982). By taking a practice  
19 perspective, however, Kaplan and Orlikowski (2013) demonstrate that it is possible to create new  
20 paths through attention to the temporal practices of strategy-making. By closely observing the  
21 daily practices of strategy makers, they find that the past is as much subject to interpretation as is  
22 the future. Their study concludes that forecasts that take an organization in a new direction are  
23 only possible to the extent that the organization's history is engaged in this new narrative. That  
24 is, the espoused practice for the organization was "forecasting," but the actual practice as enacted  
25 by strategy makers involved constructing strategic narratives. Thus, work to negotiate  
26 interpretations of the past, present and future shape the degree and direction of deviations from  
27 an original path. This research suggests that history matters but not in a purely deterministic way.  
28 Instead, when new projections of the future lead to reimagining the past, organizations can  
29 follow newly constructed paths. These findings offer insights into the degree to which resources  
30 and capabilities can be valuable, rare, inimitable and nonsubstitutable. For example, practices  
31 that were no longer valuable can become valuable again through new interpretations by actors  
32 that are constructed into new narratives about the future of the organization. That is, the how of  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 practice enactment transforms the what of the original practices.  
4

### 5 **Reconciliation of emergent and deliberate strategies**

6

7  
8 Many studies of strategy process portray it as an emergent pattern in a stream of actions  
9  
10 (Mintzberg and Waters, 1982; Brown and Eisenhardt, 1997). Yet there is substantial evidence  
11  
12 that organizations engage in deliberate strategy making, often through strategic planning  
13  
14 practices (Grant, 2003; Joseph and Ocasio, 2012; Menz and Sheef, 2014; Brews and Hunt 1999).  
15

16  
17 A practice perspective helps to see that this tension between deliberate planning practices and  
18  
19 emergent strategies represents a false dichotomy. In depth observations of practice show that  
20  
21 managers' different strategizing (Jarzabkowski, 2008), discursive (Rouleau and Balogun, 2011)  
22  
23 and legitimizing practices (Paroutis and Heracelous, 2013) advance deliberate strategies. Further,  
24  
25 managers adapt their supposedly deliberate intentions continuously in response to the strategies  
26  
27 that emerge from the autonomous actions of managers at multiple levels of the firm (Mirabeau  
28  
29 and Maguire, 2014). Thus, the tension between deliberate and emergent strategizing in the  
30  
31 literature exists because of assumptions that deliberate strategy practices, such as planning, are  
32  
33 enacted as formally described.  
34  
35  
36  
37

38  
39 By contrast, close study of strategy making as it happens shows how these practices are  
40  
41 in fact interpreted, manipulated, and improvised in many different ways by actors, according to  
42  
43 their social skill (Jarzabkowski, 2008; Paroutis and Heracleous, 2013), and their relative position  
44  
45 as in the organization (Balogun and Johnson, 2004; Mantere and Vaara, 2009; Rouleau and  
46  
47 Balogun, 2011). Hence, when we study the actual praxis of strategy making and widen the scope  
48  
49 of study beyond top managers, we see that strategy is neither deliberate nor emergent. Rather,  
50  
51 emergence involves continuous deliberation, in which who is doing the strategizing (e.g.  
52  
53 operational, middle or top managers) and how they do it, shapes the pattern that emerges in  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 distinctive ways. The association of formal strategic planning practices wholly with deliberate  
4 strategy is a misleading exaggeration.  
5  
6

### 7 **Rethinking the benefits of alignment between corporate and business unit strategy**

8  
9  
10 Strategic alignment of corporate and business unit strategies, particularly within the multi-  
11 divisional or multinational firm (Bouquet and Birkinshaw, 2008a; 2008b) is typically considered  
12 to be a desirable objective for firms. Hence, there has been considerable empirical focus on the  
13 relative effects of corporate or business unit influence on firm performance (McGahan and  
14 Porter, 1997) and examination of the structures that best enable such alignment (Collis et al.,  
15 2007; Joseph and Ocasio, 2008).  
16  
17

18  
19  
20 However, a practice perspective – in examining the interactions between managers at  
21 different levels of hierarchy and in different geographic regions – shows us that making  
22 alignment work on the ground involves a great deal of local adjustment that may deviate from  
23 corporate policies, albeit often in positive ways for the firm. For example, multi-level studies of  
24 managerial influence suggest that misalignment, far from being damaging, may be critical for  
25 preserving key strategic markets, branding and skills within business units (Balogun,  
26 Jarzabkowski and Vaara, 2011), generating strategic innovations that radically alter firm strategy  
27 (e.g., Regnér, 2003), and enabling firms to adjust to the complexities of delivering strategy in  
28 multiple contexts with diverse stakeholders (Rouleau and Balogun, 2011). Such findings run  
29 counter to the concepts of corporate control and strategic alignment that seek to understand how  
30 firms can perform consistently despite the complexity of the multiple contexts of their business  
31 units (Kreutzer et al., *forthcoming*; Luo and Park, 2001). Rather, an integrative practice  
32 perspective posits that perfect execution of alignment practices would actually be dysfunctional,  
33 while misalignments between the corporate center and divisions, with their associated conflicts,  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 may be important mechanisms for enhancing strategic performance.  
4  
5

6         The few studies referred to here only hint at the potential for an integrated practice  
7  
8 perspective to change the way we think about core areas of strategic management research. A  
9  
10 practice perspective can furnish insights into the who, what, and how of strategy-making,  
11  
12 bringing to the fore a wider range of actors than are typically studied in strategic management  
13  
14 research, and examining what practices they use, including their discourses, technologies, and  
15  
16 formal meeting structures, in order to explain how strategy is done. This can include not only  
17  
18 strategy formulation and change, but also how strategies emerge, how they are maintained, and  
19  
20 what constitutes success for different actors in these endeavors.  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

## 26 27 **CONCLUSION**

28  
29 This paper was motivated by a concern about the narrow focus on “best” practices in strategy  
30  
31 research as advocated by Bromiley and Rau (2014). Drawing on a recent stream of economics-  
32  
33 based studies by Bloom and colleagues on the distribution of standard practices across  
34  
35 organizations, industries, and countries (Bloom and Van Reenen 2007; 2010; Bloom et al. 2011,  
36  
37 2012), Bromiley and Rau have called for studies in strategic management to focus on the effect  
38  
39 of practices on firm performance. While we share their interest in practices, we warn against  
40  
41 Bromiley and Rau’s neglect of two decades of practice-theoretic and related research.  
42  
43  
44  
45

46         Indeed, their attempt to relate practices statistically to performance may be inherently  
47  
48 misguided and illusory for a variety of reasons, many of them raised by March and Sutton  
49  
50 (1997). The chain of causality is too long and dependent and independent “variables” are not  
51  
52 entirely separable (for example, achieving economic performance is a practice too). The practice-  
53  
54 theoretical perspective raised here shifts attention away from such variable-based reasoning,  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



1  
2  
3 highlighting entanglement and interdependence. Bromiley and Rau's (2014) elevation of  
4 practices above praxis and practitioners is thus liable to lead to faulty conclusions. Without an  
5 appreciation of the mutual dependence between the what, who and how, strategy research runs  
6 the risk of misattributing performance differentials and, as a consequence, offering misleading  
7 advice to strategy practitioners.  
8  
9


10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15 In conclusion, in this paper we offer a practice perspective on strategy that integrates  
16 insights from different practice approaches and related research from the broader strategic  
17 management field. We show how this integrated perspective can help rethink core strategy  
18 topics, and generate further research in these areas. By extending research to incorporate both a  
19 richer notion of interdependent practices and a more comprehensive attention to practitioners and  
20 their enactment of practices, scholars are more likely to come to robust conclusions regarding the  
21 efficacy of practices and their link to other outcomes. Our proposed integrative practice model  
22 will therefore aid scholars in generating more accurate and contextually-sensitive theories about  
23 the enactment and impact of practices and the critical factors shaping variation in both processes  
24 and outcomes.  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40

#### 41 **Acknowledgements**

42  
43 We would like to thank Ann Langley for her helpful comments on an earlier draft of this essay.  
44  
45  
46 The usual disclaimers apply.  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49

Figure 1: A Schematic Model of Strategy Practice



## REFERENCES

- 1  
2  
3  
4  
5 Amit, R. and Schoemaker, P.J. (1993) 'Strategic assets and organizational rent', *Strategic*  
6 *Management Journal*, 14(1): 33-46.
- 7 Balogun, J., Jarzabkowski, P. and Vaara, E. (2011) 'Selling, resistance and reconciliation: A  
8 critical discursive approach to subsidiary role evolution in MNEs', *Journal of International*  
9 *Business Studies* 42(6): 765-786.
- 10 Balogun, J. and Johnson, G. (2004) 'Organizational restructuring and middle manager  
11 sensemaking', *Academy of Management Journal*, 47(4): 523-549.
- 12 Barney, J. (1991) 'Firm resources and sustained competitive advantage', *Journal of Management*,  
13 17(1): 99-120.
- 14 Bjelland, O.M. and Wood, R.C. (2008) 'An inside view of IBM's "innovation jam"', *MIT Sloan*  
15 *Management Review*, 50(1): 32-40.
- 16 Bloom, N., Genakos, C., Sadun, R. and Van Reenen, J. (2012) 'Management practices across firms  
17 and countries', *Academy of Management Perspectives*, 26(1): 12-33.
- 18 Bloom, N. and Van Reenen, J. (2007) 'Measuring and Explaining Management Practices Across  
19 Firms and Countries', *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 122(4): 1341-1408.
- 20 Bloom, N. and Van Reenen, J. (2010) 'Why Do Management Practices Differ across Firms and  
21 Countries?' *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 24(1): 203-224.
- 22 Bloom, N., Eifert, B., Mahajan, A., McKenzie, D. and Roberts, J. (2011) 'Does Management  
23 Matter? Evidence from India'. NBER Working Paper No. 16658. Issued in January 2011
- 24 Bouquet, C. and Birkinshaw, J. (2008a) 'Weight versus voice: How foreign subsidiaries gain  
25 attention from corporate headquarters', *Academy of Management Journal*, 51(3): 577-601.
- 26 Bouquet, C. and Birkinshaw, J. (2008b) 'Managing power in the multinational corporation: How  
27 low-power actors gain influence', *Journal of Management*, 34(3): 477-508.
- 28 Brews, P.J. and Hunt, M.R. (1999) 'Learning to plan and planning to learn: resolving the planning  
29 school/learning school debate', *Strategic Management Journal*, 20(10): 889-913.
- 30 Bromiley, P. and Rau, D. (2014) 'Towards a practice-based view of strategy', *Strategic*  
31 *Management Journal*, 35(8): 1249-1256
- 32 Brown, S.L. and Eisenhardt, K.M. (1997) 'The art of continuous change: Linking complexity  
33 theory and time-paced evolution in relentlessly shifting organizations', *Administrative*  
34 *Science Quarterly*, 42(1): 1-34.
- 35 Collis, D., Young, D. and Goold, M. (2007) 'The size, structure, and performance of corporate  
36 headquarters', *Strategic Management Journal*, 28(4): 383-405.
- 37 Dosi, G. (1982) 'Technological paradigms and technological trajectories: A suggested  
38 interpretation of the determinants and directions of technical change', *Research Policy*,  
39 11(3):147-162.
- 40 Dutta, S., Zbaracki, M.J. and Bergen, M. (2003) 'Pricing process as a capability: A resource-based  
41 perspective', *Strategic Management Journal*, 24(7): 615-630.
- 42 Feldman, M.S. and Orlikowski, W.J. (2011) 'Theorizing practice and practicing theory',  
43 *Organization Science*, 22(5): 1240-1253.
- 44 Feldman, M.S. and Pentland, B.T. (2003) 'Reconceptualizing organizational routines as a source of  
45 flexibility and change', *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 48(1): 94-118.
- 46 Fiss, P.C. and Zajac, E.J. (2004) 'The diffusion of ideas over contested terrain: The (non) adoption  
47 of a shareholder value orientation among German firms', *Administrative Science*  
48 *Quarterly*, 49(4): 501-534.
- 49 Fligstein, N. (1993) *The transformation of corporate control*. Harvard University Press:  
50 Cambridge, MASS.
- 51 Floyd, S.W. and Lane, P.J. (2000) 'Strategizing throughout the organization: Managing role  
52 conflict in strategic renewal,' *Academy of Management Review*, 25(1): 154-177.
- 53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

- 1  
2  
3 Gavetti, G. and Rivkin, J.W. (2007) 'On the origin of strategy: Action and cognition over  
4 time', *Organization Science*, 18(3): 420-439.
- 5 Guérard, S., Langley, A. and Seidl, D. (2014) 'Rethinking the concept of performance in Strategy  
6 Research: Towards a performativity perspective', *M@n@gement*, 16(5): 566-578.
- 7 Ghemawat, P. (2002) 'Competition and business strategy in historical perspective,' *Business  
8 History Review*, 76(1): 37-74.
- 9  
10 Gibbons, R. and Henderson, R. (2013) 'What Do Managers Do? Exploring Persistent Performance  
11 Differences among Seemingly Similar Enterprises', in R. Gibbons and J. Roberts (eds.) *The  
12 Handbook of Organizational Economics*, pp. 680-731. Princeton NJ: Princeton University  
13 Press.
- 14 Golsorkhi, D., Rouleau, L., Seidl, D. and Vaara, E. (eds.) (2015) *The Cambridge Handbook on  
15 Strategy as Practice*. Second edition. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- 16 Grant, R.M. (2003) 'Strategic planning in a turbulent environment: evidence from the oil  
17 majors', *Strategic Management Journal*, 24(6): 491-517.
- 18 Jarzabkowski, P. (2008) 'Shaping strategy as a structuration process', *Academy of Management  
19 Journal*, 51(4): 621-650.
- 20  
21 Jarzabkowski, P., Balogun, J. and Seidl, D. (2007) 'Strategizing: The challenges of a practice  
22 perspective', *Human Relations*, 60(1): 5-27.
- 23 Jarzabkowski, P. and Kaplan, S. (2015) 'Strategy tools-in-use: A framework for understanding  
24 "technologies of rationality" in practice', *Strategic Management Journal*, 36(4), 537-558.
- 25 Jarzabkowski, P. and Spee, P.A. (2009) 'Strategy-as-practice: A review and future directions for  
26 the field', *International Journal of Management Reviews*, 11(1), 69-95.
- 27 Joseph, J. and Ocasio, W. (2012) 'Architecture, attention, and adaptation in the multibusiness firm:  
28 General electric from 1951 to 2001', *Strategic Management Journal*, 33(6): 633-660.
- 29 Kaplan, S. (2008) 'Framing contests: Strategy making under uncertainty', *Organization Science*,  
30 19(5): 729-752.
- 31  
32 Kaplan, S. (2011) 'Strategy and PowerPoint: An inquiry into the epistemic culture and machinery  
33 of strategy making', *Organization Science*, 22(2): 320-346.
- 34 Kaplan, S. and Orlikowski, W.J. (2013) 'Temporal work in strategy making', *Organization  
35 Science*, 24(4): 965-995.
- 36 Kennedy, M.T. and Fiss, P.C. (2009) 'Institutionalization, framing, and diffusion: The logic of  
37 TQM adoption and implementation decisions among US hospitals', *Academy of Management  
38 Journal*, 52(5): 897-918.
- 39  
40 Knott, A.M. (2003) 'The organizational routines factor market paradox', *Strategic Management  
41 Journal*, 24(10): 929-943.
- 42 Kreutzer, M., Walter, J. and Cardinal, L.B. (forthcoming) 'Organizational control as antidote to  
43 politics in the pursuit of strategic initiatives', *Strategic Management Journal*.
- 44 Langley, A. (1989) 'In search of rationality: The purposes behind the use of formal analysis in  
45 organizations', *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 34(4): 598-631.
- 46 Lechner, C. and Floyd, S.W. (2012) 'Group influence activities and the performance of strategic  
47 initiatives', *Strategic Management Journal*, 33(5): 478-495.
- 48 Lozeau, D., Langley, A., Denis, J.L. (2002) 'The corruption of managerial techniques by  
49 organizations', *Human Relations*, 55(5): 537-564.
- 50 Luo, Y. and Park, S.H. (2001) 'Strategic alignment and performance of market-seeking MNCs in  
51 China', *Strategic Management Journal*, 22(2): 141-155.
- 52 Mantere, S. (2005) 'Strategic practices as enablers and disablers of championing activity', *Strategic  
53 Organization*, 3(2): 157-184.
- 54 Mantere, S. (2008) 'Role expectations and middle manager strategic agency', *Journal of  
55 Management Studies*, 45(2): 294-316.
- 56  
57 Mantere, S. and Vaara, E. (2008) 'On the problem of participation in strategy: A critical discursive  
58  
59  
60

- perspective', *Organization Science*, 19(2): 341-358.
- March, J.G. (2006) 'Rationality, foolishness, and adaptive intelligence', *Strategic Management Journal*, 27(3): 201-214.
- March, J. G., & Sutton, R. I. (1997). 'Crossroads-organizational performance as a dependent variable'. *Organization science*, 8(6): 698-706.
- McGahan, A.M. and Porter, M.E. (1997) 'How much does industry matter, really?', *Strategic Management Journal*, Summer Special Issue 18: 15–30.
- McKenna, C. (2012) 'Strategy followed structure: Management consulting and the creation of a market for "strategy," 1950–2000', *Advances in Strategic Management*, 29: 153-186.
- Menz, M. and Scheef, C. (2014) 'Chief strategy officers: Contingency analysis of their presence in top management teams', *Strategic Management Journal*, 35(3): 461-471.
- Mintzberg, H. and Waters, J.A. (1985) 'Of strategies, deliberate and emergent', *Strategic Management Journal*, 6(3): 257-272.
- Mirabeau, L. and Maguire, S. (2014) 'From autonomous strategic behavior to emergent strategy', *Strategic Management Journal*, 35(8): 1202–1229.
- Nicolini, D. (2012) *Practice theory, work, and organization: An introduction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Oakes, L.S., Townley, B. and Cooper, D.J. (1998) 'Business planning as pedagogy: Language and control in a changing institutional field', *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 43(2): 257-292.
- Orlikowski, W.J. (1996) 'Improvising organizational transformation over time: A situated change perspective', *Information systems research*, 7(1): 63-92.
- Paroutis, S. and Heracleous, L. (2013) 'Discourse revisited: Dimensions and employment of first-order strategy discourse during institutional adoption', *Strategic Management Journal*, 34(8): 935-956.
- Pascale, R.T. (1990) *Managing on the Edge: How Successful Companies Use Conflict to Stay Ahead*. London: Viking.
- Peteraf, M.A. (1993) 'The cornerstones of competitive advantage: A resource-based view', *Strategic Management Journal*, 14(3): 179-191.
- Powell, T.C., Lovallo, D. and Fox, C.R. (2011) 'Behavioral strategy', *Strategic Management Journal*, 32(13): 1369-1386.
- Regnér, P. (2003) 'Strategy creation in the periphery: Inductive versus deductive strategy making', *Journal of Management Studies*, 40(1): 57–82.
- Ronda-Pupo, G.A. and Guerras-Martin, L.A. (2012) 'Dynamics of the evolution of the strategy concept 1962–2008: a co-word analysis', *Strategic Management Journal*, 33(2): 162–188.
- Rouleau, L. and Balogun, J. (2011) 'Middle managers, strategic sensemaking, and discursive competence', *Journal of Management Studies*, 48(5): 953-983.
- Schatzki, T.R., Knorr-Cetina, K. and von Savigny, E. (eds.) (2001) *The Practice Turn in Contemporary Theory*. London: Routledge.
- Seidl, D. (2007) 'General strategy concepts and the ecology of strategy discourses: A systemic-discursive perspective', *Organization Studies*, 28(2): 197-218.
- Seidl, D. and Whittington, R. (2014) 'Enlarging the strategy-as-practice research agenda: Towards taller and flatter ontologies', *Organization Studies*, 35(10): 1407-1421.
- Stinchcombe, A.L. (1965) 'Social structure and organizations', in J.G. March (ed.) *The Handbook of Organizations*, pp. 142–193. Chicago: Rand McNally.
- Suddaby, R., Seidl, D. and Lê, J.K. (2013) 'Strategy-as-practice meets neo-institutional theory', *Strategic Organization*, 11(3): 329-344.
- Teece, D. J. (1984). Economic Analysis and Strategic Management. *California Management Review*, 26(3), 87-110
- Whittington, R. (2003) 'The work of strategizing and organizing: for a practice perspective', *Strategic Organization*, 1(1): 117-125.

- 1  
2  
3 Whittington, R. (2006) 'Completing the practice turn in strategy research', *Organization Studies*,  
4 27(5): 613-634.  
5 Whittington, R, Caillaud, L. and Yakis-Douglas, B. (2011) 'Opening strategy: Evolution of a  
6 precarious profession', *British Journal of Management*, 22(3): 531-544.  
7 Whittington, R., Pettigrew, A., Peck, S., Fenton, E., & Conyon, M. (1999). Change and  
8 complementarities in the new competitive landscape: a European panel study, 1992–1996.  
9 *Organization Science*, 10(5), 583-600.  
10 Zbaracki. M.J. (1998) 'The rhetoric and reality of total quality management', *Administrative*  
11 *Science Quarterly*, 43(3): 602-636.  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

For Peer Review

**Paula Jarzabkowski**

Paula Jarzabkowski is a Professor of Strategic Management at Cass Business School, City University London. Her research focuses on strategy-as-practice in complex and pluralistic contexts such as regulated infrastructure firms, third sector organizations and financial services, particularly insurance and reinsurance. She has conducted extensive, internationally comparative audio and video ethnographic studies in a range of business contexts. Her work has appeared in leading journals including *Academy of Management Journal*, *Organization Science*, and *Strategic Management Journal*. Her first book, *Strategy as Practice: An Activity-Based Approach* was published by Sage in 2005 and her most recent book, *Making a Market for Acts of God*, was published by Oxford University Press in 2015.

**Sarah Kaplan**

Sarah Kaplan is Professor of Strategic Management at the Rotman School of Management, University of Toronto and Senior Fellow at the Wharton School, University of Pennsylvania. Her research explores how organizations participate in and respond to the emergence of new fields and technologies, with a particular focus on the role of interpretive practices. Her studies examine biotechnology, communications, financial services, nanotechnology and most recently, the field emerging at the nexus of gender and finance. She is author of the bestselling business book, *Creative Destruction*.

**David Seidl**

David Seidl is Professor of Organization and Management at the University of Zurich and Research Associate at the Centre for Business Research (CBR) at Cambridge University. Current research interests include strategy as practice, inter-organizational collaboration, dynamics of standardization, management consulting, and philosophy of science, on which he has published widely in leading organization and management journals. He has (co-)authored and (co-)edited several books and Special Issues, including the *Cambridge Handbook of Strategy as Practice*, which has just appeared in its second edition.

**Richard Whittington**

Richard Whittington is Professor of Strategic Management at the Saïd Business School and Millman Fellow at New College, University of Oxford. His principle current research interests are strategy as practice and ‘open strategy’, and he is working on a book on the evolution of strategy as a profession. He is an associate editor of the *Strategic Management Journal*, where he is currently co-editing a special issue on Strategy Process and Practice. He is author, co-author or co-editor of nine books, including the leading textbook *Exploring Strategy*, now in its tenth edition.