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TWO GOOD TURNS? THE NATURE OF THE “PRACTICE TURN” VS THE RISE OF “PERFORMANCE” IN STRATEGY RESEARCH

ABSTRACT: Numerous authors have described and welcomed a ‘practice turn in strategy’. While aspects of this have been critiqued, even the critics reinforce the assumption that this turn has experienced “prodigious growth” and that “the energy and vibrancy […] is impressive” (Carter, Clegg and Kornberger 2008b: 108, 107). We utilize a series of text-mining techniques to survey if such a turn is actually happening, and if so, its extent and what exactly this might mean. In so doing, our research illuminates a far more significant turn – toward ‘performance’ – a temporal turn from what leads to a good strategy to how particular strategies lead to good outcomes. This could have substantial implications for our field, which strategy as practice might usefully counter.
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Over the past 15 years, a number of articles have highlighted a “practice turn” in strategy research. The primary author in this regard is Richard Whittington (1996), where he set an agenda for “strategy as practice”. Here Whittington hoped to “claim some space” for an emerging practice approach, which he argued, “draws on many of the insights of the process school [which he associated with the work of Pettigrew (1985) and Johnson (1987)], but returns to the managerial level [and] how strategists ‘strategize’.” (p. 732). A subsequent essay (Whittington, 2003) was recognized with a So!what award from Strategic Organization. Ten years after setting the agenda, in “Completing the Practice Turn in Strategy Research”, Whittington (2006a) was able to report that the practice turn was well underway and write about it in the past tense, as a distinctive “shift in our conception of strategy”: a shift that, while by no means complete, was already raising new and significant challenges. Later that year, Whittington described strategy as practice as “flourishing, theoretically and empirically” (Whittington 2006b: 1905).

In between, and since, a number of other contributions have joined the quest promoting the strategy as practice (s-as-p) perspective (e.g., Balogun et al. 2007; Cailluet & Whittington 2008; Jarzabkowski 2003; Johnson et al., 2003; Whittington 2003, 2004, 2007; Whittington et al. 2006; Wilson & Jarzabkowski 2004; see Jarzabkowski et al., 2007 for a comprehensive review). By 2009, s-as-p was described as “a rapidly growing body of research” (Jarzabkowski & Spee 2009: 69). These articles, special issues of journals, and books sought to further define what strategy as practice was (and how it was different from...
other ‘turns’), partly to outline how it was already happening, and partly to advocate for its continuation.

However, the strategy as practice ‘movement’ is not without its critics and debates. Antonacopoulou (2009) questions s-as-p’s singular focus on what is done by managers rather than how they think or relate, and the movement’s lack of clarity with regard to what, exactly, is meant by practice. Carter et al. (2008a) similarly criticize s-as-p proponents for using the concept of practice in a confusing and contradictory way. They also critique it for not being robust (sociologically or philosophically); not being new (indeed for being conservative and even old-fashioned); and for being naïvely unaware of the well-established traditions that they are ‘discovering’, not only in sociology but also in management, where they are increasingly ambiguous or silent about precursors such as Mintzberg and other process school scholars.

Chia and MacKay (2007) are critical of s-as-p’s individualist bias, rather than appreciating that strategy can emerge trans-individuals or in relations. Ezzamel and Willmott (2004) see the practice turn as a retrograde step back from earlier processual work, because of its detached observation of strategy’s details leading it to have less sensitivity to the power and politics. Hodgkinson and Wright (2006) find fault (and irony) in s-a-p’s calls to get closer to the actual doing of strategy, while s-as-p itself creates the straw men to oppose this via secondary analysis of extant scholarly accounts. Tsoukas (2009), while hopeful of progress, admits that it is still not clear how s-as-p research differs from its process cousins and also sees it lacking a clear onto-epistemological grounding. While these critiques hold validity (and our findings may further illuminate them), the critique we present is slightly different and perhaps more fundamental.

One aspect of the practice turn in strategy research that even the critics do not question is whether, in fact, it is actually happening. Hoffman (2004: 213) argues that strategy researchers had connected to the world of managers in ways that organizational theory scholars had not. Carter et al. (2008a: 85, 84) claim that s-as-p has been “extraordinarily successful in constructing and establishing a field”; has “institutionalized itself quickly and effectively”; and is now “moving from institutionalization to consolidation”.
Antonacopoulou (2009: 115) sees it as now “dominant[ing] the debate in strategy research”. We set out to explicitly examine this assumption by exploring whether the practice turn is actually happening broadly across strategy research, where it is or where it is not happening (and to what extent), what this practice turn may actually mean, and how it might be similar to or different from other turns. We believe that such a line of questioning may not only illuminate the nature of the practice turn but also provide some interesting insights into which way the field of strategy research, more broadly, may be pointing.

**METHODOLOGY**

To address the questions raised above, it was necessary to generate a detailed dataset that captures key aspects of strategic management research over the last 30+ years. The existence of a ‘turn’ involves a comparison between more recent emphases within research articles and historical emphases. While some previous retrospective studies of strategy have taken a qualitative or interpretive approach (e.g., Bowman et al. 2002; Herrmann 2005; Hoskisson et al. 1999), consideration of an s-as-p turn has already been assessed in such a manner (e.g., Antonacopoulou 2009). Thus, our analysis sought to generate quantitative data to provide a clearer picture of the extent and nature of any changes in strategy research over time.

**Sample**

Our first decision involved determining which journals to include. Macmillan (1991) reported that the five most respected outlets for strategy research were *Strategic Management Journal* [SMJ], *Academy of Management Journal*, *Administrative Science Quarterly*, *Academy of Management Review* and *Harvard Business Review*. However, given that much of the published s-as-p research is by European researchers, it was important to also include a prominent European strategy journal. Thus, *Long Range Planning* [LRP] was added, as it was both the longest running strategy journal and also the journal that published Whittington’s original effort to claim space. Retrospective comparisons to assess trends, though, require that sufficient articles have been published across the relevant time periods. While SMJ and LRP only publish articles with a strategy focus, the other leading journals also publish non-strategy-related research.
In some time periods, even if article counts were combined across several journals, the total number of articles with strategy or strategic in the title/abstract was relatively small (e.g., less than 15 articles in a 4-year period for AMJ, AMR and ASQ). This meant that percentages for these journals were easily skewed by the presence of focal concepts in 1 or 2 articles or a special issue. The issue of sufficient data also occurred with respect to more recently established journals (such as Organization Science or Strategic Organization) as their coverage does not allow detailed assessment of a turn. Thus, while our analysis started with the consideration of six leading strategy journals (Macmillan’s five + LRP), the final analysis is restricted to a comparison of SMJ and LRP (see Table 1 for example articles). This, though, did provide a useful contrast between two longstanding scholarly strategy journals, with “strong citation performance” (Azar & Brock 2008: 794), based in both the North American and European strategy communities.

**Data and Analytical Approaches**

Even for only SMJ and LRP, the task of analyzing all articles published in their entirety (millions of words from thousands of articles) would require extensive historical full text access, be very resource intensive, could elevate more minor themes that are mentioned briefly in sufficient articles, and demand an extremely high level of consistency for how practice-related concepts are identified throughout. Analyzing the full text was thus deemed impracticable. At the other extreme, while authors typically craft the titles carefully, they allow limited scope to convey ideas and interrelationships in a complex manner.

Thus, we extracted the abstract for each article and combined these with the title to form the base unit for our analysis using the text-mining software Leximancer™ (www.leximancer.com). After downloading using EndNote (www.endnote.com), extraneous data such as publisher information, journal title, page numbers and keywords were removed, so that only the words in the title and abstract were analyzed as a separate block for each article. The initial analysis involved determining the key terms related to s-as-p that occurred most frequently and how their occurrence may have changed over time. A set of key concepts was identified by drawing on discussions by both proponents and critics of s-as-p (see Analysis
section). These were tracked across 4-year time periods to allow broader trends to be discerned rather than yearly variations, covering the entire 40 years of LRP articles (1969-2008) and 1981-2008 for SMJ (1980 were not included). The relative counts reported were calculated using Leximancer and reflect the proportion of combined titles/abstracts in each 4-year period that include a term related to a key concept at least once. Thus, the count is not skewed by a concept appearing multiple times in any single title/abstract.

The emphasis reflected in the repeated use of concepts within abstracts was, though, utilized in the subsequent analyses. The Leximancer software, a text-mining tool, made it possible to consider how particular concepts are used in titles and abstracts in proximity to other concepts. It can analyze the large textual documents and provides a method for transforming lexical co-occurrence information from natural language into semantic patterns (Smith & Humphreys 2006). Our analysis was seeded using keywords relating to s-as-p. Relationships between concepts are identified based on their relative frequency and co-occurrence within the texts, then displayed visually via a concept map where proximity depicts co-occurrence of concepts across adjacent sentences. Circles indicate themes that summarize closely-related concepts that appear in similar parts of a map, with shading/colours indicating frequency of occurrence. Repeating the analysis allowed us to see how the maps for key concepts varied over time. The software also provides numerical measures of co-occurrence that were plotted using radar charts.

While Leximancer provides a useful method for summarizing the co-occurrence of concepts, both the aggregation of terms (such as having practice to refer to 'practice, practiced, practician, practicing, practices, practise, practiser, practitioner, practitioners, and practiceless') and the difficulty for the software to distinguish between subtle differences in uses of the terms (e.g., experience may refer to ‘managerial experience’ or the ‘experience curve’) potentially impact its automated processing and concept mapping. This represented a further reason for restricting the analysis to 4-year blocks for the two prominent strategy journals, where such limitations and biasing effects were less likely to have a substantial influence because of the higher number of titles/abstracts being compared.
ANALYSIS

Without exception, critics of the s-as-p turn point to a worrying degree of ambiguity about what practice is being taken to mean (e.g., Carter et al. 2008a: 89: “practice [appears to] mean anything: from routine, to event, from becoming, to structuration theory, from learning in macro-contexts […] becoming a concept that can explain almost everything.” Put another way, if s-as-p is almost everything, it would be difficult to relate it to any sort of turn. Our investigations also highlighted this but recognized that this ambiguity was not always so – suggesting that s-as-p’s proponents consider which things that are not practice.

Original definitions of strategy as practice

Whittington’s original paper was graphically clear in this respect. Figure 1, from that paper, unambiguously delineates the key concepts: strategy as practice is different from planning and policy approaches in its concern for how strategy is done as opposed to where it is done, and different from the process approach in taking managers rather than the organization as its ‘unit of analysis’. “[T]he practice perspective is concerned with managerial activity, how managers ‘do strategy’” (Whittington 1996: 732).

Our first assessment, therefore, was to track the usage of the words planning, policy, process and practice in our title/abstract datasets of our two representative journals. The resulting graph for LRP (Figure 2) does indeed seem to indicate a practice turn. Planning is seen to fall away dramatically; policy, never as prominent, declines less dramatically (the spike in both planning and policy in 2005-2008 comes largely from retrospective pieces or critiques of planning). The rise of process is steady but substantial. The rise of practice is more dramatic, but in total percentage remains below process. Certainly there has been a turn in LRP toward those words that Whittington associated with the how of strategy, or what we might call strategizing as a verb rather than strategy as a noun. However, the picture for SMJ, with regard to a practice turn, is less straightforward (see Figure 3). A reduced focus on planning and policy is remarkably similar, but process is also in decline, from levels only seen in LRP in recent years. Practice basically holds its own at a relatively low frequency.
In summary, using the language of Whittington’s framework, there is definitely a turn away from where strategy comes from (the planning and policy) in both LRP (European) and SMJ (North American) strategy research. But there are two different types of strategy as practice turn in evidence – a turn in LRP toward practice and process and a turn in SMJ away from these as well. Perhaps, however, this is a question of terminology? Given that practice and process seem to now be European emphases, the phenomenon they relate to may be associated with synonyms in more American-oriented fora like SMJ? As a consequence, we went back to the s-as-p literature to see if we could, despite the ambiguity noted, develop a broader definition or sets of associate words to represent what strategy as practice addresses.

A broader definition of practice concerns

Despite a number of attempts to mark s-as-p out as different from process approaches to strategy (often to counter accusations of the two seeming very similar), it is clear that their intersection is likely greater than the distinction. From the recent description on the s-as-p website (“What we are agreed upon is the importance of a focus on the processes and practices constituting the everyday activities of organizational life and relating to strategic outcomes”: www.s-as-p.org, Dec. 2009) to Jarzabkowski and Balogun’s (2009: 1255) combination of the “processes of strategy making and strategy as practice”, it seems that how processes influence strategy has been acknowledged as a key component of s-as-p.

Similarly, s-as-p appears concerned with both organization and organizational life or how people organize (e.g., Johnson et al. 2003: 3 calling for an emphasis on the “day-to-day [or micro] activities of organizational life […] which relate to strategic outcomes”). Wilson and Jarzabkowski (2004: 15) write of an emerging activity-based view of strategy, augmenting s-as-p’s focus on the activities of individual managers or people or practitioners inside organizational processes in strategy development (Whittington 1996, 2003, 2006a; Whittington et al 2006). Jarzabkowski (2003:23-24), preferring the term actors, explains that “practice scholars examine the way that actors interact with the social and physical features of context in the everyday activities that constitute practice… [and] practices are those habits, artifacts,
and socially defined modes of acting through which the stream of strategic activity is constructed.” This seems to link s-as-p closely to the social, to culture and to structure. Relatedly, Jarzabkowski (2004: 83ff, 8) emphasises how strategy in practice, as done by practitioners, is “structurally embedded”, with practitioners as “social individuals, interacting with social circumstances” (Jarzabkowski, 2004: 8). The concern with culture, structure and indeed organization is in keeping with Whittington’s call to see s-as-p as an embedded or “situated, concrete activity” (Whittington 2003: 119), a “flow of activities” (Jarzabkowski & Whittington 2008b: 282), or a “situated, socially accomplished activity” (Jarzabkowski 2009: 70), and are in keeping with s-as-p drawing on the “sociological eye” (Whittington 2007).

As a result, we surveyed our data sets for the use of these ten terms: practice, process, organization, managers, people, activities, actors, social, culture and structure. We then had to count several words out. Activities, people, managers, actors, and social were all either cited at too low a frequency or were used with a degree of ambiguity that could not readily be accounted for and separated out. This left us with five practice-related terms to track over time: practice (and its variants, such as practices); process (+ variants, such as processes); organization (+ variants, such as organize, organizing etc. and its different spellings – e.g., organisation); structure (+ structural); and culture. All five are trending upward in LRP to such an extent that would indicate a significant practice turn (see Figure 4). However, apart from practice and culture (which have seen modest rises) the other terms are showing a significant down-turn in SMJ (see Figure 5). This reinforced our early finding that there may in fact be two practice turns in strategy research – an up-turn for European-oriented researchers and a down-turn with the American-oriented researchers.

**Been there, done that?**

One response to these figures (particularly given SMJ’s higher emphasis on ‘practice’ before Whittington's (1996) call) might be to suggest that SMJ was already dealing with practice issues before the Europeans even recognized it as important. Had SMJ worked through and ‘done practice’, enabling it to move on? On the surface, perhaps. A concept map of key terms in SMJ prior to 1995 (Figure 6) shows
that aggregated practice terms in early SMJ articles are closely related to the major theme of strategy (even more so than in the map for LRP – not included here). Practice is highlighted in green within the circle themed 'strategy', indicating that the practice terms appear in close proximity to 'strategy' terms in the titles and abstracts published in SMJ – co-occurring more frequently than either 'policy' or 'plan'.

Practice also appears in close proximity to the type of things that the s-as-p literature should, we might think, be interested in: systems, context, social, change.

But if one looks deeper, using Leximancer’s numerical measures of association to explore the relationships between the practice terms and other key terms, one can see marked differences between views of practice in strategy in these two fora, differences that would back up the claims of something of an s-as-p turn in recent times. Figures 7-9 shows the concepts that are related to practice in strategy research in SMJ and LRP in the years 1981-1995/2001-2008 at a rate of above 5% (removing the obvious and prominent association to the term ‘strategy’). Contrasting these reveals that practice is related to quite different aspects of strategic management – to ‘de-personalized’ aspects of strategy (SMJ pre-1995) that s-as-p is not primarily interested in: performance, industry, results, competition, market, plan, corporate, product, ...; the social or inter-human and human context activity (LRP after 2001): change, creativity, knowledge, leadership, learning, context, networks, ...; yet converging somewhat (SMJ after 2001): with aspects such as learning, knowledge, alliances, resources and capabilities coming into, or moving higher in, the mix. While the language remains more American than Anglo, these are terms that point to a growing awareness of social/inter-personal and intra-contextual influences on strategy (see Chia & MacKay 2007). It might, thus, be possible to develop a more global view of what a practice turn in strategy might involve (to perhaps counter the notion that s-as-p might be just a European dalliance), that is, one that emphasizes the types of activities that might interest a sociologist or anthropologist when they reflect upon practice.
DISCUSSION

*Never mind the practice turn, what about performance?*

There may, however, be something more pressing that springs out from these diagrams. What remains unexplored in our reflections upon the data presented in Figures 2 and 3, charting the rise of practice and process in LRP, contrasted with the decline of Whittington's 4P's in SMJ, raises the question of what might be taking its place. Figures 7 and 9 point to a possible answer: performance. While we intuitively recognized that performance would be an increasing concern, we were surprised at the rate and extent of its turn (see Figure 10), becoming as ubiquitous as strategy in SMJ research (in 80% of all titles/abstracts). We also found that the rise of performance could not be accounted for by shifts in language. Possible synonyms, like productivity and profitability, showed no significant upswing or downswing across SMJ's history and emphasize outcomes/results broadly. While not as dramatic or as frequency in LRP, its rise does still appear to be significant. In fact, the increase in LRP is more substantial than the concurrent rise of the aggregate of terms we tracked related to practice (practice, process, organization, structure, culture).

The inclusion of performance exhibits a similar rise in the abstracts of AMJ, AMR, and ASQ from low levels in the 1970s to over 50% of strategy articles by the mid 1990s. Thus, it may be that ‘performance’ is the new ‘planning’ in strategy research, which used to dominate abstracts in LRP and SMJ.

Whatever we may think or say about a practice turn in strategy research, there is a far more significant and widespread turn that we should be discussing. This is not so much a turn away from looking more specifically at one set of strategy elements or another, but a temporal shift: a subtle turn away from investigating what leads to a good strategy toward how particular elements and strategies lead to good outcomes. The term ‘performance’ brings forth an emphasis on tangible outcomes and perhaps also assumptions of examining and establishing direct linkages from actions to results. Overall, this turn raises some interesting questions that may impact the future health of strategy research: questions that the s-a-p movement may fruitfully become central actors in debating.
Implications: Do the strategy-as-practice and performance turns deserve another?

Our analysis revealed a sharp turn away from the traditional ‘contents’ of strategy, such as plans and policies. However, we can find only partial quantitative evidence of a widespread practice ‘turn’ in strategy research, even when multiple related terms are included. Even in LRP, it has been a steady climb rather than a turn and appears rather minor, however, when compared to the extraordinary performance turn across all strategy research (from 1 in 4 articles to 4 out of 5 referring to performance in SMJ). And while this temporal shift may seem uncontroversial, this altering eye has the potential to alter all.

Any practice turn would appear to be being overrun by a view that assesses everything in strategy research temporally. Even s-as-p researchers now seem to following the move toward performance. Recent updates of the s-as-p website (as at December 2009) claim that “we share with traditional strategy research a concern for firm performance”. The temporal shift implied by this turn may be illustrated by developing Whittington’s 1996 diagram (see Figure 11). Instead of strategy research looking at how practice (or process or planning or policy or anything else for that matter) leads to strategy, strategy research appears to now be looking backward from performance, focusing on how strategies lead to good performance.

Given this, the lack of evidence for a practice ‘turn’, and the practical difficulty of separating practice out from process or the resource-based view of the firm or research into dynamic capabilities, it may be better now to think of s-as-p as ontologically additive rather than a turn, in and of itself, undermining or replacing other dimensions that might contribute to better strategies and better performance. It may just be part of an increasing awareness of a multiplicity of contributing aspects to strategy development (e.g., Mintzberg et al. 1999). This shift toward performance may be a good thing (why should strategy research be of any value unless it looks at how particular strategies contribute to performance?). But, on reflection, we would suggest that it might not be so if this essentially involves equating strategy and performance.

The implied objectivity and causality when performance is given such a guiding role takes strategy research closer toward the model of a predictive natural or normal science. This is problematic. One thing
that sets the study of human behaviour apart is that the subject and the object are the same being, they can reflect on and change one another. As Carr (1961: 70-1) noted long ago, human or social history “rarely repeats itself among historically conscious people [because] the dramatis personae are aware at the second performance of the denouement of the first, and their action is affected by that knowledge”. For example, increasing awareness of Nike’s excellent performance in the early 1990s changed the way that consumers and other stakeholders related to the corporation. Similarly, as awareness of best practice becomes more prevalent in an industry, consumers moderate their behaviour and the result is declining margins across that industry (Nattermann, 2000). Leading firms in dynamic and competitive markets cannot (by definition) lead by following what other firms have been shown to do already (Barney, 2001; Godin, 2003). Employees encouraged to follow ‘best practice’ can become demotivated, desensitized and deskilled (Bilton and Cummings, 2010). This rising performativity should be questioned.

The potentially negative or questionable effects that such a focus on performance might have on strategy may not be seen if the human-interactive or social elements are taken out of strategy. But they certainly could be analyzed through a sociological, anthropological, historical or philosophical eye. An s-as-p perspective and its insights can help deliver such approaches further into the mainstream of strategy. S-as-p can be a foil for the performance turn, a foil that could avoid strategy from falling into a ‘performance trap’, where every relationship is judged primarily on the performance effect that it has previously created. This would, though, require doing two things. The first is relaxing s-as-p’s ontological stance. Defending the fateful lines drawn between managers and organizations is fraught with difficulty and adds little value. Second, s-as-p probably needs to embrace and utilize its critics, who generally see potential in the perspective it could bring. Overall, it may be that, s-as-p’s major contribution to strategy research is epistemological innovation rather than a turn to look at a different specific set of objects within strategy. If the ontologically hard-to-define and difficult-to-see practice turn leads us to add epistemological approaches from fields related to sociology to the strategic management canon, then the trip will have been well worth while and good turn for the field of strategy as a whole.
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Figure 1: Four perspectives of strategy (from Whittington, 1996: 732).


table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Levels</th>
<th>Organizations</th>
<th>Managers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Where</td>
<td>Policy</td>
<td>Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issue</td>
<td>How</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Process</td>
<td>Practice</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 2: Charting Whittington’s ‘four perspectives’ in LRP
Figure 3: Charting Whittington’s ‘four perspectives’ in SMJ

![Graph showing the relative count of Policy, Planning, Process, and Practice from 1965-1972 to 2001-2008.]

Figure 4: Prevalence of s-as-p terms to in LRP

![Graph showing the relative count of Practice, Process, Organization, Structure, and Culture from 1965-1972 to 2005-2008.]
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Figure 5: Prevalence of s-as-p terms to in SMJ

Figure 6: Leximancer concept map of SMJ 1981-1995 (practice terms aggregated)
Figure 7: Concepts most commonly related to practice in SMJ 1981-1995

Figure 8: Concepts most commonly related to practice in LRP 2001-2008
Figure 9: Concepts most commonly related to practice in SMJ 2001-2008

Figure 10: The ‘Performance Turn’ in SMJ and LRP
Figure 11: Amended Whittington diagram illustrating temporal shift to performance

Table 1: Recent Indicative Articles from LRP and SMJ that include Practice-related Terms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LRP</th>
<th>SMJ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Miller &amp; Le Breton-Miller (2005)</td>
<td>Young, Chams &amp; Shortell (2001)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>