

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY STRATEGIES IN STRATEGIC MANAGEMENT

José G. Vargas-Hernández, M.B.A.; Ph.D.¹

¹University Center for Economic and Managerial Sciences, University of Guadalajara, United Mexican States, jvargas2006@gmail.com, jgvh0811@yahoo.com, josevargas@cucea.udg.mx

Abstract

This paper review and examine how strategic management researchers apply research methods, and what strategies use as part of the research process, to locate, organize, manage, transform, create, communicate and evaluate research tools, data and information resources. It also analyzes recent developments on research methodology to create scientific knowledge in theory building and practice in strategic management offering an overview of methodologies used in strategic management research. The assessment of strategic management's research methodology is based on a review and analysis of strategies for the incorporation of knowledge of managerial research methods. Finally, the paper identifies and discusses some methodological research issues and reviews future directions on research methodologies in strategic management.

JEL Classification: A29, B49, M19

Keywords: Research methodology, research strategy, strategic management.

1. Introduction

Research methodology within strategic management has not been a well developed field in the academic and scientific literature. The field of organizational research methods attracts more attention from scientists than the strategic management research methods and thus, focusing more on the micro analysis than on the macro analysis. The study of strategic management is eclectic in nature, theory based, with substantial empirical research. Much of the strategic management research has been using surrogates for the firm's strategic direction.

A good theory in strategic management must meet the criteria of being uniqueness, parsimony, conservation, generalizability, fecundity, internal consistency, empirical riskiness, and abstraction. “A theory is a systematically related set of statements, including some lawlike generalizations, (sic) that is empirically testable” (Rudner, 1966: 10). A scientific theory must have generalized conditionals, empirical content, and exhibit nomic necessity. A theory that lacks support based on scientific methodology, it cannot develop into a proposition, hypothesis, conception, or model subject to empirical testing (Van Maanen, Sorensen, & Mitchell, 2007; Xu & Zhou, 2004). Theoretical structures are intended to represent and give insights into the phenomena of the real world. Representations of the real world do not necessarily portray the real world itself. The dominant worldview is the form of framing sciences at any given historical moment by a particular paradigm (Kuhn, 1970; Hesse-Biber & Leavy, 2008).

A paradigm is, “a system of ideas or theoretical principles that determine, maintain and reinforce our way of thinking about an issue or a topic” (Plowright, 2011, p. 177). Plowright (2011, p. 177) argues that a paradigm is a scientific approach in which “the world we inhabit has an ontological reality, an existence that is not dependent on our perception, understanding or descriptions of that reality or world... constructivist paradigm, in contrast, claims that reality is mind dependent and is socially constructed through the relationships, psychological activities and shared understandings that we all take part in”. Scientists describe perceptions of the ontological reality through a framing process. “The work of Kuhn, and the sociologists of science... showed that scientific change had little to do with the shape science obtains through the application of a general rational method, and more to do with the fact that it is a social institution.” (Hughes & Sharrock, 1997, p. 93)

This paper review and examine how strategic management researchers apply research methods, and what strategies use as part of the research process, to locate, organize, manage, transform, create, communicate and evaluate research tools and data and information resources. The objective of this paper is to analyze recent developments on research methodology to create scientific knowledge in theory building and practice in strategic management. The objectives of the analyses offer an overview of methodologies used in strategic management research. The assessment of strategic management’s research methodology is based on a review and analysis of strategies for the incorporation of knowledge of managerial research methods. To identify and discuss some methodological research issues in strategic

management, this paper reviews future directions on research methodologies in strategic management.

2. Research methodology

Research methodology is defined as highly intellectual activity used in the investigation of nature and matter and deals specifically with the manner in which data is collected, analyzed and interpreted. A research methodology defines the research purposes, activities, procedures, measurements and applications. The background of research methodology refers to philosophy of research conceived as the way in which is formulated the research strategy and the way in which research is conducted. The research methodology determines the framing of explanations arisen from the analysis of data and observations.

Although the field of strategic management is growing, the development of research methodologies applied has not the same tendency. Research methodology in strategic management has developed from single case studies at firm and industry levels on issues such as corporate strategies and firm performance (Rumelt 1974). Rumelt (1991) based on some methodological features empirically demonstrated that industry was less important than firm characteristics for firm performance. Research methodology used in strategy has contributed substantially to the development of the strategic management and can make significant contributions to the knowledge and study of administration and strategy fields. Regardless of the research methodology used, research methods of management strategy play a key role in the advancement at a high level of methodological rigor, extending the empirical analyses to more highly theoretical scientific principles.

Overarching research methodology goals can apply to individual specific projects managing their participants and deliverables. Sharing methodological expertise involves knowledge dissemination of techniques and practices. Changes of research methodology practices may involve some convenience in the use of research methods. Anshen and Guth (1973) argue that the field of research methodology requires some research strategies to improve the research capital such as the study of science and arts, the design and use of analytic concepts and operational approaches, the study of historical relationships and the examination of interfaces with social problems and other institutions. Research methodology is the rationale behind a technique of collecting and analyzing data systematically.

A. Data collection

Research methodology is the system of collecting data for research projects, either theoretical or practical research. Data collection is treated as a design issue to enhance the construct and internal validity of the study, as well as the external validity and reliability (Yin, 1994).

B. Data analysis

“Data analysis consists of examining, categorizing, tabulating, or otherwise recombining the evidence to address the initial propositions of a study” (Yin, 1994). Research methodologies and data analysis are increasing in sophisticated domains. More advanced tools for text-mining, grid and cloud computing, semantic web, etc. can be used as part of the research methodology on strategic management. The tools and methods for creating and using data analyses must be technologically accessible.

Other data analysis are being used in strategic management research such as repertory grid (Ginsberg, 1988, 1989; Reger & Huff, 1993), cognitive mapping (Huff, 1990), and policy capturing (Hitt & Tyler, 1991). Alternative techniques of data analysis use diverse methods as using arrays to display the data, creating displays, tabulating the frequency of events, ordering the information, etc. (Miles and Huberman, 1984). A good research strategy is one that allows for the observation of the interested phenomena and the data analysis that is being collected from a variety of sources and perspectives.

C. Taxonomy of research methods

The taxonomy developed by Van Horn (1973) classifies empirical studies in case studies, field studies, field experiments and laboratory experiments. Alavi and Carlson (1992) presented a taxonomy of research methods in three levels: Conceptual, illustrative and applied concepts. Saunders and Thompson (1980, 129) compare conceptual with empirical research and argue that a turn away “from feeble attempts at the insight type and toward hard examination of applicable data in an empirical framework is what is needed now.” Keegan and Kabanoff (2008) developed a measurement approach through applying content analysis to annual reports that incorporates managerial discretion into conceptual and empirical models. Thus, a mix of empirical testing and explanatory conceptual search aims at theory building and development for the field.

There is not any best single research methodology intrinsically better (Benbasat et al., 1987). For example, it is required to have a more pluralistic attitude towards strategic management research methodologies (Remenyi and Williams, 1996). To improve the quality of research it requires adapting a combination of methods (Kaplan and Duchon, 1988) and avoiding only using a single research method characterized as methodological monism.

D. Theory-testing and theory-building

The research methodology should imply the use of both an inductive logic and a deductive logic at different phases of the research based on previous findings and allowing theory-testing and theory-building. Inductive methodology research can be qualitative and quantitative and is being used to generate inductive theory. Quantitative techniques may be used as inductive methodology to generate inductive theory. Empirical findings emerging from the strategic management research have been for the most part inductive oriented in nature and aimed at theory building. Research methods in strategic management provide the theory-testing and theory-building and framework analysis to be applied to practical problems.

Theory-building research seeks to find similarities across many different domains to increase its abstraction level and its importance. The procedure for good theory-building research follows the definition of theory: it defines the variables, specifies the domain, builds internally consistent relationships, and makes specific predictions. Theory-building in strategic management is not developing evenly across all methodologies. If strategic management theory is to become integrative, the procedure for good theory-building research should have similar research procedures, regardless of the research methodology used. Jemison (1981) support the integrative research in content and process advocating the mid-range theories and hypothesis testing. Tyler (2000) discussed procedural justice sustaining that people may apply the heuristic by proper procedures to achieve outcomes.

Theory-building of strategic management research has been approached from the perspective of industry effects. Chandler reported in case study methodology some strategy management problems providing the basis for theory-building. The typology of generic strategies (Porter, 1980) is the framework that has fostered theory-building and empirical work. Some theory-building borrowed from the resource-based theory are amenable to empirical test through methods such as the “rate perspective” (McKelvey, 1997: 365).

Scholars have some expectations of methodological tools and scientific criteria in strategic management in order to share surprisingly similar practices in management theory-building, creation of managerial knowledge and collaboration in scientific research. Despite the robust research methods used in theory-building of strategic management and the substantial accomplishments, Ketchen, Boyd, and Bergh () consider that the field confronts significant challenges. Research in theory-building and operational procedures in strategic management needs to incorporate rational-analytical, behavioral-neoinstitutional and political approaches.

E. Limitations of research methods

Given the nature of the phenomena investigated in strategic management, the research methodology may have certain limitations. The research methodology is better suited to investigate phenomena in strategic management where few moderating or intervening variables have an impact on the relationships between dependent and independent variables. The methodological structure of strategy investigations has enduring effects (Hitt, Gimeno, & Hoskisson, 1998). Strong structures in the research methodology ensure guidance to be focused at all times. Thomas (1984, 14) suggests that “theory development should be the most important aim for research” in strategic management to have directions and traditions because it suffers from an identity crisis and lack of consensus.

3. Research strategies

Strategic management uses a relatively restricted set of research strategies and analytical methodologies of choice (Podsakoff and Dalton, 1987). The research strategies adopted to improve research in strategic management requires analytical concepts, theory building, formal analytical techniques and operational procedures.

Research strategies exist within the knowledge movement. Deploying knowledge governance mechanisms that mitigate costs of creating, sharing and integrating knowledge may have normative and practical implications for the research strategies in strategic management. Tripodi and Epstein' (1978) present potential uses of two strategies for incorporating knowledge of research methods. Foss (2009) discussed the dominant research strategies framed by the “knowledge movement” (Eisenhardt and Santos, 2002; Nonaka, 1994; Spender, 2005) manifesting itself in organization and strategic management. Foss (2009) sustained alternative research

strategies distinguishing between “capabilities first”, “networks first” and “individuals first” strategies. A research strategy may begin from individual members.

Foss (2009) elaborates a simple taxonomy of research strategies within the knowledge movement that he calls “Capabilities First,” “Networks First,” and “Individuals First”. The capabilities first and the networks first research strategies focus on supra-individual antecedents seeking to account for firm-related outcomes such as integration, knowledge sharing, innovation, etc.

4. Strategic management research approaches

The strategy research field borrows from different normative, interpretative, analytic, positive, empirical and the quantitative-qualitative research approaches, among others. The study and research of strategic management is eclectic in nature, theory based and empirical research.

A. Normative approach

The development of normative theory is enhanced by the differences in determination and explanation of strategies as a salient goal of strategic management research (Schendel & Hofer, 1979). The rational normative model assumes that the nature of the theoretical problem may determine the choice of the appropriate research method (Cohen, March, and Olsen, 1972, Martin, 1982). Normative theory-building is enhanced if a causal relationship is supported between the performance construct and other constructs, where performance is the outcome and not the cause under consideration. As a research strategy, reaching derived normative implications of empirical findings gives greater confidence and accuracy in developing and testing theory, although the parsimony of the study is diminished.

Hinings and Greenwood (1988a) identify configurations as containing elements of both organizational structure and processes strongly underpinned by meaning and interpretive schemes which bind them together in an institutionally derived normative order. Configuration research in strategic management links constructs of multiple domains such as complexity and uncertainty of the environment, organizational structures, organizational behavior and culture, technology process, strategy making processes, content of strategies, etc. The research on strategic management has fruitful developments in strategy content and process research.

Multiple domain configuration research enables to study complex multivariate relationships and the fit among constructs in multiple domains for findings that have normative implications. A more integrated approach to theory-building in strategic management research should consider normative results to guide formulation and implementation of strategies in organizational settings. Erroneous interpretations of firm-level performance may lead to inaccurate descriptions and interpretations of observed relationships, which in turn mislead findings that may have normative implications for researchers and practitioners alike.

B. Interpretative approach

One important component of the case studies is the criteria for interpreting the findings (Yin, 1994, p. 20). The analysis and interpretation of research in case studies is dependent upon the aggregation of data collected from many sources and participants. The criteria for interpretation of the findings and data linked to the propositions require development in case studies.

Phillips, N., Sewell, G. and Jaynes, S. (2008) suggests some research methods based on a discourse analysis as a critical approach to strategic management to examine and interpret the social construction of reality and the roles of rhetoric and narrative within strategy processes. In strategic management research, constructs are presented as archetypes, gestalts, and configurations. In both normative and descriptive strategy researches explore issues relevant to their configuration appropriateness (Mintzberg, 1990). Research methodologies should be appropriate for configuration research. Configuration research has as an important role to classify, describe and explain the phenomena. Researchers use configurations to develop normative and descriptive theory. Strategic management research uses configurations to represent and interpret the phenomena and to analyze complicated and interrelated relationships among many variables which are collectively meaningful. The discourse analysis provides a deeper understanding of the managers' interpretations, intentions, motivations, expectations and decisions.

The critical theory research approach to strategic management opens possibilities to examine, analyze and expose hidden agendas of the strategic agents and actors. An alternative framing of research methods in strategic management may suggest an additional layer and level of investigation when applying specific theoretical approaches. Framing is described as the "selection, emphasis, exclusion, and elaboration" (Weaver, 2007, p. 143). Framing is the way a phenomenon is seen which

depends what is chosen to include or exclude aspects to emphasize or elaborate on. Selection is inevitable arbitrary, “and, the greater the mass of information from which a selection has to be made, the more disputable will be the investigator’s choice.” (Toynbee, 1976, p. x).

Analyses may be valuable if focusing on data definition and interpretation considering institutional structures, and applying evidences from elsewhere. Institutional structure, funding attached to issue-specific research and data limitations the established databases and large volumes of existing research may affect the research possibilities. Triangulation of methods for interpretation occurs when there some followers of one approach which can increase confidence in interpretation (Denzin, 1984). Research on strategic management has not been consistently designing research using adequate conceptualizations of managerial environments in the empirical research which at the end derives wrong findings and misleading interpretations.

C. Analytic strategies

Significant analytical research has been made in strategic management beyond the typologies and taxonomies of strategies. Any research methodology has a general analytic strategy supported by some analytic techniques which rely on some theoretical assumptions. Strategies for research in strategic management are chosen to provide varying definitions of what strategic management research is, or should be in the development of a theoretical body and formal analytic techniques. The use of the analysis method can show a relationship between two variables, such as the frequency of one term employed and the strategic management implications. Researchers can demonstrate specialization in the craft of some methods which can apply to the development of some other analytical tools.

Traditional approaches to strategic management research emphasize some sources of data and analytical technique downplaying some variables while overlooking some others. Researchers that have access to data reduction analytical methods and secondary data sources can develop and test hypotheses related to the field of strategic management from multiple approaches (Ketchen, Thomas & Snow, 1993; Nath & Gruca, 1997). The multiple methods involve data collection of behaviors through personal interviews, focus groups, and webometrics. Thus, there is a range of possibilities for more diverse approaches and sources of information, being aware of limitations inherent in any research to avoid overstating the value of findings in complex real phenomena.

Researchers in strategic management must frequently demonstrate their capabilities of the archives and databases, which is a critical task of knowledge dissemination. Besides their activities of database development and digitization, they become involved with development programming after they perceive a gap in either content or analysis functionality. Data collection and analysis methods in experimental and quasi-experimental research can hide some details (Stake, 1995). Corpus based methods collect data using interviews and newspaper articles marking up using some parts of the speeches to identify portions of sentences, frequencies, concordances, etc., which are processed using text-mining and analysis tools.

The use of corpus-based methods in research requires creating instruments to analyze the concordance through packages and resources such as newspaper data. Corpus-based methods examine concordance by creating a spreadsheet to check and reorder data. Corpus linguistics researchers' methods rely upon machine-readable texts in the "analysis of specially-designed collections of texts by computer" (Anderson, 2008). Corpus linguists use complex datasets, diverse methods and a variety of theoretical perspectives to tackle research questions. The research strategy as a field has received support from the literature on scanning activities and may be framed by the research questions. Scanning activities are the gathering of information "about events and relationships in a company's outside environment, the knowledge of which would assist top management in its task of charting the company's future course of action" (Aguilar, 1967, p. 1). For data collection in case studies, participants can use text-based methods to gather and examine sociolinguistic phenomena. Analyzing language fluctuations represents some methodological challenges.

Researchers and scholars show limited uptake of advanced tools for data management and sharing. Organizational strategies are formulated and implemented among managers with the more savvy professionals using document management systems, databases, LaTeX for word processing and other more sophisticated software. Good quality of research methods are needed for effective data management and sharing, although compliance with scientific requirements. The most common practices of data management are usually accomplished on the computer desktop and storage on PDF and image files.

An analytic statement requires further conceptual development to become a law like generalization. The analytic generalizations of a case study can be informative to other similar cases. Although there are some analytic statements that are true by

definition these are not law like generalizations. An analytic statement based on the commonly accepted definitions may be true when is accepted as a correct assertion. Replacing definition of terms in a theory with its definition in the theory to determine if the statements are true by definition, it clarifies if the statements are purely analytic without empirical data. Any literal or theoretical replication logic can both strengthen and broaden analytical generalizations.

The difference between analytic generalization and statistical generalization was explained in these terms “In analytic generalization, previously developed theory is used as a template against which to compare the empirical results of the case study” (Yin, 1984). The analytic strategy requires of the specific statistical techniques to evaluate data gathered. Evaluative research methodology aims to provide some useful feedback using standard social research methods. Some analytical tools as event studies, event history analysis, logistic regression, simultaneous equations analysis, and multidimensional scaling are used in strategic management research. Yin (1994) presented some analytic techniques such as pattern-matching, explanation-building, and time-series analysis. Pattern-matching compares a predicted pattern with an empirically based pattern enhancing the internal reliability of the study when both patterns match. An analysis may follow conventional analytic techniques using anecdotal and statistical analysis.

Some analytical tools are become more used in strategic management research such as repertory grid (Ginsberg, 1988, 1989; Reger & Huff, 1993), event studies, event history analysis, logistic regression, simultaneous equations analysis, multidimensional analysis, cognitive mapping (Huff, 1990), and policy capturing (Hitt & Tyler, 1991). Narrow categories for analytic tools such as single versus multiple regressions are used by Shook et al (2003). Multiple regressions became the dominant statistical technique used in strategic management research after the research in the strategic management field was dominated by cross-sectional, static studies and employed few control variables (Ketchen, Boyd, and Bergh,). Regression may not be the most appropriate analytical method to apply where the research design and the causal relationship between two variables is not clear. Keats and Hitt (1988) employed causal modeling approach with longitudinal or time ordered data in their research in strategic management. Advanced methods of data analyses on strategic management based on databases and text mining tools are bringing greater changes in research methods.

Methodological contributions in conceptualization and measurement of firm-level performance have implications (Meyer, 1991) to analyze formation, adaptation and evolution of organizational configurations on strategic management research. Some data analytic methodologies can be used on the configuration approach.

There is value in additional analysis of processes of change both for assessing desirability and for understanding feasibility. Research value should not be judged solely on the sophistication of the techniques or the quality of available data but on the existing body of knowledge. Analytic modeling provides rational approaches to research in strategic management. Some sophisticated analytical techniques used in research on strategic management, such as for example the employment of archival data bases that are applied to capture complexity of the phenomena, to achieve more objective measures and data validation. However, to determine the correctness of analytic data is not necessary the confrontation of these data with real facts. Model estimation is only part of the way towards addressing feasibility, magnitudes change, costs and benefits, etc., considering also the legitimate research questions that incorporate additional factors. Research questions based on a particular theory or technique may not consider other additional aspects.

The use of analytical techniques in management research to develop strategy knowledge can be comparable in scope and impact to the behavioral approach. Aldag and Stearns (1988) review a sample of organizational research topics. Shook, Ketchen, Cyrcota & Crockett (2003) searched for data analytic trends on 297 papers published between 1980 and 2001 found that the use of analytical techniques is growing, although many scholars report that they are ill-equipped to use these techniques. Research in strategic management may be restrictive in the data and methods to emphasize comparisons in a complex environment of real phenomena. There is plenty of room for improvement on the use of a range of analytic tools for research in strategic management.

D. Positivist approach

The positivist upbringing favor to have full control of field research under a well structured research protocol. Amitabh, M. and Gupta, R. K (2010) found that the logical positivism-empiricism paradigm, one way linear causality in the strategy-structure-performance relationship is favored by researchers instead of two-way causality that will increase contributions using innovative designs and archival data.

There are several research methodologies that have been identified by Galliers (1991, p. 149) in two paradigms, the positivist and interpretive. Lack of objectivity associated with interpretive research methods has resulted in adopting a more positivist quantitative approach. Debate has arisen in between the areas of positive versus normative perspectives (Friedman, 1953). Mixing quantitative and qualitative methods is becoming more common, and Guba and Lincoln's criticisms of positivist approaches in the social sciences cannot be ignored. The positivist perspective has been criticized in the social sciences field. Hughes & Sharrock (1997, p. 197) argues that "Had the social sciences measured themselves against one or other of the natural sciences apart from physics...then the status of the social sciences *as sciences* might have seemed a good deal less problematic".

E. Empirical research

Few studies have attempted to empirically determine the extent of the use of a restricted and exclusively set of methodologies in strategic management. There have been major changes in the methodologies of strategic management research despite that the field is still very young.

Hoskisson, Hitt, Wan, W.P. and Yiu (1999) examine the primary theoretical and methodological bases of strategic management through its history, which they consider is eclectic in nature and theory-based with substantial empirical research. They concluded that the early works (Chandler, 1962, Ansoff 1965) centered on the relationship between strategy and structure can be characterized from a contingency perspective. Early theoretical and methodological developments in strategic management took a contingency approach in Chandler's (1962) *Strategy and Structure* and the resource-based framework in Ansoff's (1965) *Corporate Strategy*. Initial strategy research emphasized analytical methodology to explain the competitive environment of firms and industries based on simple assumptions such as the homogeneity of firms within an industry in terms of resources and strategies and the mobility of these resources.

Miller & Friesen (1978) conducted empirical research to demonstrate the existence of configurations or archetypes that exhibit internal logic, stability and integrity based on what Miller (1987) terms the imperatives such as environment, structure, leadership and strategy. However, due to difficulties in data collection and analysis, empirical research in organizational configurations has lagged behind the development of theoretical approaches. Empirical studies of configurations used

cross-validation of responses to assess reliability and convergent validity (Miller, 1986; 1987b; 1988 and Miller & Friesen (1980; 1983).

1) Theory of the firm

Theories of the firm provide a framework for analyzing important research issues in strategic management (Seth, and Thomas, 1994). Seth and Thomas (1994) demonstrate the usefulness of economic theories of the firm as a framework for guiding and analyzing strategy research and evaluate the conceptualization of the theory of firm to research strategic management compared to the traditional assumptions of strategy. In turn, the research methodology and findings challenged the strategic management principles supporting theory of the firm arguing that industry characteristics have more impact on performance.

To enhance descriptive analysis of the firm as well as to the human agents in organizational research in strategic management, it has arisen a repertoire of cognitive and motivational assumptions from very different sources, such as the economics model of man, behavioralism, social and motivational psychology as a critical reaction to the economic agent theory (Simon, 1955; Cyert and March, 1963).

2) Industrial organization economics

Industrial organization (IO) economics provides a foundation for research on strategic management with some econometric tools for the analysis competitive dynamics. The macroeconomic approach of industrial organization, the five-force framework (Porter, 1980) and the resource-based view (RBV) (Wernerfelt, 1984) Schmalensee (1985) of firm-specific qualities required new research methodologies, such as analyses of variance decomposition techniques and regression analysis despite the operationalizing the attributes of competitive advantage and firm specific qualities. Empirically the relative advantage of small firms has advantages that have been ill-understood by the discussion (Zenger and Lazzarini, 2004). Most of the research conducted in strategic management among SMEs to explain the relationship between scanning dimensions, activities and their performance are of a descriptive nature.

Empirical analysis based on Porter's framework has been conducted by Dess & Davis (1984), Hawes & Crittenden (1984), Kim & Lim (1988), Miller & Dess (1993), White (1986), Wright, Kroll, Tu, & Helms (1991). To test the arguments of Porter the method of regression analyses was ushered. Other studies use other

methodologies and analytical techniques to sample and measure the firm and industry effects on performance (McGahan & Porter, 1997; McGahan & Porter, 2005, and Ruefli & Wiggins, 2005).

3) Resource-based theory

The research on firm resources strategy has introduced some descriptive theories from industrial organization economics such as the studies on teamwork production (Alchian & Demsetz, 1972) and the relationship of price and quality (DeVany & Saving, 1983). Conceptual and empirical research based on resource based-view is very limited in terms of augmenting the original knowledge sustained by Barney (1991) as it has been treated by Bates & Flynn, 1995; Brush & Artz, 1999; Litz, 1996; McWilliams & Smart, 1995; Michalisin, Smith, & Kline, 1997; Mosakowski, 1998; Powell, 1992a,b; Rindova & Fombrun, 1999; Yeoh & Roth, 1999).

The industrial organization economics supports the resource based theory as a descriptive and explanatory approach (Barney, 1992; McWilliams & Smart, 1995; Meyer, 1991) whereas the strategic management has a prescriptive orientation. Empirical research on strategic management based on the resource-based view has used course-grained measures of firm intangible resources. The resource-based view provides some foundations for research on strategic leadership and process research on decision theory. However, the resource-base view of the firm supports the assumptions of heterogeneity and the imperfect mobility of resources of firms within an industry (Barney, 1991: 101). Recent research in strategic management has accepted the application of the resource-based view of the firm despite that it is difficult to test empirically because of the complexity and difficulties in operationalizing and measuring idiosyncratic firm resources and capabilities that are valuable, rare, costly to imitate and no substitutable (Barney, 1991). Armstrong & Shimizu (2007) examined 125 papers employing methods in resource-based view studies from 1991 to 2005 finding that although researchers have overcome some challenges in studying resources and their effects, others challenges still remain.

The research based-view strategy theory is criticized as being descriptively accurate and correct but quite difficult to manipulate in real life, for not meeting the operational validity criterion until managers can apply the descriptive theory to manipulate the independent variables (Priem and Butler, 2001). Bacharach (1989) and Hunt (1991) argue for some statements from the resource based-theory dealing with competitive advantage that are not amenable to empirical tests. Accord-

ing to the analysis of Bacharach (1989), Hunt (1991) and McKelvey (1997) the resource based view does not meet the empirical content criterion. The resource based view theory is considered to have a static argument that identifies generic resources without considering differing situations, posing potential limitations for the advancement in strategic management research.

4) Capabilities

The dominant resource-based analytics in strategic management is considered to be the sustained competitive advantage emerging through firm-specific capabilities (Dierickx & Cool, 1989; Barney, 1991). Empirical research on the resource-based view and capabilities theory has been using some course-grained measures and proxies of firm resources, such as human capital leverage, intangible resources, technological and organizational capabilities, etc. The notion of capability unites sources of firm-level experiential knowledge and behavioralism as an analytical notion of the knowledge movement of research in strategic management.

A critical methodological challenge for strategic management is the capabilities development to offer evidence-based findings those organizations and managers can use to improve and attain the best performance (Locke & Latham, 1990). A starting point for scientific analysis in knowledge in firms is the collective levels rather than an empirical proposition despite that there is significant evidence at individual level, such as the empirical research on routines and capabilities predominantly mono-level (Gupta, Tesluk & Taylor, 2007).

Stinchcombe (1991: 379-380) argues that “[w]here there is rich information on variations at the collective or structural level, while individual-level reasoning (a) has no substantial independent empirical support and (b) adds no new predictions at the structural level that can be independently verified, theorizing at the level of [individual level] mechanisms is a waste of time.” The Knowledge-based theory of economic organization (Grandori, 2001, Kogut & Zander, 1992; Nonaka, 1994; Spender, 1996; Grant, 1996; Nickerson & Zenger, 2004) brought to research in strategic management fresh concepts and analytical methods, constructs, dimensions (Winter, 1987) and measures (Heimeriks & Duysters, 2007).

Empirical research within strategic management supports the argument that productive knowledge at the firm level has an impact (Hoopes & Madsen, 2008). However, the knowledge movement has some difficulties in identifying theoretically as well as empirically the causal mechanisms. Self-determination theory (Deci

& Ryan, 1985), form motivational psychology has supported successfully both theoretical and empirical research in knowledge-related behaviors (Cabrera, Collins & Salgado, 2006).

5) Other empirical approaches

Stake (1995) proposed a naturalistic generalization as an intuitive empirically-grounded approach based on relationships between the experiences of the researcher, the readers and the case study itself, facilitating the understanding and explanation of the unit of analysis. The empirical implications regarding the unit of analysis are related to the operationalization and the types and sources of data in research using the configuration approach. The empirical use of more holistic methods on the research of configurations (Venkatraman & Prescott, 1990) such as canonical correlation analysis, cluster analysis and q- factor analysis empirically facilitates to capture multivariate interconnections among strategy, structure, organizational behavior, process and environment.

The empirical research should refer only to taxonomy and not typology for derived classifications. Empirical research use different operational types of tools and sources of data according to object of study and the unit of analysis. The empirical methods are classified as non-econometric and econometric.

F. Econometric methods

Empirical strategic management research may get more support from econometric theory models. The empirical research in strategic management is increasing with the use of econometric methods, changing the appropriate use of empirical research methodologies in strategic management. Empirical methods centered on the use of econometric techniques taking account for endogenous and omitted variables for discrete strategy choices is becoming more widely applied in strategic management research. Econometric data only describe and analyze situations that are history because they have already occurred. Econometric techniques are such as classical regression, limited dependent variables, and methods that account for omitted variables.

Common econometric research techniques automatically exclude much available information. An empirical research analysis of performance as a function of decision variables, assume that are exogenous, to yield right results should correct endogeneity based on the assumption that managers make decisions to achieve higher perfor-

mance. The empirical research approach is common in experiments assuming that strategy choice can be exogenous and assigned randomly to participants. Econometrics implicitly excludes from the analysis much of the information coming from a variety of sources of data and research methods used by other sciences by selecting only the functional forms and information suitable for econometric analysis.

Empirical research in the field of strategic management is concerned with endogeneity. Empirical papers should consider endogeneities to be corrected econometrically. Empirical research in strategic management is beginning to focus on correcting for endogeneity, and must benefit from econometric advances. To achieve highly pertinent empirical strategic management research is required the implementation of econometric methods to correct for endogeneity. Empirical strategy research in firm-level performance outcome should consider correcting for endogeneity.

Hamilton and Nickerson (2001) reviewed more than a decade of empirical research and assessed the econometric methods used and found that few papers econometrically correct the endogeneity of management decisions and the expected performance. Hamilton and Nickerson (2001) report in their study that 169 of the 196 performance-related papers (86%) do not control for endogeneity. They also report that out of 601 papers, 426 empirical papers published, only 27 papers explicitly econometrically correct for potential endogeneity concerns. The authors argue that empirical research in strategic management is a failure due to the low number of papers that account for endogeneity. Failure to statistically correct for endogeneity leads to faulty conclusions contaminating the direction of empirical research difficult to predict *ex ante*. The empirical research in strategic management simply reports coefficient estimates and “robust” standard errors that account for heteroscedasticity but not pre-estimation error.

From an alternative perspective to econometrics, it may consider a wider range of not predetermined relationships between the chosen variables, but selecting other significant points to influence the choice.

G. No-econometric methods

Non-econometric are simple statistical descriptors or multivariate analysis, exploratory data analysis such as principal component analysis or clustering analysis, etc.

Research strategy in strategic management is having a major shift away from more basic analyses, such as descriptive studies with a rise in the use of regression

and ANOVA models. Empirical papers use descriptive statistics, means and correlations as their primary analysis, chi-square tests of contingency tables, regression and ANOVA for analysis, and discriminant and cluster analyses in the context of strategic groups. Cluster analysis has been applied as a research technique in strategic management research since the late 1970s. Ketchen & Shook (1996) focused on cluster analysis of 45 papers published during the period 1977-1993 found that the implementation of cluster analysis methodology often less than ideal.

However, the implementation of this research technique has not been applied properly to generate knowledge in strategic management. Cluster analysis as a multivariate technique enabled to reduce large data sets into groups and types. Cluster analysis as a statistical technique requires several methodological choices to sort data into similar groups or sets to give solution to the cluster. Research choices are made within a bounded time and space which can justify the particular denials and exclusions associated with our choice of approaches to research.

Logical empiricism as a research approach has been used for example to identify performance indicators of implemented strategies. Empirical strategy research is emerging in the form of a broad-based narrative reviews, content analyses and best practice guidelines. Collaboration among researchers involves detailed methodological and content analysis and discussions, often taking into account the established standards and even challenging them. The empirical research separates purely analytic contents which are considered true because of their “either/or” form based on their logic or because the definition of their terms, from synthetic statements, which are true only after investigation. The empirical content criterion addresses the logic and semantic of theory rather than vagueness, as Bacharach (1989) argues that many organizational-level theories are so vague they can never be empirically tested.

Empirical strategy research has gained from the use of contingency tools. Boyd, Haynes & Hitt (2007) identified moderation in form or strength (Venkatraman, 1989) such as interaction, as the most prevalent tool used to analyze contingency studies. There is little empirical research to support the assertion that control of strategic assets determines the profitability of firms (Miller and Shamsie, 1996).

An empirically based pattern may be confronted to the initial theoretical framework for theoretical validation. Empirical tests include field-based case study and comparative outlier (Hitt, Harrison, Ireland, and Best, 1996) and the case survey (Larsson, 1993) methodologies used for theory development and for theoretical replication and extension. Field research methods have been used to develop stra-

tegic management theory supported by a multiplicity of research approaches and data analysis techniques. Field studies are classified according to their research goal as descriptive, explanation, or predictive.

Results and research findings in empirical research should be reasonably accurate despite the implicit assumptions due to loss of information to portray the phenomena under investigation. Results based on empirical research pertaining to scanning practices have contributed to the development of theoretical approaches to strategic management. The result of research can be some absolute truths besides it involves decisions on the choice of methods, questions and selection of the data. Research methodological decisions are made regarding questions, sources of data, methods, techniques, etc.

Anshena and Guth (1973) emphasize the need of integrative, multidisciplinary research in strategic management. Empirical methodology research in strategy, model building and new techniques should be emphasized (Saunders and Thompson, 1980). Jeremy Bentham advocated utilitarianism, the dominant consequentiality position. A utilitarian believes in 'the greatest happiness for the greatest number.' (PHG Foundation, 2011).

H. Case study

Case studies are fine-grained research methodologies (Harrigan, 1983). Case study methodology has applications to investigate empirical phenomena in real-life contexts. A case study model can be applied to explain and describe complex causal links in real-life interventions, to describe the intervention itself and to explore some situations (Yin, 1994). A case study can be used to analyze by building an explanation as a pattern – matching, for exploration and a hypothesis-generating process. *The case study as a research method in strategic management has been useful to analyze generic business strategies and corporate diversification strategies among other important organizational areas.* One of the characteristics of the research methodology of case studies is that researchers have no control over behavioral events (Tellis, 1997).

Case studies have been used in varied investigations, particularly in sociological studies, but increasingly, in instruction. As a research tool of strategic management investigations, the case study methodology has been employed since the 1930's subject to criticisms that consider it is not a reliable research methodology. The methodology of case study recommended by Yin (1984) and a version of the question-

naire developed by Levy (1988) were modified and adapted for use at Fairfield University. Levy (1988) used the methodology of the case study in his investigation aimed to show the impacts of information technology at the University of Arizona. Levy (1988) used a single-case design based on exploratory and explanatory methodology strategies to conduct an in-depth case study of the pace of acquisition of information technology at the University of Arizona was considered the most suitable for the investigation of information technology.

While the exploratory strategy examined the environmental and economic aspects of information technologies, the explanatory strategy analyzed the patterns followed by institutions of higher education when acquiring and using information technology. The single-case study methodology used by Levy (1988) was based on the contributions of Yin (1984) and Feagin, Orum, and Sjoberg (1991).

Case study research is not necessarily sampling research considering that it is a system of action focusing on some selective issues where the most critical factor is the unit of analysis. Each case study is unique in such a way that the data collection, questions and unit of analysis cannot have the same form. The unit of analysis in a case study could be “an individual, a community, an organization, a nation-state, an empire, or a civilization” (Sjoberg, Williams, Vaughan, & Sjoberg, 1991). Holistic or embedded case studies can be revelatory of inaccessible phenomenon involving more than one unit of analysis. Case studies have been used in varied strategic management investigations an ideal methodology when a holistic, in-depth investigation is needed (Feagin, Orum, & Sjoberg, 1991).

Intrinsic case studies are those on which the researcher has an interest. Instrumental case studies are those considered to contribute to develop more profound understanding beyond the researcher. Collective case studies are those that belong to a group of cases. The action research as a methodology provides to the involved participants an insider view of the specific situations for the analytical and reflective learning, although it has been criticized that it may lack objectivity.

The case study methodology requires a discussion of procedures and their application. “good use of theory will help delimit a case study inquiry to its most effective design” (Yin, 1993, p. 4). To consider case studies as a research strategy in strategic management consideration must be given to construct internal validity, external validity, and reliability (Yin, 1989). Any case study should attain external validity and must provide the reliability required of all research in strategic management. The reliability, internal and external validity of any case study research can be enhanced

by the rules and procedures stated in the protocol, more essentially in multiple-case studies (Yin, 1994) that follow replication logic. To ensure accuracy in case studies, and to confirm validity of the research processes is required triangulation to establish meaning with explanations using multiple sources of data (Yin, 1984). The types of triangulation identified are data source, investigator, theory and methodological triangulation. Case study as a research strategy can triangulate methods, data, theories, researchers, etc. (Feagin, Orum, & Sjoberg, 1991) asserted that triangulation can occur with data, investigators, theories, and even methodologies.

Case studies can be exploratory, explanatory, descriptive (Yin, 1993) intrinsic, instrumental and collective (Stake, 1995) and multiple-case applications. Exploratory case studies may be used to prelude research. Exploratory case studies aim to find causal relationships in research. Descriptive case studies are based on descriptive theory. A case study may be organized around a descriptive framework leading to the analysis that relies on theoretical propositions. If there are not any theoretical propositions in the research design for a reliable analysis, still is possible to develop a descriptive framework for a case study.

The multi-site study is a research strategy that combines several approaches merging on case study research (Eisenhardt, 1989; Yin, 1993, 1994). Audet, J. and d'Amboise, G. (2001) conducted a case study research in a multi-site study to analyze data of an organizational phenomenon by combining the positivism, interpretative and qualitative theoretical approaches using cross-case comparisons and explanation building techniques.

Yin (1994) recommended as a case study methodology to design, conduct, analyze the evidences and develop the conclusions, recommendations and implications. The development of the case study protocol is required in the case study methodology (Yin, 1994). A complete description of the research explains what available information is necessary to used. Design of case studies as a research strategy should satisfy the conditions of the research question posed, the extent of control and the degree on focus over behavioral events (Yin, 1994). Case study as a research designs are not variants of other research designs (Yin, 1994).

Case studies are designed to use multiple sources of data bringing out the details from diverse viewpoints of the involved participants. The case study as a strategy of research in strategic management has the characteristic to consider points of view of all parties, agents and actors involved regarding the selected issues to study (Feagin, Orum, & Sjoberg, 1991). The nature of the research questions lead to the

relevant strategy to be used in an explanatory-exploratory case study (Levy, 1988). The explanatory strategy determines the extent of similar patterns applicable in other environments.

The analysis presented in a case study must include relevant evidence, use of rival arguments. Using multiple sources of data for case study research based on documentation, archival records, interviews, direct observation, participant observations and physical artifacts (Yin, 1994) is an important strategy to achieve reliability of the research (Stake, 1995; Yin, 1994). Yin (1984) analyzed the strengths and weaknesses of the different sources of evidence, which are presented in table 1.

Yin (1994) recommended conduct as the second stage of the methodology used in a case study, to be carried out by the activities of preparation for data collections, distribution of the questionnaire and conducting interviews. As a field method, data collection is treated in isolation from the research process (Yin, 1994), although this would not be productive in case study research. Doz (1996) conducted an empirical test on field-based case study methodologies to collect both archival and interview data from three sets of alliance partners, using a qualitative theory building approach. Doz (1996) used field-based case study methodologies centered on qualitative theory building approach to empirically test archival and interview data from sets of alliance partners.

Table 1 Types of Evidence

Source of Evidence	Strengths	Weaknesses
Documentation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • stable - repeated review • unobtrusive - exist prior to case study • exact - names etc. • broad coverage - extended time span 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • retrievability - difficult • biased selectivity • reporting bias - reflects author bias • access - may be blocked
Archival Records	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Same as above • precise and quantitative 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Same as above • privacy might inhibit access
Interviews	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • targeted - focuses on case study topic • insightful - provides perceived causal inferences 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • bias due to poor questions • response bias • incomplete recollection • reflexivity - interviewee expresses what interviewer wants to hear

Direct Observation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • reality - covers events in real time • contextual - covers event context 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • time-consuming • selectivity - might miss facts • reflexivity - observer's presence might cause change • cost - observers need time
Participant Observation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Same as above • insightful into interpersonal behavior 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Same as above • bias due to investigator's actions
Physical Artifacts	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • insightful into cultural features • insightful into technical operations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • selectivity • availability

(Yin, 1994, p. 80)

The case study methodology has the data analysis of case study as one of the least developed areas of research methods. Research based on case study has a frequent criticism of the generalization of results that are not being widely applicable in real and some other specific situations. There has been a lot of criticism of some research techniques and methodologies of not being scientific in nature, such as the case study because it is not possible to replicate it.

1. Quantitative and qualitative research

There is a trend in strategic management research projects toward the integration of both quantitative and qualitative data (Judge and Zeithaml, 1992) that requires using multiple methods and measures (Hitt, Hoskisson, Johnson, and Moesel, 1996). The increasing sophistication of some research methodologies combines both quantitative and qualitative approaches and statistical tools. Combined qualitative and quantitative data approaches as a strategic management research design methodologies is gaining more grounding and popularity. There is an increased tendency in the quantity and quality of research developments in the theoretical and methodological fields of strategic management (Hitt, 1997). Research in strategic management tends to integrate in complex models both quantitative and qualitative data (Judge and Zeithaml, 1992) requiring multiple methods and multiple measures of specific constructs (Hitt, Hoskisson, Johnson, and Moesel, 1996).

The research methodologies used in strategic management are becoming increasingly sophisticated and frequently combine both quantitative and qualitative approaches with new statistical tools. Quantitative measures attract the attention to underlying objective facts that give evidence of the phenomena, while qualitative data colors and enrich the analysis and interpretation of such phenomena.

1) Quantitative research

The analytical mathematical research methodology, analytical statistical and causal relationships are popular quantitative research methods used in strategic management to test for internal validity. Quantitative research is the systematic scientific investigation used to measure and gather quantitative data of everything that is measurable. Research in strategic management is already developing complex and sophisticated models though the integration of multiple theories and methods such as structural equation modeling, panel data analysis, network analysis dynamic models of partial adjustment, logistic and Poisson regression analyses and event history analysis.

Quantitative research methodology in strategic management emphasizes longitudinal data, dynamic analysis, and focus on specific strategic decisions and actions. Data for quantitative research can be collected through interviews, structured questionnaires, surveys, etc. Quantitative measures are likely to facilitate cross-case comparisons comparison between scores, and the use of multiple indicators with scales provides more confidence in the validity of the measure. Comparison between the predicted pattern and actual pattern for internal reliability of the study might not have any quantitative criteria, but discretion of the research is required for interpretations.

Quantitative methodologies have some limitations if they are confined in studying configurations, despite overcoming problems associated with conventional statistical analysis.

2) Qualitative research

Qualitative research methodologies have evolved beyond the techniques of qualitative data collection helping researchers to improve understanding and explaining a variety of complex management phenomena. The qualitative research approach can be used to analyze the strategic management phenomenon barely researched that is both adaptive and innovative. Given the complexity and ambiguity of the qualitative methodological components (Lee, 1999), the researcher has more room to design a research strategy more suitable to his skills and his specific objectives and needs. The qualitative research approach is being used for example in the design of multi-site study research strategies to gain an in-depth knowledge of strategic management in organizations.

Qualitative research is a multi-focal investigation to get an in-depth insight of behaviors, values, attitudes, motivations, etc., based on unstructured interviews, feedback and recordings methods. Qualitative data are useful for uncovering emic views (Guba & Lincoln, 1994, p.106). In strategic management research it may not be possible to undertake standard analyses limited by the etic or outsider theory based on the knowledge of the countries' firms' economic, political, cultural, etc. circumstances may not correspond within the emic or insider view.

Greckhammer, Misangyi, Elms, and Lacey (2008) introduce the research technique termed qualitative comparative analysis (QCA) for strategic management research aimed to diagnose interdependent causal effects across different levels of analysis. Longitudinal qualitative analysis as a research strategy in strategic management provides meaningful insights about the inter relationships among the environment, strategy, structure, processes and outcomes and the different constructs of organizational evolutive configurations (Eisenhardt, 1989; Bourgeois & Eisenhardt, 1988). A qualitative research design may support and combine theory testing and generation (Lee, 1999). Qualitative research does not require and justifies probabilistic sampling (Merriam, 1998, p. 61). Patton (1999, p. 1190) argues that, "it need not be antithetical to the creative aspects of qualitative analysis to address issues of validity and reliability". Other research methodologies such as case replication (Leonard-Barton, 1990) and retrospective event histories (Glick et al., 1990) are designed to overcome some of these problems.

Some approaches to strategic management include action (Birks, 2010; Stringer, 2007) and grounded theory (Strauss & Corbin, 2008), approached that differ from the "detached observer" view of research. Egon Guba describe action research as a reaction to the search for common, general findings (Stringer, 2007, p. ix) that combines qualitative and quantitative research methods in a close involvement in specific situations. Personal experience and involvement supports grounded theory approach that provides insights for the etic/emic analyses although it may result in a limited range of possibilities because the difficulties to become impartial observer.

Qualitative studies are being the target of criticism which considers has limitations because they are subject to the researcher bias, non-replicability and labor intense (Van de Ven & Huber, 1990). It is also criticized the impartial observer view of detached researchers (Guba & Lincoln, 1994) as unrealistic, because their subjectivity. The concept of "street-level epistemology" (Hardin, 2002 states that information and views are passed on from others, including academic disciplines.

5. Strategic management research

As a field of strategic management advances, so should its level of research methodological rigor. Research methodology improves the scientific background and framework of strategic management, and contributes to enhance confidence in the results and findings generated. McGuire (1986) argues that researchers and managers can benefit from each other if their needs and modes of thinking are compared. Both have to abstract the general theoretical principles to be applied to specific situations and to assess the generalizability of their conclusions. Bower (1982) argues that research in strategic management should concentrate on issues of concern to the top management of the firm to enrich the field by well-structured problems although it may emerge the problem of rewarding academics.

The interest in strategic management research has been increasing over the last three decades. Research methods in strategic management have evolved over time growing since its inception in the late 1970s (Bowman, Singh & Thomas, 2002; Kay, McKiernan & Faulkner, 2003; Mintzberg, Ahlstrand, & Lampel, 1998). Some academic papers presented the research methodological implications in a broad overview of strategic management's development, such as hypothesis formulation, quantitative and qualitative analytic tools among other important methodological issues (Hitt, Gimeno and Hoskisson, 1998). Empirical strategy papers increased in number and in diversity of topics to create a strong research stream in strategic management. However, there is a relatively limited set of research methodology strategies and analytical procedures in strategic management.

Strategic management is one of the most recent fields of the management discipline (Boyd, Finkelstein & Gove, 2005; Hambrick, 1990). Strategic management has become one of the most popular fields (Bergh, 2001; Ramanujam & Varadarajan, 1989) since a pioneering research by Rumelt (1974) found that "strategy matters" and gives rise to a notable research in the field (Bergh & Holbein, 1997; Greve & Goldeng, 2004). Research in strategic management has focused on some specializations such as strategic leadership, competitive dynamics, restructuring, etc. The large number of topics and subjects covered by strategic management literature gives the idea that it does not have a unified, coherent and integrative scientific field's identity, object of study, research methods, conceptual and theoretical frameworks.

The conceptual, theoretical and methodological frameworks challenged by Williamson's (1975, 1985) model of transaction cost economics, the following in-

vestigations on strategic management by Miles and Snow (1978), Meyer (1982), Eisenhardt (1989), and Henderson and Cockburn (1994) produced influential conceptual, theoretical and methodological frameworks. During the 1980s, different approaches to research methodologies resulted in the new theoretical developments of strategic management; among them the transaction cost economics (TCE) (Williamson, 1975, 1985) that provided theoretical and conceptual frameworks, although it is difficult to capture and measure not observed transaction costs in bargaining and negotiating processes.

Content analysis in strategy research has been improving for the last three decades (Bergh & Holbein, 1997; Boyd, Gove & Hitt, 2005; Shook, Ketchen, Hult & Kacmar, 2004). Bergh & Holbein (1997) looking at longitudinal designs in 203 papers on strategic management from 1980 to 1993 found that more than 90% of studies had insufficient attention to methodological assumptions, thus, the investigations were affected by type I bias. Sarker and Lee (2001) using a case research methodology in business process reengineering to test competing theories, found evidences to refute the dominant technocentric theory and the alternative sociocentric view while providing support to adopt the socio-technical approach.

Bergh & Fairbank (2002) found that strategy researchers reach flawed conclusions and inaccurate findings because when measuring changes they do not recognize the required research methodology. Hitt, Boyd and Li (2004) summarized key content analyses of research methodology employed in strategic management. Ketchen, Boyd and Bergh, D. D. (2008) reviewed the research methods applied in strategic management between 1980 and 2004 observing a growth in the number of articles devoted to strategy topics using empirical tools.

Lohrke (2008), Shook (2008), and Wright (2008a) have reviewed different topics of research methodology, integrating them in a coherent analytic framework and making important contributions to research on strategy methods. These papers review the application of some research methods employing traditional tools and more specialized methods. Among the traditional methodological tools are reviewed meta-analysis, strategic groups, survey data collection, etc. Among the more specialized methods the authors review cause mapping, conjoint analysis, internet data collection, repertory grids, etc. Regarding the content analyses these authors review some conceptual, theoretical and methodological frameworks, such as the resource based-theory, discretion, upper echelons, etc.

Research methods used address theoretical perspectives such as resource-based view, traditional tools such as survey data collection, meta-analysis, etc., and more specialized methods such as internet data collection, conjoint analysis, repertory grids, cause mapping, etc. The methodological practices of strategic management research strength the scientific character of the field to the extent that increase the confidence in the findings resulting from a variety of research design, sampling, measurement, analysis, and interpretation of results techniques.

Management research is aimed to analyze recent developments on research methodology in strategic management. Organizational location using spatial research methodology in strategic management is a research topic that has called the attention of some researchers such as Dohn and Hahn (2008). Venkatraman (2008) highlights the improvements on research methodological sophistication of the strategic management field.

Research methods used at the different levels of analysis to capture motives, preferences, and decisions of industries, firms, management strategic groups and individuals are very limited on the design, implementation and monitoring strategies. The simplicity of some methods used to analyze multi-level phenomena, such as variance decomposition, is not suitable for more complex analysis of situations. The integrative nature of strategy research leads to an imperative for adoption of multiple theoretical frameworks. Innovations in research methodology provided new insights out of the debate industry versus firm provided new insights. "...every new innovation consists of a new combination of existing ideas, capabilities, skills, resources etc. It follows logically from this that the greater the variety in these factors within a given system, the greater the scope for new combinations of these factors, that is, new innovations..." (Fagerberg, 2003, p. 7). Researchers and scholars address identified methodological areas of omission.

Strategic management has borrowed some research methods and techniques from other fields such as economics, sociology, psychology, politics, and more recently geography, etc. Research in strategic management influences other fields such as organizational theory (Oliver 1991, 1997) and human resource management (Huselid, 1995; Wright, Dunford & Snell, 2001).

Ketchen, Boyd and Bergh (2008) argue that the research methodology used to analyzed strategic management are as robust as the findings generated, although the methods still face some challenges despite the accomplishments. Not all case studies require or have absolute necessity of statistical robustness. However, researchers

in strategic management repeat past mistakes of adopting a technocentric or socio-centric approaches without considering the interactions between the social and the technological (Collins, R. S. and Cordon, C., 1997).

6. Challenges for research methodology strategy

New communication and information technologies have changed the pace, volume and nature of available information but also in the methods for analyzing such data. Sources of data are more easily accessible and searchable depending of type and mix of research methods and techniques used. Analysis of textual information as an input derived from data sources and literature review has many forms and is itself research (Johnson & Christensen, 2012; McKee, 2003) that may require some quantitative, mathematical and econometric modeling. Meta analyses and combinations of existing knowledge can give valuable insights.

Research methods in strategic management face several challenges due to the methodological limitations for the examination and analysis of the strategy's processes and phenomena complexities. Longitudinal methods help to the analyses of evolving events over time although the complexity, uncertainty and immeasurability variables associated to these phenomena. The strategy phenomena pose a challenge for researchers due to the multidimensional nature of constructs. Strategic management might be enriched through inclusion and use of alternative techniques in addition to conventional tools.

The strategies of research in strategic management should consider the actions and interactions of all agents and actors involved in organizational activities. Research on the processes of formulation, design and implementation of strategies in organizations has called the attention not only of scientists, scholars and practitioners but also common people interested in the topic, despite the fact that the research methods have limitations.

Research methodology still has plenty of perverse problems that limit the application of research findings in design, measurement and analysis. Research methodological practices prevail that provide limited insights in strategic management.

Less developed economies have a small budget for scientific research, innovation and technology transfer. It is difficult to introduce new research methodologies in less developed countries where the scientific culture is not widely promoted and adapted as the common ground among the scientific community. "Conventional

wisdom” (Galbraith, 1999) considers that group culture and political influences shape dominant views. Strategies for engaging strategic management researchers and scholars with new types of research methods and resources and new ways of practicing and working with them require sensitivity to the existing scientific cultures and practices. If researchers in strategic management want to be effective in optimizing the use and exchange of research methodology and resources, they should be more sensitive to the practices and cultures of different research communities.

Samik-Ibrahim (2000) proposes a grounded theory methodology (GTM) in a developing country at the stage where research activities have a lot of obstacles and many shortages such as low effectiveness-productivity and efficiency, lack of funding, etc. Grounded Theory Methodology (GTM) is a “general method of comparative analysis” to discover theory with four central criteria: Work or generality, relevance or understanding, fit or valid, and modifiability or control.

The future research in strategy process research has the tendency to be more holistic, more integrative, with an emphasis on team work, corporate management and be more oriented and supportive of action research methodologies (Hitt, Gimeno y Hoskisson, 1998). Future research in strategic management phenomena will include integration of multiple theoretical and empirical complex models supported by sophisticated statistical tools such as structural equations modeling and multinomial logit analysis.

References

1. Alavi, M. and Carlson, P. (1992). “A review of MIS research and disciplinary development,” *Journal of Management Information Systems* (8:4), 1992, pp. 45-62.
2. Alchian, A. A., & Demsetz, H. (1972). “Production, information costs, and economic organization.” *American Economic Review*, 62: 777-794.
3. Aldag, R. J. and Steams, T. M. (1988). “Issues in research methodology” *Journal of Management*, June 1988, vol. 14, 2: pp. 253-276.
4. Aguilar, F. J. (1967). *Scanning the business environment*. New York: MacMillan Company.
5. Amitabh, M. and Gupta, R. K (2010). “Research in strategy-structure-performance construct: Review of trends, paradigms and methodologies.” *Journal of Management and Organization*. Vol. 16 (5) November 2010. 744-763.

6. Anderson, W. (2008). "Corpus Linguistics in the UK: Resources for Sociolinguistic Research." *Language and Linguistics Compass*, 2(2), 352-371.
7. Anshena, M. and Guth, W. D. (1973). "Strategies for Research in Policy Formulation" *Journal of Business* (October, 1973), pp. 449-511.
8. Anshen, M. and Guth, D. (1973). "Strategies for research in policy formulation", *Journal of Business* (October, 1973) pp. 449-511.
9. Ansoff, I. (1965). *Corporate Strategy*, McGraw-Hill, New York, NY.
10. Armstrong, C.E. & Shimizu, K. (2007). "A review of approaches to empirical research on the resource-based view of the firm." *Journal of Management*, 33, 959-986.
11. Audet, J. and d'Amboise, G. (2001). "The multi-site study: An innovative research methodology". *The Qualitative Report*, Volume 6, Number 2 June, 2001 (<http://www.nova.edu/ssss/QR/QR6-2/audet.html>).
12. Barney, J. B. (1992). "The distinctive competencies of strategic management." Presentation at the annual meeting of the *Academy of Management*, Las Vegas, NV.
13. Barney, J. (1991). "Firm resources and sustained competitive advantage." *Journal of Management*, 17: 99-120.
14. Bergh, D.D. (2001). "Diversification strategy at a crossroads: Established, emerging and anticipated paths." In Hitt, M.A., Freeman, R.E., & Harrison, J.S. (eds.), *The Blackwell Handbook of Strategic Management*, Blackwell Publishers Ltd., Oxford, England: 362-383
15. Bergh, D.D. & Fairbank, J.F. (2002). "Measuring and testing change in the strategic management research." *Strategic Management Journal*, 23: 359-366.
16. Bergh, D. D. & Holbein, G. F. (1997). "Assessment and redirection of longitudinal analysis: Demonstration with a study of the diversification and divestment relationship." *Strategic Management Journal*, 18: 557-571.
17. Birks, S. (2010). "Action research." *Asymmetric Information*, (37, April), 11. Retrieved from http://www.nzae.org.nz/news/newsletters/Asymmetric37-April_2010_WEB.pdf
18. Birks, S. (2008). *Statistical significance and policy significance*. Paper presented at the New Zealand Association of Economists Conference. Retrieved from <http://ssrn.com/abstract=1156166>
19. Bowman, E.H., Singh, H., & Thomas, H. (2002). "The domain of strategic management: History and evolution." In A. Pettigrew, H. Thomas & R. Whittington (eds.), *Handbook of strategy and management*. Sage, London, England: 31-54.
20. Bower, J. L. (1982) "Business policy in the 1980's". *Academy of Management Review*, Vol 7 No. 2 (1982) 630-638.

21. Boyd, B.K., Haynes, K., & Hitt, M.A. (2007). *Contingency models in strategy: Use, disuse, or misuse?* Paper presented at the Strategic Management Society Annual Conference, San Diego.
22. Boyd, B.K., Gove, S., & Hitt, M.A. (2005). "Construct measurement in strategic management research: Illusion or reality?" *Strategic Management Journal*, 26: 239-257.
23. Boyd, B.K., Finkelstein, S., & Gove, S. (2005). "How advanced is the strategy paradigm? The role of particularism and universalism in shaping research outcomes." *Strategic Management Journal*, 26: 841-854.
24. Brush, T. H., & Artz, K. W. (1999). "Toward a contingent resource-based theory: The impact of information asymmetry on the value of capabilities in veterinary medicine." *Strategic Management Journal*, 20: 223-250.
25. Cabrera, A., Collins, W. C., and Salgado, J. F. (2006). "Determinants of Individual Engagement in Knowledge Sharing". *International Journal of Human Resource Management* 17: 245-264.
26. Cyert, R.M. and J.G. March. (1963). *A Behavioral Theory of the Firm*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
27. Cohen, D., March, J. G., & Olsen, J. P. (1982). "A garbage can model of organizational choice." *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 17: 1-25.
28. Deci, E. and R.M. Ryan. (1985). *Intrinsic Motivation and Self-determination in Human Behavior*. Berlin: Springer.
29. Denzin, N. (1984). *The research act*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
30. Dess, G. G. & Davis, P. (1984). "Porter's (1980) generic strategies as determinants of strategic group membership and organizational performance." *Academy of Management Journal*, 27: 467-488.
31. Dierickx, I. and K. Cool. (1989). "Asset Stock Accumulation and the Sustainability of Competitive Advantage," *Management Science* 35: 1504-1513.
32. Doz, Y.L. (1996). "The evolution of cooperation in strategic alliances: Initial conditions or learning processes?" *Strategic Management Journal*, 17(Special issue): 55-84
33. Eisenhardt, K. M. (1989). "Building theories from case study research." *Academy of Management Review*, 14(4), 532-550.
34. Chandler, A.D. Jr. (1962). *Strategy and structure*. MIT Press. Cambridge MA.
35. Collins, R. S. and Cordon, C. (1997) "Survey methodology issues in manufacturing y and practice research", *International Journal of Operations & Production*, Vol. 17 Iss: 7, pp.697 – 706

36. DeVany A. S., & Saving, T. R. (1983). "The economics of quality." *Journal of Political Economy*, 91: 979-1000.
37. Doh, J. & Hahn, E. (2008). "Using spatial methods in strategy research." *Organizational Research Methods*, This issue.
38. Fagerberg, J. (2003). *Innovation: A Guide to the Literature*. Centre for Technology, Innovation and Culture, University of Oslo.
39. Feagin, J., Orum, A., & Sjoberg, G. (Eds.). (1991). *A case for case study*. Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press.
40. Friedman, M. (1953). "The methodology of positive economics." In M. Friedman (Ed.), *Essays in positive economics* (pp. 3-43). Chicago, Ill.: University of Chicago Press.
41. Foss, N. J. (2009). "Alternative research strategies in the knowledge movement: from macro bias to micro-foundations and multi-level explanation" Invited paper, *European Management Review*. January 14, 2009.
42. Galbraith, J. K. (1999). *The affluent society* (New ed.). London: Penguin.
43. Ginsberg, A. (1989). "Construing the business portfolio: A cognitive model of diversification." *Journal of Management Studies*, 26: 417-438.
44. Ginsberg, A. (1988). "Measuring and modeling changes in strategy: Theoretical foundations and empirical directions." *Strategic Management Journal*, 9: 559-576.
45. Glick, W. H., Huber, G. P., Miller, C. C., Doty, D. H., & Sutcliffe, K. M. (1990). "Studying changes in organizational design and effectiveness: Retrospective event histories and periodic assessments." *Organization Science*, 1:293-312.
46. Grandori, A. (2001). "Neither hierarchy nor identity: Knowledge governance mechanisms and the theory of the firm". *Journal of Management and Governance*, 5, 381-399.
47. Grant, R. M. (1996). "Towards a knowledge-based theory of the firm". *Strategic Management Journal* 17: 109-122.
48. Greckhammer, T., Misangyi, V., Elms, H. & Lacey, R. (2008). "Using qualitative comparative analysis in strategic management research: an examination of combinations of industry, corporate, and business-unit effects." *Organizational Research Methods*, October, 2008.
49. Greve, H.R., & Goldeng, E. (2004). "Longitudinal analysis in strategic management." In Ketchen, D.J. Jr. & Bergh, D.D. (eds.), *Research methodology in strategy and management*. Elsevier, Oxford, England: 1: 135-164.
50. Guba, E. G., & Lincoln, Y. S. (1994). "Competing paradigms in qualitative research." In N. K. Denzin & Y.S. Lincoln (Eds.) *Handbook of qualitative research* (pp. 105-117). Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.

51. Gupta, A.K., Tesluk, P.E. and Taylor, M.S. (2007). "Innovation At and Across Multiple Levels of Analysis," *Organization Science* 18: 885-897.
52. Hambrick, D.C. (1990). "The adolescence of strategic management, 1980 – 1985: Critical perceptions and reality." In, J. Fredrickson, (Ed.), *Perspectives on Strategic Management*, Cambridge: Ballinger, 237-253.
53. Hamilton, B. H. and Nickerson, J. A. (2001). "Correcting for Endogeneity in Strategic Management Research" *Presented at the BPS Doctoral Consortium at the 2001 Academy of Management meetings* in Washington D.C.
54. Hamilton, B. H and Nickerson, J. A. (2001a). "Correcting for Endogeneity in Strategic Management Research." *Strategic Organization* 1(1): 51-78. May, 2001.
55. Hardin, R. (2002). "Street-Level Epistemology and Democratic Participation." *Journal of Political Philosophy*, 10(2), 212-229.
56. Hawes, J. M. & Crittenden, W. F. (1984). "A taxonomy of competitive retailing strategies." *Strategic Management Journal*, 5: 275-287.
57. Hawes, J. M. & Crittenden, W. F. (1984). "A taxonomy of competitive retailing strategies." *Strategic Management Journal*, 5: 275-287.
58. Heimeriks, K. H. and G. Duysters. (2007). "Alliance Capability as a Mediator Between Experience and Alliance Performance: an Empirical Investigation Into the Alliance Capability Development Process," *Journal of Management Studies* 44: 25-49.
59. Henderson, R., & Cockburn, I. (1994). "Measuring competence? Exploring firm effects in pharmaceutical research." *Strategic Management Journal*, 15: 63-84.
60. Hesse-Biber, S. N., & Leavy, P. (2008). "Pushing on the methodological boundaries: The growing need for emergent methods within and across the disciplines." In S. N. Hesse-Biber & P. Leavy (Eds.), *Handbook of emergent methods* (pp. 1-15). New York: Guilford Press.
61. Hinings, C. R. & Greenwood, R. (1988a). "Organizational design types, tracks, and the dynamics of strategic change." *Organization Studies*, 9: 293-316.
62. Hitt, M. (1997) "Current and future research in strategic management". Workshop at Western Academy of Management. *Research Methods Forum* No. 2 (Summer 1997)
63. Hitt, M.A. & Tyler, B.B. (1991). "Strategic decision models: Integrating different perspectives." *Strategic Management Journal*, 12: 327-351.
64. Hitt, M.A., Boyd, B., & Li, D. (2004). "The state of strategic management research: A view of the future." In, D. Ketchen & D. Bergh (Eds.) *Research Methodology in Strategy and Management*, Elsevier, Oxford, England 1: 1-31.

65. Hitt, M.A., Gimeno, J. & Hoskisson, R.E. (1998). "Current and future research methods in strategic management." *Organizational Research Methods*, 1: 6-44.
66. Hitt, M.A., Harrison, J.S., Ireland, R.D. & Best, A. (1995). *Learning how to dance with the Tasmanian Devil: Understanding acquisition success and failure*. Paper presented at the Strategic Management Society Conference, Mexico City.
67. Hitt, M.A., Hoskisson, R.E., Johnson, R.A. & Moesel, D.D. (1996). "The market for corporate control and firm innovation." *Academy of Management Journal*, 39: 1084-1119.
68. Hoopes, D. and T. Madsen. (2008). "A Capability-based View of Competitive Heterogeneity," *Industrial and Corporate Change* 17: 393-426.
69. Hoskisson, R. E.; Hitt, M.; Wan, W.P. and Yiu, D. (1999). "Theory and research in strategic management: Swings of a pendulum." *Journal of Management*, Volume 25, Number 3, 1999, pp. 417-456(40).
70. Huff, A.S. (1990). "Mapping strategic thought." In A.S. Huff (Ed.), *Mapping strategic thought*. Chichester: John Wiley & Sons.
71. Hughes, J. A., & Sharrock, W. W. (1997). *The philosophy of social research* (3rd ed.). London ; New York: Longman.
72. Hunt, S. D. (1991). *Modern marketing theory: Critical issues in the philosophy of marketing science*. Cincinnati, OH: South-Western Publishing.
73. Huselid, M. (1995). "The impact of human resource management practices on turnover, productivity, and corporate financial performance." *Academy of Management Journal*, 38: 635-672.
74. Jemison, D.B. (1981) "The importance of integrative approach to strategic management research". *Academy of Management Review*, Vol. 6, No. 4 (1981) 601-608.
75. Judge, W.Q., Jr. & Zeithaml, C.P. (1992). "Institutional and strategic choice perspectives on board involvement in the strategic decision process." *Academy of Management Journal*, 35: 766-794.
76. Kay, J., McKiernan, P., & Faulkner, D. (2003). "The history of strategy and some thoughts about the future." In Faulkner, D. & Campbell, A. (eds.), *The Oxford handbook of strategy, Volume 1: Strategy overview and competitive strategy*. Oxford, England: 21-46.
77. Keats, B.W. & Hitt, M.A. (1988). "A causal model of linkages among environmental dimensions, macro organizational characteristics and performance." *Academy of Management Journal*, 31: 570-598.

78. Keegan, J. & Kabanoff, B. (2008). "Indirect industry and sub-industry-level managerial discretion measurement." *Organizational Research Methods*, October 2008.
79. Ketchen, D. J., & Shook, C. L. (1996). "The application of cluster analysis in strategic management research: An analysis and critique." *Strategic Management Journal*, 17: 441-460.
80. Ketchen, D. J., Boyd, B.K. and Bergh, D. D. (2008). "Research methodology in strategic management: Past accomplishments and future challenges" *Organizational Research Methods*, October 2008.
81. Ketchen, D.J., Thomas, J. & Snow, C.C. (1993). "Organizational configurations and performance: A comparison of theoretical approaches." *Academy of Management Journal*, 36: 1278-1313.
82. Kogut, B. and Zander, U. (1992). "Knowledge of the firm, combinative capabilities, and the replication of technology". *Organization Science* 3: 383-397.
83. Kuhn, T. S. (1970). *The structure of scientific revolutions* (2 ed.). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
84. Larsson, R. (1993). "Case survey methodology: Quantitative analysis of patterns across case studies." *Academy of Management Journal*, 36: 1515-1546.
85. Lee, T. W. (1999). *Using qualitative methods in organizational research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
86. Leonard-Barton, D. (1990). "A dual methodology for case studies: Synergistic use of a longitudinal single site with replicated multiple sites." *Organization Science*, 1: 248-266.
87. Levy, S. (1988). *Information technologies in universities: An institutional case study*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Northern Arizona University, Flagstaff.
88. Litz, R. A. (1996). "A resource-based-view of the socially responsible firm: Stakeholder interdependence, ethical awareness, and issue responsiveness as strategic assets." *Journal of Business Ethics*, 15: 1355-1363.
89. Locke, E.A. & Latham, G.P. (1990). *A theory of goal setting and task performance*. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall.
90. Lohrke, F.T. (2008). Book Review of "Research Methodology in Strategy and Management, (Volume 3)." *Organizational Research Methods*. 11: 860-864.
91. Martin, J. (1982). "A garbage can model of the research process." Pp. 17-39 in J. E. McGrath, J. Martin, & R. A. Kulka (Eds.), *Judgment calls in research*. Beverly Hills: Sage.
92. Merriam, S. B. (1998). *Qualitative research and case study applications in education*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

93. Meyer, A. D. (1991). "What is strategy's distinctive competence?" *Journal of Management*, 17: 821-833.
94. McGahan, A.M., & Porter, M.E. (2005). Comment on "Industry, corporate and business-segment effects and performance: A non-parametric approach" by Ruefli and Wiggins. *Strategic Management Journal*, 26: 873-880
95. McGahan, A.M., & Porter, M.E. (1997). "How much does industry matter really?" *Strategic Management Journal*, Summer Special Issue, 18: 15-30.
96. McGuire, J. B. (1986). "Management and research methodology" *Journal of Management*, Spring 1986; vol. 12, 1: pp. 5-17.
97. McKelvey, B. (1982). *Organizational systematics*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
98. McWilliams, A., & Smart, D. L. (1995). "The resource-based view of the firm: Does it go far enough in shedding the assumptions of the S-C-P paradigm?" *Journal of Management Inquiry*, 4: 309-316.
99. Meyer, A.D. (1982). "Adapting to environmental jolts." *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 27: 515-536.
100. Michalisin, M. D., Smith, R. D., & Kline, D. M. (1997). "In search of strategic assets." *International Journal of Organizational Analysis*, 5: 360-387
101. Miles, M., & Huberman, M. (1984). *Qualitative data analysis: A source book for new methods*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.
102. Miles, R.E., & Snow, C.C. (1978). *Organizational strategy, structure, and process*. McGraw-Hill: New York.
103. Miller, D. (1986). "Configurations of strategy and structure: Towards a synthesis." *Strategic Management Journal*, 7: 233-249.
104. Miller, D. (1987). "The genesis of configuration." *Academy of Management Review*, 12: 686-701.
105. Miller, D. (1987a). "The structural and environmental correlates of business strategy." *Strategic Management Journal*, 8: 55-76.
106. Miller, D. (1987b). "Strategy making and structure: Analysis and implications for performance." *Academy of Management Journal*, 30: 7-32.
107. Miller, A. & Dess, G. G. (1993). "Assessing Porter's (1980) model in terms of its generalizability, accuracy, and simplicity." *Journal of Management Studies*.
108. Miller, D. & Friesen, P. H.. (1978). "Archetypes of strategy formulation." *Management Science*, 24: 921-933.
109. Miller, D. & Friesen, P. H. (1980). "Archetypes of organizational transition." *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 25: 269-299.

110. Miller, D. & Friesen, P. H. (1983). "Strategy-making and environment: The third link." *Strategic Management Journal*, 4: 221-235.
111. Miller, D., & Shamsie, J. (1996). "The resource-based view of the firm in two environments: The Hollywood film studios from 1936 to 1965." *Academy of Management Journal*, 39: 519-543.
112. Mintzberg, H. (1990). "The manager's job: Folklore and fact" *Harvard Business Review Catalog*, 90(2), 163 - 176.
113. Mintzberg, H., Ahlstrand, B., & Lampel, J. (1998). *Strategy safari: A guided tour through the wilds of strategic management*. Free Press, New York, NY.
114. Mosakowski, E. (1998). "Managerial prescriptions under the resource-based view of strategy: The example of motivational techniques." *Strategic Management Journal*, 19: 1169-1182
115. Nath, D., & Gruca, T. (1997). "Convergence across alternative methods for forming strategic groups." *Strategic Management Journal*, 18: 745-760.
116. Nonaka, I. (1994). "A Dynamic Theory of Organizational Knowledge," *Organization Science* 5: 14-37.
117. Oliver, C. (1991). "Strategic responses to institutional processes." *Academy of Management Review*, 16: 145-179.
118. Oliver, C. (1997). "Sustainable competitive advantage: Combining institutional and resource-based views." *Strategic Management Journal*, 18: 697-713.
119. Patton, M. Q. (1999). "Enhancing the quality and credibility of qualitative analysis." *Health Services Research*, 34(5), 1189-1208.
120. PHG Foundation (2011). "Moral theories: consequentialism." Retrieved 15 June 2011, from <http://www.phgfoundation.org/pages/contact.htm>
121. Plowright, D. (2011). *Using mixed methods: frameworks for an integrated methodology*. Los Angeles: Sage.
122. Podsakoff P. M. and Dalton, D. R. (1987). "Research Methodology in Organizational Studies". *Journal of Management*, June 1, 1987 13:419-441.
123. Porter, M.E. (1980). *Competitive strategy*. Free Press: New York.
124. Powell, T. C. (1992a). "Strategic planning as competitive advantage." *Strategic Management Journal*, 13: 551-558.
125. Powell, T. C. (1992b). "Organizational alignment as competitive advantage." *Strategic Management Journal*, 13: 119-134.
126. Priem, R. L. and Butler, J. E. (2001) "Is the resource-based" view" a useful perspective for strategic management research?" *The Academy of Management Review*, Vol. 26, No. 1, (Jan., 2001), pp. 22-40.

127. Ramanujam, V., & Varadarajan, P. (1989). "Research on corporate diversification: A synthesis." *Strategic Management Journal*, 7: 485-502.
128. Reger, R. K., & Huff, A. S. (1993). "Strategic groups: A cognitive perspective." *Strategic Management Journal*, 14, 103-123.
129. Rindova, V. P., & Fombrun, C. J. (1999). "Constructing competitive advantage: The role of firm-constituent interactions." *Strategic Management Journal*, 20: 691-710.
130. Rudner, R. S. (1966). *Philosophy of social science*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
131. Ruefli, T.W., & Wiggins, R.R. (2005). Response to McGahan and Porter's commentary on "Industry, corporate and business-segment effects and business performance: A non-parametric approach." *Strategic Management Journal*, 26: 881-886.
132. Rumelt, R.P. (1991). "How much does industry matter?" *Strategic Management Journal*, 12: 167-185.
133. Rumelt, R.P. (1974). *Strategy, structure and economic performance*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
134. Samik-Ibrahim, R. M (2000). "Grounded theory methodology as the research strategy for a developing country", *Forum: Qualitative social research*, Vol. 1, No. 1, Art. 19-January 2000.
135. Sarker, Suprateek and Lee, Allen S. (2001). "Using A Positivist Case Research Methodology To Test Three Competing Theories-In-Use Of Business Process Redesign," *Journal of the Association for Information Systems*: Vol. 2: Iss. 1, Article 7.
136. Saunders, C. B. and Thompson, J. C. (1980). "A Survey of the Current State of Business Policy Research" *Strategic Management Journal* Vol. 1 (1980), pp. 119-30.
137. Schendel, D. & Hofer, C. W. (1979). *Strategic management*. Boston: Little, Brown
138. Schmalensee, R. (1985). "Do markets differ much?" *American Economic Review*, 75: 341-351.
139. Seth, A. and Thomas H. (1994). "Theories of the firm: Implications for methodology research" *Journal of Studies* Volume 31, Issue 2, pages 165–192, March 1994. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-6486.1994.tb00770.x
140. Shook, C.L. (2008). Review of "Research Methodology in Strategy and Management, Volume 1." *Organizational Research Methods*. 11(4), 853-854.
141. Shook, C., Ketchen, D., Cycyota, C. & Crockett, D. (2003). "Data analytic trends and training in strategic management." *Strategic Management Journal*, 24: 1231-1237.

142. Shook, C.L., Ketchen, D.J., Hult, G.M.T., & Kacmar, K.M. (2004). "An assessment of the use of structural equation modeling in strategic management research." *Strategic Management Journal*, 25: 397-404.
143. Simon, H.A. (1955). "A Behavioral Model of Rational Choice," *Quarterly Journal of Economics* 69:99-118.
144. Spender, J. C. (1996). "Making Knowledge the Basis of a Dynamic Theory of the Firm". *Strategic Management Journal* 17 (Winter Special Issue): 45-62.
145. Stake, R. (1995). *The art of case research*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.
146. Strauss, A. L., & Corbin, J. M. (1990). *Basics of qualitative research: grounded theory procedures and techniques*. Newbury Park, Calif.: Sage Publications.
147. Stinchcombe, A. (1991). "The Conditions of Fruitfulness of Theorizing About Mechanisms in Social Science," *Philosophy of Social Science* 21: 367-388.
148. Stringer, E. T. (2007). *Action research* (3rd ed.). Los Angeles: Sage Publications.
149. Tellis, W. (1997). "Application of a case study methodology" *The Qualitative Report*, Volume 3, Number 3, September, 1997. (<http://www.nova.edu/ssss/QR/QR3-3/tellis2.html>).
150. Thomas, H. (1984). Mapping Strategic Management Research, *Journal of General Management* (1984) Pages: 13-28. Available from www.thebhc.org
151. Thomas, H. (1986). Mapping Strategic Management Research, in J. McGee and H. Thomas (eds) .
152. Toynbee, A. (1976). *Mankind and Mother Earth: a narrative history of the world*. New York: Oxford.
153. Tripodi, T. and Epstein, I. (1978). "Incorporating Knowledge of Research Methodology into Social Work Practice" *Journal of Social Service Research*, Volume 2, Issue 1, 1978, Pages 65 – 78.
154. Tyler, T. R. (2000). "Social justice." *International Journal of Psychology*, 35, 117-125.
155. Van de Ven, A. H. & Huber, G. P. (1990). "Longitudinal field research methods for studying processes of organizational change." *Organization Science*, 1: 213-219.
156. Van Horn, R.L. (1973). "Empirical Studies of Management Information Systems", *Data Base*, Vol . 5, No. 4-5, pp.172-180.
157. Van Maanen, J., Sorensen, J., & Mitchell, T. (2007). "The interplay between theory and method." *Academy of Management Review*, 32: 1145–1154.
158. Venkatraman, N. & Prescott, J. E. (1990). "Environment-strategy coalignment: An empirical test of its performance implications." *Strategic Management Journal*, 11: 1-24.

159. Venkatraman, N. (2008). "Advancing strategic management insights: Why attention to methods and measurement matters." *Organizational Research Methods*.
160. Venkatraman, N. (1989). "The concept of fit in strategy research: Toward verbal and statistical correspondence." *Academy of Management Review*, 14: 423-444.
161. Wernerfelt, B. (1984). "A resource-based view of the firm." *Strategic Management Journal*, 5: 171-181.
162. White, R. E. (1986). "Generic business strategies, organizational context and performance: An empirical investigation." *Strategic Management Journal*, 7: 217-231.
163. Williamson, O.E. (1975). *Markets and hierarchies: Analysis and antitrust implications*. New York: Free Press.
164. Williamson, O.E. (1985). *The economic institutions of capitalism*. New York: Free Press.
165. Winter, S. G. (1987). "Knowledge and Competence as Strategic Assets", in Teece, D.J, ed. *The Competitive Challenge*. Cambridge, MA: Ballinger.
166. Wright, R.P. (2008a) Review of "Research Methodology in Strategy and Management, Volume 2." *Organizational Research Methods*, 11(4), 855-859.
167. Wright, R. (2008b). "Eliciting cognitions of strategizing using advanced repertory grids in a world constructed and reconstructed." *Organizational Research Methods*.
168. Wright, P.M., Dunford, B.B. & Snell, S.A. (2001). "Human resources and the resource based view." *Journal of Management*, 27: 701-721.
169. Wright, P., Kroll, M., Tu, H., & Helms, M. (1991). "Generic strategies and business performance: An empirical study of the screw machine products industry." *British Journal of Management*, 2: 1-9.
170. Yeoh, P.-L., & Roth, K. (1999). "An empirical analysis of sustained advantage in the U.S. pharmaceutical industry: Impact of firm resources and capabilities." *Strategic Management Journal*, 20: 637-653.
171. Yin, R. (1984). *Case study research: Design and methods* (1st ed.). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publishing.
172. Yin, R. (1989). *Case study research: Design and methods* (Rev. ed.). Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publishing.
173. Yin, R. (1993). *Applications of case study research*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publishing.
174. Yin, R. (1994). *Case study research: Design and methods* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publishing.
175. Xu, D., & Zhou, C. (2004). "Evaluation of the current state-of-the-art of strategic management research in China." *Management World*, 5: 76-87 (in Chinese).