The Qualitative Report

Volume 11 | Number 4 Article 4

12-1-2006

A Critique of the Capacity of Strauss' Grounded Theory for Prediction, Change, and Control in Organisational Strategy via a Grounded Theorisation of Leisure and Cultural Strategy

Ali Bakir
Buckinghamshire Chiltens University College, ali.bakir@bucks.ac.uk

Vian Bakir
University of Glamorgan, vtbakir@glam.ac.uk

A Critique of the Capacity of Strauss' Grounded Theory for Prediction, Change, and Control in Organisational Strategy via a Grounded Theorisation of Leisure and Cultural Strategy

Abstract

In this paper we critique grounded theory's ability to fulfil its aim of offering a practical vehicle for prediction, change, and control as stipulated in grounded theory's original formulation by Glaser and Strauss, and later developed by Strauss. We do this through a case study approach, whereby we develop a grounded theory of leisure and cultural strategy within a local authority, and critically reflect on the process of grounded theorisation, together with its implications for generating practical tools in that most practical of academic fields; organisational strategy. We demonstrate that despite generating good grounded theory on leisure and cultural strategy, here termed "navigational translation," that offers sociological insight, its claim to offer practical tools is inappropriate to the strategy field.

Keywords

Leisure and Cultural Strategy, Grounded Theory, Coding, Generalisability, Prediction, Change and Control, and Navigational Translation

The Qualitative Report Volume 11 Number 4 December 2006 687-718
http://www.nova.edu/ssss/QR/QR11-4/bakir.pdf

A Critique of the Capacity of Strauss' Grounded Theory for Prediction, Change, and Control in Organisational Strategy via a Grounded Theorisation of Leisure and Cultural Strategy

Ali Bakir
Buckinghamshire Chilterns University College, United Kingdom

Vian Bakir
University of Glamorgan, United Kingdom

In this paper we critique grounded theory's ability to fulfil its aim of offering a practical vehicle for prediction, change, and control as stipulated in grounded theory's original formulation by Glaser and Strauss, and later developed by Strauss. We do this through a case study approach, whereby we develop a grounded theory of leisure and cultural strategy within a local authority, and critically reflect on the process of grounded theorisation, together with its implications for generating practical tools in that most practical of academic fields; organisational strategy. We demonstrate that despite generating good grounded theory on leisure and cultural strategy, here termed "navigational translation," that offers sociological insight, its claim to offer practical tools is inappropriate to the strategy field. Key Words: Leisure and Cultural Strategy, Grounded Theory, Coding, Generalisability, Prediction, Change and Control, and Navigational Translation

Introduction

In this paper we assess whether grounded theory is capable of fulfilling its aim of offering a practical vehicle for change, prediction, and control (Glaser & Strauss, 1967). We do this by adopting a case study approach in that most practical of academic fields, management, and in particular, strategy. Whilst the field of strategic management is largely oriented towards generating rationalistic tools that can be utilised by mangers for practical ends (Hendry, 1995; Mintzberg, Lampel, Quinn, & Ghoshal, 2003; Prahalad & Hamel, 1994; Stacey, 2003; Volberda & Elfring, 2001), prominent academics in the field have increasingly recognised that strategy is an elusive phenomenon (Ansoff & McDonnell, 1990; Mintzberg et al.), that the tools generated have not been found practically useful by managers (Berry, 1995; Hendry; Partington, 2000; Pfeffer & Sutton, 1999; Starkey & Madan, 2001; Tsai, Hong-quei, & Valentine, 2003), and that grounded theory can play a role in generating fresh understanding (MacLean, MacIntosh, & Grant, 2002; Partington). Grounded theory would particularly be attractive to

tool-oriented strategic management researchers as it is expected to offer a practical vehicle for prediction, change, and control (Glaser & Strauss, 1967). Indeed, Douglas (2003) argues that the "explanatory power of grounded theory is to develop predictive ability– to explain what may happen to, for instance, a business or organisational sub-unit or a manager in a related context" (p. 51).Whilst there are few grounded theories on strategy that have yet attempted to use grounded theory as a practical tool (to our knowledge, the only example is Andriopoulos and Lowe in 2000, who present their grounded theory of "perpetual challenging" as a diagnostic tool to assess creativity in the working environment), this is probably because the field of organisational strategy has only recently identified its methodological relevance. Through developing a grounded theory of leisure and cultural strategy (that we term "navigational translation"), we hope to show the value of grounded theory in generating understanding, whilst also highlighting its limits in providing practical tools in the strategy field.

The Need for a Grounded Theory of Strategy

Organisational strategy is rooted in the discourse of mainstream strategic management, which is viewed as an applied professional field whose principal purpose is to predict, change, and control organisational situations (Gopinath & Hoffman, 1995; Summer, Bettis, Duhaime, Grant, Hambrick, & Snow, 1990). As such, organisational strategy is conceived within a rational instrumental epistemology and associated analytical methodology characteristic of the "rational approach." This approach projects strategy as rational, objective, and calculable, and encompasses two schools of rational thought. The first is the school of "sequential rationality," which views strategy as a distinct process of formulation, followed by a distinct one of implementation, offering planning prescriptions for managers (Andrews, 1980; Ansoff, 1987; Ansoff & McDonnell, 1990; Porter, 1980, 1991). The second is the school of "rational problem-solving," whose concern is with integrating formulation and implementation views into structured decision-making processes, offering decision aide prescriptions for managers (Huff & Reger, 1987; Littler, Aisthorpe, Hudson, & Keasy, 2000).

As the rational approach requires objective and exhaustive analysis of the environment and organisational resources in order to design a strategy, two competing views of the conditions that shape strategy have also come into existence, with corresponding prescriptions. Academics from the "resource-based" view of strategy (Grant, 1991; Wernerfelt, 1984) privilege the organisation's resources as the primary conditions that shape strategy, while academics from the "natural selection" view (Ansoff, 1987; Porter, 1991) privilege the environment.

However, conventional strategy research associated with the rational approach is perceived as being generally limited in producing knowledge that can be applied to factual situations, particularly in complex and rapidly changing environments (Hendry, 1995; Levy, 1994; Mintzberg, 1994; Mintzberg et al., 2003; Prahalad & Hamel, 1994; Stacey, 2003; Volberda & Elfring, 2001). This has prompted critiques from the contrasting "behavioural approach" to strategy,

which encompasses the schools of "muddling through," "organised anarchy," and "self-organisation" to reject the predetermined notion of strategy. Proponents of the "muddling through" school (Cyert & March, 1963; Huff & Reger, 1987; Lindblom, 1959) view strategy as politically motivated behaviour and strategy processes as persistently non-rational. They argue that individuals and organisations can achieve, at best, only bounded rationality as the nature of people, and that of organisations do not allow the sequential formulation through to implementation in the development of strategy. Proponents of the organised anarchy school (Cohen, March, & Olsen, 1972) find that decision-making processes in some organisations are characterised by ambiguity, where cause and effect relationships are difficult to identify, and where participation is fluid and limited. Stressing the uncontrollable characteristic of strategy, Levy (1994) and Stacey (2003), of the self-organisation school, argue that organisations are complex adaptive feedback systems, where unpredictable new patterns emerge from a process of spontaneous self-organisation; consequently, they find planning for their long-term future an impossible task.

The fact that these schools have competing assumptions has resulted in "debilitating fragmentation … in the field of strategic management" (Hambrick, 2004, p. 93), and might in itself point to the elusiveness of strategy. Consequently, there is a divergence between strategy research and managers' perception of its utility, either because the dominant rational strategy tools fail to work in practice or because critiques of these tools fail to offer practical alternatives.

This disillusion with rational strategy tools and their critiques has added momentum to the field of "strategy as practice" in the academic community since the 1990s, inspired by the "Mode 2" ideas of Gibbons et al. (1994). Mode 2 is knowledge created in a context of application, as opposed to traditional "Mode 1" knowledge generated in a context of established disciplines. Accordingly, the field of strategy as practice sees strategy as social action encompassing richly interactive and contextually situated social behaviours (Tranfield, 2002; Whittington, 2003). Proponents of this field increasingly suggest that grounded theory is a relevant methodology for their research aims (MacLean et al., 2002; Partington, 2000). This makes sense given that the originators of grounded theory suggested that it be used where a totally fresh approach to the existing theory is warranted (Glaser, 1992; Strauss & Corbin, 1990, 1998), either because existing theories do not adequately explain a phenomenon (as is the case with the dominant rational strategy discourse and its critiques) or when existing theory on the phenomenon being studied is minimal (as is the case in the strategy as practice field).

As will be explained in the following sections, we develop a grounded theory of leisure and cultural strategy, and label it "navigational translation". We demonstrate how navigational translation can help us understand the complexity of strategy, and explore whether it can be used as a tool for prediction, change, and control.

Grounded Theory – Glaser versus Strauss

Before progressing to generate our own grounded theory on strategy, it is important to distinguish two strands within grounded theory; Glaserian grounded theory versus Strauss' grounded theory. This distinction has been explained at length elsewhere (Cutcliffe, 2000; Glaser, 1992; Goulding, 2005; Stern, 1994), therefore only an overview of the relevant aspects will be presented here. The bifurcation between the two approaches to grounded theory was largely marked by Strauss and Corbin (1990), provoking Glaser's accusations of distortion and infidelity to the central objectives of parsimony and theoretical emergence. Whilst Glaser and Glaser and Holton (2004) came to stress the interpretive, contextual, and emergent nature of theory development, Strauss (1987) emphasised the need for complex and systematic coding techniques, arguing that this gives the grounded theory rigour and conceptual density.

Strauss and Corbin's (1990) efforts to demystify grounded theory resulted in a development of grounded theory that differs from Glaser and Strauss' (1967) original grounded theory and Glaser's (1992) later developments in at least one significant way. The difference concerns the "generality" and "control" criteria for judging the grounded theory's rigour. According to Strauss and Corbin (1990, p. 251), generality refers to systematic and widespread theoretical sampling that builds in conditions and variations so that "precision and predictive capacity" will be greater. They further argue that "the theory should provide control with regard to action toward the phenomenon" (Strauss & Corbin, 1990, p. 23). These criteria do not significantly feature in Glaser's (1992) version, who stressed instead "modifiability," namely that the theory "should be readily modifiable when new data present variations in emergent properties and categories" (p. 15). We felt that Strauss and Corbin's (1990) criteria of generality and control were important because given that management, and, in particular, strategy is a highly practice-oriented academic field, a grounded theory that offers possibilities for precision, prediction, and control would ultimately be the most attractive to strategy researchers, given the dominant strategy discourse. However, as shall become apparent, we critically scrutinised the generated grounded theory using Strauss' tools to see if such precision, prediction, and control was possible or likely. In so doing, we offer a methodological contribution by critiquing these generality and control criteria of Strauss for generating good grounded theory.

We expound key stages in the generation of our grounded theory on leisure and cultural strategy in the next section, so that readers may audit its dependability (Guba & Lincoln, 1989) whilst also appreciating a strategy's complexity. This paves the way for the following section where we scrutinise this emergent grounded theory for its capacity to act as a practical tool.

Applying Grounded Theory to Leisure and Cultural Strategy

Grounded Theory – The Research Approach

In response to the strategy literature that notes the elusiveness of the concept of strategy (Ansoff & McDonnell, 1990; Mintzberg et al., 2003), our aim in this study was to unravel and obtain a theoretically dense explanation of what managers understand leisure and cultural strategy to consist of. We addressed this research problem through "qualitative interviewing" (Mason, 1996, p. 38) of purposively sampled (Miles & Huberman, 1994) senior managers of a local authority in England.

We adopted semi-structured, informal interviews that allowed us to explore complex, retrospective, and reflective questions more fully, in addition to facilitating informational questions (Charmaz, 1994; Kvale, 1996; Wilson, 1996). We conducted such interviews throughout two strategy review periods[1] between 1996 and 2000, where managers reflected upon past and current strategies and discussed future strategies. We developed a list of questions in the form of an aide memoir (see Appendix A) based on concepts derived from the literature, commonsense knowledge, and our own theoretical sensitivity (Strauss, 1987) and experiences[2] to guide the semi-structured settings of the interviews. We conducted the interviews, in the participants' offices, typically lasting three hours at a time, with most extending over multiple sessions. We explained to the participants that the general aim of the research was to gain insight into their understanding of what they do as they make strategy. We negotiated access to the organisation and obtained permission at the corporate and individual manager's levels. We achieved informed consent that included agreement to record the interviews and publish the data and analysis, and that allowed participants to withdraw from the research[3]. Exploring managers' understanding of leisure and cultural strategy over a long period of time facilitated our ongoing analysis and reflection on the complexity of this phenomenon. We generated and transcribed seventy-nine hours of interview material from this organisation.

As interviewers, we were alert to potential reactivity (Hammersley & Atkins, 1993). It is possible that managers' statements in interviews were retrospective justifications of their past, present, and planned strategising processes rather than an account truthful to their memory of events, and that managers were constructing what they understood strategising ought to be like,

---

[1] During this study, the Council produced two strategy review documents in 1997 and 1999, each looking at what had been achieved in the previous review period and what needed to be changed in the following two years.

[2] Ali Bakir worked in senior managerial positions (for over ten years) in the private sector. Also, in his current role as Principal Lecturer, he has been actively involved in decisions with organisation-wide strategy implications. Vian Bakir worked with a small promotions company in a management capacity for three years and has had strategic management experience in her role as Course Director for Masters courses and Departmental Marketing Coordinator at her current place of employment. For a discussion of the extent to which grounded theory enables reflexivity, see Cutcliffe (2000) and Hall and Callery (2001).

[3] One manager did in fact withdraw and was not included in this research.

rather than what it actually is. We addressed these issues through triangulation (Denzin & Lincoln, 1994), with detailed strategy documents from the organisation's archives, comprising its strategic corporate, leisure, and cultural plans and strategy reviews. Furthermore, conducting in-depth interviews over time built rapport, facilitating greater frankness on the part of participants, and allowing them to reflect with different temporal perspectives on strategising that had been current or future in their initial interview, but had become past or current in subsequent interviews.

We followed Strauss and Corbin's (1990) procedures for coding and memoing of interview transcripts summarised below and detailed later in this paper. Analysis of each interview allowed us in subsequent "theoretical sampling" (namely, sampling guided by the emerging theory in Strauss and Corbin, 1990, p. 176)) to look for more properties and variations to saturate the emerging theory. Grounded theory demands that as provisional categories emerge from the data, they are developed into "conceptually dense" (Strauss & Corbin, 1990, p. 109) categories by the process of "constant comparison" (Strauss & Corbin, 1990, pp. 62-63), first comparing data from one interview with data from other interviews, then comparing data with emergent theory through the interplay between induction, deduction, and verification. Thus, where data gave rise to concepts, the induced concepts allowed us to deduce other concepts, which we then verified by comparison with other data and with data from the strategy literature (we show this in the coding sections below as we develop our grounded theory). It is through this process of constant comparison that we critically utilised and integrated the breadth of strategy literature, alongside data generated from practitioners in order to pin down the elusiveness of strategy. The sample size was determined by whether "theoretical saturation" (Strauss, 1987, p. 21) was reached by the data generated and their analysis. This occurred after we interviewed fourteen senior managers and councillors responsible for developing strategy in the local authority organisation studied.

A core category, navigational translation, emerged through rigorous application of grounded theory's coding procedures as demonstrated in the following sections.

Open Coding: Deriving Concepts from Data and Developing Categories

Open coding is where data is broken down and examined to form concepts and categories. In line with grounded theory's methodology, the concepts generated are the first stage in our own interpretation of the data: Our chosen labels logically relate to the data they represent and were graphic enough to remind us quickly of their referent (Strauss & Corbin, 1990). Our open coding examination of the data resulted in a large number of concepts, which we noted down alongside the data. We show an extract of this in Appendix B, Figure 1. This open coding allowed some of these concepts to emerge as provisional categories by having the capacity to subsume other concepts as their "subcategories," "properties" (characteristics pertaining to a category), and

"dimensions" (locations of properties along a continuum) (Strauss & Corbin, 1990, p. 61).

We found, for example, that the induced concept of "navigating" has the capacity to subsume many of the other concepts. We show a summary of this in Appendix B, Figure 2. So, when managers navigated, they consulted, defined purpose, and mapped direction: "We get a view from people, again before we take a specific direction" (Chief Executive interview, November, 1996; we shall refer to this interviewee as CE in subsequent citations). Some of their consultation resulted in reviewing, reorienting, and changing direction and purpose: "We're going out and asking people and … we have to change our stance because of that consultation" (Chair of Leisure, Health, and Community Services interview, March, 1997; we shall refer to this interviewee as CoLHCS in subsequent citations). They also engaged in many other activities that were necessary for navigating to take place, all of which became subcategories or properties of navigating. Furthermore, each property displayed a dimensional range which gave it specificity: For example, the property "cyclicality" of the subcategory "consulting and reviewing" has a "frequent-infrequent" dimensional range and the property "scope" has a "wide–narrow" dimensional range, allowing consulting and reviewing to be described as frequently or infrequently undertaken, and of wide, moderate, or narrow scope, depending on the context of consulting and reviewing. Navigating in the case-study organisation studied had a two-year cycle, where the strategy was reviewed: "They [the Council]... agreed they'd do market research every two years" (CE interview, November, 1996). Furthermore, the scope of the review was very wide: "But there is health dividend from leisure, more and more councils … are becoming more aware of health for all, and working together for healthy alliances" (Director of Leisure, Health, and Community Services interview, December, 1996; we shall refer to this interviewee as DoLHCS in subsequent citations).

It is this capacity of navigating to subsume other concepts that allowed us to assign to it the status of provisional category. As a category, navigating is then defined by the concepts it subsumed as its subcategories, properties, and dimensions (see Appendix B, Figure 2). Close inspection of Appendix B, Figure 2 provides an appreciation of what the category navigating is: We show not only some of the subcategories, but the properties and their dimensional range in order to convey the complexity of this category. This is important as it will have implications for whether this grounded theory can be used as a practical tool.

We can also now tentatively give a context-specific definition of navigating as: A set of interactions initiated by managers that were purposeful, fluid, and complex with wide scope and many directions, which lacked clarity; that were largely consultative, of fifteen years vision, ideological and political, and so on; requiring managers to engage in the activities of scanning over fifteen years period, planning every four years, reviewing or changing direction every two years, continuously aligning, deploying limited resources, measuring, controlling, and so on.

A process similar to that of navigating gave rise to the provisional category of "translating," which we again tentatively define based on our findings as: A set of interactions initiated by managers to transform their vision into reality, that were intended, largely formal, creative, very fragmentary, and detailed, having wide resonance, continuous, and so on; requiring managers to plan and execute, deploy limited resources effectively, provide good facilities and services, and so on (see Appendix B, Figure 3).

As with navigating, the provisional category of translating had numerous context-specific profiles. This profile-specificity is significant because it points to the difficulty encountered in formulating a generalised strategy prescription.

We found three other provisional categories, each with its subcategories, properties, and dimensions. We labelled these provisional categories "gazing & envisioning," "interconnecting and interrelating," and "exercising power". In line with grounded theory's methodology, we looked at all the provisional categories and found that they share in common many of the subcategories and properties (although we do not have space to evidence this here). We also found that the provisional categories of navigating and translating have, between them, the capacity to subsume all the other provisional categories together with their lower concepts (see Appendix B, Figure 6). Rather than dwelling on these subsumed provisional categories, we will develop the two categories of navigating and translating, which ultimately emerged as conceptually dense strategy categories, capable of encompassing maximum variation in the phenomenon of leisure and cultural strategy. We will do this by following the grounded theory technique of constant comparison, firmly embedding the concepts in the data and showing the category that subsumed them. We present an extract of this process in the following section, italicizing the emerging concepts as they first appear, bolding the category to which they belong.

Developing Conceptually Dense Categories: The Categories of Navigating and Translating

"I see it [strategy] as the 10, 15, 20 year outlook. It's got to be the big picture, which then clearly has to cascade down to the smaller picture; making it happen, the building blocks" (CE, interview, November, 1996). We induced from this data that strategy was portrayed as a process of simultaneous *integration* ("the big picture") and *fragmentation* ("the smaller picture"), where through *resonance* ("cascade down") the fragments are *aligned* (that is, **navigated**) to achieve the corporate *purpose* ("making it happen"), that is, **translating** through an *incremental* process ("the building blocks"). From the following data we induced that managers were *gazing* into the future *environment* and *envisioning* a corporate purpose, that is, **navigating** and **translating**: "So it's very much about having a vision as to the type of leisure provision we want to see in the future and what our role in that should be" (Head of leisure Services Department interview, October, 1996; we shall refer to this interviewee as HoLSD in subsequent citations). They would then be fragmenting this general vision into a number of smaller *plans*, working out "the travelling arrangements...for the journey, the

steps we are taking under each area" (Corporate Strategic Plan, n.d.; we shall refer to this documents as CSP in subsequent citations), that is, **translating** and **navigating**. This shows strategy as a *complex* set of activities, where in order to *cope with* the volume of data, managers' first fragment to simplify, and then reintegrate to align the fragmented increments with each other and with the corporate purpose. For example, managers' *broad* corporate objective for leisure service provision was to view leisure as having "a vital and significant contribution to make to the quality of life within the district" (Leisure Strategy document, n.d.; we shall refer to this document as LS in subsequent citations), again showing the resonance of **navigating** and **translating**. For this to happen, a set of smaller purposes *emerge,* which requires managers to *interrelate* and *interconnect,* that is, **navigate** and **translate** such as to, "*encourage* and *facilitate* a growth in leisure provision, ... *improve the quality* of all leisure provisions, *ensure equality and equity* of access to all leisure services" (LS, n.d.). Ensuring quality and equity points to the fact that manager's *values* and *beliefs* intervene in navigating and translating. Within the general leisure provision area, we found a cascading set of specific services such as, "arts and entertainment, community leisure facilities and services, countryside recreation, indoor sports, and so on" (LS, n.d.), pointing to complex and *interlocking* relationships.

The complexity of leisure and cultural strategy arising principally from the interlocking relationships between these leisure and cultural areas resulted in some *emergent* outcomes that were *unintended*, pointing to *misalignment*: "…the things that happen all the time to throw you off course" (Chairperson of the Strategic Board interview, February, 1998; we shall refer to this interviewee as CoSB in subsequent citations), thus requiring *reorientation* and new emergent strategies (that is, **navigating**). This data points to the fluid nature of the *environment* which impacted **navigating** and **translating**. Management's *intention* was to *improve* all the district's services by putting in place a "framework of *effective* business *planning,* which delivers the strategic plan through directorate business units" (CSP, n.d.), that is, **translating** and "a system of *monitoring* at committee level" (CSP, n.d.). These **navigating** and **translating** processes of planning, monitoring, and *controlling* embody *review* processes: "Over the next two years we will be reviewing all we do to ensure that the services are delivered in the most cost effective way" (CSP, n.d.), pointing to the impact of resources on how managers **navigate** and **translate**. However, reviewing may result in a *revision* of the strategy. "This [new] strategy...is designed to provide the Council with a new strategic *direction*," (CSP, n.d.) reorienting (**navigating)**. Reviewing encompassed *reflecting* on past decisions and experiences and *acquiring new understanding* and *learning*, which might have required a new orientation. "The Council has decided to carry out a further review... This takes account of the significant changes that have occurred since the previous strategy was published" (Leisure Strategy Review document, n.d.; we shall refer to this document as LSR in subsequent citations). Reviewing the strategy "through the use of data on national and regional trends" (CSP, n.d.) allowed managers "to *forecast* the needs of the community ... over the next five to ten years" (CSP, n.d.); a process of *gazing and envisioning,* which might have

resulted in reorientation and new **translating** activities. Due to the *cyclical* nature of reviewing, namely every two years (CSP, n.d.), navigating and translating acquired not only the property of cyclicality, but also that of *continuousness*. "So this is the process of strategy; in fact...it's non-ending" (CoSB interview, February, 1998).

In this short extract and in line with grounded theory, we have demonstrated how the categories of navigating and translating were made more conceptually dense, by allowing the concepts that relate to them to emerge from data from various interviews and organisational documents, so as to cater for maximum variation, and to increase the dependability of the emerging grounded theory. In doing so, we provided an insight into the interlocking relationships between the emerging concepts and between the categories: We will look at these relationships in a much more structured way in the axial coding in the next section.

Axial Coding: Making Connections

In axial coding we analysed each category, using the "coding paradigm" (Strauss, 1987, pp. 27-28), producing cumulative knowledge about relationships within a category and between categories. The coding paradigm is a coding procedure where concepts that relate to a category are classified as that category's properties, context, causal conditions, intervening conditions, actions/interactions, or outcomes/consequences (Strauss & Corbin, 1990; Strauss, 1987). We will show the development of the categories of navigating and translating (see also Appendix B, figures 4 & 5) in some detail, grounding the concepts in the data to sufficiently define what navigating and translating are, and to allow the reader to more fully appreciate and audit the emergence of the grounded theory of navigational translation.

The Category of Navigating

Causal conditions

We found that a causal condition that gave rise to the strategy category of navigating was having a new purpose or goal: "The thing that influences strategy is the vision, the knowledge of where you want to go, what you want" (CoSB interview, February, 1998).

Unstable environment was another causal condition: "So I would have thought that we have to look a bit more at unpredictability and instability" (CE interview, November, 1996).

We needed then to ask questions about the properties of the causal conditions, that we induced and/or deduced by focusing on the category and systematically analysing and refining the data through constant comparison, where we compared data from one interview with data from other interviews. For instance we induced from another piece of data that the causal condition of having a new purpose was shaped by the degree of urgency of achieving that purpose and

linked to the stage in the four-year local authority election cycle: "Sometimes a deliberate decision is made not to make a decision on a strategic issue because … there's an election coming up. I think … if there's an election coming up people will delay decisions until after the election" (CoLHCS interview, March, 1997).

Specific properties (context)

Navigating displayed a large number of specific properties (for example, having wide scope, being integrative and multi-directional) of 10-20 year horizon, comprised of 4-year planning periods with 2-year review cycles. We have already derived many of these concepts earlier in the open coding section and displayed them in Appendix B, Figure 2, and shall not repeat here. We merely emphasise that each property has a dimensional range along which navigating may be located, and together, these form the context under which navigating took place and shaped the actions/interactions that needed to be taken.

Actions/interactions

Managers' actions and interactions when navigating included:

- Scanning the environment: "The legislation which tends to privatise services, if you look back the signals were there for many years" (DoLHCS interview, October, 1998).
- Determining direction: "We're … setting a new direction for the future" (HoLSD interview, October, 1996).
- Collaborating and consulting: "… you have to go outside to take account of other people's opinions" (CoLHCS interview, May, 2000).

Outcomes/consequences

Undoubtedly, the above actions, and other actions and interactions, resulted in certain outcomes that were not always predictable or intended: "People's tastes have changed so you've … a massive great swimming pool and nobody wants to go swimming in it. So these issues change fairly rapidly. So … from a leisure perspective, they change … fairly quickly" (CoLHCS interview, May, 2000). Other outcomes included understanding new meanings and learning: "…going out, asking people's opinions and starting off with an idea … and finding out … that people don't …like the idea, we can back-track and take another decision" (CoLHCS interview, May, 2000) and increased motivation: "but there are so many trends, fashions, expectations … And certainly it makes leisure an interesting and creative place to be" (HoLSD interview, September, 1999).

Intervening conditions

These conditions acted to facilitate or constrain the actions/interactions that were taken and affected their outcomes. Examples included manager's inability to look clearly into the future because of unpredictable environments: "Nobody can see any clear direction, nobody has any idea what's going to happen" (CoSB interview, February, 1998); managers' values and ideology: "you made a decision to join a party, you recognise some of the values, ideals of that party and will therefore approach problems from those perspectives on them" (CoLHCS interview, May, 2000); and lack of resources: "We clearly know that the cheque book has a finite number of pages to know that choices have to be made" (DoLHCS interview, October, 1998).

This coding allows us to define navigating, moving beyond our earlier context-specific definition, by stating that under conditions where navigating is known to have the specific properties shown above, and triggered by the causal conditions defined above, managers will set about acting and interacting in the manner described in order to achieve the stated outcomes, provided that the identified intervening conditions do not change the actions/interactions and their outcomes. Unlike the previous tentative definition of navigating that demonstrated its capacity to subsume concepts, this definition elucidates the relationships between these concepts. It provides a specific template of navigating (see Appendix B, Figure 4) which may entice both researchers and managers to use it as a tool for prediction, change, and control; we will say more about this in the discussion at the end of this paper.

The Category of Translating

Causal conditions

We found that many of the causal conditions that triggered navigating also gave rise to translating; some of their properties had navigational effects, while other properties had translational ones. Having a new vision or purpose, which was driven by the manager's beliefs and ideology, was such a causal condition that required translating: "I want to care for the most fortunate and the less fortunate in society" (CE interview, November, 1996). Other causal conditions originated in the environment, what the community demanded: "Influences on strategy will emanate from the community at large, and I think we have to listen carefully to what our community... is saying" (DoLHCS interview, December, 1996).

Specific properties (context)

The specific properties forming the context, under which translating took place, included being creative: "We're in the business of creating opportunities for the local community" (DoLHCS interview, December, 1996) and fragmentary, working out "the steps we are taking under each area" (CSP, n.d.). Again each

property has a dimensional range along which translating was located and formed the specific context of translating.

Actions/interactions

The actions/interactions that managers engaged in when translating included:

- Planning and deploying resources: "The strategy is … a cycle of planning, resource allocation" (HoLSD interview, October, 1996).
- Researching, reviewing, and revising: "We carry out a lot of market research to find out if our strategy is still in accord with what people were telling us two years ago" (HoLSD interview, October, 1996).

Outcomes/consequences

The above actions/interactions resulted in intended and unintended outcomes such as:

- Flexible service provision: "…the emphasis has moved, … looking at leisure provision now, on building a big empty square, with a roof on it with a lot of easily changeable facilities within it, you can meet the changing demands fairly quickly" (CoLHCS interview, May, 2000).
- Motivated workforce resulting from delegating: "…a fairly free hand on how to deliver … made motivation very high" (DoLHCS interview, October, 1998).

Intervening conditions

These included:

- Manager's character (personality, disposition, and temperament) and social background: "You bring a whole load of baggage with you… You will make the decisions. …according to where you come from" (CoSB interview, February 1998).
- Limited resources: "…the resource element is again dictated to us and has been cut back in real terms" (DoLHCS interview, October, 1998).

We can thus define translating by stating that; under conditions where translating has the above specific properties and triggered by the defined set of causal conditions, managers will engage in the described actions and interactions in the hope of achieving some or all of the desired outcomes. Their actions/interactions may, however, be affected by some of the stated intervening conditions, producing unintended outcomes. We display the axial coding template of translating in Appendix B, Figure 5.

Strauss (1987) argued that specifying the features of a category in this form gives it rigour and conceptual density. The rigour and conceptual density of navigating and translating would have been further enhanced by studying these categories across the entire dimensional range of its properties, a monumental task that was not feasible in terms of resources and time (Goulding, 2005).

Selective Coding: Naming the Core Category

The final stage in forming a grounded theory of strategy was to find the core category that subsumed the categories of navigating and translating, and provided an explanation of leisure and cultural strategy. We achieved this through selective coding by relating the core category to the categories of navigating and translating, relating these categories to their concepts through the coding paradigm (see also axial coding above), and validating those relationships with reference to the data (see open coding above as we will not refer to the data again because of lack of space), and by linking with the strategy literature (Glaser, 1992; Strauss & Corbin, 1990, p. 52, pp. 116-118). A core category emerged that has high conceptual capacity, enabling it to subsume navigating and translating and their lower concepts. We present an extract of the selective coding process below showing the categories italicized.

A prerequisite in making a strategy was the formation of a defined purpose or intent; having purpose was a causal condition of *navigating* and *translating*, which managers identified through gazing and envisioning. Hardy (1996) argues that the formation of intent depends on persuading other people on the basis of tenuous or ambiguous data. In turn, this suggests that managers manoeuvred, manipulated, and cajoled, all of which were action/interaction concepts of exercising power, a sub-category of *navigating*; they are also notions that are firmly embedded in the behavioural approach to strategy.

Having formed their purpose, managers were then concerned with realising it, which Hardy (1996) argues happens through employing the agency of other people; that is, interconnecting and interrelating, both of which were subcategories of *navigating* and *translating*. Here, a principal set of activities that managers engaged in was the deployment of resources through "goal-directed" and "coordinated" actions (MacCrimmon, 1993). The concept of direction was a property of *navigating*, coordinating was an action/interaction of *navigating* and *translating*, and the concept of resources was an intervening condition of *navigating* and *translating*. "Resources" is also a principal concept in the resource-based view of strategy: Proponents of this view (Grant, 1991; Wernerfelt, 1984) strongly argued that the resources of an organisation form the foundation of its strategy. In deploying resources, managers were also engaging in planning. Planning was an action/interaction concept of *navigating* and *translating*, and is also a central premise of the sequential rationality school of strategy (Ansoff & McDonnell, 1990).

As managers acted and interacted, unexpected outcomes emerged (Mintzberg et al., 2003; Stacey, 1996) requiring "day-to-day" (Stacey, 1996, p. 2) adjustment and reorientation. The concept of emergence was an unintended

outcome of *navigating* and *translating*, and a principal notion of the "muddling through", organised anarchy, and self-organisation schools of strategy. "Day-to-day" suggests incremental (Quinn, 1981) and continuous activities, properties of *translating* and *navigating*: They are also central concepts in the "muddling through" and organised anarchy schools of strategy.

In *navigating* and *translating*, managers were also responding to a changing environment: The environment was an intervening condition impacting *navigating* and *translating*. Advocates of the natural selection view of strategy (Eisenhardt & Bourgeois, 1988; Porter, 1991) saw the environment as a primary factor in determining strategy. In their response to environmental events, managers were reorienting and aligning, allowing the coming together of internal decisions and external events to create a shared consensus for action among managers. The concept of aligning or "finding a fit" between the internal and external contexts was an action/interaction of *navigating*: It also forms a principal premise of the rational approach to strategy (Ansoff & McDonnell, 1990; Huff & Reger, 1987).

While deploying resources, planning and aligning, managers were looking towards creating a desired future outcome, which McMaster (1996) and Raimond (1996) urge them to develop through "creative" and "effective" foresight. "Developing foresight" was an outcome concept of *navigating*: Managers' foresight was also shaped by their character and values, the latter being intervening conditions of *navigating* and *translating*, and a source of strategy in the behavioural school. Managers, according to this school, would be reflecting on events and actions, sense-making, learning and creating knowledge (Nonaka & Toyama, 2003; Stacey, 2003; Weick, 2002), and politically interacting allowing new strategic directions to emerge (Pettigrew, 1997; Pfeffer, 1992; Stacey, 2003). The concepts of political, reflecting, sense-making (developing new understanding), learning, and creating (allowing new directions to emerge) were all properties, actions/interactions, and outcomes of *navigating* and *translating*.

In the above extract, we have demonstrated that the categories of navigating and translating, and their lower concepts, were interlocked in complex and fluid interrelationships. Also, in the process of validating and refining the strategy categories of navigating and translating, via the strategy literature, of which we showed only a fragment above, we found that we have used the full breadth of this literature from the various schools. This reinforces the view that any one of the strategy explanations offered by any school of strategy is only a very partial representation of what actually happens (for instance, see Hambrick, 2004; Hax & Majluf, 1991; Hendry, 1995), whilst also demonstrating that each contributes towards our understanding of some aspect of strategy.

We have also demonstrated that the concepts embraced by the phenomenon of leisure and cultural strategy were all integrated around either *navigating* or *translating* or both. Since the core category must have a higher conceptual power than either *navigating* or *translating*, we termed the core category that best described leisure and cultural strategy "*navigational translation*" (see Appendix B, Figure 6). In developing leisure and cultural strategy, we thus found managers to engage in translational activities that were

navigated. We can define navigational translation as: Purposeful, fluid and complex processes that were interlocked with equally complex relationships within the configuration of the organisation's resources and its business environment, shaped by managers' character and values, which gave rise to intended and unintended outcomes.

Whilst space constraints prevent an exhaustive presentation of data and generation of concepts, the emerging core category of navigational translation is auditable given the data selected for presentation, and the explanations provided on the various coding stages.

We noted in the introduction that academics see strategy as complex, ambiguous, and therefore elusive. Our main contribution to knowledge is offering the concept of navigational translation as a richer, practice-oriented framework of leisure and cultural strategy that unpacked strategy's complexity and, by offering a fuller insight into strategy, pinned down its elusiveness, showing it to contain elements from all schools of strategy.

Having generated this grounded theory, we now explain how it meets Strauss and Corbin's (1990) criteria for good grounded theory.

Meeting the Criteria of Good Grounded Theory

The grounded theory of navigational translation satisfies the first six of Strauss and Corbin's (1990, 1998) seven criteria for a well-constructed grounded theory, namely: "fit," "understanding," "reproducibility," "variation," "conceptual density," "generality," and "control" explained below.

- Fit: "If theory is faithful to the everyday reality of the substantive area and carefully induced from diverse data, then it should fit that substantive area" (Strauss & Corbin, 1990, p. 23). We have demonstrated that navigational translation is central in that it relates to all the other categories and their properties; it appears frequently in the data; it explicates what is happening in the data, linking the various data together; and its details are worked out analytically.
- Understanding: **"**Because it represents that reality, it should also be comprehensible and make sense both to the persons who were studied and to those practicing in that area" (Strauss & Corbin, 1990, p. 23). We showed the sample of managers that we interviewed the grounded theory of navigational translation and they found it both comprehensible and representative of the reality of strategising.
- Reproducibility: Our theoretical perspectives and rules for data gathering and analysis have been outlined and much data (linked to their emerging concepts) has been presented, so enabling auditability and reproducibility.
- Variation: Our careful application of the coding procedures has generated a grounded theory of navigational translation capable of encompassing much variation in the data.

- Conceptual density: We have closely followed Strauss and Corbin's (1990) coding paradigm in generating conceptually dense categories, and hence conceptually dense grounded theory.
- Generality:

> If the data upon which it is based are comprehensive and the interpretations conceptual and broad, then the theory should be abstract enough and include sufficient variation to make it applicable to a variety of contexts related to that phenomenon. (Strauss & Corbin, 1990, p. 23)

In order to provisionally test whether our grounded theory is abstract enough, and includes sufficient variation to make it transferable to a variety of contexts as an explanation of strategy, we interviewed senior managers from six other organisations[4] from the leisure and cultural industries between 1996 and 2000[5]. We purposefully sampled these organisations to cover a good spectrum of leisure and cultural practices (public, public-private, and commercial), so widening the scope of the grounded. As with the local authority organisation studied, we chose to interview senior managers. We again applied the coding techniques of grounded theory and the same categories and core category that formed the grounded theory of strategy in the local authority organisation emerged as a grounded theory of strategy in these organisations. Thus, the core category displayed a capacity to account for variations in the strategy phenomenon across these organisations, allowing it to potentially become a more general grounded theory of strategy within the leisure and cultural industries.

Whilst satisfying six of Strauss and Corbin's (1990, 1998) seven criteria for a well-constructed grounded theory, navigational translation diverges from Strauss and Corbin's (1990, p. 23) seventh criterion, namely "control". This divergence runs through the heart of our critique of grounded theory as a practical tool for managers, and we shall expound this more thoroughly in the following, and penultimate, section.

Discussion: The Utility of "Navigational Translation" to Managers

We note that the criterion of control which was present in the original grounded theory (Glaser & Strauss, 1967) was dropped by Glaser (1992) in his own subsequent grounded theory developments, but retained by Strauss and Corbin (1990, p. 23). Strauss and Corbin further argue that it is when grounded theory becomes more generalised that control is possible. "The more systematic

[4] Those interviewed were a director of a leisure institute, a top executive of a government cultural department, the marketing manager of an airline business, the coordinator of a children's play charity, a director of a national sport organisation, and the chief executive of a sport, leisure and conference centre.

[5] The aim of the exercise was to provisionally test, rather than conclusively establish the transferability (generalisability) of this grounded theory, of strategy, to other leisure and cultural organisations. Full testing of the transferability of the grounded theory would have required a fully fledged research commitment in terms of researchers, time, and resources similar to that of the main local authority organisation studied in this paper.

and widespread the theoretical sampling, the more conditions and variations that will be discovered and built into the theory, therefore the greater its generalisability (also precision and predictive capacity)" (1990, p. 251).

We noted earlier that strategy academics find strategy elusive, and managers find the academic tools of strategy wanting. A grounded theory of strategy should therefore appeal to managers as it promises to provide the prediction, precision, and control, so crucially needed for business success. In order to utilise the grounded theory of navigational translation as a management tool, we must operationalise its two constituent categories; navigating and translating, and their various subcategories and properties. Taking the category of navigating (see figure 2), for example, we must examine its numerous subcategories such as consulting, reviewing, gazing, envisioning, making choices, scanning, and others, and operationalise each of them. Looking at the "scanning" subcategory, for example, we must find all its relevant properties such as effectiveness, focus, scope, and duration. We must then develop a mechanism to cater for all the possible dimensions of these properties, so that we can determine whether scanning is highly effective, moderately effective, or of low effectiveness; whether it is internally or externally focussed; whether it is of wide or narrow scope of long, medium, or short duration; and so on. We must thus develop a tool that covers all the possible variations; every possible dimension of every property of every subcategory of every category of navigational translation.

If managers are able and willing to use such a tool, our labour is not yet finished, as the static nature of this tool does not take into consideration the dynamic and complex nature of human interactions characteristic of navigational translation. Because of managers' desperate need for prediction and control, to ensure business success and enticed by the grounded theory promise for delivering prediction and control, we would have to attempt to unlock the sets of relationships under which the concepts of each category are grouped (summarised in the category's coding paradigm), and devise probability tools to cater for the various impacts of each group of relationships on other groups. Again, taking the category of navigating, we would have to first identify all the possible "causal conditions" of navigating. Then, we would have to identify the properties of these causal conditions and their dimensional ranges, so that we can understand how these causal conditions shape the specific properties of navigating. So, for instance, if the causal condition of "having a new purpose" was politically motivated, it would attribute to navigating the specific properties of being "ideological" with "wide resonance". We would have to identify all the other specific properties of navigating, which in their totality form the context under which managers' navigational actions and interactions take place. So, if navigating had the specific properties of being highly ideological with wide resonance managers would, for instance, have to manoeuvre, manipulate, deploy resources, exercise power, and take other actions to achieve their desired outcomes. We would also have to identify the intervening conditions that may impact managers' actions/interactions: Here managers' ideology and values would have acted as an intervening condition in navigating, and would most likely give rise to some unintended outcomes that we would need to design

contingencies for. We would have to attempt to build into the predictive and control tool countless possible combinations of specific causal conditions, specific category properties and contexts, specific actions and interactions, specific intervening conditions, and specific outcomes. Also, we would have to do this for all the categories and subcategories of navigational translation.

Because of the complex processes involved in navigational translation, unintended and unexpected interactions, and outcomes, will always arise. Operationalising these would require us to do the impossible: We would have to look for the interlocking relationships within, and across the categories, and attempt to build their impacts on each other into our tool. Manages will have little time or resources to invest in such a tool (assuming it can be designed), particularly as the outcome is uncertain because of the dynamic and complex nature of navigational translation. Thus, the complexity of the leisure and cultural context within which navigational translation takes place, precludes utterly its utility as an action-oriented tool.

Thus, although navigational translation describes what happens in strategy, it cannot tell managers how to successfully navigate and translate. As such, the grounded theory of navigational translation poses a dilemma when it comes to providing a practical tool: It captures complexity and generates sociological insights (in this case into leisure and cultural strategy), but it is too complex to be meaningfully applied as a management tool.

Conclusion

We have shown that grounded theory can provide a foundation for understanding strategising in the leisure and cultural fields as processual, contextualised, and interlinked, and therefore complicated. By generating and critiquing the grounded theory of navigational translation to explain leisure and cultural strategy, we have demonstrated that the aim of Strauss' grounded theory of offering a practical vehicle for prediction, change, and control is not realisable. It is possible that the problem of prediction, change, and control may be particularly exacerbated by the case studies we have chosen to look at, as they deal with inherently complex phenomena that revolve around human relationships (intrinsically unpredictable and changeable). It is possible that grounded theories of more stable and simple phenomena are better able to meet the criterion of prediction, change, and control. We tentatively note that one other grounded theory on strategy (Andriopoulos & Lowe, 2000) that pertains to offer diagnostic tools is also too complex to operationalise, as it is composed of 17 categories and sub-categories with innumerable specific properties. However, further analysis of this grounded theory and other grounded theories that pertain to offer diagnostic tools in other disciplines should be conducted to evaluate the extent to which they can be operationalised and used for prediction, change, and control.

Our research suggests that organisational strategy researchers should not be seduced into using grounded theory in the hope of generating useful tools. The best that they can hope for, perhaps, is a framework of action for managers, and this only as long as initial conditions do not change considerably. In such a fluid

and complex field as leisure and cultural strategy, these conditions are unlikely to be met.

We stress, however, that whilst the grounded theory of navigational translation has not directly provided useful management tools, it has provided sociological insight into the concept of strategy, pinning down its elusiveness. In this sense, our grounded theory research on strategy fulfils the aims of Glaser and Strauss' (1967) original conception of grounded theory; to use qualitative research to develop theoretical analysis, and to discover what concepts and hypotheses are relevant for the area of study rather than merely attempting to verify pre-existing theory. Given the complexity of strategy, it is perhaps more than enough that grounded theory can shed sociological insight into this phenomenon without forcing these insights into the language of prescription.

References

Andrews, K. R. (1980). *The concept of corporate strategy*. Homewood, IL: Irwin.

Andriopoulos, C., & Lowe, A. (2000). Enhancing organisational creativity: The process of perpetual challenging. *Management Decision, 38*(10), 734-742.

Ansoff, H. I. (1987). The emerging paradigm of strategic behaviour. *Strategic Management Journal, 8*, 501-515.

Ansoff, H. I., & McDonnell, E. (1990). *Implanting strategic management*. London: Prentice-Hall.

Berry, M. (1995). Research and practice of management: A French view. *Organization Science, 6*, 104–116.

Charmaz, K. (1994). Discovering' chronic illness: Using grounded theory. In B. G. Glaser (Ed.), *More grounded theory methodology: A reader* (pp. 65-94). Mill Valley, CA: Sociology Press.

Cohen, M. D., March, J. G., & Olsen, J. P. (1972). A garbage can model of organisational choice. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 17*, 1-25.

Cutcliffe, J. R. (2000). Methodological issues in grounded theory. *Journal of Advanced Nursing, 31*(6), 1476-1484.

Cyert, R. M., & March, J. G. (1963). *A behavioral theory of the firm*. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.

Denzin, N. K., & Lincoln, Y. S. (Eds.). (1994). *Handbook of qualitative research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Douglas, D. (2003). Grounded theories of management: A methodological review. *Management Research News, 26*(5), 44-52.

Eisenhardt, K. M., & Bourgeois, L. J. (1988). Politics of strategic decisions making in high velocity environments: Towards a mid-range theory. *Academy of Management Journal, 31*(4), 737-770.

Gibbons, M., Limoges, C., Nowotny, H., Schwartzman, S., Scott, P., & Trow, M. (1994). *The new production of knowledge: The dynamics of science and research in contemporary societies*. London: Sage.

Glaser, B. G. (1992). *Basics of grounded theory analysis. Emergence vs. forcing*. Mill Valley, CA: Sociology Press.

Glaser, B. G., & Holton, J. (2004). Remodelling grounded theory. *Grounded Theory Review, 4*(1), 1-24.

Glaser, B. G., & Strauss, A. L. (1967). *The discovery of grounded theory: Strategies for qualitative research*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Gopinath, C., & Hoffman, R. C. (1995). The relevance of strategy research: Practitioner and academic viewpoints. *Journal of Management Studies, 32*(5), 575-594.

Goulding, C. (2005). Grounded theory, ethnography, and phenomenology: A comparative analysis of three qualitative strategies for marketing research. *European Journal of Marketing, 39*(3/4), 294-308.

Grant, R. M. (1991, Spring). The resource-based theory of competitive advantage: Implications for strategy formulations. *California Management Review*, 119-135.

Guba, E., & Lincoln, Y. (1989). *Fourth generation evaluation*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Hall, W. A., & Callery, P. (2001). Pearls, pith, and provocation. Enhancing the rigor of grounded theory: Incorporating reflexivity and relationality. *Qualitative Health Research, 11*(2), 257-272.

Hambrick, D. C. (2004). The disintegration of strategic management: It's time to consolidate our gains. *Strategic Organisation, 2*(1), 91-98.

Hammersley, M., & Atkins, P. (1993). *Ethnography: Principles in practice*. London: Routledge.

Hardy, C. (1996, March). Understanding power: Bringing about strategic change. *British Journal of Management, 7*, S1-S16.

Hax, A. C., & Majluf, N. (1991). *The strategy concept and process: A pragmatic approach*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Hendry, J. (1995, Summer). Strategy formation and the policy context. *Journal of General Management, 20*(4), 54-64.

Huff, A. S., & Reger, R. K. (1987). A review of strategic process research. *Journal of Management, 13*(2), 211-236.

Kvale, S. (1996). *Interviews: An introduction to qualitative research interviewing*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Levy, D. (1994). Chaos theory and strategy: Theory, application, and managerial implications. *Strategic Management Journal, 15*, 167-178.

Lindblom, C. E. (1959). The science of muddling through. *Public Administration Review, 19*, 79-88.

Littler, K., Aisthorpe, P., Hudson, R., & Keasy, K. (2000). A new approach to linking strategy formulation and strategy implementation: An example from the UK banking sector. *International Journal of Information Management, 20*, 411-428.

MacCrimmon, K. R. (1993). Do firm strategies exist? *Strategic Management Journal, 14*, 113-130.

MacLean, D., MacIntosh, R., & Grant, S. (2002, September). Mode 2 management research. *British Journal of Management, 13*. Retrieved on December 15, 2005, from the Business Source Premier Database.

Mason, J. (1996). *Qualitative researching*. London: Sage.

McMaster, M. (1996). Foresight: Exploring the structure of the future. *Long Range Planning, 29*(2), 149-155.

Miles, M. B., & Huberman, A. M. (1994). *Qualitative data analysis* (2nd ed.). London: Sage.

Mintzberg, H. (1994). Rethinking strategic planning. Part I: Pitfalls and fallacies. *Long Range Planning, 27*(3), 12-21.

Mintzberg, H., Lampel, J., Quinn, J., & Ghoshal, S. (2003). *The strategy process* (4th ed.). London: Pearson Education.

Nonaka, I., & Toyama, R. (2003). The knowledge-creating theory revisited: Knowledge creation as a synthesizing process. *Knowledge Management Research & Practice, 1*(1), 2-10.

Partington, D. (2000, June). Building grounded theories of management action. *British Journal of Management, 11*(2). Retrieved on December 15, 2005, from the Business Source Premier Database.

Pettigrew, A. M. (1997). The double hurdles for management research. In T. Clarke (Ed.), *Advancements in organizational behaviour: Essays in honour of D. S. Pugh* (pp. 277–296). London: Dartmouth.

Pfeffer, J. (1992). Understanding power in organisations. *California Management Review, 34*(2), 29-50.

Pfeffer, J., & Sutton, R. I. (1999). Knowing "what" to do is not enough: Turning knowledge into action. *California Management Review, 42*(1), 83–108.

Porter, M. E. (1980). *Competitive strategy: Techniques for analyzing industries and competitors*. New York: Free Press.

Porter, M. E. (1991). Towards a dynamic theory of strategy. *Strategic Management Journal, 12,* 95-117.

Prahalad, C. K., & Hamel, G. (1994). Strategy as a field of study: Why search for a new paradigm? *Strategic Management Journal, 15,* 5-16.

Quinn, J. B. (1981). Formulating strategy one step at a time. *Journal of Business Strategy, 1*(3), 42-63.

Raimond, P. (1996). Two styles of foresight: Are we predicting the future or inventing it? *Long Range Planning, 29*(2), 208-214.

Stacey, R. (1996). *Strategic management and organisational dynamics*. London: Pitman.

Stacey, R. (2003). *Strategic management and organisational dynamics* (4th ed.). London: Pitman.

Starkey, K., & Madan, P. (2001, December). Bridging the relevance gap: Aligning stakeholders in the future of management research. *British Journal of Management, 12,* S3-S26.

Stern, P. N. (1994). Eroding grounded theory. In J. M. Morse (Ed.), *Critical issues in qualitative research methods* (pp. 212-223). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Strauss, A. L. (1987). *Qualitative analysis for social scientists*. Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press.

Strauss, A., & Corbin, J. (1990). *Basics of qualitative research: Grounded theory procedures and techniques* (1st ed.). London: Sage.

Strauss, A., & Corbin, J. (1998). *Basics of qualitative research: Grounded theory procedures and techniques* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Summer, C. E., Bettis, R. A., Duhaime, I. H., Grant, J. H., Hambrick, D. C., & Snow, C. (1990). Doctoral education in the field of policy and strategy. *Journal of Management*, *16*(2), 361-398.

Tranfield, D. (2002). Future challenges for management research. *European Management Journal*, *20*(4), 409-413.

Tsai, S. D., Hong-quei, C., & Valentine, S. (2003). An integrated model for strategic management in dynamic industries: Qualitative research from Taiwan's passive-component industry. *Emergence*, *5*(4), 34–56.

Volberda, H. W., & Elfring, T. (Ed.). (2001). *Rethinking strategy*. London: Sage.

Weick, K. E. (2002). Puzzles in organizational learning: An exercise in disciplined imagination. *British Journal of Management, 13*(2), S7-S15.

Wernerfelt, B. (1984, April-June). A resource-based view of the firm. *Strategic Management Journal*, *5*(2), 171-180.

Whittington, R. (2003). The work of strategizing and organizing: For a practice perspective. *Strategic Organization*, *1*(1), 117–125.

Wilson, M. (1996). Asking questions. In R. Sapsford & V. Jupp (Eds.), *Data collection and analysis* (pp. 94-120). London: Sage.

Appendix A

Interview Aide Memoir

We used the following questions as a guide in the interviews. These questions were not always asked in the same format as presented below, as we wanted to keep the interviews as informal and conversational as possible to generate more insight (REF). Varying lengths of time were spent on each question, according to the responses received. Usually, these questions extended over several interviews, depending upon the depth of response received and other lines of thought generated. Not all questions were asked in all the interviews, again dependent on the interviewees' responses.

- What business are you in? [What is the nature of the organisation?] (*This easy question was asked first to warm up the interviewee and establish rapport*.)
- How do you perceive strategy? [What do you understand by strategy?]
- Does your organisation have a strategy? If you have a strategy, how do you form it?
- What influences strategy; what is the nature of these influences? Are there any dominant influences; do these influences change with time? Do they interrelate with each other (if so, how), or do they remain separate?
- Do strategy decisions impact these influences? If so, how do they do that; what do you find from your own experience?
- Can you describe your usual way of making strategic decisions? How do you make strategy decisions? (*This is to explore if the interviewee uses strategy theories, or if they have their own ways derived from their own experience.)*

- Do you see strategy as a process? *(Some strategy theorists see strategy as a tool rather than a process.)*
- Does strategy theory help in making your decisions? If so, how does it help; if not, why not? Do you have your own practice theory? (*This question was only asked if interviewees identified that they used theory in making their strategy*.)
- Did your strategy evolve over time? If so, can you identify where your strategy evolved from? Would you explain? (*This difficult question encouraged the interviewee to reflect deeply on possible causalities.*)
- How far in the future does your strategy take you; how clear is the direction and goal of strategy? How long is the long-term of the organisation?
- To what extent do the day to day management decisions relate to the strategy of the organisation?
- How does the present performance of your organisation compare with past performance, how does it compare with future expectations?
- Some people think that conditions of stability and predictability are essential for business success. Others see instability and unpredictability as preconditions for success. What do you find from your own experience?
- Can you describe the culture within your organisation? [By culture, we mean values, beliefs, ideologies etc.]
- To what extent is your strategy tied up with the culture of the organisation?
- Can you tell me about your background; do you think it bears any influence on the decisions you make? Do you think your decisions reflect your personal beliefs and values; can you explain?
- Are strategic decisions taken by individuals or by groups; would you explain?
- Do you engage in planning? If so, are you able to describe the process of the last planning period; were you able to achieve your goals?

Appendix B

Coding Extracts

Figure 1. Open coding - Deriving concepts from data.

Data	**Concept**
We're in the business of creating opportunities for the local community - various elements of leisure in fact at whatever level they so desire. Particularly with the objective of improving health and quality of life for those resident in the district. I believe that's fundamental. There are 100 plus members of staff involved with leisure in the department, and the organisation's influence spreads beyond that to the private sector.	Creative, purposeful Guided by community expectation Improving, affecting, changing Personal belief. Deploying resources. Broad, spatial resonance Political environment. Fluid, dynamic situation.

We had 20 odd years of Conservative Council, and their policies, I don't think they were particularly true blue. They were socialist in many areas, they were quite sensible and they changed on a regular basis, because the Council does review its policies and its strategy. The same as the leisure department does fairly regularly. We have service review; these are the sort of mechanisms that allow us to change incrementally with time (DoLHCS, interview, December, 1996).	Review Continuous, cyclical Incremental alignment, navigating, temporal change
I believe what we are embarked upon here, will give us clear a direction. But the impact of the legislation can be felt 50-100 years on and sometimes I think they'd do better to reflect on what they have achieved and what needs to be changed (HoLSD interview, October, 1996).	Steering, setting direction, pointing to a destination, navigating Temporal resonance Reflecting
I see it as the 10, 15, 20 year outlook. They... agreed they'd do market research every 2 years to never again be caught like that by surprise. ...each time we updated our strategic plan looking towards the year 2000 ... So that's our strategy. We get a view from people, again before we take a specific direction (CE, interview, November, 1996).	Gazing, envisioning, duration Reviewing, cyclical Reflecting, pre-empting, coping Planning, defining destination Consulting, defining purpose and mapping direction, navigating
We're going out and asking people and … we have to change our stance because of that consultation (CoLHCS, interview, March, 1997).	Consulting Reviewing, reorienting and changing direction and purpose, navigating

Figure 2. Open coding - Labelling the sub-categories, properties, and dimensions of navigating.

Category	**Subcategory**	**Properties**	**Dimensional range**
Navigating		Breadth/scope	Wide Narrow
		Direction	Many Few
			Unclear Clear

		Duration	Long Short
		Field	Wide Narrow
		Integrative	High Low
		Ideological	High Low
		Intention (purpose)	Deliberate Emergent
		Complexity	High Low
		Resonance	Wide Minimal
		…	
	Consulting & reviewing	Cyclicality	Frequent Infrequent
		Scope	Wide Narrow
		…	
	Gazing & envisioning	Purpose	Clear Unclear
		Personal belief	Affecting Not Affecting
		Imagination	High Low
		…	
	Making choices	Type	Good poor
		…	
	Scanning	Effectiveness	High Low
		Focus	Internal External
		Scope	Wide Narrow
		Duration	Long Short
		…	
	Mapping, (re-orienting)	Direction	Clear Unclear
		…	
	Aligning	Frequency	Many Few

		…	
	Planning	Effectiveness	High Low
		Control	Tight Loose
		Creative	High Low
		Foresight	Penetrative Shallow
		…	
	Deploying & configuring resources	Effectiveness	High Low
		Extent	Large Small
		Quantity	Sufficient Limited
		…	
	Revising	Frequency	Many Few
		Impact	Improve Degrade
		Change	Large Small
		…	
	Reflecting & learning	Learning potential	High Low
		Community input	High Low
		…	
	Measuring, monitoring & controlling	Effectiveness	High Low
		…	
	Motivating & supporting	empowerment	High Low
		…	

Figure 3. Open coding - Labelling the sub-categories, properties, and dimensions of translating.

Category	**Subcategory**	**Properties**	**Dimensional range**
Translating		Intention (purpose)	Deliberate Emergent
		Formality	High Low

		Creative	High Low
		Fragmentary	High Low
		Resonance	Wide Minimal
		Duration	Defined Continuous
		Complexity	High Low
		Breadth/scope	Wide Narrow
		…	
	Planning	Effectiveness	High Low
		Control	Tight Loose
		Creative	High Low
		Foresight	Penetrative Shallow
		Detail	High Low
		…	
	Deploying resources	Effectiveness	High Low
		Extent	Large Small
		Quantity	Sufficient Limited
		…	
	Executing & providing	Satisfaction	High Low
		Effectiveness/ efficiency	High Low
	Reflecting & learning	Learning potential	High Low
	Measuring, monitoring & controlling	Effectiveness	High Low
	Interconnecting & interrelating	Differentiating	High Low
		Complexity	High Low
	…	…	

Figure 4. Axial coding – Relational linkages between the category of navigating and its concepts.[6]

<table>
<tr><td colspan="2">Causal conditions → Category
1) New or changed purpose Navigating
2) Unstable environment
3) Enhance position, improve performance
…</td></tr>
<tr><td>Properties of causal conditions
1) Unclear direction, undetermined degree of urgency
2) Uncertain political environment, rapidly changing trends, rapidly changing technology, EU legislation, etc.
3) Defensive, high pressure and manipulation, etc.
…..</td><td>Specific properties of category
<table><tr><td>Wide scope/very broad</td><td>Fluid</td></tr><tr><td>Fairly integrative</td><td>Very complex</td></tr><tr><td>Unclear direction, multi-directional</td><td>Incremental</td></tr><tr><td>10-20 year horizon</td><td>Political</td></tr><tr><td>4-year planning period</td><td>Instrumental</td></tr><tr><td>2-year review cycle</td><td>Fairly participative</td></tr><tr><td>Wide field</td><td>Wide resonance</td></tr><tr><td>Moderately ideological</td><td>Unthreatening</td></tr><tr><td>Intended</td><td>Imaginative</td></tr><tr><td>…</td><td></td></tr></table></td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="2">Context
Under conditions where navigating is recognised to have the above specific properties.</td></tr>
<tr><td>Actions/Interactions
Scanning the environment
Mapping destination and determining direction
Collaborating, consulting, delegating and empowering
Making choices, reviewing, reflecting, revising,
Aligning, correcting or changing bearing/destination
Responding and changing
Encouraging and facilitating
Monitoring, measuring and controlling
Planning, deploying resources, and co-ordinating
Taking the lead
Manipulating, manoeuvring, cajoling and persuading</td><td>Outcomes & consequences of actions/interactions
Intended/unintended (emergent) direction and destination
Learning, sense making and understanding new meanings
Increased motivation
Misalignment
Reorientation and change of direction
Developing a clearer picture of the future
Inducing new complexity
Coping with complexity and surviving
Arriving/Unable to arrive at intended destination
Developing foresight
…</td></tr>
</table>

[6] The format of this diagram is adapted from Strauss and Corbin (1990)

Gazing, envisioning, predicting and forecasting Interrelating and seeking political support Exercising power …	
Intervening conditions Managers' ability to look clearly into the future Fluid and unpredictable environment Managers' values and ideology Lack of resources …	

Figure 5. Axial coding – Relational linkages between the category of translating and its concepts.

Causal conditions → **Category**

1) New or changed purpose **Translating**
2) Changing environment
3) Enhance position, improve performance
…

Properties of causal conditions	**Specific properties of category**	
1) Desirable, achievable, having wide resonance, etc. 2) Uncertain political environment, rapidly changing trends, rapidly changing technology, EU legislation, etc. 3) Wide impacts, high degree of urgency, etc. …	Creative/innovative/imaginative	Intended
	Fragmentary	Continuous
	Differentiating	Fluid
	Incremental	Wide resonance
	Cohesive	Multi-dimensional
	Purposeful	Interactive
	Participative	Largely formal
	Complex	…

Context
Under conditions where translating has these specific properties.

Actions/Interactions	**Outcomes & consequences of actions/interactions**
Planning, co-ordinating and interconnecting Deploying resources, facilitating, collaborating Reviewing, reflecting, revising and changing Developing/operating structures, systems and procedures Building in flexibility	Flexibility/rigidity in service provision Motivated workforce Realisation of purpose/vision, emergence of new vision Inducing new complexity Creating intended/unintended realities Learning, sense making and understanding new meanings Achieving desired position Improved service quality

Measuring and controlling Consulting, motivating and rewarding Delivering the desired services …	…
Intervening conditions Manager's character and values Limited resources Changing external environment Unforeseen circumstances …	

Figure 6. Selective coding - Developing the core category, navigational translation.

Provisional category	*Provisional category*	*Provisional category*	*Category*	*Category*	*Core category*
Gazing & Envisioning	**Interconnecting & interrelating**	**Exercising power**	**Navigating**	**Translating**	**Navigational translation**
Properties/ sub-categories	*Properties/ sub-categories*	*Properties/ sub-categories*	*Properties/ sub-categories*	*Properties/ sub-categories*	*Properties/ sub-categories*
Breadth/scope	-	-	Breadth/scope	-	Breadth/scope
Direction	-	-	Direction	-	Direction
Duration	-	-	Duration	Duration	Duration
-	-	-	Field	-	Field
-	Integrative	-	Integrative	-	Integrative
-	Fragmentary	-	-	Fragmentary	Fragmentary
Ideological	-	Ideological	Ideological	-	Ideological
Intention (purpose)	-	Intention (purpose)	Intention (purpose)	Intention (purpose)	Intention (purpose)
-	Complexity	Complexity	Complexity	Complexity	Complexity
-	Resonance	Resonance	Resonance	Resonance	Resonance
-	-	-	-	Formality	Formality
Creative	-	-	-	Creative	Creative
-	-	Political	Political	-	Political
Cyclical	-	-	Cyclical	-	Cyclical
Imaginative	-	-	Imaginative	-	Imaginative
-	Interactive	Interactive	Interactive	Interactive	Interactive
Scanning		-	Scanning	-	Scanning
Mapping destination	-	-	Mapping destination	-	Mapping destination
-	-	-	Mapping	-	Mapping

			destination		destination
-	-	Manipulating, manoeuvring	Manipulating, manoeuvring	-	Manipulating, manoeuvring
-	-	-	Aligning	-	Aligning
Forecasting		-	Forecasting	-	Forecasting
	Planning	-	Planning	Planning	Planning
Deploying resources	Deploying resources	Deploying resources	Deploying resources	Deploying resources	Deploying resources
-	Coordinating	-	Coordinating	Coordinating	Coordinating
…	…	…	…	…	…

Author Note

Ali Bakir (PhD) is Principal Lecturer in the Faculty of Enterprise and Innovation, Buckinghamshire Chilterns University College, UK. He lectures on Strategic Management in the recreation and creative industries. His research interests lie in the discourse of Strategy, particularly in exploring the tension between rational organisational strategies and the substantive social and cultural contexts within which they are deployed. Correspondence regarding this article should be addressed to Ali Bakir, Principal Lecturer, Faculty of Enterprise and Innovation, Buckinghamshire Chilterns University College, Wellesbourne Campus, Kingshill Road, High Wycombe, Buckinghamshire, UK, HP13 5BB; Telephone: +44 (0)1494 522141 ext 4026; Fax: +44 (0)1494 465432; Email: ali.bakir@bcuc.ac.uk

Vian Bakir (PhD) is Senior Lecturer in the Media, Culture and Communication Research Unit at the University of Glamorgan, UK. She has published in the areas of media and European identity, risk communication, policy agenda-setting via the media, and dataveillance and ethics. She can be contacted at the Division of Media and Communication, Department of Media, Culture and Communication, School of Creative and Cultural Industries, Room 220, Forest Hall, University of Glamorgan, Trefforest, Pontypridd, Wales, UK, CF37 1DL; Telephone: +44 (0)1443- 654520; Email: vtbakir@glam.ac.uk

Article Citation

Bakir, A., & Bakir, V. (2006). Dialectical inquiry: A critique of the capacity of Strauss' grounded theory for prediction, change, and control in organisational strategy via a grounded theorisation of leisure and cultural strategy. *The Qualitative Report*, *11*(4), 687-718. Retrieved [Insert date], from http://www.nova.edu/ssss/QR/QR11-4/bakir.pdf