|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Type:** Multiple Choice | | |
| **Title:** Chapter 2 Question 1 | | |
| **1)** | How many points of explanation does the dynamic ‘process–practice’ framework of strategy aim to deliver? | |
| Correct | **a.**# | 5 |
| **Feedback:** In line with a crafting metaphor, we introduce a dynamic ‘process–practice’ framework of strategy. This framework accommodates the interpretations of strategy highlighted in Chapter 1. Drawing on the latest theorizing about how strategy occurs over time in context, the process–practice framework should help you understand and explain:  • the central importance of practitioners and what they do in strategy  • how you can cope when strategy ideas don’t work out as planned in reality  • the ways in which strategy can be considered as a continual stream of activity  • how we can responsively revise our practices, crafting strategy to meet situational needs  • how different theories, data sources, and interpretations can be incorporated into collective  strategy practices. **Page reference:** Section 2.1 | | |
| Incorrect | **b.**# | 6 |
| **Feedback:** In line with a crafting metaphor, we introduce a dynamic ‘process–practice’ framework of strategy. This framework accommodates the interpretations of strategy highlighted in Chapter 1. Drawing on the latest theorizing about how strategy occurs over time in context, the process–practice framework should help you understand and explain:  • the central importance of practitioners and what they do in strategy  • how you can cope when strategy ideas don’t work out as planned in reality  • the ways in which strategy can be considered as a continual stream of activity  • how we can responsively revise our practices, crafting strategy to meet situational needs  • how different theories, data sources, and interpretations can be incorporated into collective  strategy practices.  **Page reference:** Section 2.1 | | |
| Incorrect | **c.**# | 12 |
| **Feedback:** In line with a crafting metaphor, we introduce a dynamic ‘process–practice’ framework of strategy. This framework accommodates the interpretations of strategy highlighted in Chapter 1. Drawing on the latest theorizing about how strategy occurs over time in context, the process–practice framework should help you understand and explain:  • the central importance of practitioners and what they do in strategy  • how you can cope when strategy ideas don’t work out as planned in reality  • the ways in which strategy can be considered as a continual stream of activity  • how we can responsively revise our practices, crafting strategy to meet situational needs  • how different theories, data sources, and interpretations can be incorporated into collective  strategy practices.  **Page reference:** Section 2.1 | | |
| Incorrect | **d.**# | 3 |
| **Feedback:** In line with a crafting metaphor, we introduce a dynamic ‘process–practice’ framework of strategy. This framework accommodates the interpretations of strategy highlighted in Chapter 1. Drawing on the latest theorizing about how strategy occurs over time in context, the process–practice framework should help you understand and explain:  • the central importance of practitioners and what they do in strategy  • how you can cope when strategy ideas don’t work out as planned in reality  • the ways in which strategy can be considered as a continual stream of activity  • how we can responsively revise our practices, crafting strategy to meet situational needs  • how different theories, data sources and interpretations can be incorporated into collective  strategy practices.  **Page reference:** Section 2.1 | | |
| END OF QUESTION | | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Type:** Multiple Choice | | |
| **Title:** Chapter 2 Question 2 | | |
| **2)** | Jarzabkowski 2003:24 claims that strategy practice is: | |
| Correct | **a.**# | on-going stream of activity that constitutes organizational life |
| **Feedback:**  Underpinning SaP is a definition of practice as the ‘on-going stream of activity’ that constitutes organizational life (Jarzabkowski 2003:24). As a matter of organizational relevance, strategy-as-practice can be considered as ‘a situated, socially accomplished flow of organizational activity’ (Jarzabkowski, 2005:7). The elements of this definition are instructive. ‘Situated’ means that the strategy activity undertaken occurs within context at a moment in time that will, in part, shape what is done. ‘Socially accomplished’ means that strategy results from the actions and interactions of practitioners. ‘Flow’ indicates that strategy is an ongoing concern that is always moving and shifting. **Page reference:** Section 2.2 | | |
| Incorrect | **b.**# | Excellence in resource allocation |
| **Feedback:** Underpinning SaP is a definition of practice as the ‘on-going stream of activity’ that constitutes organizational life (Jarzabkowski 2003:24). As a matter of organizational relevance, strategy-as-practice can be considered as ‘a situated, socially accomplished flow of organizational activity’ (Jarzabkowski, 2005:7). The elements of this definition are instructive. ‘Situated’ means that the strategy activity undertaken occurs within context at a moment in time that will, in part, shape what is done. ‘Socially accomplished’ means that strategy results from the actions and interactions of practitioners. ‘Flow’ indicates that strategy is an ongoing concern that is always moving and shifting. **Page reference:** Section 2.2 | | |
| Incorrect | **c.**# | The central purpose of the organization |
| **Feedback:** Underpinning SaP is a definition of practice as the ‘on-going stream of activity’ that constitutes organizational life (Jarzabkowski 2003:24). As a matter of organizational relevance, strategy-as-practice can be considered as ‘a situated, socially accomplished flow of organizational activity’ (Jarzabkowski, 2005:7). The elements of this definition are instructive. ‘Situated’ means that the strategy activity undertaken occurs within context at a moment in time that will, in part, shape what is done. ‘Socially accomplished’ means that strategy results from the actions and interactions of practitioners. ‘Flow’ indicates that strategy is an ongoing concern that is always moving and shifting. **Page reference:** Section 2.2 | | |
| Incorrect | **d.**# | A coordinated effort led by the CEO |
| **Feedback:** Underpinning SaP is a definition of practice as the ‘on-going stream of activity’ that constitutes organizational life (Jarzabkowski 2003:24). As a matter of organizational relevance, strategy-as-practice can be considered as ‘a situated, socially accomplished flow of organizational activity’ (Jarzabkowski, 2005:7). The elements of this definition are instructive. ‘Situated’ means that the strategy activity undertaken occurs within context at a moment in time that will, in part, shape what is done. ‘Socially accomplished’ means that strategy results from the actions and interactions of practitioners. ‘Flow’ indicates that strategy is an ongoing concern that is always moving and shifting. **Page reference:** Section 2.2 | | |
| END OF QUESTION | | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Type:** Multiple Choice | | |
| **Title:** Chapter 2 Question 3 | | |
| **3)** | According to Jarzabkowski and Spee (2009) practices are: | |
| Correct | **a.**# | complex bundles involving social, material and embodied  ways of doing |
| **Feedback:** As summarized by Jarzabkowski and Spee (2009:82) practices are ‘complex bundle[s] involving social, material and embodied ways of doing that are interrelated and not always articulated or conscious to the actor involved in doing’. **Page reference:** Section 2.2 | | |
| Incorrect | **b.**# | Linear processes generating strategy outcomes |
| **Feedback:** As summarized by Jarzabkowski and Spee (2009:82) practices are ‘complex bundle[s] involving social, material and embodied ways of doing that are interrelated and not always articulated or conscious to the actor involved in doing’. **Page reference:** Section 2.2 | | |
| Incorrect | **c.**# | Dynamic approaches in which strategy emerges |
| **Feedback:** As summarized by Jarzabkowski and Spee (2009:82) practices are ‘complex bundle[s] involving social, material and embodied ways of doing that are interrelated and not always articulated or conscious to the actor involved in doing’. **Page reference:** Section 2.2 | | |
| Incorrect | **d.**# | Top down implementation |
| **Feedback:** As summarized by Jarzabkowski and Spee (2009:82) practices are ‘complex bundle[s] involving social, material and embodied ways of doing that are interrelated and not always articulated or conscious to the actor involved in doing’. **Page reference:** Section 2.2 | | |
| END OF QUESTION | | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Type:** Multiple Choice | | |
| **Title:** Chapter 2 Question 4 | | |
| **4)** | According to Jarzabkowski and Kaplan (2015), strategy tools: | |
| Correct | **a.**# | provide a common language for strategic conversations between managers across boundaries |
| **Feedback:** Strategy tools ‘provide a common language for strategic conversations between managers across hierarchical, functional, and geographic boundaries’ (Jarzabkowski and Kaplan 2015:544). **Page reference:** Section 2.2 | | |
| Incorrect | **b.**# | Are essential for strategy success |
| **Feedback:** Strategy tools ‘provide a common language for strategic conversations between managers across hierarchical, functional, and geographic boundaries’ (Jarzabkowski and Kaplan 2015:544). **Page reference:** Section 2.2 | | |
| Incorrect | **c.**# | Are understood by senior members of the organization |
| **Feedback:** Strategy tools ‘provide a common language for strategic conversations between managers across hierarchical, functional, and geographic boundaries’ (Jarzabkowski and Kaplan 2015:544). **Page reference:** Section 2.2 | | |
| Incorrect | **d.**# | Can obscure meaning in organization-wide conversations |
| **Feedback:** Strategy tools ‘provide a common language for strategic conversations between managers across hierarchical, functional, and geographic boundaries’ (Jarzabkowski and Kaplan 2015:544). **Page reference:** Section 2.2 | | |
| END OF QUESTION | | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Type:** Multiple Choice | | |
| **Title:** Chapter 2 Question 5 | | |
| **5)** | Joseph and Wilson (2018) suggest that attentional design is: | |
| Correct | **a.**# | using tools and procedures to deliberately channel the attention of decision-makers |
| **Feedback:** Joseph and Wilson (2018) suggest that attentional design—using tools and procedures to deliberately channel the attention of decision-makers—will have a major influence on how strategic choices are made. **Page reference:** Section 2.3 | | |
| Incorrect | **b.**# | Multi-channel internal communications |
| **Feedback:** Joseph and Wilson (2018) suggest that attentional design—using tools and procedures to deliberately channel the attention of decision-makers—will have a major influence on how strategic choices are made. **Page reference:** Section 2.3 | | |
| Incorrect | **c.**# | The format of internal communications |
| **Feedback:** Joseph and Wilson (2018) suggest that attentional design—using tools and procedures to deliberately channel the attention of decision-makers—will have a major influence on how strategic choices are made. **Page reference:** Section 2.3 | | |
| Incorrect | **d.**# | Feedback loops designed to improve the strategy |
| **Feedback:** Joseph and Wilson (2018) suggest that attentional design—using tools and procedures to deliberately channel the attention of decision-makers—will have a major influence on how strategic choices are made. **Page reference:** Section 2.3 | | |
| END OF QUESTION | | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Type:** Multiple Choice | | |
| **Title:** Chapter 2 Question 6 | | |
| **6)** | King (2008) defines planned emergence as: | |
| Correct | **a.**# | Where preparation meets opportunism |
| **Feedback:** Senior management teams and organizational leaders will be evaluated on the results that they deliver over time. Therefore remaining open to revisiting strategy thinking and practices on a continuing basis, driven by learning from doing and awareness of contextual changes, appears vital to ensuring organizational performance in the long run. This way of engaging in strategy work can be termed as planned emergence—‘where preparation meets opportunism’ (King 2008:362). **Page reference:** Section 2.4 | | |
| Incorrect | **b.**# | A key strategy milestone |
| **Feedback:** Senior management teams and organizational leaders will be evaluated on the results that they deliver over time. Therefore remaining open to revisiting strategy thinking and practices on a continuing basis, driven by learning from doing and awareness of contextual changes, appears vital to ensuring organizational performance in the long run. This way of engaging in strategy work can be termed as planned emergence—‘where preparation meets opportunism’ (King 2008:362). **Page reference:** Section 2.4 | | |
| Incorrect | **c.**# | The strategy end point |
| **Feedback:** Senior management teams and organizational leaders will be evaluated on the results that they deliver over time. Therefore remaining open to revisiting strategy thinking and practices on a continuing basis, driven by learning from doing and awareness of contextual changes, appears vital to ensuring organizational performance in the long run. This way of engaging in strategy work can be termed as planned emergence—‘where preparation meets opportunism’ (King 2008:362).  **Page reference:** Section 2.4 | | |
| Incorrect | **d.**# | The point at which the organization gains significant market share |
| **Feedback:** Senior management teams and organizational leaders will be evaluated on the results that they deliver over time. Therefore remaining open to revisiting strategy thinking and practices on a continuing basis, driven by learning from doing and awareness of contextual changes, appears vital to ensuring organizational performance in the long run. This way of engaging in strategy work can be termed as planned emergence—‘where preparation meets opportunism’ (King 2008:362).  **Page reference:** Section 2.4 | | |
| END OF QUESTION | | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Type:** Multiple Response | | |
| **Title:** Chapter 2 Question 1 | | |
| **1)** | The five categories of practices outlined in the process in the process practice framework are: | |
| **Feedback:**  Categories of practices  We have identified five main categories of strategy practices that will be explored throughout the book as shown in Figure 2.5. These categories are described by their intended outcome/contribution to strategy activity:  **Define** strategy meaning, approach, and outcomes. Ways of working intended to establish what strategy means to stakeholders in the current context, agreeing an approach and target outcomes for strategy work, including who to involve, and how, in making decisions.  **Enhance** knowledge of context and options. Practices concerning collection and analysis of data about strategy options, opportunities, and constraints arising from organizational context, environmental trends and resources, capabilities, and organizational activities.  **Debate** how to scope, compete and perform. Practices that review the sectors and locations in which the organization could or should operate, how it competes, and how to organize and deploy resources for optimal performance.  **Shape** strategy to context and objectives. Practices that evaluates and refine strategy ways, means, and objectives according to collaboration, innovation, and growth needs; influences of digitalization and possibilities of disruption; internationalization considerations; and sustainability attitudes, obligations, and opportunities.  **Activate** strategy and learn from experience. Ways of leading the planning and organizing of strategizing episodes and strategic change, engaging stakeholders and building momentum behind realization activities, and continually improving understanding of how to make and manage strategy in practice.  **Page reference:** Section 2.3 | | |
| Correct | **a.**# | Define |
| Correct | **b.**# | Enhance |
| Correct | **c.**# | Debate |
| Incorrect | **d.**# | Deliberate |
| Correct | **e.**# | Shape |
| Correct | **f.**# | Activate |
| END OF QUESTION | | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Type:** Multiple Response | | |
| **Title:** Chapter 2 Question 2 | | |
| **2)** | According to Sull et al. (2015), several key issues prevailing across organizational strategy work that limit the possibilities of strategic success and impact include: | |
| **Feedback:**  A review of strategy implementation failure by Sull et al. (2015) highlights several key issues prevailing across organizational strategy work that limit the possibilities of strategic success and impact:  (a) an emphasis on installing top-down ‘alignment’ of strategy rather than lateral coordination and agreement  (b) sticking rigidly to strategy plans rather than acting opportunistically within a set of  shared principles  (c) investing time in one-way communication rather than building shared meaning and  understanding of strategy  (d) performance management cultures that reward ‘more of the same’ behaviours rather  than measured risk-taking in pursuit of change and innovation  (e) concentrating strategy responsibility and involvement in a few leaders rather than distributing it across the organization.  **Page reference:** Section 2.1 | | |
| Correct | **a.**# | An emphasis on installing top-down ‘alignment’ of strategy rather than lateral coordination and agreement |
| Correct | **b.**# | Investing time in one-way communication rather than building shared meaning and understanding of strategy |
| Incorrect | **c.**# | Sharing strategy implementation across departments |
| Incorrect | **d.**# | Having an emergent rather than an established definition of organizational strategy |
| END OF QUESTION | | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Type:** True/False | | |
| **Title:** Chapter 2 Question 3 | | |
| **3)** | 60%–90% of all strategies fail | |
| **Feedback:**   * Strategic initiative success rate ~ 55%   (Economist intelligence unit 2013)   * 60–90% of strategies fail   (Kaplan and Norton 2005)   * Estimates of strategy implementation failure range from 28 to 90%   (Candido and Santos 2015)   * 67–75% of large organizations struggle to implement their strategies   (Sull et al. 2015)   * c.75% of strategic change initiatives fail to deliver expected outcomes   (Anand and Barsoux 2017)  **Page reference:** Section 2.2 | | |
| Correct | **a.**# | True |
| Incorrect | **b.**# | False |
| END OF QUESTION | | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Type:** True/False | | |
| **Title:** Chapter 2 Question 4 | | |
| **4)** | By doing a little, you can learn a lot that helps decision-making during strategizing | |
| **Feedback:**  By taking limited strategic action, observing the realised outcomes and reflecting on the insights gained, new learning can be used to inform a subsequent round of strategizing. By doing a little, you can learn a lot that helps decision-making during strategizing (Ashkenas 2013).  **Page reference:** Section 2.3 | | |
| Correct | **a.**# | True |
| Incorrect | **b.**# | False |
| END OF QUESTION | | |