Happy New Year and welcome to another edition of the SAP AOM Newsletter!

The February Issue is full of exciting news, calls for papers, and reflective pieces that we hope will spark further debates in our IG.

You will have already noticed in the top left of this page a new, redesigned logo that will accompany from now on all our visuals – providing a consistent message across all our communications.

It is a refreshing and modern design that characterizes the dynamic nature of our IG. It was designed by a professional designer, using funding kindly provided by Professor Saku Mantere. We hope you like it!

We start the newsletter with a number of insightful and reflective pieces on key issues that will inform the research agenda in our IG in the years to come.

We continue to feature emerging scholars and provide you with news about online seminars, calls for papers and other exciting developments across our community.

We are seeking volunteers for the IG elections and membership activities, so please put yourself forward!

Do you have any feedback for us or stories we have missed and we can feature in our next newsletter? Let us know at: Sotirios.Paroutis@wbs.ac.uk

Enjoy!

### Inside this issue:

- Trends in video-based research
- Strategy-as-Practice and micro-foundations research
- Is Strategy-as-Practice practically relevant?
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- Open strategy: Transparency and inclusion in strategy processes (workshop and call for papers)
- Feature topic: Video-based research methods (call for papers)
- The performativity of strategy (call for papers)
- On-line seminars on Strategy-as-Practice
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- Your IG needs you! (Elections)
- Your IG needs your votes
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TRENDS IN VIDEO-BASED RESEARCH

Curtis LeBaron and Paula Jarzabkowski

The popularity and volume of video-based research is rising. Video-based research is any research that features or includes video as a primary data source. The table below shows results of a keyword search within the most prominent databases for scholarly publications: In recent decades, the frequency of publications making reference to “video data” or “video method” or “video analysis” has increased sharply.

In the 1970s, video was a new and relatively expensive technology that only a few researchers used. During the 1980s, various approaches to analyzing video data emerged within disciplines from which organization research draws (sociology, anthropology, psychology, communication, etc.). However, each approach was imbued with the particular ontological, epistemological and practical assumptions of its field, which has created a fundamental challenge for organization scholars wanting to select the video methods that are most appropriate for their work. In the 1990s and 2000s, video-based research flourished within these social science disciplines.

In recent years these video methods have taken hold within organization studies as scholars are turning to video as a way to increase the rigor of their qualitative work, and/or build data banks for the purpose of quantitative research.

The growing use of such data for organizational analysis is evident at the Academy of Management (AoM), as well as other leading international conferences, such as European Group for Organization Studies (EGOS). For example, the line graph (right) shows the frequency of “video” being listed in the program of AoM’s annual meetings (workshops, panels, symposia, etc.). We thus assert that this wave of video-based research needs to be addressed above and beyond its uses in other disciplines, for the particular methodological benefits and challenges that it poses to organization research.
STRATEGY-AS-PRACTICE AND MICRO-FOUNDATIONS RESEARCH

Patrick Regnér

There have been several calls for linking Strategy as Practice more to the “mainstream” strategy literature (Jarzabkowski and Kaplan, 2010) and the resource-based and capabilities views have often been in the center for these calls (Johnson et al., 2003; Langley et al., 2007; Regnér, 2008). The calls show that Strategy as Practice is underutilized for understanding capabilities and more recently the significant linkages to micro-foundations research have been emphasized (Regnér, 2012; Vaara and Whittington, 2012). Micro-foundations research emphasizes micro-foundations as essential for understanding organizational capabilities and resources and their origins. The emphasis is on how individuals and their interactions aggregate to collective effects and organizational capabilities, resources and routines (Abell, Felin and Foss, 2008; Barney and Felin, 2013; Felin and Foss, 2005; Gavetti, 2005; Teece, 2007).

It is a natural next step for Strategy as Practice research to broaden the range of outcomes to resources and capabilities as it is in a unique position to connect the micro with the macro and to bridge structure and agency (Vaara and Whittington, 2012). It thus offers an opportunity to reach beyond the sole focus on the micro and single individuals, which is the case in extant micro-foundations research. Strategy as Practice research can instead introduce an examination of the foundations part of micro-foundations as it has already demonstrated how strategic agency is socially situated and distributed in contrast to only being individual-centric. In fact, more than any other research stream in strategic management Strategy as Practice has both the theory and methods to carefully describe and examine (micro-) foundations. Individual’s micro strategy activities that underpin capabilities are not isolated, but depend on various foundations in social contexts and interactions including strategy practices, praxis and various practitioners (Whittington, 2006).

Strategy as Practice will only be strengthened by incorporating linkages to micro-foundations research as this will demonstrate the importance of social context and practices in explaining organizational level resources and capabilities. So far we have only started to address this “open window of opportunity” (Vaara and Whittington, 2012, p.321) in the intersection with organizational capabilities and micro-foundations (e.g. Ambrosini et al., 2007; Regnér, 2003; Salvato, 2003) and there are numerous of intriguing research prospects ahead.
IS STRATEGY-AS-PRACTICE RESEARCH PRACTICALLY RELEVANT?

David Seidl and Violetta Splitter

While the strategy-as-practice approach was initially developed as a reaction to the lack of practical relevance of most strategy research to date (see the editorial of the JMS Special Issue in 2003), we find only very little serious debate about what “relevance” really means and how it can be achieved. Often it is somewhat uncritically assumed that by studying what practitioners do, SAP research becomes more or less automatically relevant to practitioners. Yet, over the last few years we can find a string of publications by SAP scholars investigating the possibilities and conditions of practical relevance. These studies have led to three key insights so far:

1. Strategy research and strategy praxis are two different domains of activity: Various researchers have pointed out that strategy research and strategy praxis belong to different domains that function according to different modes of reasoning and exhibit different logics (Splitter/Seidl 2011; Sandberg/Tsoukas 2011). This has two important implications: First, the researchers’ observations are inevitably distanced from the reality as experienced by the practitioner. Thus research results do not represent the practitioners’ reality as experienced by themselves. Second, this differentiation of domains also means that a direct transfer of knowledge between research and praxis is impossible. To the extent that practitioners use academic knowledge, a transformation of this knowledge will necessarily take place (Jarzabkowski/Wilson, 2009).

2. Various means of dealing with the gap between strategy research and praxis: Various researchers have argued that despite the differentiation between the domains of strategy research and strategy praxis, strategy scholarship can still be practically relevant. Yet, this requires some re-orientation in our research. Sandberg and Tsoukas (2011), for example, have called for a research practice from a framework of scientific rationality to one of practical rationality. Such research would aim to capture the logic of practice by investigating entwinements and breakdowns of management practice. Splitter and Seidl (2011), in turn, have argued that in addition to adopting a framework of practical rationality a particular kind of reflexivity (which Bourdieu calls “participant objectivation”) is required on behalf of the researcher. Thereby, the researcher’s social detachment from strategy praxis is incorporated into the scientific analysis.

3. Strategy-as-practice research is more likely to be conceptually than instrumentally relevant: Various researchers have pointed out that due to the particular differentiation between strategy research and strategy praxis, strategy-as-practice research is more likely to produce conceptually than instrumentally relevant knowledge (Langley 2010; Sandberg/Tsoukas, 2011; Splitter/Seidl 2011). Thus, instead of prescribing what courses of actions practitioners should follow, strategy-as-practice research can provide a deeper understanding of the practitioners’ situations and thus help them to see alternative courses of actions that they might have not been aware of (Nicolai/Seidl, 2010; Sandberg/Tsoukas, 2011). Central publications dealing with the practical relevance of strategy-as-practice research:


Nicolai, A., & Seidl, D. (2010). That’s relevant! Different forms of practical relevance in management science. Organization Studies, 31, 1257-1285: This paper distinguishes different types of practical relevance and discusses which ones can be expected from researchers. Even though the paper does not explicitly focus on strategy-as-practice research it is directly relevant to the above debate.

Sandberg, J., & Tsoukas, H. (2011). Grasping the logic of practice: Theorizing through practical rationality. Academy of Management Review36. 338-360: This paper calls for a reorientation of research practice from a framework of scientific rationality to one of practical rationality. It shows what this implies and what can be achieved in that way. Even though the paper does not focus on strategy-as-practice research in particular it is directly relevant to the above debate.

Splitter, V. and Seidl, D. (2011) “Does practice-based research on strategy lead to practically relevant knowledge? Implications of a Bourdieusian perspective” Journal of Applied Behavioral Science 47, 98-120: This paper applies a Bourdieusian perspective for discussing the relation between strategy research and strategy praxis. It argues that strategy research and praxis constitute different fields with different logics and calls for a particular form of reflexivity (participant objectivation) in research to account for this differentiation.
EMERGING SCHOLARS

Guillaume Carton  guillaume.carton@dauphine.fr

Topic: The transformation of research into practice

Guillaume Carton is a 3rd-year PhD Candidate in strategic management at the Université Paris-Dauphine (France). His PhD is supervised by Professor Stéphanie Dameron. His research interests include the production and diffusion of management knowledge between research and practice. He is particularly interested in the role of management innovations, in the role of scholar-practitioners, and in the rigor/relevance debate. He conducts qualitative research, employing a strategy-as-practice lens and mobilizing Giddens’ framework. His dissertation papers have been presented in peer-reviewed conferences and workshops. Beside his research activity, he works as a consultant in a management consulting firm.

Felix Werle  felix.werle@uzh.ch

Topic: Inter-organizational strategizing

Felix Werle is a PhD candidate at the Chair of Organization and Management, University of Zurich (David Seidl). His research is on inter-organizational strategizing processes where firms establish a collective understanding on strategic topics which informs their respective internal sensemaking and strategizing processes. Besides focusing on how organizations can extend their sensemaking capacities by engaging across organizations from often different industries, the research focus is further on the role of epistemic and partial objects for shaping such processes. The paper on ‘Inter-organizational Strategizing as Extension of Sensemaking Capacities’ also won the SAP Best Student Paper Award at the AOM Conference in Boston 2012. Felix has worked as a facilitator and consultant specialised on (inter-organizational) sensemaking and strategizing formats. At the AOM Conference in Orlando his research together with David Seidl was presented at the Symposium on ‘Open Strategy’. Felix will finish his PhD in summer 2014.

Shenghui Ma  shenghui.ma@uzh.ch

Topic: The CEO post-succession process

Shenghui Ma is a doctoral student at the University of Zurich’s Chair of Organization and Management (Prof. David Seidl). His PhD project focuses on new CEOs and how they manage the dynamic post-succession process. For this project, he had followed eight new CEOs by interviewing them regularly over the last two years. His general research interests include strategy process and strategic change, with a particular focus on the role of CEO and TMT. Shenghui is responsible for the bibliography section of our Strategy-as-Practice International Network (SAP-IN) website. Currently he is spending a research stay at HEC Montréal (Prof. Ann Langley). He expects to finish his PhD study in summer 2014.
OPEN STRATEGY:

TRANSPARENCY AND INCLUSION IN STRATEGY PROCESSES

Richard Whittington, Julia Hautz and David Seidl

Deadline for submission of papers to the Special Issue: **October 31st, 2014**
Deadline for submission of abstracts to associated Workshop: **April 14th, 2014**

Over the last few years there has been an apparent trend towards greater openness in the strategy process, for which Chesbrough & Appleyard (2007) and Doz & Kosonen (2008) coined the term “open strategy”. This new development parallels earlier ones in the area of innovation resulting in radically more open approaches to managing innovation processes (Chesbrough, 2006). Openness in strategy processes comes in many different forms such as *strategy jamming*, i.e. the inclusion of larger numbers of internal employees beyond the TMT by means of various social media technologies; *inter-organizational strategizing*, i.e. the organization of strategy workshops between different organizations for the collaborative exploration of strategic opportunities and threats; more transparent *external communication of strategy*, such as through analyst and media strategy presentations and more detailed strategy reporting; or *collective, participatory strategy processes of community-based or network-based organizations*, making use of crowdsourcing technologies. Clearly these new developments are partly made possible by the availability of new social technologies (Haefliger et al. 2011; Stieger et al. 2012), but they are also reinforced by new organizational forms and changing managerial cultures (Whittington et al. 2011).

Whittington et al (2011) summarize the trend to greater strategy openness by distinguishing two dimensions: (1) greater internal and external transparency with regards to processes and outcomes; (2) greater inclusiveness of various actors in strategy-making, internal and external. Greater openness on these dimensions is clearly opposed to conventional notions of strategy which treat it as exclusive and secretive rather than inclusive and transparent. Hence openness, which extends across the private and public sector, constitutes a significant challenge to the way strategy is traditionally understood and practiced. With this special issue we want to bring together papers that explore the drivers, forms and implications of this new development in strategic management.

We call for papers that deal with the various aspects and dynamics of open strategy – particularly where it goes beyond traditional notions of open innovation. We are interested in conceptual and empirical studies from a variety of different theoretical perspectives, such as network theory, resource-based theory, resource dependency theory, institutional theory, micro-political approaches and theories of social practice. We encourage equally quantitative and qualitative studies, and are open to work from profit and not-for-profit sectors. To aid in the development of papers, an associated *workshop* will be held on **30th June and 1st July 2014** at the *Saïd Business School*, University of Oxford. Papers may be submitted directly to the Special Issue without attendance at the workshop.

Further details of the Special Issue and associated workshop are available at:

CALL FOR PAPERS:
FEATURE TOPIC: VIDEO-BASED RESEARCH METHODS

Guest Editors:

Paula Jarzabkowski, Curtis LeBaron, Katherine Phillips and Michael Pratt

For practical reasons, video technology has become irresistible as an instrument of data collection for many researchers. Recording equipment is now readily available, relatively inexpensive, and easy to use. For example, most mobile phones have the ability to create and share digital video. Many organizations are now using video as a workplace tool for public broadcast, video conferencing, quality control, internal knowledge management, training, and more. Some organizations create archives or banks of video data, which may be valuable resources for research. Similarly, public events, such as congressional hearings, may now be video recorded, providing valuable extra-organizational data. Indeed, even in experimental research laboratories, which have long included video equipment, the prevalence of video as a medium of choice within our culture has expanded the possibilities for organizational research.

For organizational research methods, the empirical advantages of video data are noteworthy. Video recordings can capture behavior in real time and can then be slowed, zoomed and replayed, enabling analysts to be careful, precise, and consistent in generating accounts of organizational activity—who did what, when, where and how. Video recordings constitute a permanent record that others can watch and verify.

Perhaps most important, video provides ontological opportunities for researchers. While social scientists have traditionally focused on discourse (talk and text), often due to technological constraints, real-time video may provide insight into issues such as:

- Materiality. Organizations are teaming with “things” – objects, artifacts and tools – that are central to work and deserve careful attention and consideration. How do people interact with these “things” in relating, coordinating and organizing?

- Embodiment. Although the human body is absent or only implied in most organization research, video recordings often capture the body at the center of social interaction and organizational work. How does the engagement of the body affect social interaction in organizations?

- Spatio-temporality. Human activity unfolds through time and space, which are scarce organizational resources that must be carefully negotiated and strategically allocated. How does the way people use time and space affect organizational outcomes?

- Multimodality. Within organizations, people regularly engage through a variety of modes or semiotic systems that must be carefully orchestrated: talk, text, pictures, drawings, gestures, facial expressions, embodied maneuvers, and more can all be captured on video. How are these various modes and systems orchestrated in basic social functioning such as negotiating, team interactions, and communicating?

However, with the opportunities of video come potential pitfalls. Too often, researchers regard video as a lens on reality, without fully appreciating that the most basic cinematic decisions constitute theories about the world and how it should be studied. By locating, pointing and starting a camera, researchers make decisions about what is important. By using a camera to frame, focus or crop a particular scene, researchers already begin to analyze human activity in progress. With secondary video data, the intentions of the recorder may thus be imposed upon the researcher.

Organization scholars also need to be aware of underlying disciplinary assumptions associated with the various
methods available. For example, theories with roots in the field of psychology may be incompatible with methods informed by sociology when analyzing video data, and vice versa. In particular, the practices that constitute various methods (recording, archiving, transcribing, analyzing, interpreting, triangulating, coding, counting, reporting, etc.) come imbued with the ontological, epistemological and practical assumptions of their parent disciplines. Hence, a “one-size-fits-all” approach, mindless analytic “borrowing,” or citing precedents from other disciplines may not be sufficient for an inherently interdisciplinary field such as management and organization studies without clear guidance about which theories and methods apply to which types of research questions and disciplinary approaches. This is not to say that different disciplinary approaches may be incompatible with studying management and organizations; rather, a careful consideration of ontological, epistemological, and practical assumptions guiding video research is critical.

A special issue submission on video-based research methods might include but not be limited to the following topics:

i. What unique methodological challenges do video data raise? For example, how can three-dimensional data be rendered visible in articles, which are essentially two-dimensional texts? What are the implications for online multimedia journal publication of data?

ii. Video data foreground details and forms (including space, place, bodies and physical arrangements) that may escape notice in standard observations. What new ontological and epistemological assumptions do researchers need to make in analyzing video data and deciding what elements to examine?

iii. What are the unique methodological issues around archival (secondary, or pre-existing) versus ethnographic (researcher-collected) video data? In secondary data, how should researchers address the intentions of the data collector? In particular, what challenges and opportunities arise when using extra-organizational video data to enlighten organizational phenomena?

iv. While time is currently a fluid concept in much process research, video renders time visible in relation to other spatial configurations and specific sequences of actions. How can scholars deal with spatial-temporal notions captured in video data?

v. What constitutes good video data, given the wide variety of data sources, in which, for example, edited documentaries or video-recorded interviews are not the same as naturally occurring video of people in action? For example, does editing complicate or corrupt the spatial-temporal properties of video data?

vi. What are some best practices and protocols for analyzing video-based data and how might these vary qualitatively and quantitatively? How do we, or indeed should we, assess the quality, validity or trustworthiness of video-based research in terms of the measures and protocols that are appropriate?

vii. How might emerging technologies, such as facial recognition and movement mapping, enable and motivate video-based methods in the future? And what content analysis methods for video data might arise from such technologies?

All papers will undergo the standard double-blind ORM review process and must meet the standards of the ORM Editorial Policy Statement (see http://orm.sagepub.com). All articles published in this feature topic must improve our understanding of video-based research methods in the social sciences generally and organization studies specifically. Manuscripts may be submitted via the ORM website (http://orm.sagepub.com) between September 15 and October 15, 2014.
CALL FOR PAPERS – SPECIAL ISSUE OF LONG RANGE PLANNING:  
THE PERFORMATIVITY OF STRATEGY

Guest Editors:

Laure Cabantous, Jean-Pascal Gond, Alex Wright

The Performativity of Strategy

Although it is widely acknowledged that strategy matters to society and has multiple effects on organizations and markets, the processes whereby strategic ideas, theories and models influence individuals, organizations and markets remain under-studied. In addition, despite extensive research on strategy, we still know little about how strategy theories “work” in practice.

This special issue is a forum to study the performativity of strategy and to answer the following questions: How and why are strategy theories and concepts used and “performed” in practice? What are the implications and impact of the performativity of strategy?

We would like management scholars to engage thoroughly with Michel Callon’s idea that economics and management theories are performative, that is they perform and shape the external world. However, we also consider that other conceptualizations of performativity – such as the conceptualization developed by the Communicative Constitution of Organization perspective, Barad’s post-humanist approach to performativity, or the concept of performative praxis – offer promising avenues to address these questions.

The purpose of this Special Issue is to engage scholars who have an interest in the discursive, social-material or practice-based dimensions of the performativity of strategy. We will therefore consider conceptual and empirical manuscripts as long as they explicitly mobilize one (or several) conceptualizations of performativity and they seek to create a new body of knowledge concerning the relationships between strategy theories and practice. We also welcome manuscripts that critically reflect on strategy theories’ influence on organizational reality.

We encourage papers from researchers and practitioners that address, but are not limited to, the following topics:

- How and to what extent does strategic management acquire the power to shape organizational life and the organizational field? Are strategy theories self-fulfilling prophecies? Can strategy be approached as performative praxis—a set of activities that contribute to turning a theory into social reality?

- How are some strategic management frameworks and tools such as Porter’s five forces framework, Barney’s VRIN model or Freeman’s stakeholder theory more performative than others?

- How do performativity struggles between alternative models or theories of strategy in organizations emerge? For instance, how do strategy theories compete with economic representations of the firm, financial models (e.g., real option modelling) and theories, models and concepts from other disciplines (e.g., decision theory, sociology, ecology) to shape organizational strategies?

- How do academics and practitioners interact (or compete) when designing or diffusing innovative strategic concepts, such as the Bottom of the Pyramid, Blue Ocean Strategy, Coopetition or the Red Queen Effect?
• If business models are models encapsulating an organization’s strategy, to what extent are these models “performative”? Where does the performative power of business models come from?

• How are strategy and management consultants, and other professionals involved in the performativity of strategy?

• In responding to this call, we particularly welcome empirical contributions that document the concrete and practical effects of strategy theory. In terms of methodology, we welcome submissions in which a variety of research strategies and methods for collecting and analysing data are used.

Process and Deadlines

Stage 1: Submission of a 1000-words abstract by 30 September 2014

Please submit an extended abstract or a clear expression of interest to the guest editors by 30 September 2014 at the email address that follows: performativity.strat@gmail.com

All abstracts will receive a first screening and feedback by the guest editors who will encourage authors of promising abstracts to submit full manuscripts to the Special Issue.

Stage 2: Papers for the special issue will have to be sent by 15 March 2015

Papers for the special issue should be prepared according to LRP’s guidelines for authors (www.lrp.ac). Papers will undergo a normal reviewing process. Please submit full manuscripts to the online submission system of LRP before 15 March 2015: http://ees.elsevier.com/lrp/default.asp Should you have any questions about the Special Issue process and deadlines, please contact the guest editors at performativity.strat@gmail.com.

Suggested References


ONLINE SEMINAR SERIES ON STRATEGY-AS-PRACTICE: NEW TALKS AVAILABLE

The online seminar series on “Strategy as Practice: Theories, methodologies and phenomena” (edited by David Seidl and Paula Jarzabkowski) has been extended over the last year to cover important four important new topics.

In addition to the exiting talks (examples in the attached snapshots) it now includes a new seminar on methods in SAP (Ann Langley), one on micro-foundations in SAP (Patrick Regnér), one on the strategic role of middle managers (Linda Rouleau) and one on strategic planning (Ann Langley) a further seminar on Strategist and their individual identities (Dalvir Samra-Fredricks) will be added over the next few months.

SAP as an interest group at Academy has grown considerably since it was founded in 2010. The current membership is 508 members, which is fantastic for such a new group. Our membership is also one of the most diverse from an international standpoint.

Last year, our group went through a full review process by Division and Interest Group Relations (DIGR) Committee at Academy, and our status as an interest group was renewed for an additional five years. A lot of hard work, by quite a number of people, has made all of this possible. The positive effects of these efforts can be seen a bit everywhere with SAP groups and research centers mushrooming across the globe, more SAP research being published in top journals and an active conference circuit.

There is certainly a lot to be proud of! This being said, we must not sit on our laurels, and for that we’d like to solicit your help! One of our objectives is to expand our reach and increase our membership over the next few years. In order to do that we’d like to get a better sense of how we can better serve the interests of our members, and we’d like to make it easier for the curious and interested to get information about us.

**Can you help?** Among other initiatives we’d like to set up a network of **SAP country reps**. A country rep can work alone or with others within their countries in order to spread the word and get others involved in our group (for countries that have large membership, e.g. US/UK, we expect to have multiple regional reps). Tasks might include:

- Being listed on the interest group website as a local contact people can get in touch with should they have questions or inquiries about our group, or Academy related questions (submitting to an Academy conference, signing up to be a reviewer, organizing an event such as a symposium or PDW, getting in touch with other SAP groups and activities, etc.)

- Posting information and or announcements about SAP activities at your local institutions

- Helping to host small focus groups among your peers to find out what people would most like to get out of their membership in a group like ours. How can we make SAP so awesome that everyone will want to join?

- Any other ideas you might have that might help us boost our numbers

If you’re interested in lending a hand, even just a bit, please send a quick email to either of us and we’ll be in touch!

Charlotte ([charlotte.cloutier@hec.ca](mailto:charlotte.cloutier@hec.ca)) and Sotirios ([sotirios.paroutis@wbs.ac.uk](mailto:sotirios.paroutis@wbs.ac.uk))
YOUR IG NEEDS YOU (ELECTIONS)!

The SAP Interest Group is going to hold elections in April/May for four positions: PDW Chair (normally progressing through to IG Chair) and Representative at Large, Treasurer and Secretary (each normally three years). Being an officer is a great way of getting more involved in the IG. These positions will be particularly crucial for the future of the IG, as we currently expect to apply for full Divisional status in the periods of office. These officers will be making an impact on the Academy as a whole.

So we are asking for candidates nominations until 16 February, for elections in April-May. Do feel free to put yourselves forward! Nominations can be made at the following website: http://apps.aomonline.org/divnomination You will need to log-in using your last name and your member ID# as password.

It's important that we have real choices so being a candidate is a great way of contributing to the IG. And even if you don't get elected first time, then you're better placed for next time... If you are even just a bit interested, or have any queries, do get in touch with me, the election officer, at richard.whittington@sbs.ox.ac.uk.

YOUR IG NEEDS YOUR VOTES!

Subject to final confirmation from the Academy Board, we are expecting to run a final poll in the next few weeks (February/February) about two important changes:

1. A change in IG title, to Strategizing Activities and Practices. The term ‘practices’ is intended to clarify our focus on practices such as discursive practices, sociomaterial practices, analytical practices and so on, as well as strategizing activity. This proposal was supported by the IG Review membership survey last year and endorsed by the Academy’s Divisional and Interest Group Review committee.

2. The creation of a new Membership Secretary, distinct from the IG Secretary role (as currently organized). Having a new position dedicated to membership will be important to increasing the participation of members and recruiting new members. We are particularly keen that this new Membership Secretary increase membership and participation from currently under-represented regions of the world, for example the United States and Asia, but elsewhere as well.

So, look out for the poll in the next few weeks, launched through the AoM’s online voting facility. We need your votes!

Richard Whittington (Past Chair)
30\textsuperscript{TH} EGOS COLLOQUIUM
ROTTERDAM, THE NETHERLANDS
JULY 3–5, 2014

SUB-THEME 05: (SWG) STRATEGIZING PRACTICES AND RESOURCES: UNPACKING THE MICRO-FOUNDATIONS AND DYNAMICS OF RESOURCE ALLOCATION, DEPLOYMENT, DEVELOPMENT AND PERCEPTION

**Convenors:**

Martin Friesl, Lancaster University Management School, UK: m.friesl@lancaster.ac.uk
Patrick Regnér, Stockholm School of Economics, Sweden: patrick.regner@hhs.se
Carlo Salvato, Bocconi University, Italy: carlo.salvato@unibocconi.it

Strategy-as-practice (SAP) sees strategy as an on-going activity and accomplishment – something people do rather than organizations have. The emphasis is on people, the strategy work they do and the way this is embedded within the broader organizational and societal levels. Although the approach emphasizes the interrelationships between strategy work and organizational and institutionalized practices, the organizational resources at hand have been largely overlooked. To explore and fill this void in SAP, this year’s sub-theme emphasizes how strategists allocate, deploy, develop and perceive resources when strategizing. Addressing these questions promises to further develop the SAP area as well as bridge extant research debates in strategy process research and the resource and (dynamic) capability based views. We interpret the notion of resources broadly as including organizational resources, capabilities and routines.

**Resource allocation.** The resource allocation process model introduced by Bower (1970) and further extended by Burgelman (1983) has been one of the most lasting contributions in strategic management and SAP promises to extend this research in several ways. For example, one strand of research has addressed the relationship between strategizing activities and firms’ portfolios of resources and capabilities. Others have looked at the mediating role of taken-for-granted resource allocation practices.

**Resource deployment and development.** The resource and (dynamic) capability based views (Barney, 1991; Teece 2007) have dominated strategy content research over the last couple of decades. Nevertheless, the micro-foundations of resources, routines and capabilities are still something of an enigma. The SAP approach has a lot to offer regarding the micro-dynamics of the people involved and the routines and practices they draw on. It also promises insights into the use of institutionalized resources in strategy work (artefacts, tools, language, etc.). More generally, drawing on practice theorists such as Giddens and Bourdieu could provide the opportunity for a more complex understanding of resources and their implications for strategizing practices.

**Resource perception.** Managers differ in their understanding of resources and the significance of sensemaking has earlier been investigated through the SAP lens. This line of inquiry examines the relationships between how people perceive resources and capabilities and the institutionalized strategy practices at the group, organizational or societal levels (e.g. Eggers and Kaplan, 2013).
In keeping with the subtheme, we invite papers from a range of theoretical and methodological approaches that address the role of resources in the study of strategizing activities and practice. Related questions might include but are not restricted to the following:

- How does the access and allocation of resources constrain or enable processes and outcomes of strategizing?
- How do actors engage with resources in order to make them accessible, available and relevant for strategizing?
- What are the resources on individual, group or on diverse organization levels that are salient in strategizing processes?
- What are the people, activities and practices involved in developing novel resources and capabilities?
- How do organizationally situated and embedded strategy activities relate to resource-, capability- and routine inertia and inimitability?
- How do actors on different levels of the organization draw on (perceptions, conceptions or representations) firm level resources, routines and capabilities when strategizing?
- How can theories of practice inform a more nuanced understanding of “resources” used in strategizing processes (such as Bourdieus notion of cultural and symbolic capital or Giddens’ distinction of allocative and authoritative resources)?
- How are resources and routines (and their representations) transformed in the process of strategizing?
- What are the methodological implications of studying the role of resources in strategizing?

The topics outlined give room for a variety of possible contributions. Please note that because EGOS has acted as an important forum for the development of SAP scholarship, SAP papers offering contributions beyond the scope of the current theme are also welcomed. For further information on SAP please also visit: www.SAP-IN.org.

Sub-theme Convenors:

**Martin Friesl** is Senior Lecturer in Strategic Management at Lancaster University Management School. In his research Martin is particularly interested in the micro-practices of capability development, replication and change.

**Patrick Regnér** is Associate Professor of Strategic Management at Stockholm School of Economics. His research focuses on strategizing that underlies the origins of resources and capabilities including exploitation/exploration trade-offs.

**Carlo Salvato** is Associate Professor of Business Strategy at Bocconi University. Carlo’s research focuses on micro-level and endogenous aspects of capability development and change, internal entrepreneurship and corporate level strategy.
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In Madrid, the conference theme will be “Strategies in the world of networks”. A networked world exposes the dynamism that underpins the way strategy practices are formed, performed, and transformed. It allows us to appreciate that what makes a working net (network) of connections possible are the strategic dynamics that shape the emerging practices and the connection they foster within and across organizations in a ‘World of Networks’.

The conference theme provides an opportunity to rethink strategy practice. A dynamic perspective on strategy practice fosters greater attention to the emergence of practices. At the same time, it provides scope to appreciate that such emergence provokes emergency in the way judgments (phronesis) are called for in performing strategy practice in an ever-uncertain and unpredictable world.

In the Strategy Practice Interest Group, we encourage submissions that focus on the emergence of practices. Submissions might, for instance, discuss the relational nature of strategizing, strategy practice embedded in networks and the meaning of relationships in strategy practitioners work. We are looking forward to academics, practitioners, and strategy consultants to share their insights on strategizing and to work together to develop fresh stories from their lived experiences and new insights from innovative empirical research that captures the relational dynamism of strategy practice.

Attending SMS allows for making an impact and leaving your imprint in the future of strategic management research. The conference brings together all schools of thought within the strategic management research, which makes the networking opportunities remarkable. During the conference, you will get to meet and eat together with the distinguished scholars in the field. Also, there is a wonderful opportunity for sharing thoughts and ideas with consultants from the leading companies in the world. Besides presenting your own work, you might find sessions and workshops on teaching strategy, publishing in strategy journals and working on your Ph.D. as valuable.

One of the greatest benefits of the SMS is that you get to submit an early stage paper and receive good and insightful reviews for work that is under development. The Strategy Practice Interest Group has put in place a reward for the best reviewers, which means that you will get a high quality reviews for your paper. So, why not start writing today and plan submitting your work to the next conference. The deadline to submit a proposal to the Madrid conference (Sept. 20-23, 2014) is February 27, 2014. You can send your proposal at:

http://madrid.strategicmanagement.net/submissions/proposal_submit.php
The 2012 Dauphine workshop gathered about 60 scholars from 14 countries from Europe, North America, Asia and Oceania. 23 research projects were presented and 4 PhD students discussed their dissertation project with SaP scholars. The 2nd Dauphine strategy workshop will be dedicated to the theme “Strategy & Networks”. With this workshop, we seek to explore new developments regarding the link between strategy and networks. More specifically, we encourage contributions that address the use of sensitive information in networks for strategic purposes. Special guests: Tomi Laamanen (Institute of Management, Universität St. Gallen, Switzerland – Associate Editor, Strategic Management Journal) and Emmanuel Lazega (CSO, Sciences Po Paris, France). We welcome theoretical, conceptual, comparative and empirically-based papers that may provide new insights on the link(s) between strategy and networks. The practice-based lens that we seek to develop may resonate with other theoretical streams that deal with networks and strategy, including Actor Network Theory, cognition-based theories, strategic decision making, resource-based views, etc. We welcome submissions related but not limited to the following issues:

- How do managers use networks to make decisions?
- What practices do managers develop in order to strategically influence their environment?
- How does strategic information circulate in companies/networks?
- Do networks enable better strategic decision-making than hierarchies?
- What role do outsiders play in strategic decision-making?
- In what ways do strategic processes rely on internal/external networks?
- How might networking resources lead to competitive advantage?
- What do people do in order to extract sensitive information from their network(s)?
- How is coopetition practiced?
- How is strategic (e)-reputation developed?
- How do people develop networks in order to improve their company’s competitive advantage?
- What information do people hide and/or reveal through their relations with peers in networks?

Important Dates:
- Submission (about 500 words): February 15th, 2014
- Notification of decision to authors: March 15th, 2014
- Full papers (at least 5000 words): May 10th, 2014
- Parallel sessions: June 10th-11th am, 2014
- PhD workshop: June 11th pm, 2014

For more info visit the workshop website at: http://www.workshopstrategy.dauphine.fr
STRATEGY AS DISCOURSE:

ITS SIGNIFICANCE, CHALLENGES AND FUTURE DIRECTIONS

Language and communication are crucial aspects to strategy as practice. The current issue of Journal of Management Studies is a special issue that breaks new ground on these issues. Read more at:


to find about e.g. the following questions:

- why are so many strategy documents ambiguous
- what role does emotional communication play in strategic decision making
- what are the linguistic micro strategies of achieving consensus in strategic discussions
- how does the language of strategic management construct strategists
- what are the power implications of strategy discourse

The Special Issue features work from Chahrazad Abdallah and Ann Langley, Stéphanie Dameron and Christophe Torset, Cynthia Hardy and Robyn Thomas, Winston Kwon, Ian Clarke and Ruth Wodak, and Feng Liu and Sally Maitlis. The editors Julia Balogun, Claus Jacobs, Paula Jarzabkowski, Saku Mantere and Eero Vaara write a substantial editorial.

NEW BLOG!

When you get the chance – please check out the official blog of our IG at: www.strategizingblog.com. Many thanks to Leonhard Dobusch for setting it up. The blog is open to new article suggestions, just send your blog entry to Leonhard.dobusch@fu-berlin.de
PHD STUDENTSHP AT CASS

Applicants with excellent research potential are invited to apply for two fully-funded, full-time, 4-year Doctoral Studentships to commence in October 2014, working under the lead supervision of Professor Paula Jarzabkowski. These studentships will cover tuition fees and provide an annual bursary. Cass Business School, City University London is one of Europe’s leading providers of business and management education at both undergraduate and postgraduate levels and is fast developing into the intellectual hub of the City of London. The School is renowned worldwide for its extensive and high quality research and The Financial Times has ranked our PhD offering in the top 40 in the world every year since 2007. Proposals are invited on the topic of practice theory approaches to strategy and organization. While the research context and topic is open, candidates taking an explicitly strategy-as-practice approach, and those with an interest in studying finance industries and/or financial risk are particularly welcome. One studentship is specifically open for those with a particular interest in the area of video ethnography. The successful applicant would take part in an existing video-ethnographic programme of research examining trading of risk in the reinsurance industry. Applicants for this studentship will join a team and an ongoing programme of research into the reinsurance industry at Cass. We invite applications from students who have (or can show evidence that they reasonably expect to have) a Masters degree from a leading university with top grades in business, sociology, anthropology or a relevant discipline for the topic areas. Only applicants interested in pursuing an academic career will be considered. How to apply: Applicants should contact Professor Paula Jarzabkowski directly to discuss their interest via email on P.Jarzabkowski@city.ac.uk. All applicants will also need to fill out the PhD application form, which may be accessed on the Cass Business School website: www.cass.city.ac.uk/courses/phd/how-to-apply.

PHD STUDENTSHP AT BATH

Bath University School of Management has a fully funded PhD Scholarship in Strategy as Practice under the Supervision of Julia Balogun available for October 2014. The School of Management at Bath is situated in a world heritage city famous for its architecture, and is one of the UK's highest ranked Management Schools in both research and teaching. The school was placed 5th in the most recent Research Assessment Exercise, and was most recently ranked first for student satisfaction in Business Studies (http://www.bath.ac.uk/management/about/). The school runs FT ranked MBA, Masters in Management and Masters in Finance programmes, and its MBA is ranked 2nd in the UK in the Economist Which MBA. Interested applicants should contact Professor Julia Balogun directly by email on j.balogun@bath.ac.uk. All applicants will need to complete the Bath School of Management on-line PhD application process (http://www.bath.ac.uk/management/phd/). The application process requires candidates to submit a preliminary research proposal. Proposals are invited topics such as strategy making, strategic renewal and change. For more information see http://www.bath.ac.uk/management/phd/pdf/SMSCURSAdvert2014.pdf