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1. INTRODUCTION
1.1.1 Situation and complication.

There has been a practice turn in different fields of research. This turn is also identified in Strategy Research (Whittington, 2006). The view on strategy shifts from long-term planning to strategy as an emergent process (Chia & Holt, 2006). The Strategy-as-Practice approach focuses on strategists and strategizing, including what actors do during strategy making. It shows how strategy making is a social practice of organized human activity. A practice driven approach enables us to see how it is that actors draw on shared understandings about things, others and time to realize practice ends instead of realizing these ends through a conscious strategy process and an awareness of the practice (Loohuis & Ehrenhard, 2014).

Strategy-as-Practice theory directs attention from macro-processes to varying aspects of the minutaie of strategizing (Chia & MacKay, 2007). Practice theory seeks out a middle-ground. On the one hand it refuses the notion of strategic planning as reflection of rationality, on the other it resists the seductive ironies of strategic emergence. The practice middle-ground responds well to reality reported back from the field (Whittington, 2011).

Nevertheless, in strategy research the main focus still is on actors and individualistic models of decision making (Vaara & Whittington, 2012). Explanations by looking at actions as being motivated by the actors’ intentions, relying on their own system of beliefs, is called methodological individualism (Chia & Holt, 2006). A focus on practices rather than on the individual actor is called relationalism. Relationalism seeks to explain human action in terms of practical coping (Chia & Holt, 2006). The practice turn should represent a complete shift in emphasis from methodological individualism to a form of relationalism (Chia & Holt, 2006). However, strategy-as-practice research still tends to focus too much on methodological individualism. This leads to a lack of clarity about the ontological and epistemological position implied in the strategy-as-practice research. Ontology is the part of philosophy that tries to categorize all things, whereas epistemology is the science of knowledge (Kramers Handwoordenboek Nederlands, 1998).

The difference between methodological individualism and relationalism can also be seen in the Heideggerian perspective (1962) in which there is a distinction in the way the world may ‘show itself’ to a being who is active within it. These concepts are availability and occurrence (Chia & Holt, 2006). In the first mode, the being is totally immersed in his/her surroundings: a being-in-the-world that is prior to mental representation and purposeful intentional action (Chia & Holt, 2006). The second mode involves a distancing of the individual from the phenomenon apprehended (Chia & Holt, 2006). Translated to strategy-as-practice research these are the concepts of building and dwelling. The building mode represents the strategy as a conscious process of long-term planning, whereas the dwelling mode sees strategy as something that emerges as consequence of (unconscious) human action which is immanent in everyday practical coping (Chia & Holt, 2006; Chia & MacKay, 2007). This practical coping can still be seen as strategy, because over time a certain consistency of action arises. This consistency can be explained with Bourdieu’s concept of Habitus: a transposable set of dispositions by which individual actions are guided (Chia & Holt, 2006; Chia & MacKay, 2007). In this dwelling mode, Chia & Holt (2006) point out the importance of micro (social) actions of the strategy practitioners, which can be seen in everyday practices of strategy formation. Schatzki describes practices not as ‘just what people do’, but practices as social sites in which events, entities and meaning help compose one another. So the organization of a practice is not a collection of properties of individual people, nor is an organization the simple summation of practices (Chia & Holt, 2006). Availability relates to the dwelling mode of strategy and is characterized by practical coping. Occurrence on the other hand relates to the building mode and involves a distancing of the individual from the phenomenon apprehended. This takes place especially during a breakdown. Heidegger states that it is only in this occurrence mode that thematic representation, deliberate intention and action take over from everyday practical coping (Chia & Holt, 2006; Chia & MacKay, 2007; Loohuis, 2015).

This occurrence mode is comparable with the concept of Strategy Episodes. Strategy episodes are based on the theory of Niklas Luhmann (1995) about social systems and the treatment of change within a reproduced system of practice (Hendry & Seidl, 2003). In this treatment of change the concept of an episode of communication, structured in terms of its beginning and ending, is important because it is through these episodes that organizations are able to routinely suspend their normal routine structures of conversation, communication and hierarchy and so create the opportunity for reflexive strategic practice (Hendry & Seidl, 2003). This means that a strategy episode takes people out of their normal working environment and places them in a new context. The beginning and ending of an episode creates an inside/outside difference between the sequence of communications within an episode and the communications that takes place before and after it. This means that through these episodes, a system constantly changes its structures, introducing different structures for limited time periods only (Hendry & Seidl, 2003). These episodes can be everything, from small talk at the coffee machine to a formal meeting on executive level. Hendry & Seidl (2003) see strategy as two faced: on the one hand as providing stability and direction, on the other hand as tool for change and the difference between the future and the present. Luhmann’s social systems theory excludes psychological elements like thought, individual motivation and intention. It is focused on the sociologically observable practices and routines of strategists and other actors, and the socially reproduced nature of these practices (Hendry & Seidl, 2003).

Just like strategy episodes enable for reflexive strategic practice, so does temporal work (Kaplan & Orlikowski, 2013). Also, both concepts consider change. Temporal work deals with strategy making in uncertain times and/or crises and starts with an uncertain future. These uncertainties lead to breakdowns in understanding and require cognitive reorientations to move forward. Envisioning new futures provokes reassessments of the past and present just as new understandings of current concerns triggers new imaginations of the future and alternative versions of history. Negotiating these interpretive differences is called temporal work and is central to strategy making in practice (Kaplan & Orlikowski, 2013). Temporal work can be understood as a building mode of existence, deriving from a more dwelling mode, that allow actors to deliberately reconstruct the past, present, and future on the background of their involvement in socio-material practices. This temporal work is shaped by the actors’ existential situation (Loohuis & Ehrenhard, 2014). Low temporal work implies that actors reproduce ongoing practice and postpone actions to change. In other words, the past, present, and future remained coherently linked. Moderate temporal work implies a re-alignment of practices in the present in anticipation of the future. Actors were
able to re-construct the past, present, and the future successfully. Substantial temporal work results into a drift as actors can’t see how to align future demands in ongoing practice (Loohuis & Ehrenhard, 2014).

Summarizing: in Strategy-as-Practice research, the actor’s existential situation shapes their strategy making involved in everyday practice and this can be seen as a dwelling mode or emergent form of strategy making. When there is need for change or an adaption to external/internal circumstances, this strategy making shifts to the building mode, making it a conscious process. Strategy episodes and temporal work are examples of these conscious processes. This is different from the ‘old-fashion view of strategy’ where strategy was only seen as a conscious, long term planning process. The present practice turn in Strategy Research treats strategy as an emergent process. The only time this emergent process transforms in conscious strategy making is when the circumstances ask for it.

As said before, there’s a lack of clarity about the ontological and epistemological position implied in the strategy-as-practice research. Sandberg & Dall’Alba (2009) state that the practice turn is mostly seen from a dwelling perspective. However, they say that the empirical research on the subject is mostly analyzed through a more building perspective. The question is whether this is true or not. This paper will focus on empirical research on strategy.

1.1.2 Research Goal.
To study from which ontological position (building or dwelling) empirical papers on strategy are approached.

1.1.3 Research Question.
Which ontological & epistemological position (building or dwelling) is implied in empirical Strategy-as-Practice research?

1.1.4 Theoretical Framework.
The following concepts/models are going to be used in the paper:

- Heidegger’s concepts of awareness (Chia & Holt, 2006; Chia & MacKay, 2007).
- Dwelling mode of strategy making (Chia & Holt, 2006; Chia & MacKay, 2007).
- Habitus (Chia & Holt, 2006; Chia & MacKay, 2007).
- Building mode of strategy making (Chia & Holt, 2006; Chia & MacKay, 2007).

1.1.5 Academic relevance.
My research will elaborate on the work of Hendry & Seidl (2003) on strategy episodes and the work of Kaplan & Orlikowski (2013) and Loohuis and Ehrenhard (2014) on temporal work. Besides, this paper will review the work of Sandberg & Dall’Alba (2009) by investigating their statement about empirical research on strategy. They state that most empirical Strategy-as-Practice research is analyzed through a building perspective. I will investigate if this is true or not, and why this is the case. Feldman and Orlikowski distinguish three different kinds of practice approaches: empirical, theoretical and philosophical (Vaara & Whittington, 2012). This paper doesn’t treat the approaches as distinct entities, but tries to combine them by looking at empirical research through a theoretic/philosophical lens. The gathered knowledge will contribute to the practice turn in strategy research and to strategy research in general. The turn to practice theory is an opportunity because it has a theoretical reach across disciplinary fields, offering a prospect of transdisciplinary cohesion around practice theory (Whittington, 2011). This means that knowledge gathered in this research can be applied in several organizational disciplines.

1.1.6 Practical relevance.
By gaining more insight into the building and dwelling mode of strategy, the business (sector) can apply this knowledge to gain more insight in their own strategy making process and maybe improve their performance.

1.1.7 Outline of the thesis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1 Introduction</th>
<th>Introducing the subject and the research question.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 Theoretical framework</td>
<td>Explaining the most important concepts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Method</td>
<td>Explaining what is going to be investigated and in what way.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Results</td>
<td>Giving the results.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Conclusion and discussion</td>
<td>Concluding the results and name the practical recommendations and limitations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 References</td>
<td>List of all the references used.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

2.1.1 Heidegger’s concepts of awareness.
In the Heideggerian perspective (1962) there are two modes of existing: Heidegger’s concepts of awareness. ‘Availableness’ or ‘readiness-to-hand’, from which the world does not appear ‘ready-made’ but comes into being and takes on significance through its incorporation into everyday activities, and ‘occurrence’, which involves a distancing of the individual from the phenomenon apprehended. So availableness/readiness-to-hand is characterized by smooth and unobtrusive practical coping, whereas ‘occurrence’ involves a distancing of the individual from the phenomenon apprehended. Turning on your computer without thinking is an example of availableness. But it’s only when your computer doesn’t work, that you consciously think about it. This is occurrence. (Chia & Holt, 2006; Chia & MacKay, 2007).

2.1.2 Dwelling mode of strategy making
Heidegger’s concept of availableness, translated to the strategy-as-practice research, is the dwelling mode of strategy making. This mode sees strategy as something that emerges as consequence of (unconscious) human action which is immanent in everyday practical coping. Here the strategists ‘don’t think, but just do’. (Chia & Holt, 2006; Chia & MacKay, 2007).

2.1.3 Habitus.
The practical coping involved in the dwelling mode of strategy making can still be seen as strategy, because over time a certain consistency of action arises. This consistency can also be explained with Bourdieu’s concept of Habitus. Habitus is a transposable set of dispositions by which individual actions are guided (Chia & Holt, 2006 ). Habitus can be seen as culturally and historically transmitted regularities detectable through the patterns of activities actually carried out (Chia & MacKay, 2007). As with dwelling, habitus can be considered as modus operandi (Chia & Holt, 2006; Chia & MacKay, 2007).

2.1.4 Building mode of strategy making
Heidegger’s concept of occurrence, translated to the strategy-as-practice research, is the building mode of strategy making.
This mode represents strategy as a conscious process of long-term planning. (Chia & Holt, 2006; Chia & MacKay, 2007).

3. METHOD
My research will be conceptual and consist of a literature review into empirical research about strategy making and outcomes. First I will read the articles and investigate what is said about strategy. After that, I will analyse if the paper took on the building mode, the dwelling mode or a combination of both. The articles used will be selected on the following criteria:
- Subject is strategy (related).
- The paper considers strategic change or the varying aspects of the minutiae of strategizing.
- The research is empirical.

I chose these criteria because Strategy-as-Practice theory directs attention from macro-processes to varying aspects of the minutiae of strategizing (Chia & MacKay, 2007). Moreover, strategic change has a special place in the strategy-as-practice theory. The ‘old-fashion view of strategy’ sees strategy as only a conscious, long term planning process. The present practice turn in Strategy Research treats strategy as an emergent process. The only time this emergent process transforms in conscious strategy making is when the circumstances ask for it. These circumstances often involve strategic change. In the strategy-as-practice theory there are important concepts regarding strategic change: strategy episodes and temporal work. So if the subject is strategy and considers strategic change or the minutiae of strategizing, I think the paper is applicable for my research because it is in line with the practice turn in strategy research. The research needs to be empirical because the statement from Sandberg & Dall’Alba (2009), which I’m going to test, is about empirical research.

I used two procedures in finding the articles:
- Using search terms like strategy; strategy as practice; practice; strategizing.
- Looking at the references in papers if there are articles being mentioned which are interesting and applicable to my research.

Most papers were found using the second method.

The articles used in this paper don’t represent everything that is produced in the strategy-as-practice research. Due to the limited time available, it is not achievable to review all the strategy-as-practice papers. Besides, these papers are a good mix of the different subjects involved in the strategy-as-practice research. There are several papers about the minutiae of strategizing, for example about linguistic skills. Other articles look at strategic change, for example the study of the provincial museums and cultural heritage sites (Oakes, Townley, & Cooper 1998). Strategy in general is also being treated, and there are papers which review certain strategies or strategy failures. So despite the fact that not all strategy-as-practice literature is being analyzed, the selected articles cover most of the subjects involved in the strategy-as-practice research. This is why I chose the following articles.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Content</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
The analysis of these articles can take on the form of an overview, comparable to the study of Vaara & Whittington (2012). This will probably look something like the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Main methodology</th>
<th>Context</th>
<th>Socio-material practices</th>
<th>Empirical focus</th>
<th>Building or dwelling mode</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Most of the parts of the overview don’t need further explanation. First I name the author(s), and after that the methodology of the study (observations, interviews etc.). The context says something about the institutional/societal field in which the study takes place. Socio-material practices are for example strategy meetings, workshops, and away days (Vaara & Whittington, 2012). The empirical focus explains what is being measured and/or investigated in the paper, after which the study will be classified in building, dwelling or a combination of both.

4. RESULTS
Oakes, Townley, & Cooper (1998) investigate the business planning process. They examine an episode of change at the provincial museums and cultural heritage sites of Alberta, Canada. In this episode, they have to change their self-image and shift from cultural capital towards economic capital. The sector has understood its main rationale as the preservation and interpretation of the province’s historical resources and this has to change into a more money-oriented purpose. This is comparable to the concept of temporal work. They treat business planning as a mechanism to implement direct and explicit controls through formally established goals. From this point of view, business planning is a rational decision-making instrument. This suggest business plans as a building mode of strategy making. They state that business plans not only announce that change is coming, but it is through the activity of business planning that change actually occurs. Business planning encouraged managers to try to learn a feel for the new situation and to try to absorb some of the cultural capital to be gained by appearing entrepreneurial. This absorbed cultural capital becomes their new habitus. The symbolic violence involved in change is not always explicit and doesn’t always involve conscious strategic action. They also state that organizations are constructed through institutionalized practices and historical experiences. These institutionalized practices and historical experiences can be seen as the modus operandi or habitus, suggesting a dwelling mode of strategy making.

Summarizing, one can observe both the building and the dwelling mode. The business plans are formulated by taking on the building mode: they consciously decide what will be documented and what not. The implementation and execution of this strategy however, is analyzed through the dwelling mode. This can be seen in an observation of a senior divisional manager: “They know what they need to achieve, how they come there varies.” So there is a combination of a building and a dwelling mode, whereby strategy formulation is carried out by taking on a building mode and strategy implementation and execution is done through a dwelling mode. You could also say that the article views strategy as dwelling, until there is need for change. In changing, the building mode of strategy making takes over. After that, strategy making returns to the dwelling mode. This is comparable to the current practice turn in strategy research, which also treats strategy as an emergent process, whereby the only time this emergent process transforms in conscious strategy making, is when the circumstances ask for it.

Mintzberg (1978) reviewed the completed studies of the strategies of Volkswagenwerk from 1934 to 1974 and the United States government in Vietnam from 1950 to 1973. Before starting his review, Mintzberg (1978) distinguishes between two types of strategy. Strategy as deliberate plans conceived in advance of the making of specific decisions is called the intended strategy, and strategy as a pattern in a stream of decisions is called the realized strategy. This intended strategy is developed through a building perspective, whereas the realized strategy is analyzed by taking on a dwelling perspective. The strategy of Volkswagenwerk was analyzed through a building perspective. They consciously made a plan, or in their case a vision of the car(s) they wanted to produce, and followed this plan. Here the intended and the realized strategy were the same. The case of the US government was analyzed by taking on a dwelling perspective. At first, none of the intended strategies accomplished its purpose. This led to a growing debate within the government over the strategy to follow. As the debate went on, the realized strategy began to change due to the practical coping of the soldiers in Vietnam. The government later took on this emerged strategy and communicated it as the intended strategy. So here the emergent strategy became a deliberate one, once it was recognized by the government. But the strategy of the United States government is analyzed by taking on the dwelling perspective, by looking at the practical coping of the soldiers deployed to Vietnam.

Sandberg & Pinnington (2009) conducted an empirical study on corporate lawyers. The purpose of the analysis was to identify specific ways of practising corporate law. By reading the transcripts and the observational notes, they tried to identify the meaning of the specific ways of practising corporate law. They also looked at self-understanding and understanding of the work. This implies a building mode, because giving meaning to something involves a distancing of the individual from the phenomenon apprehended. After that, the researchers looked at the role of others and things in each specific way of practising corporate law. The focus here was not on the tools themselves, but on their use in each specific way of practising corporate law, and their role in the constitution of competence in corporate law. Again, this involves a distancing of the individual from the phenomenon apprehended, implying the building mode. For example, the clothing and the buildings are chosen consciously. The lawyers don’t do things without thinking, it isn’t practical coping. They consciously choose the best options for the case. Their strategy making for each case is also done through the building mode. Up front the lawyers consciously plan which steps they need to take and what needs to be arranged, after which they execute it.

Samra-Fredericks (2003) investigates strategists’ linguistic skills and forms of knowledge for strategizing. In other words, it’s a study of how strategizing is accomplished through language use and talking. These conversations can be seen as a form of temporal work, because the strategists need to make the ‘past’ their flexible resource and selectively draw upon it, bend it and make it meaningfully consistent in the here-and-now.
given their current projects. The study focusses on naturally occurring talk-based interaction and everyday activities as opposed to metaphor use and storytelling. Where metaphor use and storytelling is consciously used, suggesting the building mode, naturally occurring talk-based interaction could indicate the dwelling mode of strategy making. However, there are a few passages in the study which suggest the building mode of strategy making: “The strategists were managing strategic change in the form of implementing a prior strategic decision to build this new facility.” and “What the core group of six strategists also felt they needed to do was to develop a five year strategy which would ‘reap the benefits’.” Both citations contain some sort of consciously, long term planning and execution of these plans. On the other hand, constituting a context where specific decisions were ‘made’ to enable the employees to project the organization into the future as described, was achieved by recognizing the two weaknesses of the organization. The strategist knew that the organization needed to be competitive to reach the overall goal: growth through acquisition. Becoming competitive however, was achieved through practical coping: the strategist recognized the two weaknesses standing in the way and communicated this, which constituted the context needed. This was done through the dwelling mode of strategy making: the strategist wasn’t consciously planning on recognizing and communicating the weaknesses, but ‘just did it’. There is one particular strategist, named SA in the paper, whom made the strategy. He convinces the other strategists by using his linguistic skills and his knowledge. Whereas he probably consciously planned to convince the other strategists and anticipated on some sceptical or unsympathetic responses, the use of his linguistic skills can be seen as practical coping. Although improvable, linguistic skills is something you have or not. So the linguistic skills can be seen as someone’s habitus, suggesting the use of linguistic skills can be seen as the dwelling mode. The same applies for his knowledge, which he gathered in previous jobs. This knowledge is his transposable set of dispositions by which his actions are guided. This example is characteristic for the whole paper: the strategy can be explained through a combination of the building and the dwelling mode, because both perspectives can be seen.

Samra-Fredericks (2003) does a proposal for developing a critical pedagogy in management, developed through her research in the previous paper (Samra-Fredericks, 2003). Here the practitioners began to discuss aspects of their spoken taken-for-granted world. This discussion is part of their strategizing as discussed in Samra-Fredericks (2003) and is mainly aimed at improving their strategizing. By discussing the taken-for-granted aspects of their strategizing, the practitioners distanced themselves from their strategizing. This suggests the building mode of strategy making. However, in admitting that there’s a taken-for-granted part of their strategizing, so habitual strategizing without consciously thinking about it, the practitioners also admit that (at least a part of) their strategizing is carried out by the dwelling mode of strategy making. So in this paper, both the building mode and the dwelling mode can be seen.

Maitlis & Lawrence (2003) develop a framework for understanding failure in strategizing by looking at a British symphony orchestra trying to construct an artistic strategy for their organization. In the article, strategy is seen as: consciously giving an artistic identity to the work of the orchestra and developing an artistic policy. This is a sort of longer-term vision and hasn’t anything to do with practical coping, so it can be seen as the building mode of strategy making. However, when the Artistic Advisor defended their strategy, he explained their strategizing through the dwelling mode. He said: “You need to try as many things as you can to see what will and what won’t work, otherwise it makes for a very, very long process.” This implies practical coping and in being so the dwelling mode of strategy making. The chairman stated: “A compromise of what the Principal Conductor wants and what’s financially possible is what happens.” This suggests a combination of both forms, with a formulated strategy developed through the building mode and a realized strategy through the dwelling mode. The formulation of the artistic strategy was tried to accomplish through strategy episodes. This concept also occurs in other strategy-as-practice literature and is a building mode of strategy making. But a strategy episode takes people out of their normal strategy making, and normal strategy making is mostly done through the dwelling mode. This is typical for this paper, where both the building and the dwelling mode of strategy making can be seen.

Salvato (2003) proposes a model of strategic evolution by looking at two comparative case studies. The investigator tries to trace intentional behaviour, and after that to investigate the controversial effects of departures from these purposeful directions. This suggests a starting point developed through the building mode, followed up by the dwelling mode of strategy making. The development of all the strategic initiatives investigated in this study point to the central role of an established bundle of organizational routines and resources. This established bundle of routines and resources can be seen as habitus, suggesting the dwelling mode. The dwelling mode can also be seen in the following citation: “Other metaprojects simply ‘emerge’, as a result of the informal interplay between Alessi and its designers.” Here the projects, so the strategy, emerges. However, these were intentionally developed metaprojects, which suggests the building mode. The new strategic initiatives were realised by recombining the original Core Micro-strategies and new elements. Salvato (2003) states that “empirical evidence suggested that recombination processes described so far are the result of conscious decisions.” These conscious decisions are typical for the building mode of strategy making. Although these decisions could have been consciously made, there is also enough evidence in the paper that suggest the dwelling mode: like the emerging metaprojects and the established routines and recourses as habitus. Both modes of strategy making can be seen, leading to the conclusion that the strategy making in this case is done through a combination of the building- and the dwelling mode of strategy making.

Jarzabkowski & Wilson (2002) investigate how a top management team puts strategy into practice in a UK university. The practice approach taken in this paper, offers insights into the ingrained habits and bits of tacit knowledge that make up the streams of actions or events. These habits and knowledge are seen as habitus, suggesting the dwelling mode of strategy making. They seek an understanding of how strategy is derived from the actual practices in which people habitually engage as part of their daily work, again suggesting the dwelling mode. On the other hand, strategic intent is clearly mentioned in the strategic plan. This sort of consciously made plans is characteristic for the building mode. Furthermore, there is a strong coherence between strategic intent and strategic action, supporting the notion of a building mode of strategy making. Summarizing: the strategic intent, or strategy making, is consciously made up through the building mode, whereas the strategy implementation is done by taking on the dwelling mode. This means there is a combination of the building- and dwelling mode of strategy making.
Regnér (2003) examines how managers create and develop strategy in practice. In the analysis of the outer contexts, he examined emerging strategies, suggesting the dwelling mode. In these complex outer contexts, strategy content was very vague. The analysis of the inner context showed a clear distinction between a more peripheral and a central setting. Strategy making in the periphery was inductive, including externally oriented and exploratory strategy activities like trial and error, informal noticing, experiments and the use of heuristics. The use of for example trial and error and experiments can be seen as practical coping, which is characteristic of the dwelling mode. The following citation from a Couplet manager supports this claim: “We used trial and error . . . tried out things, we never calculated . . . it was an informal way to cope with it [electro-hydraulic couplings]” The same can be seen at RSA/Ericsson: “to enter the US was not part of any plan . . . and taking England . . . both these events were not part of any plan.” Strategy making in the centre was more deductive involving an industry and exploitation focus, and activities like planning, analysis, formal intelligence and the use of standard routines. Activities like planning and analysis suggests the building mode. All the managers working in the centre are mainly focussed on previously made plans and goals, which is the building mode of strategy making. The use of standard routines on the other hand can be seen as habitus, which suggests the dwelling mode. In most cases, ideas were developed in the periphery. Often, there first was tension between the periphery and the centre, but after the centre acknowledged the ideas of the periphery, it became the companies’ strategy. In summary you can see both modes of strategy making, with the dwelling mode at the periphery and a more building mode at the centre. However, the dwelling mode prevails because the centre also uses the dwelling mode in their emphasize on standard routines and previous experiences.

Ocasio & Joseph (2008) examine the history and evolution of strategic planning practices at the General Electric Company (GE) during six CEO regimes. Integrative strategic planning at GE was originally called long range planning. Conscious long range planning is part of the building mode of strategy making. In their analysis, they define strategy as a framework that guides the organization’s choices of action. In this context, strategy can be seen as habitus, so implying the dwelling mode. They interpret this definition broadly and view strategies as planned and emergent, suggesting a combination of the building and the dwelling mode. However, they state that their definition implies that strategic planning is a management practice developed for the purpose of intentional strategizing. This intentional strategizing can be seen as the building mode. Overall, strategizing was long-term planning, later called strategic planning; development; corporate initiatives and GE Operating System, after which these plans were carried out. So the main perspective implied in this analysis is the building mode of strategy making.

5. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Main methodology</th>
<th>Context</th>
<th>Socio-material practices</th>
<th>Empirical focus</th>
<th>Building or dwelling mode</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Samra-Fredericks, 2003</td>
<td>Her previous research, interviews.</td>
<td>The building of a new manufacturing facility of a large company located in France.</td>
<td>Informal talks and meetings/ workshops.</td>
<td>Strategists’ talk-based interactive routines.</td>
<td>Combination.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Limitations and future research directions

There are some limitations to this research. First, some of the differences between the building mode and dwelling mode could maybe be explained through the methodology chosen. When using interviews, the interviewees are forced to distance themselves from the phenomena they’re talking about, which quicker leads to the building mode of strategy making. Observations on the other hand, don’t disturb people’s everyday activities and doesn’t require a distancing from the phenomena being studied. This could be the reason that the dwelling mode of strategy making has the upper hand in studies that use observations. Samra-Fredericks (2003) makes the same distinction in her study, which uses observations, between researching strategizing as a lived experience as opposed to a ‘reported’ experience in interviews. The influence of methodology choice on the outcome of building or dwelling could be subject to future research. Besides, in this investigation only 10 articles are subject to analysis. This number is so small compared to the total amount of (empirical) research on strategy, that the findings aren’t generalizable for all the research. To achieve this, more empirical research needs to be analyzed to see if the results stay the same when using a bigger sample.

### Results and future research directions

In the analysis of the empirical research, both the building and dwelling mode of strategy making can be seen. However, most articles showed a combination of both perspectives. I think that almost every strategy is made through a combination of the building mode and the dwelling mode. In some cases, the building mode prevails, and in other cases the dwelling mode prevails. Rather than seeing building and dwelling black and white, as opposites, I think the two modes of strategy making can work complementary. The complementary working was also recognizable in some articles, with strategic intent consciously made and formulated through the building mode, after which the dwelling mode took over during the strategy implementation. Often, the building mode can be used as starting point, to set the goals and direction. After that, strategist can dwell on this direction. This point of view could be used as hypothesis in future research on strategy. In this future research, rather than investigation which perspective works best, the aim could be on investigating the strong points of both perspectives. Instead of choosing between the two, you take the strong points of both and investigate how these can be combined to one successful strategy making process.

### Conclusion

A combination of the building- and dwelling mode is implied in empirical research on strategy. 11 strategies, discussed in 10 articles, are analyzed. The building mode is represented in 3 strategies, the dwelling mode in 1 strategy and the other 7 strategies were analyzed by taking on a combination of the building and the dwelling mode. In the combination of both modes, the building mode prevailed in some cases, and in other cases the dwelling mode prevails. One can see this combination as a continuum with the building- and the dwelling mode as extremes. Depending on which one prevails, the strategy can be classified in the continuum. As said before, in most research a combination of the building and dwelling mode was implied. In taking on this combination, most papers started with the building mode of strategy making. Consciously made plans and goals often were the starting point for strategizing. After that first stage, the dwelling mode took over in most of the cases. Strategy implementation and execution was done through practical coping, by dwelling on the earlier set direction. So the two modes of strategy making worked complementary. In terms of the continuum, the papers tend to the dwelling mode. If you set the dwelling mode as right extreme in the continuum and the building mode as left extreme, the papers can be classified in the right centre. This makes that the answer to the research question is as follows: a combination of the building- and dwelling mode is implied in empirical research on strategy.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Methodology</th>
<th>Case Studies</th>
<th>Meetings, Informal talks in the corridor or during lunch.</th>
<th>Local Actions of the Top Managers in the Strategy Formulation and Implementation.</th>
<th>Strategic Initiatives of the Companies.</th>
<th>Combination.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jarzabkowski &amp; Wilson, 2002.</td>
<td>Case study.</td>
<td>Warwick University.</td>
<td>Meetings, informal talks in the corridor or during lunch.</td>
<td>Local actions of the top managers in the strategy formulation and implementation.</td>
<td>Combination.</td>
<td>Combination.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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