I

Organizing/Strategizing

The Challenge of Organizing/Strategizing

Richard Whittington and Leif Melin

INTRODUCTION

This chapter provides a broad theoretical frame to the empirical chapters
that follow in this part of the volume. Its title expresses two core themes in
these chapters. First, as the verbs '*organizing*' and '*strategizing*' emphasize,
the focus will be not so much on organizational strategies and forms in
themselves, but on the continuous processes involved in moving towards
and moving along such strategies and forms. Secondly, as the oblique
mark indicates, *organizing* and *strategizing* will be treated not as two
discrete practices, but as inextricably linked together, a single duality rather
than separable building blocks. This commitment to *organizing/strategizing*
involves a theoretical double-turn that puts the emphasis firmly on holistic
processes.

This theoretical move is, we shall argue, at once driven by recent
changes in the nature of business and underpinned by contemporary
developments in social and economic theory. The business context is radi-
cally changing with the increased dynamism and competitiveness of mar-
kets (D'Aveni, 1994); business content is shifting from traditional
manufacturing to the management of knowledge (Brown and Duguid,
1998). Theory is grasping these changes in a variety of ways: in
economics, through the notion of complementarities (Milgrom and
Roberts, 1995); in social theory, through structuration theory (Giddens,
1984), the notion of practice (Schatzki et al., 2000), and the postmodern
challenge (Chia, 1997).

The chapter is structured as follows. The next section introduces
what we term the double-turn in contemporary management theory. It
is this double-turn that renders nouns into verbs and elides strategizing

with organizing. The following section considers the business drivers of this double-turn, both the move towards the verb form and the merger of the two elements into a single duality. Subsequent sections examine various developments in social theory and economics, both as they provide theoretical context for our double-turn and as they offer resources for taking it further. We conclude by linking these broader themes to the more focused empirical materials that follow, highlighting issues of knowledge, learning and leadership.

THE DOUBLE-TURN IN MANAGEMENT THEORY

The strategic management discipline still bears the mark of its founding father, Alfred Chandler. It was Chandler (1962: 11–13) who laid down the fundamental distinctions between strategy and operations, decisions and implementation; it was he who then defined the iconic sequence of structure *following* strategy. Chandler's (1962) approach is understandable. As a pioneer in the development of the strategic management discipline, he was approaching the complexities of big business with very little conceptual apparatus: he needed to cut out some sharp distinctions. As a historian using the past to explain the present (Whittington and Mayer, 2000), his attention is always casting ahead towards the end-states, diversification and divisionalization. The processes of change are described, but only as frustrating frictions on the inevitable path towards the ultimate 'chapter' of American enterprise.

Forty years on, we are ready to supersede the Chandlerian instinct towards distinctions and states. The nouns *strategy* and *organization* are supplanted by verb forms emphasizing processes of becoming and sustaining. And even the verb forms, *organizing* and *strategizing* are no longer left to stand apart, but are merged together in a single duality.

The strategy discipline itself has long fretted over the sharp distinction drawn between strategy and organization. Hall and Siais (1980) began the process by challenging the order of the sequence. As they declared, 'strategy follows structure'. Businesses reflect their pasts, so that old structures influence future strategies. Mintzberg (1990: 183) went further by rejecting the sequential notion altogether: '… structure follows strategy as the left foot follows the right … Strategy formation is an integrated system, not an arbitrary sequence.'

It is a small step from abolishing the sequence to dissolving the distinction. Although Ghoshal and Moran's (1996) concept of 'organizational advantage' originates in a more general assertion of the value of organizations by comparison to markets, it also leads to a conception of advantage lying not only in the traditional strategic variables (price, differentiation and so on), but also in forms of organization. As Nahapiet and Ghoshal (1998) elaborate, particularly in knowledge-based firms, the ways in which social

and intellectual capital are organized can together constitute an organizational advantage capable of beating both market mechanisms and other forms of organization. The point is no longer that organization doesn't necessarily follow strategy; rather, it is that organization *is* the strategy (Whittington, 2002). Or, as Sir John Browne of British Petroleum puts it: 'Our strategy is our organization' (Day, 2001: 4). Strategy and organization form an integrated duality.

The turn towards a more active, processual perspective expressed through the verb form was denoted early by Weick (1969) in his first edition of *The Social Psychology of Organising*. Weick's (1969: 1) opening injunction to readers is to '… assume that there are processes which create, maintain, and dissolve social collectivities, that these processes constitute the work of organizing, and that the ways in which these processes are continuously executed *are* the organization' (emphasis in the original). Among the many important insights that follow from this perspective is that organizations are neither concrete nor static. Rather they need to be continuously 're-accomplished', and as that re-accomplishment is necessarily imperfect, so they must continuously mutate (Weick, 1969: 39; Chakravarthy and White, 2002). In other words, there are no organizational end-states. In his second edition, Weick (1979: 44) is still more emphatic, urging us to stamp out nouns, stamp in verbs. As he elaborates, '… verbs keep things moving' (Weick, 1969: 188). *Organizing* is now an accepted, if not always agreed, term in management studies (Sims et al., 1993; Bate et al., 2000).

Strategizing has much less currency. One early important usage is in fact pejorative. Williamson (1991) dismisses 'strategizing' – by which he means the search for winning positions and ploys – as an extravagant and foolish distraction from the real business of 'economizing'. But if strategizing is understood in the more neutral terms of the active processes of strategists engaged in strategy-making (Johnson et al., 2003), then we are close to something more valuable. In a fast-moving world, it is better to invest in fertile strategy-making than in finite strategies. Strategies need to be made and re-made continuously.

Unfortunately we still know little about what makes for effective strategy-making processes. As Hamel (1998: 11) observes: 'Strategists may have a lot to say about the context and content of strategy, but, in recent years, they have had precious little to say about the conduct of strategy – that is, the task of strategy-making … What we need is a deep theory of strategy creation.' Researchers are now beginning to converge on this gap (Whittington, 1996; Eden and Ackerman, 1998; McNulty and Pettigrew, 1999; Roos and Victor, 1999; Floyd and Lane, 2000; Johnson et al., 2003). One early learning from this new research is that the contemporary re-organizing of business into more flexible and decentralized forms is catapulting previously detached middle managers into a more active participation in the strategizing process (Floyd and Lane, 2000). Here organizing is very directly linked to strategizing.

Thus the double-turn in management theory is already moving thinking towards the *organizing/strategizing* duality. Weick has expanded our notions of organization beyond the early static view to include on-going processes of organizing. Strategy is increasingly seen as an activity, a task, in which advantage may be drawn not simply from the superiority of what is adopted, but also from the creative potential of the process. The relationship between the two poles is increasingly recognized as well. On the one hand, organization is seen as a source of strategic advantage in itself; on the other, more decentralized modes of organizing are pressing more managers into the processes of strategizing. All this is no accident. The next section identifies business drivers for this double-turn in contemporary management thinking. The following section goes on to introduce four recent currents in broader social and economic theory that offer valuable theoretical resources for taking this double-turn still further.

BUSINESS DRIVERS FOR 'ORGANIZING/STRATEGIZING'

Chandler's (1962) subjects were traditional large-scale enterprises, mostly industrial, in the first half of this century. Stable end-states and clear distinctions may have seemed feasible aspirations in the conditions of post-war growth and US leadership when he was writing; less so now. This section outlines three drivers from the changing business context underpinning the more interlinked, verbal formulation we are proposing here.

The first is a substantial increase in the pace of change. D'Aveni (1994) characterizes an increasing number of markets as 'hyper-competitive': instead of long, stable periods in which firms can achieve sustainable competitive advantage, competition allows only short periods of advantage, punctuated by frequent interruptions. In these conditions, stable end-states are illusory and verbs supplant nouns. In terms of organization, the key is not to arrive at a final 'chapter', à la Chandler (1962), but to achieve a permanently flexible form, capable of responding fast and appropriately to a wide variety of changes (Volberda, 1996). Galunic and Eisenhardt (1996) show that even divisionalized corporations do not show the fixed domains envisaged in the traditional theory of the M-form; rather, divisional 'charters' are fluid, with businesses and resources continually being recombined. In other words, organizations require constant re-organizing (Eisenhardt and Brown, 1999; Whittington, 2002). In the area of strategy, Teece et al. (1997) respond to the increasing pace of change by extending the resource-based view of the firm from a static focus on existing stocks of resources, towards the appreciation of innovation and renewal implied by 'dynamic capabilities' (cf. Eisenhardt and Martin, 2000). Under conditions of fast-paced change, particular resources and strategies are soon redundant. Fleeting opportunities for competitive advantage can only be

snatched through the continual application of the skill of 'strategizing' (Hamel, 1998).

The second driver for 'Organizing/Strategizing' is the problem of imitation in increasingly competitive markets (Grant, 1991; Rivkin, 2000). Here the interlinkage becomes important, both as superior implementation is less easily copied than clever formulation and as organizing becomes a means of embedding critical resources within the firm to inhibit their transfer. Market positions and innovative products are highly visible and, in themselves, vulnerable to imitation (Williamson, 1991). What is less easy to imitate is the ability to do these things well and to do so repeatedly. This ability relies upon a superiority in both organizing and strategizing that is likely to be deeply entrenched within the firm's structures, cultures and processes. The transfer of critical resources to competitors is likewise dependent upon the degree of embeddedness within the firm. Thus the capacity to appropriate the value of key human resources to the advantage of the firm depends upon curbing their internal bargaining power by reducing their potential mobility and value to other employers. As Liebeskind (1996) shows, the structuring of jobs to ensure the dispersal of key skills among many groups of people and the design of systems by which to capture and routinize otherwise tacit and private information are central to embedding such human resources to the advantage of the firm. In this sense, it is the organizing of resources that makes them strategic.

Human resources have become, of course, sharply more important in the contemporary 'knowledge age' (Miles et al., 1997). The third driver, therefore, is the challenge of managing knowledge, particularly potent in forcing strategizing and organizing closer together. Brown and Duguid (1998), in their article *Organizing Knowledge*, insist: 'All firms are in essence knowledge organizations. Their ability to outperform in the marketplace rests on the continuous generation and synthesizing of knowledge.' In particular, they reprise Ghoshal and Moran's (1996) concept of 'organizational advantage' to emphasize the superiority of firms over markets in organizing knowledge. Again, organizing capability, not just strategic positioning, is central to competitive advantage. It is the active verbal form, moreover, that best applies to the 'emergent' character of knowledge within firms (Tsoukas, 1996). Knowledge cannot be controlled centrally; it is continually changing. The exploitation of knowledge within the firm requires a continuous chase after shifting properties, a process better captured by the dynamics of organizing than the finality of organization.

In short, the organizing/strategizing duality needs to be taken seriously for at least three reasons. First, the environment is now changing too fast to rest upon the fixities of nouns: success no longer depends on having the right strategies or structures, but on having the capability to continuously reinvent them. Secondly, in increasingly competitive and transparent markets, the most secure competitive advantages lie deep inside the firm

and their value relies upon how they are organized in order to ensure exclusive and effective appropriation. Finally, the 'knowledge age' underpins and extends both these first two drivers, raising the organizing of knowledge to a central position in competitive advantage and giving to this key resource a fluidity and elusiveness that requires the continuous effort of the verb form. But it is not simply changes in the business environment that prompt this turn towards the duality. As we shall see in the next section, social and economic theory is in tune with these developments and provides powerful intellectual resources for pursuing them.

THEORETICAL RESOURCES FOR ORGANIZING/STRATEGIZING

If 'organizing/strategizing' deserves to be taken seriously for practical reasons, we shall require deep and robust theoretical resources with which to address it for research. This section will introduce four potentially valuable perspectives. From economics, the concept of complementarities emphasizes the indissolubility of strategizing and organizing. From social theory, the recent postmodern turn both challenges the reductionist instinct towards distinctions and argues for the superseding of nouns by verbs. Structuration theory insists on a related duality between structure and action, leaving organization structures as the continuously re-created and ever precarious product of human activities. The practice perspective is similar in its linkage of action to context, but its notions of practice and habitus emphasize the continuous routine of most such action.

   We are not going outside the management disciplines per se, because our disciplines have nothing to say about these questions – the work of Weick, Ghoshal and Hamel clearly suggests they have. Rather, by looking outside to some of the base disciplines we can see that the concern for the problematic suggested by 'organizing/strategizing' is shared and supported widely throughout the social sciences. We shall also find that these base disciplines offer a rich and varied resource in terms of perspectives and methods for research on this theme.

The economics of complementarities

Since the early 1990s, Stanford economists Paul Milgrom and John Roberts have been addressing the challenge of new forms of business strategy and organization through the concept of 'complementarities'. This concept builds on the proposition that doing more of one thing may increase the returns to doing more of another (Milgrom and Roberts, 1995: 181). When two activities reinforce each other in this way, they are complementary. In highlighting the potential for complementarities, their concept accords with notions of synergy, fit and coherence that are long-recognized within management

theory (Pettigrew and Whipp, 1991). But Milgrom and Roberts add precision in modelling, a wider scope and some surprising implications to these earlier notions. We shall explore the implications of complementarities, particularly for change and performance, more extensively in the third part of the volume. Here, though, we shall concentrate on how the complementarities concept both promotes a holistic view of strategy and organization and illuminates the new, more flexible forms of manufacturing that have emerged in the last two decades.

The complementarities concept specifically addresses the new, smaller, more flexible forms of organization that traditional economic notions of scale and scope seem poorly able to explain. Milgrom et al. (1991) suggest that we have been undergoing a simultaneous set of technological and managerial transformations equivalent to that which created Chandler's (1990) large-scale corporations a century before. Just as the coincidence of new communications technologies (the telegraph), new transportation technologies (railways) and new managerial technologies (for example, cost accounting and continuous production lines) allowed the emergence of great corporations such as DuPont or General Motors, so today a mutually reinforcing web of innovations in telecommunications, computing and managerial practice (for example, simultaneous design and just-in-time) have stimulated new forms of flexible, fast-paced manufacturing within advanced economies. These innovations are complementary in the sense that advances in one spark advances off in the others, so that positive feedback between them provides ever-growing momentum.

Such complementary effects are not simply economy-wide but can become embodied in sets of synergistic practices within firms too. Milgrom and Roberts (1990) analyse the economics of 'modern manufacturing' in terms of complementarities between new computer and telecommunications technologies and managerial practices across the whole range from production through inventory to marketing. Thus, in their account, the introduction of computer aided design (CAD) makes more profitable a switch from mass to flexible production; this in turn allows savings from smaller inventories; it becomes easier to design for specific or fleeting customer needs; and marketing strategies can shift from economy in mass markets to quality in niche markets. In other words, at the level of both whole economies and particular firms, the economics of complementarities points to the importance of setting up 'virtuous circles' of mutually reinforcing advantage (Whittington et al., 2000).

These virtuous circles have important implications for the relationship between organization and strategy. It is not just that organization structures should fit strategy, though this is important too (Milgrom and Roberts, 1995). The complementarities concept warns that organizational decentralization can easily trap firms in suboptimal strategies. Organizational units are liable to stick at points below their potential because increased performance relies

upon other units making complementary changes, for which none individually has the incentive to be first, and potentially sole, mover. Under these conditions, effective strategy requires strong central co-ordination (Milgrom and Roberts, 1995: 190). Strategy and organization are again closely linked.

The third part of this volume will explore further the implications of the complementarities concept, particularly issues of performance and the need to develop a sense of process. For the moment, however, we note how the economics of complementarities not only furnishes us with an account of the spread of innovative forms of organizing, the empirical subject of this book. It also underlines the intimate connection of strategy and organization implied by our theoretical concept of organizing/strategizing. A similar holistic distrust of distinctions is offered through the postmodern tradition, enlivened, however, by a strong sense of process.

Postmodernism

Postmodernism as intellectual tradition responds to similar late twentieth-century transformations as the economics of complementarities, only framing them more comprehensively as the transition from modernity to postmodernity. According to Lyotard (1984), at the heart of this transition to 'the postmodern condition' were changes in the importance and character of knowledge that the strategic management discipline would only catch up with a decade or so later. In the conditions of postmodernity, knowledge is a commodity indispensable to the worldwide competition for power (Lyotard, 1984: 5). The prominence of knowledge, its diffusion and its commercialization are profoundly destabilizing, however. This instability both jeopardises hard-won distinctions and shifts attention from states to processes. Both bear on the duality of organizing/strategizing.

The great economic advances of modernity depended upon division and specialization: the division of labour, the specialized functions and responsibilities of bureaucracy (Harvey, 1993). Likewise, the achievements of modernism as a form of intellectual enquiry was its continued refinement of nicer and nicer distinctions (Lash, 1990). Both the subject (divisionalization) and the method (distinction) of Chandler's (1962) work exemplify these principles. Postmodernity as a set of economic conditions and postmodernism as intellectual tradition challenge these head-on. For Harvey (1993), the characteristic of postmodern industry is the move from the rigid specialization of mass production to a flexible specialization in which polyvalent skills re-unite highly divided labour. Likewise, the postmodernist impulse in the sphere of knowledge is one of 'de-differentiation' (Lash, 1990), according to which boundaries such as those between high and low art, image and reality, become increasingly blurred. In short, postmodernism repudiates fragmentation, affirms holism. The distinction between strategy and structure, and

the ordering into sequence, are no longer sustainable. Strategy and organization merge.

More than this, postmodernism gives these concepts an essentially processual character. Modernistic thinking, according to Chia (1995; 1997), lends itself easily to the Fallacy of Misplaced Concreteness, the multiplication of conceptual distinctions that, once made, soon take on the status of 'things'. Chia (1995) cites nouns such as 'organizations', 'competition' and 'environment'. Postmodernism suspects distinctions and insists on instability; verb forms are preferred. For Law (1994: 1–2), the verb forms – ordering rather than order, organizing rather than organization – emphasize the incompleteness and precariousness of organizational achievements. Chia (1995: 593) summarizes: '… a postmodern style of thinking is one which eschews thinking in terms of accomplishments, of nouns, end-states, insulated, discrete social entities and events. Instead it is a style which privileges action, movement, process and emergence.' Where modernism reifies, postmodernism destabilizes.

We do not need to take on all its intellectual baggage to recognize in postmodernism some valuable correctives to traditional organizational theory. If we take a position that is simply 'after modernism' (Whittington and Mayer, 2000; Whittington et al., 2002; Pettigrew, 2001), we can repudiate the over-drawn distinctions and misplaced concreteness of modernism without burdening ourselves with the exaggerated relativism and irresponsible detachment of postmodernism's fringe. Our adoption of the verb form, and our elision of 'organizing' and 'strategizing', draw on the postmodern critique. But the concept of 'organizing/strategizing' commits us to being no more than 'after modern'.

One further insight of the postmodernist critique is its re-evaluation of practical, local knowledge as opposed to the hard generalizations of positivism. In the contingent, unstable conditions of postmodernity, Lyotard (1984) advocates the contextual wisdom embodied in the 'little stories' of folk history rather than the grand narratives of modernistic science. In this context, it is not the formal truth conditions of traditional *savoir* that matter, but practical *savoir faire*, the knowing of how to get on in particular situations. Something of the same scepticism of modernistic science, and an equivalent emphasis on the practical, is to be found in the third set of theoretical resources we introduce here, those of the practice perspective.

The practice perspective

Schatzki et al. (2000) describe a 'practice turn' in contemporary social theory that is displacing traditional concerns for structure and systems as the fundamental elements of inquiry and explanation. This practice turn embraces a good many things, but central is a focus on the active engagement of

people as practitioners in shared sets of activities, or practices. As such, the notion of practice has already been taken up widely within management theory, including the fields of technology (Orlikowski, 2000), learning at work (Wenger, 1998), accounting (Hopwood and Miller, 1994), organization structure (Whittington, 2002), and strategy (Whittington, 1996; Hendry, 2000). It can help us here too. The focus on activity resonates clearly with our verbal formula of organizing/strategizing. But the practice notion also helps by balancing the verbal sense of creation with a respect for the ordinary accomplishments of the routine, while at the same time introducing a concern for how practitioners learn.

In an important review of the increasing role of the practice notion in the social sciences, Ortner (1984: 149) gave as definition of practice simply 'anything people do'. Strongly implied is the need to re-embrace the micro activities of ordinary people – what De Certeau (1984) has called the 'murmurings of everyday life'. Thus De Certeau and his students attend to such ordinary activities as 'doing cooking' and 'doing shopping' (De Certeau et al., 1998). Understanding these activities carries with it an appreciation of the individual tricks and stratagems required in the daily business of 'making do' within constrained and shifting circumstances. For Bourdieu (1980: 177), this 'practical sense' entails the capacity for instantaneous reflex actions that respond to the demands of each unique situation without conscious calculation or appeal to precedent. It is these tacit skills and capacities that sort out the effective practitioner from the ineffective.

How well these skills and capacities are learnt, and by what processes, becomes critical to success. But practical skills are elusive to traditional science and hardly to be learnt formally. For Bourdieu (1990), these skills come from the past experience that constitutes the practitioner's 'habitus' – the accumulated schemes of perception, thought and action derived from their pathway through life. This habitus is embodied history, internalized in the actor as second nature and so producing practices in the present both spontaneously and barely consciously. There is a holism here too, as habitus acquires through experience an integrated, if fuzzy, coherence. Acquisition of the tricks and stratagems necessary to effective practice, therefore, is not something that relies a great deal on formal learning, more on accumulated practical experience. 'Agents can adequately master the modus operandi that enables them to generate correctly formulated ritual practices only by making it work practically, in a real situation, in relation to practical functions' (Bourdieu, 1990: 91). Learning is critical to effectiveness, but there are few short-cuts and no final moments. Learning demands laborious engagement in particular contexts, an endless and effortful process.

The practice perspective's emphasis on the tacit and the experiential tends to entail methodologies of deep ethnography, aimed at surfacing what is inaccessible to superficial observers from outside and unconscious to busy practitioners within (Bourdieu, 1990). As the following account of structuration

theory implies, we expect enough of both observers and practitioners to allow for broader methodologies. However, we can take from the practice perspective a reinforcement of the active sense denoted by 'organizing/ strategizing', but affirm with it a readiness to include not just the dramas of organization and strategy construction, but the routines of organizational and strategic maintenance. Organizing/strategizing should be seen as a chronic and effortful accomplishment. We take also from the practice perspective an appreciation of how organizing/strategizing relies upon practitioner skills, typically irreducible to scientific formulae and therefore hard to access and transmit. A strong implication of the practice perspective is that organizing/strategizing involves learning processes that are challenging and contextual.

Structuration theory

The structuration theory developed by Anthony Giddens (1984) takes a similar duality to that of organizing/strategizing, that of structure and action. For Giddens (1984: 20–5), structure is inextricably linked to action as both its medium and its outcome. Actors draw upon structural properties, established rules and resources, in order to act, and as they do so they reproduce and amend these same properties. 'Structuration' refers to the consequent structuring of rules and resources over time, their regularities and their evolution. The neologism is necessary to capture Giddens' (1984) twofold concern: on the one hand, to avoid a lop-sided emphasis on either structure or action; on the other, to convey the active, constructive processes involved in reproducing and amending the patterns of everyday life. The potential of structuration theory has long been recognized in the management disciplines (Ranson et al., 1980; Pettigrew, 1985; Whittington, 1992). But particularly relevant to the organizing/strategizing notion are an empowering sense of structure, a reciprocal view of leadership and a methodological guide.

Duality is a theme throughout this book, and the structurationist duality of action and structure has special resonance here. Structure enables as well as constrains. By implication, organizational structures too are not so much passive drags on strategic action, necessary evils to be regretted and minimized; they are central resources upon which action must draw, demanding equal attention alongside strategy and initiative (Adler and Borys, 1996). Action is not simply fettered by structure, it positively relies on it. This duality has important implications for our view of business leaders, essential to action yet dependent on structure. The model of leaders as heroic individuals downplays – to their own disadvantage – the structural rules and resources on which they must draw for their empowerment (Whittington, 1993). Here, structuration theory points to a delicate reciprocity between those who will lead and those who follow. Even as they play

creatively on them, still leaders must subscribe to the structural limits and expectations embodied in their organizations. For leaders, action and structure are tied together.

The structurationist emphasis on the continuous processes of creating and maintaining structures is strongly sympathetic to processual perspectives on organizing (Pettigrew, 1997a). It has therefore been a natural step for processual studies of change to draw explicitly on structuration theory (Pettigrew, 1985: 37; Barley and Tolbert, 1997; Huff and Huff, 2000). Here structuration theory has informed a readiness to extend analysis of organizational change both over long periods of time, to capture long-run structural cumulation, and beyond the firm, to include the broader environment that forms the context and basis for action. While processual studies share the practice perspective's concern for close observation, they differ in taking seriously Giddens' (1984) confidence in the reflexivity of human actors: the processualists expect much more from actors' accounts of their own actions. An ability to trust in actors' own accounts relaxes the requirement for deep ethnography implied by heavy emphasis on unconscious and tacit understanding. The interview-based case study is thereby allowed to access more than typically conceded by the practice approach, and the relative economy of this method makes possible multiple case studies, with all the power yielded by the comparative method (Pettigrew and Whipp, 1991).

The contribution of structuration theory, therefore, is both theoretical and methodological. Theoretically, it sensitizes us to both the enabling aspect of structure and the delicate reciprocity of leadership, each consistent with our notion of organizing/strategizing. Methodologically, it licences comparative case studies, less absorbed than the practice perspective, but respectful of actors' own accounts and concerned for history, process and context. Again, therefore, there are useful resources beyond the strict confines of management theory with which to advance the agenda of organizing/strategizing.

SUMMARY AND DISCUSSION

This chapter has introduced the double-turn involved in moving from a concern with organization and strategy towards the duality of *organizing/strategizing*. This move brings both a strong sense of process, captured in the verb form, and an orientation towards holism, reflected in the oblique. Organizing refers to the processes that both constitute and define the on-going activities of an enterprise, underlining the effortful achievement involved as much in maintaining as in creating these activities. Strategizing likewise refers to continuous processes, this time those of making and re-making the strategies of the enterprise. Running these two into the single duality of organizing/strategizing emphasizes their intimate connection.

Strategizing activity is shaped by organizing; organizing is a crucial variable within the strategizing task.

The chapter argues for the growing relevance of this duality. Rapid environmental change requires not fixity, but continued processes of organizational and strategic creation and re-creation. The dangers of imitation and resource transfer in today's competitive markets argue for the importance to strategy of the relatively opaque organizing processes of implementation and the embedding of critical resources within organizational cultures, structures and routines. The contemporary success of knowledge-based strategies relies upon the continuous organizing of systems for capturing and exploiting critical human resources. In all these ways, for many businesses, resting upon the traditional static distinctions of the strategic management discipline will no longer do.

From the social sciences more generally, we have proposed four theoretical perspectives that both support the notion of 'organizing/strategizing' and provide perspectives for exploring its reality. All four are oriented towards a holistic view in one sense or another: the complementarities approach through its insistence on completeness; postmodernism in its rejection of distinctions; the practice perspective through the assumption of underlying coherence in habitus; structuration theory in its conception of duality. There are differences, of course. Process is central to structuration theory, practice theory and postmodernism, less prominent in the economics of complementarity. Knowledge and learning are strong themes of both the practice and postmodern perspectives, but not intrinsic to structuration and complementarity theories. Complementarity theory cares about the economic performance of the firm; for the others, the performance issue is more salient at the level of the individual actor or practitioner. The strong strategic direction urged by complementarity theory is qualified by structuration theory's reminder of the mutual dependency of leaders and followers.

Just as there are different nuances among the theoretical resources we have introduced here, so there are differences among the chapters that follow. Yet in their own ways they do participate in the sensibilities and themes we have established so far. All are concerned with processes – of leadership, of learning and of knowledge integration. There is clear recognition in all three of the intimate linkage of organizing and strategizing. The chapters on learning and leadership each make full use of the comparative case method, the first considering leading European technology firms, the second a wider comparison of banking and engineering. Concerning leadership, the cases reveal an importance of reciprocity between leaders and followers strongly resonant of structuration theory. As for learning within technology firms, the emphasis on learning-by-doing recalls the practical, experiential wisdom valued by both practice and postmodern approaches, while its continuous, routine nature is in sympathy with theories of structuration and practice alike. Finally, in Chapter 5, our Dutch colleagues demonstrate the mutuality

of organizing and strategizing in the transformation of the Dutch financial services firm of ING.

It is our contention that the sensibility implied by the processual duality of organizing/strategizing is of increasingly urgent relevance to business in the contemporary world. Management theory is already beginning to grasp its implications, as exemplified by the double-turn emerging from the work of Weick, Ghoshal and others. Yet economic and social theory more widely has much to give as well, and developing this new sensibility will require all the theoretical resources that we can get. The complexity and dynamism described in the following chapters all make the case for a more sophisticated approach to innovative forms of organizing. This approach will have a caution about distinction and reification, and a sympathy towards process and holism, together encapsulated in the notion 'strategizing/organizing'.