INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF BUSINESS, 1(2), 1996 ISSN:1083-4346

RE-EDUCATING RAGNOR: STRATEGY AMISS

Manab Thakur

Using a sample of professors who teach strategic management/business policy in regional universities in the U.S. and England, this study examined the "value" of research with a set of strategy-related articles as published in the **Academy of Management Journal** and **Strategic Management Journal** from 1989 to 1993. In this study, readability, rigor, and usefulness explained the "value" of research. In the context of regional universities, implications of the findings are discussed from the point of view of faculty, administrators, and the role of the Academy of Management as a professional body.

I. INTRODUCTION

"*Frankly speaking, I don't care to read most of the studies published in the Academy of Management Journal (AMJ) or in the Strategic Management Journal (SMJ)...they are so obscure, so complex reasoning enrobed with fancy statistics...I feel just lost. Do I feel bad about it? You bet I do. I'm not a lazy person...I'm respected as a professor but I feel excluded from my professional peers.*"

Consider the above comment by Ragnor Segland, a professor in a regional university in the U.S. who has been teaching strategy/policy for more than 12 years. Having taught in three regional universities, I have heard too many times from too many of my strategy colleagues expressing similar sentiments primarily about the empirical articles and their usefulness. For some time, I attributed these comments as a refuge for inattention to and carelessness about theoretical development of strategic management as an academic field of study. Only recently, did I start rethinking this issue and reminding myself of my "covenant" to students--*your job is not just to find problems but you must also find solutions that are technically defensible, socially acceptable, and administratively convenient!* My research interest grew out of this milieu, and I sought to test the depth of this "apathy" with a cross-section of strategy faculty from the U.S. and England.

The purpose of the study, as evolved through this concern, was to explore with a sample of academicians from regional business schools in the U.S. and England on a selected set of empirically based, strategy-related articles to answer two specific questions: (a) Did U.S. faculty view readability, rigor, and usefulness *differently* from the faculty in England?, and (b) Did the faculty with *adequate* publication records view readability, rigor, and usefulness differently from those with *inadequate* publication records?

Manab Thakur, Craig School of Business, Department of Management, California State University, Fresno, CA 93720

II. STUDY PERSPECTIVE

Over the years, many management writers have argued the need for business-related research to be understandable and relevant (Aktouf, 1992; Lang & Dittrich, 1982; Peters & Waterman, 1982; Zoffer, 1991). A more respectable forum asserting this need is presented by Porter and McKibbin (1988). What is interesting in these writings is the fact that the need for relevant research is neither differentiated between the managers and the academicians nor is it distinguished between the faculty teaching in flagship as opposed to regional business schools. The differentiation of need between the managers and faculty at large is due to job orientation of the former group which demands, among other things, immediate application and expediency. Most of the academically oriented articles however do not go along with this generic predisposition. An elaboration of the other assumption appears in the following pages.

Study Assumptions

In addition to the assumption stated above, the other assumption is that the demand and the relevancy of research between the faculty in flagship and regional schools are situationally based, and they cannot be obfuscated by aggregation. Consider the mission-linked differences between the schools. The Carnegie Foundation defines flagship schools as the "institutions (that) offer full baccalaureate programs, are committed to graduate education through the doctorate degree, and give high priority to research." Regional schools, on the other hand, are defined as the "institutions (that) offer baccalaureate programs and, with few exceptions, graduate education through the Master degree" (1987:3).

During the course of the study, I found several administrators in regional schools (Deans, Associate/Assistant Deans, Chairs) and faculty voicing their schools' missions primarily as "teaching" and thus differentiating themselves from "research" institutions such as the flagship business schools. Interestingly, I did not find faculty in regional schools *denying* the linkage between research and teaching but what they seemed to argue was the extent to which their research should result in publications. In several instances, I observed the debate subtly shifting from the need to do research to the logistical problems of publishing research results. The problems mentioned were a combination of the following: heavy teaching load, lack of teaching assistance, inadequate library and computer facilities, lack of travel money, etc. Most administrators were rather annoyed by this litany of inadequacies from their own faculty members. Not only did they challenge the assertions but they also questioned the academic integrity of some of their faculty members in making them. For example, the administrators argued that their old tenure system had undergone great transformation in recent years where being just a "good citizen" would no longer do. Research resulting in publication was clearly the path to get tenure in the future, they claimed. Unfortunately, they added, the impact of this new system had not affected the tenured faculty (Over 62 per cent of the U.S. faculty were tenured. A corresponding figure for Britain was not available.)

Why were the regional schools shifting their performance focus on research and publication? It is partly economical in the sense that as the state legislatures squeeze the budget for higher education, the schools have to increasingly rely on external funding. This source of funding is decided by the quality of publishable research of the existing faculty. And this is where all business schools--regional and flagship--compete on a level playing field. The other reason is intertwined with the realization that research/publication and teaching are highly compatible activities. In common with their flagship counterparts, the regional schools are moving toward a similar set of criteria--*where do the faculty publish and how many are being published* (see Byrne, 1990; Dulex & Fieldon, 1992; Maeroff, 1993).

Why England

Having spent 15 years in England, initially as a student, lecturer, and a manager in industry, I expected a certain degree of congruence with the sentiments of Ragnor and others by the British counterparts teaching in similar institutions such as polytechnics and technical colleges. Many of these polytechnics and colleges started in the late 1950s to provide business education to those who were not otherwise "admissible" to traditional universities. The faculty at the polytechnics that were recruited at that time came primarily from industry. And many of the recruits had only Master's degrees. In 1992, most of the polytechnics were transformed into regional universities. Some of the reasons for this transformation were, a glut of candidates with doctoral degrees, demand for formally qualified employees (as opposed to being vocationally trained) who were able to compete against other candidates from the Common Market countries, and improved pay scales in higher education. This emerging scenario and the wide circulations of both AMJ and SMJ made England an interesting location.

III. LITERATURE REVIEW

Accepting the need for eclectic theory building, Schendel & Hofer (1979) drew the boundary of strategic management into 18 topical areas and called for more conceptual work on the relationships between implementations and formulation of strategy. Srivastava (1987), following this call, divided the area further into 23 research programs and examined several publications representing the programs identified. The publications were selected from a wide variety of sources, such as "individual research papers, books, and monographs into distinctly identifiable groups representing separate research programs" (1987:80-81). Srivastava then analyzed the publications against two dimensions: *rigor and usefulness*. *Rigor* was assessed by the conceptual adequacy of the publication in question and the methodological rigor, which ranged from qualitative data analysis to mathematical modeling. *Usefulness* was based on the ability of the contribution to provide managers with rationale for making decisions. Calling for a greater need to include variables that have clear action relevance and to incorporate practical insights in methodology documenting the contextual conditions, Srivastava concludes that the field is well-poised to attain the level of maturity it rightly deserves.

Schwenk and Dalton (1988) examined selected publications in strategic management from five refereed journals. They analyzed various dimensions of internal validity, such as the unit of analysis, cross-sectional or longitudinal data, and sample sizes. One of the most interesting findings of this study, as reported by the authors, is an excessive dependence on self-reported measures and the apparent unwillingness of scholars to cross-validate their research results.

In terms of strategy-related research, Bowman (1988) asks for qualitative studies to validate company practices and Mintzberg (1988) suggests that studies with a single dependent variable do not reflect the complexities and dynamics of change. Other authors (Fahey & Christensen, 1986; Ramanujan & Varadarajan, 1989) argue that strategy research should be concerned with process issues by using small samples. Lyle opines that future studies “need to address how to serve two masters (academicians and practitioners) and how to incorporate research methodologies that make the research meaningful to both” (1990:374). In recent years, Rumelt, Schendel, and Teece have articulated four research questions in the strategy field: “how do firms behave, why are firms different, what is the function of, or value added by, the headquarters unit in multinational firm, and what determines the success or failure of the firm in international competition” (1994:2). In order to teach strategy, these authors suggest that one has to be aware of the developments in the fields of “microeconomics, cognitive psychology, organizational sociology, and political science,...[and this awareness has to blended with the current] management practice” (1994: Preface).

As I shall explain later in the section entitled Method, the questionnaire sent to the respondents included three variables--rigor, readability, and usefulness--as listed in Appendix 1

The Study Focus

Although the above contributions, particularly the studies by Srivastava (1987) and Schwenk and Dalton (1988), have been useful in opening the agenda of publication credibility, it should be noted that these studies suffer from serious methodological limitations. In these studies, the selection of sample publications for analyses came from a variety of sources, thereby confounding them with style, readership, and other editorial preferences so endemic in the struggle for publishing. For example, the articles published in **Acadaemy of Management Journal and the Academy of Management Executive** could be equally useful in meeting the rigor sought by the respective editors and reviewers. But it would be improper to take these publications as a composite and analyze them by a single set of criteria. Since the audience is different, so is the demand for methodological adequacy and the rationality of appropriateness from the point of end consumers. Furthermore, the analytical techniques used by the above authors demand critical attention. For instance, Schwenk and Dalton (1988) relied exclusively on descriptive statistics with its inherent limitations. Srivastava (1987) used facet analysis technique, and thus, limited his study with categorical data.

In order to attain greater consistency, this study concentrated on the faculty who teach strategy/policy at regional business schools with a set of empirically based strategy-related articles published in AMJ and SMJ from 1989 to 1993. Thus, the focus was narrowed to the (a) strategy faculty, (b) strategy-related and empirically based articles, and (c) two specific journals similar in terms of coverage and readership.

IV. METHOD

This study was conducted in three distinct steps: (1) Assembling a sample of strategy-related articles; (2) Identifying a sample of faculty who teach strategy/policy to analyze those articles; and (3) Administering a questionnaire to those faculty to examine the extent to which the selected articles were found to be rigorous, useful, and readable.

Step 1: Assembling a Sample of Strategy-related Articles

The first step in this study was designed to minimize the limitations of previous studies by focusing on a pre-selected set of strategic management articles published in the AMJ and SMJ from 1989 to 1993. These two journals were selected for their similarity in terms of depth and readership. The rationale for focusing on empirical, strategy-related articles was based on two realities. First, along with many other organizationally anchored disciplines, strategic management has become a robust area of study with its own set of distinct literature and a deluge of publication opportunities in many management journals, which have up to now restricted publications to certain macro and micro aspects of general management. Second, it is believed that most of the contents and processes of an emerging discipline, such as strategic management, is refined through empiricism (Ansoff, 1979; Camerer, 1985; Franke, Edlund & Oster, 1990). This emphasis on empiricism makes an instructor hesitant to profess knowledge based on “unproven but easy answers, unsupported assertions, and ideas that are just plain wrong” (Rumelt, Schendel & Teece, 1994: 7).

The selection of strategy-related articles involved 90 hours of personal interviews with a sample of nine (9) faculty who teach strategy/policy at regional schools in the U.S. and England and seven (7) reviewers of journals in the strategy area. Through this process, 18 empirical articles were selected (9 from AMJ and 10 from SMJ published between 1989 -1993) representing the following topical areas: Strategic Alliances and Collective Strategizing (3 articles), Mergers and Acquisitions (2 articles), Sustaining Competitive Advantage (3 articles), Global Strategies (3 articles), Role of Managers (2 articles), Implementation and Control Issues (3 articles), and Strategic Research (2 articles). For each selected article, I prepared a three to five page summary and each summary went through three iterations by four strategy faculty who teach at flagship and regional schools. As the articles were summarized, the overwhelming concern was to make each summary comprehensive and easy to read. One of the main concerns of the group that reviewed the summaries was to make sure that the summaries did not become "reviews" in disguise. Pointedly, the format of each summary included the following topics: (a) Shortcomings of existing theories as stated by the author/s leading to hypotheses formulations, (b) Methods followed to test the hypotheses, (c) Conclusions with support for the hypotheses formulated, (d) Limitations of the study as indicated by the author/s; and (e) Need for further research as identified.

The summaries were then *sent to the respective authors* (some of them were returned as the auhtor/s have changed their institutional affiliations and could not be traced back) of the original articles. In the cover letter, I explained the purpose of the study and defined rigor, readability, and usefulness as adopted by the study. Of the 19 authors (only the first author listed of each article was contacted), 9 of them made some minor corrections in their respective summaries, and the another 3 were contacted by telephone and their comments and observations were incorporated accordingly. A final copy of each summary was sent to each respective author for a further check.

Step 2: Identifying a Sample of Faculty Who Teach Strategy/Policy

Since some of the faculty in the U.S. were not members of either the Academy of Management or the Strategic Management Society, the decision was made to write directly to the Deans of 200 AACSB-accredited regional business schools. Following the same procedure, 114 similar institutions were contacted in England. The letter to the Deans of business schools briefly described the purpose of the study with a request to provide a list of full-time faculty who normally teach (at least once a year) strategy/policy either at the graduate or undergraduate level. Responses were received from 127 U.S. and 102 British business schools, identifying 211 U.S. and 167 British "strategy faculty."

Step 3: Administering the Faculty Questionnaire

Packages of 19 summarized articles were sent to 211 U.S. and 167 British strategy faculty. The names of the authors and their affiliations were removed from the summary pages including the journal name, issue, volume, and year published. Each participant was asked to read the summaries and answer the extent to which each article was thought to be rigorous (*rigor*), readable (*readability*), and useful to our existing body of knowledge (*usefulness*). They were instructed to look at the variables for each dimension and to respond on a Likert scale (1 low; 5 high). See Appendix 1 for a list of variables selected for the study. Participants were also asked to provide demographic data including their publications between January 1989 and December 1993 and their syllabi.

V. RESULTS

A total of 134 U.S. and 122 British faculty (64 and 67 per cent respectively) responded. Table 1 provides the descriptive data.

Table 1: Sample Characteristics

	U.S. (n=134)	England (n=122)
Education:		
Doctorate	91%	68%
Masters	9	32
Age:		
Less than 35	5	8
35-45	32	31
46-55	42	49
55+	21	12
Gender:		
Male	69	78
Female	31	22
Teaching load (semester/qtr/term):		
less than 9 hours	11	32
9 to 12 hours	72	41
12+ hours	17	27
Institutional Status:		
Undergraduate/Masters	93	67
Undergrad/Masters/Doctoral	7	33
% of Tenured Faculty:	61	58
# Teach Strategy/Policy:		
Every Semester/qtr/term	64	53
Every other sem/qtr/term	21	14
Teach occcasionally	15	33

Table 1 (Continued)

Reading of AMJ/SMJ:		
Read regularly	12	9
Read occasionally	32	14
Look at it (not read)	38	22
Hardly read or look	18	55
Membership of the Academy/SM Society:		
Member*	68(39)	29(11)

# of Time Articles from AMJ/SMJ used in Class: (in the last two semesters/qtr/term)		
2 to 3 articles	14(19)	9(11)
hardly any**	38	29
Contribution of Articles to existing body of knowledge:		
Have Value	31(41)	28(33)
Don't Know	28(14)	32(21)

* Membership of the Strategic Management Society is in parentheses.
** Not reported.

As identified in Table 1, most of the differences between the U.S. and British respondents could be attributed to the educational system and the institutional mission of the two countries. For instance, in England when an institution is elevated to the status of a university most often, it includes doctoral programs even though many of its instructors might not have doctoral degrees themselves. This is somewhat contrary to the U.S. positions. The similarities in demographics appear to be overwhelming notwithstanding the fact that both groups only minimally used (in classes) the articles published in the AMJ and SMJ. It is interesting to note that only 31 and 28 per cent of the U.S. and British faculty, respectively, thought that the articles "had value" and the rest did not know or did not respond to the question.

In determining the question of *adequacy* of publications within the confines of regional schools, I sought the assistance of three Deans of business schools (2 from the U.S. and 1 from England) and four faculty who teach strategy (2 from each country). After many hours of deliberations, the group decided the threshold of *adequate* publication for each faculty: every two years, one refereed publication in a journal with 25 per cent or less acceptance rate as per Cabell's Directory (1993), and one paper presentation at a national meeting. Anything short of this was thought to be an *inadequate* publication record. However, deviations from this absolute, such as authoring a textbook or a chapter contribution, and other publishing vagaries were accounted for in categorizing the respondents. Following this categorization, 39 and 26 per cent of the U.S. and British faculty, respectively were found to have *adequate* publications. Table 2 provides a correlation matrix for the questionnaire items.

In order to test the assertion that this was not an exclusively American phenomenon, the two groups (U.S. and England) were compared. The t-test, as shown in Table 3, did not reveal a statistically significant difference between the groups, shedding light on the first research question that the academicians in both countries were seemingly predisposed in the same way as far as the selected articles were concerned.

Table 3: T-Test of U.S. and British Faculty

Factors	U.S.	England	t-statistics
Readability	2.79	2.86	0.46
Rigor	2.16	2.02	1.21
Usefulness	2.87	2.53	1.52

None of the above t-statistics is significant at .005 level.

Table 4: Factor Loadings

	Factor 1 Readability	Factor 2 Rigor	Factor 3 Usefulness
A. Discussions of theories	0.131	0.269	0.188
B. Shortcoming of theories	0.106	0.711	0.113
C. Reasons for new theories	0.253	0.626	0.146
D.Measurement of techniques	0.026	0.723	0.277
E. Techniques with hypotheses	0.137	0.782	0.145
F. Adequate sample size	0.157	0.374	0.033
G. Evidence supporting the hypotheses	0.125	0.367	0.124
H. Understandable writing style	0.818	0.303	0.032
I. Non-jargonistic writing	0.909	0.267	0.091
J. Interest-provoking writing style	0.867	0.293	0.023
K. Adequate style for readership	0.796	0.301	0.011
L. Non-obvious results	0.101	0.377	0.573
M. Thought-provoking results	0.122	0.295	0.516
N. Do-able results	0.323	0.256	0.869
O. Specification of pre-conditions	0.233	0.231	0.923
P. Aiding decision-making	0.167	0.355	0.919
Eigenvalue	3.203187	3.19221	3.239839
Percentage of Variance	0.20019	0.19951	0.20248
Cum % of Variance	0.20019	0.39971	0.6022

Because of this similarity in responses, the principal component of factor analysis was carried out by aggregating the samples of both countries, as shown in Table 4.

The factors displayed in Table 4 reflect three distinct but consistent patterns of behavior across the sample. These three patterns were classified as readability, rigor, and usefulness. The orthogonally-rotated factor pattern reveals three distinct factors with eigenvalues greater than 1, accounting for over 60 per cent of the total variance (see Haire et al, 1979; Kim & Muellerer, 1978). The relatively equal eigenvalues suggest that each factor is equally important in explaining the variability of expectations that the respondents had from the articles selected. The amount of variance explained by each factor is also about equal, rendering a total explained variance of 60 per cent. It is noteworthy that previous research did not regard *readability* as a factor whereas the respondents here clearly thought of this as a stand-alone factor not to be submerged with rigor or usefulness. One may wonder to what extent this was a function of the individual faculty person's publication record.

The publication records of the participants were cross-validated with the responses in the intercorrelations matrix and the factor loadings. The t-test scores for the three factors--*readability (.001), rigor (.01), and usefulness (.01)*--were significantly higher for those faculty with *adequate* publications. The greatest difference between the groups relates to readability and the least difference relates to usefulness, although the loading is significantly higher on all three factors for those who publish the most or do so to an adequate degree.

VI. IMPLICATIONS OF THE STUDY

The respondents seem to perceive *readability, rigor, and usefulness* as the criteria that denote the "value" of research in strategic management. In spite of the fact that there were institutional differences among the faculties, these differences were not found to be significant on the basis of national location. However, significant differences were found in terms of publication records. Although the causality was not determined, results seem to indicate that those who publish regard the empirical articles as worthwhile. Let us consider the implications of the study from the perspective of the regional business schools and the faculty who teach strategy/policy.

Having found that those who publish make efforts to keep themselves updated is not a finding incongruent with our daily experience. Many of us would probably respond by saying, “"So what...they don't read and they don't publish." The enormity of this issue is that in the U.S. alone, each business school in the sample had an enrollment of 3000 to 5000 business majors, graduating about 1000 to 1300 majors each year (1000 x 127 schools = 127,000 graduates per year).

To this "so what" question, consider, as discussed earlier, that teaching strategy/policy necessitates an understanding of theoretical development and a visceral effort in synthesizing the field with "successful" management practices around the world. The proponents for research/publication argue that a faculty person needs to share the power of synthesis with his/her professional peers in published format. Without this "public sharing", they ask, how could anyone decide the power of an instructor's synthesis of knowledge explosion?

The AACSB's mission-linked accreditation standards and practices have pushed the debate on compatibility between research/publication and teaching to a new height. As a result, many regional schools in the U.S. (and in England, mainly for economic reasons) are busily reformulating their strategic plans. Note for example the following strategic priorities as set by one regional school: "University level instruction requires content knowledge and currency that can be achieved only through a program of continuous research. Every member of the...School faculty has an obligation to be involved in research and scholarly activity." This laudable objective might remain blindsided without conscious acceptance that research/ publication and teaching are compatible activities, and that without this clear thrust a plan can hardly be strategic (Das, 1994).

The administrators of regional schools have to realize that due to historical reasons it might be futile to force *all* faculty to do research and publish. Instead, they should offer a choice to individual faculty either to go through the "research" or the "teaching" stream on an open enrollment basis, i.e., a faculty could elect to go through either stream every two years. This choice, however, must be complemented by sufficient support and must specify the expected outcome for each stream. The political gumption--applying the same criteria for the tenured and tenure-track faculty--of administration to establish such a stream appears to be the critical block as reported by several faculty respondents.

The role of individual faculty appears to be moot here. In the course of the study, I collected a plethora of syllabi on undergraduate and graduate strategy classes. Apart from the requirement of a textbook at the undergraduate level, and often a compilation of selected readings for the graduate course, requirements for term or research papers ranged from an "assessment" of a particular organization to updating cases. There was a definite bias, as the syllabi indicated, to cover the theory part *before* getting into case analyses; but, in several instances, the cases were *not* sequenced with the theoretical inputs. With some of the syllabi, I had difficulty finding the linkage between the writing assignments and the field of study (42 syllabi in the U.S. and 24 from England were collected). Some of the term papers asked students to write their obituaries (think about the relevancy to a 22-year old undergrad!) while others included questions such as "What does an American businessman need to know to do business in Brunei?"

If the current mood of the state legislatures and the parents are indicative of the future, then one has to conclude that (a) there must be a perceived linearity between the pedagogical structure and the theoretically grounded end objective and (b) academic freedom cannot be a matter of expediency, and freedom cannot be a refuge for shortchanging the future managers by yesteryears' cognitive base. The business faculty, most particularly those teaching strategic management as a capstone course, should be aware of the following imperatives:

> *Is he/she connected?* (The extent to which the instructor's cognition of the field is accepted by the peers as evident through publication.)
>
> *Does he/she connect?* (Disseminating both contents and processes to students in a comprehensible fashion.)

The role of the Academy of Management as the professional body can no longer be limited to, as one faculty commented, "collecting dues and shipping the journals on time." It is encouraging that the **Academy of Management Executive** has started publishing abridged versions of important articles, but they are not quite of the AMJ or SMJ variety. Why should it not be possible for the editors of such quality journals to publish summaries of articles that provide their members a comprehensive representation of the noteworthy contributions of recent years? Could this not be a market niche and a worthwhile service? The Academy could also make its regional chapters organizing research workshops on a regular basis. It could also help to break the glass ceiling between the flagship and the regional schools by initiating cross-fertilization of faculty through teaching and fellowship. This might assist the regional schools' faculty to retool themselves with updated research skill and assist others in internalizing the resource-based model, appropriate for state-funded school of superior performance (Grant, 1991).

In generalizing the findings of this study, one must note two specific *limitations*. First is the representativeness of the articles selected and the limitation of the total number to 19. The packet sent to the participants consisted of 62 pages of summarized articles. Adding more pages was thought to be unwise. Furthermore, the selection process involved both faculty and reviewers of journals to minimize biases as well as the authors of the original articles. Second is the extent to which the phenomena observed here are restricted to the regional schools. A corresponding sample of flagship schools could have been helpful. But even within the confines of a limited data set is a rejoinder that dissemination of the discipline comes through being current in the literature of which empirically based studies are an integral part. To this end, this study should be seen as a primer for the ensuing debate in re-educating Ragnor et al. for the decade ahead.

APPENDIX: Variables Selected for the Study

RIGOR:

A. Discussions of existing theories/concepts
B. Discussions of shortcomings of current theories/concepts
C. Reasons for developing new theories/concepts
D. Appropriate use of statistical techniques
E. Adequate sample size
F. Evidence supporting the hypotheses

READABILITY:

G. Understandable

H. Non-jargonistic style of writing
I. Interest provoking style
J. Adequate for targeted readership

USEFULNESS:

K. Non-obvious results
L. Thought provoking results
M. Do-able results in organizational setting
N. Clear specification of antecedents
O. Leads to speedy and quality decisions

REFERENCES

[1] Aktouf, O. (1992). Management and Theories of Organizations in the 1990s: Toward a Critical Radical Humanism? *Academy of Management Review*, 17, 407-431.

[2] Ansoff, H. I. (1979). The Changing Shape of Strategic Problem. In D. E. Schendel and C. E. Hofer (eds.), *Strategic Management*. Boston, Little Brown, 30-44.

[3] Bowman, E. H. (1988). Strategy Change. In J. W. Fredrickson (ed.), *Perspective on Strategic Management*. New York, Ballinger.

[4] Byrne, J. (1990). Is Research in the Ivory Tower Fuzzy, Irrelevant, Pretentious? *Business Week*, October 20, 62-63.

[5] Cabell, D. W. E. (1993). *Directory of Publishing Opportunities in Business Administration and Economics*. Beumont, TX, Cabell Publishing.

[6] Camerer, C. (1985). Redirecting Research in Business Policy and Strategies. *Strategic Management Journal*, 6, 1-15.

[7] Das, T. K. (1994). Educating Tomorrow's Managers: The Role of Critical Thinking. *International Journal of Organizational Analysis*, 2, 4, 333-360.

[8] Dulex, R. E. and Fielden, J. S. (1992). Why fight the system? The Non-Choice Beleaguered Business Faculties. *Business Horizons*, 35, 13-19.

[9] Frank, R. H., Edmund, T. W. and Oster, F. (1990). The Development of Strategic Management Journal Quality and Article Impact. *Strategic Management Journal*, 11, 243-253.

[10] Grant, R. M. (1991). The Resource-based Theory of Competitive Advantage: Implications for Strategy Formulation. *California Management Review*, 33, Spring, 114-135.

[11] Hair, J. F., Anderson, R. E., Tatham, R. L. and Grablowsky, B. J. (1979). *Multivariate Data Analysis*. Tulsa, OK, Petroleum Publishing.

[12] Kim, J. and Mueller, C. W. (1978). *Factor Analysis: Statistical Methods and Practical Issues*. Beverly Hills, CA, Sage Publications.

[13] Lang, J. R. and Dittrich, J. E. (1982). Information, Skill Building, and the Development of Competence: An Education Framework for Teaching Business Policy. *Academy of Management Journal*, 7, 269-279.

[14] Lyle, M. A. (1990). A Research Agenda for Strategic Management in the 1990s. *Journal of Management Studies*, 27, 4, 363-375.

[15] Maeroff, G. I. (1993). College Teachers, the New Leisure Class. *Wall Street Journal*, March 24, A16.

[16] Mintzberg, H. (1988). Strategy Content Research in Perspective. *McGill University*, Working Paper.

[17] Morgan G. (1980). Paradigms, Metaphors and Puzzle Solving in Organizational Theory. *Administrative Sciences Quarterly*, 3, 605-622.

[18] Rumelt, R. P., Schendel, D. E. and Teece, D. J. (eds.). (1994). Fundamental Issues in Strategy: A Research Agenda. Mass., *Harvard Business School Press*.

[19] Peters T. and Waterman, R. (1982). *In Search of Excellence*. New York, N.Y., Warner Books.

[20] Porter, L. W. and McKibben, L. E. (1988). *Management Educations and Development*. New York, N.Y., McGraw-Hill.

[21] Schwenk, C. R. and Dalton, D. R. (1989). The Changing Shape of Strategic Management Research. *Ninth Annual Conference of the Strategic Management Society*.

[22] Srivastava, P. (1987). Rigor and Practical Usefulness in Strategic Management. *Strategic Management Journal*, 8, 77-92.

[23] Sykes, C. J. (1990). *Prof Scam*. New York, N.Y., St. Martin Press.

[24] Zofer, H. J. (1991). Educating People for a Competitive World. In R. H. Kilman, I. Kilman & Associates (eds.). *Making Organizations Competitive*. San Francisco, CA, Jose-Bass.

Table 2: Intercorrelation Matrix

	x	sd	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M	N	O	P
A. Discussions of theories	3.21	0.49	-															
	(2.91)	(1.05)																
B. Shortcoming of theories	3.01	0.66	.21*	-														
	(2.80)	(.42)	(.18)															
C. Reasons for new theories	3.62	0.74	.38*	.39*	-													
	(3.83)	(.92)	(.41)*	(.42)**														
D. Measurement of techniques	2.01	0.92	.31*	.28*	.43*	-												
	(3.12)	(1.86)	(.28)*	(.31)*	(.49)**													
E. Techniques with hypotheses	2.69	1.03	.42*	.33*	.49**	.52***	-											
	(2.02)	(.81)	(.46)**	(.28)*	(.38)*	(.56)***												
F. Adequate sample size	2.02	1.32	.52***	.31*	.41*	.43**	.33*	-										
	(2.13)	(.63)	(.54)***	(.36)*	(.38)*	(.44)**	(.29)*											
G. Evidence supporting the hyp.	3.01	1.91	.21*	.27*	.28*	.3*	0.13	.21*	-									
	(2.81)	(1.01)	(.18)	(.30)*	(.31)*	(.34)*	(.18)	(.27)*										
H. Understandable writing style	3.16	1.12	-0.13	0.09	-0.11	0.07	0.11	0.13	0.14	-								
	(3.91)	(1.74)	(.03)	(1.10)	(.09)	(.10)	(.12)	(.09)	(-.11)									
I. Non-jargonistic writing	2.81	0.96	-0.16	0.06	0.14	0.08	0.04	0.08	-0.08	.61***	-							
	(3.62)	(1.74)	(-.12)	(.04)	(.13)	(.07)	(-.02)	(.02)	(.04)	(.58)***								
J. Interest-provoking writing style	2.15	0.69	0.04	-0.12	-0.13	0.07	-0.11	0.06	-0.12	.43**	.57***	-						
	(3.16)	(1.55)	(.12)	(-.09)	(.11)	(.08)	(.09)	(.02)	(.03)	(.46)**	(.61)***							
K. Adequate style for readership	2.52	1.04	-0.18	-0.13	0.08	-0.13	0.04	0.12	0.02	.41*	.36*	.71***	-					
	(3.73)	(1.86)	(-.15)	(.10)	(.04)	(-.11)	(.03)	(-.09)	(.03)	(.36)*	(.28)*	(.68)***						
L. Non-obvious results	2.16	0.77	-0.16	-0.31	0.05	-0.14	0.03	0.07	-0.14	.51***	.53***	.41**	.49**	-				
	(2.51)	(1.01)	(-.09)	(-.20)	(-.03)	(-.11)	(.02)	(.09)	(.03)	(.48)**	(.49)***	(.38)**	(.51)***					
M. Thought-provoking results	2.17	1.21	0.04	-0.17	-0.12	-0.16	-0.12	-0.14	-0.15	0.07	0.07	.29*	0.03	.51***	-			
	(3.60)	(1.81)	(.06)	(-.09)	(-.11)	(-.14)	(.07)	(-.12)	(.05)	(.03)	(.04)	(.22)	(-.02)	(.48)***				
N. Do-able results	3.11	1.68	0.11	-0.14	-0.02	-0.11	0.07	-0.11	-0.16	-0.13	-0.09	0.06	-0.12	.41*	.63***	-		
	(3.69)	(1.78)	(.10)	(.05)	(.03)	(-.08)	(.06)	(.03)	(.05)	(-.04)	(.02)	(.04)	(.06)	(.39)*	(.65)***			
O. Specification of pre-conditions	2.1	0.95	-0.12	0.06	0.13	-0.09	0.11	-0.13	-0.12	-0.06	-0.06	0.11	-0.14	.39*	.33*	.48**	-	
	(3.15)	(1.60)	(.03)	(.04)	(.05)	(.04)	(.13)	(.08)	(-.14)	(-.04)	(.02)	(.12)	(-.11)	(.28)*	(.36)**	(.42)**		
P. Aiding decision-making	3.22	1.81	0.03	-0.16	0.03	-0.07	-0.11	-0.16	-0.13	0.03	-0.13	0.12	0.06	.42**	.45**	.39*	.52**	-
	(3.43)	(1.73)	(.06)	(-.11)	(.02)	(.06)	(-.07)	(.06)	(-.06)	(.02)	(-.02)	(.15)	(.04)	(.39)*	(.41)*	(.32)*	(.61)***	

Figures in parentheses represent UK data. Scale: 5 Strongly Agree/1 Strongly Disagree. ***p<.001 **p<.01 *p<.05