The Pleonasm in Strategic Initiation?
Revisiting Concept, Content and Context

Heru Santosa Hadiyanto
Senior Lecturer, Binus Business School
Bina Nusantara University
Jakarta, Indonesia
heru.hadiyanto@binus.ac.id

Abstract

Strategic management process generally starts from the strategic initiation stage. Several previous researchers have used several different terminology and unique concepts. But does the difference between these concepts contain a completely unique element, or is it just a mere pleonasm? This has not been widely researched and known. Starting from these phenomena, theoretical research will be carried out by analyzing several previous studies. The qualitative method with the study literature was carried out on this study with purposive sampling technique, then will be summarized and synthesized to obtain similarities and differences between these researchers. Thus, it is hoped that the results will be able to describe the concept of strategic initiation more comprehensively and be able to answer whether the developments that occur are merely pleonasms or are really relevant to the development of the current situation.

Keywords
strategic initiation, strategic intelligent, strategic imagination

1. Introduction
The development and discussion about the concept of strategic initiation has been discussed in many literature and previous research. Some people might even argue that the discussion is actually causing confusion, or maybe it's just a pleonasm. Pleonasm here is intended as something that might be quite clear, but packaged in different terms so that it appears as something new.

Some previous researchers such as Mintzberg (1994) revealed two differences in the context of the strategy-making process. First in the form of "strategic thinking" and the second in the form of "strategic planning". Both of these are expressed as two different approaches and cannot be equated, as well as the synthesis process with the analysis process. As if confirming what was stated by Mintzberg, Raimond (1996), Heracleous (1998) and Graetz (2002) regarding strategy management discussed many differences about strategic thinking and strategic planning.

In another study, Parnell & Lester (2003) used the term "strategy approach" as one of five critical dilemma or five critical factors that often become dilemmas in choosing a strategy. They review the debate between strategic artist and scientist here. In comparison, they compared the two orientation of strategy approach here in the context of systematic analysis of environment, environmental predictability, perception of environment, planning steps, and key intellectual influence.

Other researchers revealed the term "strategic renewal" start from intuitive approaches and interpreting approaches (Crossan & Berdrow, 2003). While De Wit & Meyer (2010) uses the term "strategy tension" which can often be seen as a puzzle, dilemma, trade-off or paradox to describe the debates and controversies that arise. Furthermore, they classify strategic thinking here into two different schools, namely creative orientation and logical orientation. Then Pisapua et al. (2005) viewed that strategic thinking consist of systems thinking, reframing thinking and reflecting thinking, which complement each other.

The parameters that distinguish between the two orientations are explained in more detail, in cased the more dominant main emphasis, the more dominant cognitive style, systematic thinking, the nature of thinking, the way to recognize a problem, how to solve problems, how to place values applicable values, assumptions and

acknowledgments about information or reality, constraints that are often faced, and how the basis used in decision making. Differences in terms of context and content regarding strategic analysis here can be summarized and presented in the Table 1 below.

Table 1. Strategic Initiation in Many Version

Researcher	Context	Content
Mintzberg (1994)	Strategy Making Process	Synthesis vs. Analysis Thinking vs. Planning
Raimond (1996)	Strategic Thinking	Intelligent vs. Imagination
Heracleous (1998) Graetz (2002)	Strategic Management	Thinking vs. Planning
Parnell & Lester (2003)	Strategy Approach	Art vs. Science
Crossan & Berdrow (2003)	Strategic Renewal (Learning)	Interpreting, Intuitive, Integtrating, Instituializing
Pisapua et al (2005)	Strategic Thinking	System Thinkinh, Reflective Thinking, Reframing Thinking
Parnell & Lester (2006)	Strategic Leadership (Approach)	Planning vs. Artist
De Wit & Meyer (2010)	Strategic Tension (Thinking)	Creative vs. Logic

1.1 Objectives
According to the explanation above, research here aims to explore about the concept of strategic initiation between researchers, especially to analyze and synthesize several previous studies until getting the similarities and differences expressed by the researchers. At the end, this research is expected to be able to describe the strategic initiation concept more comprehensively.

2. Literature Review

Strategic Initiation
The aim of every organization is to create high profitability in an effective and efficient manner (Bock et al., 2012; Yang, Zhang, Jiang, & Sun, 2015). To achive this objective, organization must be able to determine the most compatible strategic options by aligning external conditions with internal resources. Moreover, in a highly competitive and volatile era, organizations must have the ability to adapt with environmental dynamism while trying to influence their business environment to implement strategies (Ghorban-Bakhsh & Gholipour-Kanani, 2018). In other words, this increased dynamism poses an extra challenge for the company (Kahingo & Muchemi, 2020). One of them is because it triggers changes in external environment (Petrus, 2019). At the same time, companies that have developed the best fit between strategic orientation and environmental, changing demands and emerging opportunities can offer advantages as they are better positioned to capitalize on them (Azadegan, Patel, Zangoueinezhad, & Linderman, 2013).

With this explanation, whatever type of chosen strategy, it should be able to provide direction and supporting for strategic decision making (Fehre et al, 2015). This is the essence of strategic management: how companies can strive so that the resources and capabilities of the organization can be prepared to anticipate changes in the external environment (Henry, 2011). In this case, how the organization can create a sustainable competitive advantage to achieve superior performance against competitors. This process can be divided into three stages, namely strategy analysis, strategy formulation, and strategy implementation (Henry, 2011). Another researcher, David & David (2015) divides the strategy management process into strategy formulation, strategy implementation, and strategy evaluation. At the stage between strategy formulation to strategy implementation, there is a function of strategy generation as a liaison. Strategy generation here can be defined as the process of compiling the most attractive alternative strategies to be selected and further developed based on several considerations such as advantages, disadvantages, trade-offs, costs, and benefits of the strategy. Base on this, strategic analysis and/or strategic

generation (next called srategic initiation in this research) can be define as first step in strategic management process to create the most attractive strategy to be selected and further developed based on several considerations.

As explained in the previous section, several previous researchers have explain about strategic initiation with different context and terminology, like strategy making process (Mintzberg (1994), strategic thinking (Raimond, 1996), strategic management (Heracleous, 1998; Graetz, 2002), strategy approach (Parnell & Lester, 2003), strategic renewal (Crossan & Berdrow, 2003), strategic thinking (Pisapia et al, 2005), strategic leadership (approach) (Parnell & Lester, 2006), strategic tension (De Wit & Meyer, 2010). At their concept, each researcher separate strategic initiation ino two until four orientation with unique terminonolgy.

For example, Mintzberg (1994) stated that there is two differences in the context of the strategy-making process. First in the form of "strategic thinking" and the second in the form of "strategic planning". Talking about strategic thinking, many researcher agrre that this process are very important as organization guideline and continuity (Goldman et al., 2015; Bonn, 2001; Liedtka, 1998). But there is many definition about strategic thinking (Almarshad, 2019; Tavakoli dan Lawton, 2005; Heracleous, 2003; O'Shannassy, 2003; Bonn, 2001; Lawrence, 1999; Heracleous, 1998; O'Shannassy, 2001; Lawrence, 1999; Kustschera dan Ryan, 2009; O'Shannassy, 1999). One of researcher explain strategic thinking as a sythesis process, which is involved intuition and creativity (Mintzberg, 1994). Other researcher state strategic thinking as a set activities like perceiving, reflecting, feeling, realizing and acknowledging alert or phenomena that affect to organization (Jelenc and Swiercz, 2011; Almarshad, 2019). Then Heracleous (1998) explain strategic thinking with creative and synthetic thinking, Graetz (2002) viewed strategic thinking in three key words: creative, intuitive, innovative. While Bonn (2005) linked strategic thinking as "vision orientation thinking".

Strategic thinking are different with strategic planning (Mainardes, Ferreira and Raposo, 2014; Heracleous, 1998; Liedtka 1998a; Mintzberg, 1994a; Mintzberg, 1994b; Liedtka, 1998b; Graetz, 2002). The function of strategic planning is to detailing and supporting the outcomes of strategic thinking (Almarshad, 2019). One point differentiation is about right brain and left brain orientation. The elements of right-brain required to stimule strategic thinking, while left-brain thinking required to make startegic planning (Graetz, 2002).

In other research, state the strategic thinking with "intuiting", while strategic planning with "intepretating". Intuiting here can explain as preconscious mind about the symptoms, phenomena, and/or possibilites inherent in a past experience, then intepretating can be define as share and explan about an idea or insight to the others with the right language (Crossan & Berdrow, 2003). Then, Raimond (1996) state two strategic orientation, namely intelligence and imagination. Strategic intelligence is associated with "intelligence machice" like data gathering and data-scientist to produce key information about the business environment, the strategic imagination associated with the "creative imagination" about ideal expectation and future orientation. Parnell & Lester state strategic initiation here with terminology "strategic approach" (2003) and "strategic leadership" (2006) with two orientation, namely planning/sciance and art. The scientist associated with data and information with basic assumptiom that business environment can be predict. While the artist associated with creativity and imagination.

Explaination from researcher's content will try to be compiled and summarized further from the point of view of antecedents, behavioral, and outcome. At the end, conclusions can be obtained regarding the similarities and/or differences of each researcher.

[1] Antecedent Context
In the context of **antecedents** perspective, some researchers discuss the factors that influence a manager's tendency to prefer a certain strategic orientation. One of the underlying factors is how much a person's belief in analyzing environmental changes accurately (Parnell & Lester, 2003). In this perspective, someone will be more likely to become a "scientist" if he has confidence that the dynamics of the business environment in the future can be predicted. One essence is because of the existence of a business cycle that has a recurring pattern so that it can be predicted through what is in science, for example forecasting techniques, macro economics analysis, etc. They may believe that even if the environment changes, there will still be a dominant factor that does not change within that change. Whereas people who believe that the dynamics of the environment in the future cannot be predicted will have the tendency to become a "strategic artist". They believe that the environment is unpredictable, so companies need to put more emphasis on aspects of imagination and creativity. This creative aspect is very crucial because by focusing on these factors, the company will be able to create differentiation and unique value proposition, so that the

company is able to compete and differentiate itself from competitors. Thus they are more able to create markets with their unique value propositions.

The second factor that forms the basis of the antecedent context is his personal view of whether strategy can be taught or learned in a short time. People who think that strategies can be learned formally and scientifically will have the tendency to become a "strategic scientist". Some variations of generic strategy model produced in the scientific literature become starting point for choosing to implement in their company. Otherwise, people who view the strategy cannot be learned will tend to become a "strategic artist". They think that a great strategy is a result of thinking that promotes intuition and personal beliefs from a leader. From this leader's belief can be transmitted and can inspiring all its members. In the context here, great strategies cannot be generalized to be chosen, but are more customized and case by case.

The third factor that becomes the foundation in an antecedent perspective is how the leader's belief about the accuracy all of the information they received. Those who view that most of the information from the field can be known accurately through objective data will have a tendency to become a "strategic scientist". Otherwise, those who think that information in the field cannot be reflected in the data objectively will tend to become a "strategic artist". In different language, the strategic artist more often question subjectively "who" that give information: how about their credibility, whether the person concerned is worthy of trust or not. Whereas strategic scientist more concern about such "what" information they receive. The strategic artists are more influenced personally and subjectively, while the scientist looks more at the objectivity of the data and information they receive.

[2] Behaviorial Context
From behaviorial perspective, the discussion focuses more on their practical processes and behavior. For example, what is the more dominant emphasis is used, the more dominant cognitive style is used, systematic thinking, the nature of thinking, the direction of thinking, how to recognize a problem, how to solve problems, how to place applicable values, assumptions and recognition of information or reality, obstacles that are often faced, and how the basis used in decision making.

Generally, it is explained that people who adhere to a "strategic scientist" rely more on logic and rationality in systematic thinking. They use reason in a straightforward manner and are consistent in their arguments so that others can understand their intentions. Logical thinking is used to carry out analysis of internal and external conditions (De Wit & Meyer, 2010). According to this logical orientation perspective, conclusions and recommendations, or decisions that will be implemented will only be produced after conducting research on data and information that has been objectively processed through deductive systematic thinking. With a systematic deductive thinking like this, the direction of one's thinking becomes straight and directed (vertical). With this process, what is produced will be felt more objectively, more accurately, and can be understood or accepted by others as a formal policy.

Scientists believe that changes in the business environment can be largely analyzed and predicted (Parnell & Lester, 2003). This belief is reflected in their activities like collecting, analyzing, and interpreting past data so that patterns, trends, trends, or cycles can be found to predict or predict what will happen in the future. In different languages, these "strategic science" adherents tend to minimize or avoid the role of imagination and creativity in the process of strategy formulation. Top management seem to be outlined to follow a systematic process of analyzing the competitive environment and internal environment in developing organizational strategies (Parnell, 2005). Thus, the process of analyzing causal relationships objectively becomes very crucial in this planning model, so they must be trained to be highly skilled analytical thinkers in digesting a number of data objectively and further translating (Parnell & Lester, 2006).

Conversely, "strategic artist" often rely on broader reasoning or generative reasoning (De Wit & Meyer, 2010). They try to get out from the existing frame of mind to explore new possibilities using systematic lateral thinking, which is a way of thinking that seeks solutions through methods that are not common and are usually ignored by logical thinking (Crossley & Berdrow, 2003; Parnell, 2005; De Wit Meyer, 2010).. In contrast to the logical orientation that often requires a systematic and deductive calculation process, strategic artist who are more oriented towards creativity think inductively, think opposite, or start from what is in their end in mind. With this way of thinking, they are more able to find alternative solutions that are 'out of the box' and relatively not lose direction on the goals to be achieved.

In addition, if the logical approach requires objective and systematic data calculations, individuals who are more oriented towards creativity rely more on judgment or personal judgment. For example, they often go directly to the 'real world' and feel directly about the problems and developments that occur, or rely more on opinions or opinions from several practicionaire who's invlove directly on the field. Individuals who adhere to this mindset assume that changes that occur in the environment will not be predictable or accurately predicted through mere trend or cycle analysis, so that more creativity and intuition are needed that is sharper and comprehensive or comprehensive (Ford & Gioia, 2000 in Parnell, 2005).

Similiar with the other research, Pisapia et al (2005) state that there are three elements in strategic thinking (strategic initiation): system thinking, reflectig thinking, and reframing thinking. System thinking associate with capablity to see holistically through connecting the pattern and interrelationship. Reflecting thinking means the ability to optimalizing rational thinking and logical reason to make decision about the next action. Reframing thinking relates to the ability to change the way of thinking across multiple perspectives and paradigm to getting new idea and 'out of the box' alternatives (Almarshad, 2019). Base on the defintion, reflecting thinking here are equivalen with strategic scientist and reframing thinking associate with strategic artist.

[3] Outcomes Context

From production perspective, which is result that produced to be implemented further, "strategic artist" (Parnell, 2005) or "strategic thinking" (Minzberg, 1994) generally produce something different or the latest breakthrough (Goldman et al. , 2015; Heracleous, 1998). In the final output, they often use beautiful terms to inspiring others, so often they tend to be perceived as "head in the cloud". In this case, it is often associated with images and methaphor (Crossan, Lane, White, 1999). Other research state the final output from strategic thinking is "integrated perspective" (Mintzberg, 1994) or "crafting strategic architecture" (Hamel & Prahalad, 1994). Thus, what they convey is often perceived as an radical innovation and changes something that already exists. Others researchers state the many output of strategic thinking: effective strategic change (Tregoe & Zimmerman, 1980), strategic renewal (Zahra & Nambisan, 2012), opportunity recognition peluang (Hanford, 1995), leadership development (Dragoni et al., 2014), team building and team-base decision making (Bates & Dillard Jr., 1993; Thomas & McDaniel Jr., 1990).

While strategic scientist generally produce something that is more "down to earth" by producing an improvement that is a system operating procedure or manual book that is more real and easy to apply (Crossan & Berdrow, 2003). In the output perspective here, each has its own advantages and disadvantages. For example, during the socialization process, people will relatively easily understand the output produced by scientists because they use something that seems more real, logical, and systematic. In contrast to the output of the "strategic artists" who are more easily perceived radically, change something that has been around for so long, and is more easily perceived as "sexy on paper" only. Conversely, if the company face a saturation, strategic artists can be perceived as "new hope". Their work will be very much awaited because they are considered capable of offering a different breakthrough and it is very likely that others have not thought about it.

Another illustration that can better explain the differences between two approaches when viewed from an output perspective is that the strategic scientist produces more output in the many form of standardization. For example, the standardization of working process, control card, checklist, or manual book. Standardization produced here is generally only one version and almost without adjustments. The operators just need to implement what is outlined in the control card. Otherwise, "strategic artists" tend to put forward "mutual adjustment" based on conditions in the field or base on feedback from people they trust. The guidebook and manual book is just guideline, but the implementation can not be 100% matching based on what is written in the manual book.

3. Methods

The research here is a qualitative research type. It conducted by literature study from several references such as journals and/or textbooks that are relevant with topic of strategic management. By definition, qualitative research is a research method based on post-positivism philosophy, used to examine the condition of natural objects (as opposed to experiments), which the researcher is the key instrument (Rukin, 2016). Qualitative research does not use random sampling, does not use a large population and sample, but the sample is selected from its relationship with research purposes (Nasution & Usman, 2008; Sugiyono, 2018).

While sampling technique that use is non-probability sampling. Non-probability sampling is a sampling technique that does not provide equal opportunities or opportunities for each element or member of the population to be

selected as a sample (Sugiyono, 2018). Specifically, purposive and snowball sampling technique are used to get the relevant reference are in line with this research. By definition, purpose sampling technique is a sampling method by using certain considerations in accordance with the desired criteria to be able to determine the number of samples to be studied (Sugiyono, 2018). While snowball sampling technique is a sampling technique that is initially small in number, then enlarges (Sugiyono, 2018).

4. Data Collection

As qualitative research to build some proposition, this study uses some literature as basic reference. Purposive and snowball sampling technique is combine to get the relevant reference. At first stage, total 35 references are used as a initial source of information. Then at second stage, more than 140 references can be used to support and build several propositions. Summary about the distribution of reference from past four decade can be seen in Table 2 below.

5. Results and Discussion

According to the explanation in introduction and literature review above, it is known that there are some similiarity between one researcher and the others. But, there are some different and uniqueness each others. The equation or similiarity, and the difference or uniqueness will be explain below.

The Equation & Similarity

In several different studies, researchers use different terms for a more or less the same understanding. As an example of agreement, Mintzberg (1994) uses the term strategic thinking which is then defined as a "synthesis" process. The use of the term "thinking" is the same as stated in other studies (Heraclous, 1998; Graetz, 2002). While the research of Raimond (1996) uses the term "imagination" that have same meaning relatively with Parnell & Lester (2003) in the term "art". Then Crossan & Berdrow (2003 used the term "intuitive" as a new approach on strategic renewal. While De Wit & Meyer (2010) in their publication used the term "creative" as one used it. Some of these different terms discuss one meaning that is not the same. In the research here it will be generalized into one term "strategic intelligence", which can be interpreted as one of the studies in terms of strategic thinking used by synthesizing information and prioritizing aspects of creativity, intuition, and them.

While in research written by the same researcher, Mintzberg (1994) uses the term "strategic planning" which is defined as a process of "analysis" that is different from the term "strategic thinking". The use of the term "planning" is the same as stated in other studies like Heraclous (1998) and Graetz (2002). In another research, Raimond (1996) uses the term "intelligent" to ask for things that contradict the term "imagination". The term intelligent here is used to oppose a pattern of strategic planning that is based on "data-driven" which is very important by processing data and information so that the strategy here is referred to as "intelligent machine". The use of this term in line relatively with what is proposed by Parnell & Lester (2003) in the term "science." Furthermore, Crossan & Berdrow (2003) use the term "institutional" to define the process of strategic renewal that emphasizes on systematic analysis, routines, in accordance with regulations and procedures. In another research, De Wit & Meyer (2010) used the term "logic" as one that prioritized rational reasons. Based on analysis from several researchers here, these different terms actually refer to a same definition relatively. In this research, it will be generalized into a "strategic intelligent", which can be interpreted as one of the strategic thoughts that emphasizes rational logic, systematic thinking, and analytical intelligence. The summary about similiarities can be seen on Table 2 below.

Table 2. The Equation and Similiarity About Strategic Initiation Orientation

Researcher	Context	Content	
		Similiar with Strategic Imagination	**Similiar with Strategic Intelligent**
Mintzberg (1994)	Strategy Making Process	**Strategic thinking:** a synthesis process, which is involved intuition and creativity	**Strategic planning:** detailing and supporting the outcomes of strategic thinking
Raimond (1996)	Strategic Thinking	**Imagination**: "creative imagination" about ideal expectation and future orientation	**Intelligent**: data gathering and data-scientist to produce key information about environment

Heracleous (1998)	Strategic Management	**Thinking**: creative and synthetic thinking; produce something different or breakthrough	**Planning**: supporting the outcomes of strategic thinking
Graetz (2002)		**Strategic thinking:** Right-brain thinking orientation	**Strategic planning:** Left-brain thinking orientation
Parnell & Lester (2003)	Strategy Approach	**Artist**: creativity and imagination with basic assumption that business environment can't be predict, so strategy can't be teach and learned.	**Scientist**: data and information with basic assumptiom that business environment can be predict, so strategy can be learned formally and scientifically
Crossan & Berdrow (2003)	Strategic Renewal (Learning)	**Intuitive:** preconscious mind about the symptoms, phenomena, and/or possibilites inherent in a past experience; produce something different or the latest breakthrough	**Intepreting:** share and explan about an idea or insight to the others with the right language; producing an improvement that is a system operating procedure or manual book that is more real and easy to apply
Pisapia et al (2005)	Strategic Thinking	**Reframing:** Ability to change the way of thinking across multiple perspectives and paradigm to get new idea/alternatives	**Reflecting**: Optimalizing rational thinking and logical reason to make decision about the next action
De Wit & Meyer (2010)	Strategic Tension	**Creative**: explore new possibility using systematic lateral thinking and rely on broader reasoning or generative reasoning	**Logic**: process through deductive systematic thinking & used to carry out analysis of internal and external conditions

The Distinctive & Different

[1] Sequential Perspective

Mason (1986) state that strategic thinking precede the strategic planning process. This statement in line with many researcher that viewed strategic thinking precedes strategic planning (Heracleous, 1998; Liedtka, 1998; Mintzberg, 1994;Graetz, 2002). Then, Almarshad (2019) resumed from many researcher like Mainardes, Ferreira and Raposo (2014); Heracleous (1998); Liedtka (1998); Mintzberg (1994), Graetz (2002) and stated that the strategic planning is the realization process from strategic thinking. This reflect that strategic thinking and (then) strategic planning like sequential process.

Specifically, Mintzberg (1994) mentions the difference between strategic thinking and strategic planning in strategy making process. The strategic planning is related to the analysis process, while strategic thinking is related to the synthesis process. The synthesis process here involves creativity and intuition so that it can produce a whole perspective unit (integrated perspective). While the analysis process referred to here relates to the process of translating a set of initiatives that need to be followed up in more detail in the form of steps, formalizing in the form of guidelines so that they can run automatically, and anticipating potential impacts that may occur in each of these steps. This thinking is in line with research conducted by Crossan & Berdrow (2003), which states that in the context of strategy renewal, a sequential process is known in the order of "intuiting, interpreting, integrating, and institutionalizing". Intuiting here related with experience, images and metaphor. Then the next level called "interpreting" related wih language, cognitive map, and dialogue (Crossan, Lane, White, 1999). With this kind of thinking, researchers here seem to stated that "interpreting" is a next stage from what is called strategic thinking (intuiting). Strategic planning is at a different stage with strategic thinking, and cannot replace each other. In the other language, Crossan & Berdrow (2003) resumed the four stage intuiting, interpreting, integrating, and institutionalizing to be two stage: exploitation and exploration. Exploitation associated with efficiencies and routine process, while exploration associated with something more intangible and less concrete. So, exploitation at the first step must be follow with exploration later.

[2] Combination Perpective

Combination perspective here can be explain s "two become one", which is two orientation complementary each other in every step and can't be seperate. For example, Parnell & Lester (2003) used the term "strategy approach" and divides into two different approaches namely art and science. In his research, Parnell stated that in a strategy there must be elements of art and also scientific elements, although evidence that shows the existence of a balance or combination of these two approaches is still fairly weak (Parnell, 2005). Then Pisapia et al. (2005) viewed that strategic thinking consist of systems thinking, reframing thinking and reflecting thinking, which complement each other and can't be seperate. Three orienation of strategic thinking skill here are compementary each others as key driver to success. In contrast to the "group" of researchers before, this statement affirms that these two elements are things that always exist in each stage of strategic preparation that are complementary and are not sequentially separated.

6. Conclusion

Base on exploration from many literature review above, it can be synthesis into some similiarity and difference between previous researchers. Given the similarities and differences between the researchers above, it can be seen that research conducted in different terms is not a pleonasm. But, this research is still limited in looking for similarities and differences in concepts between researchers, so it still needs to be completed with further research. For example, it can be analyzed the relationship between concepts to find under what conditions the differences found can be more suitable to be applied to achieve better performance results.

References

Almarshad, M. Strategic Thinking in Jordan: Still Crafting the Architecture? European Journal of Business and Management, Vol.11, No.26 (2019).

Azadegan, A., Patel, P.C., Zangoueinezhad, A., & Linderman, K. The effect of environmental complexity and environmental dynamism on lean practices. Journal of Operations Management, 31 (4), 193-212 (2013).

Bates, D. L.; Dillard Jr., John E. (Generating strategic thinking through multi-level teams. Long Range Planning, Volume 26, Issue 5, Pages 103-110 1993).

Bock, A.J., et al. The Effects of Culture and Structure on Strategic Flexibility during Business Model Innovation, 279–305. 2012.

Bonn, I. Developing strategic thinking as a core competency. Management Decision, 39(1), pp. 63-70. (2001),

Bonn, I. Improving Strategic Thinking: a multilevel approach. Leadership and Organization Development Journal, 26(5), pp.336-354. (2005),

Crossan, M.M.; Berdrow, I. Organizational Learning and Strategic Renewal. Strategic Management Journal, 24, 1087-1105. (2003)

Crossan, MM; Lane, HW; Wite, RE. An Organiation Learning Framework: From Intuition to Institution (1999).

David, Fred R.; David, Forest R. Strategic Management: A Competitive Advantage Approach. 15. Pearson Education Limited. England. ISBN: 978-1-292-01689-4. (2015).

Dragoni, L., Oh, I.-S., Tesluk, P. E., Moore, O. A., VanKatwyk, P., & Hazucha, J. Developing leaders' strategic thinking through global work experience: The moderating role of cultural distance. Journal of Applied Psychology, 99(5), 867–882. (2014). https://doi.org/10.1037/a0036628

De Wit Bob; Meyer, Ron. (Strategy Synthesis: Resolving Strategy Paradoxes to Create Competitive Advantage. South-Western Cengage Learning 2010).

Fehre, Kerstin; Kronenwett, Daniel; Lindsta, Hagen; Wolff, Michael. Lost in transaction? The transfer effect of strategic consistency. Business Research (2016) 9:101–131 (2015).

Ford, C.M. and Gioia, D.A. (2000). Factors influencing creativity in the domain of managerial decision making. Journal of Management, Vol. 26, pp. 705-32.

Ghorban-Bakhsh, Raheleh; Gholipour-Kanani, Yousef. Investigating the Impact of Strategic Flexibility on Organizational Innovation. International Review of Management and Marketing, Vol 8, Issue 3 (2018).

Graetz, Fiona. Strategic thinking versus strategic planning: towards understanding the complementarities. Management Decision, Vol. 40, Issue 5 (2002).

Goldman, E. Scott, A., and Follman M. Organizational practices to develop strategic thinking. Journal of Strategy and Management, 8(2), pp. 155-175. (2015).

Hanford, P. Developing director and executive competencies in strategic thinking. In B. Garrett (Ed.), Developing strategic thought: Reinventing the art of direction-giving (pp. 157-186). London: McGraw-Hill. (1995).

Hamel, G. and Prahalad, C. K. Competing for the Future. Boston, USA: Harvard School Press. (1994).

Henry, Anthony E. (Understanding Strategic Management (2nd ed.). New York: Oxford University Press, Inc. 2011).

Heracleous, L. Strategy and Organization: Realizing Strategic Management. Cambridge, United Kingdom:Cambridge University Press. (2003).

Heracleous, L., Strategic Thinking or Strategic Planning? Long Range Planning 31(3), pp. 481-487. (1998).

Jelenc, L.; Swiercz, P.M. Strategic thinking capability: Conceptualization and measurement. The 56th Annual ICSB World Conference, Stockholm, Sweeden, 15-18 June, (2011).

Kahingo, Caroline; Muchemi, Anne. Strategic Flexibility, Tmt Cognitive Capability And Firm Performance: A Review Of Literature. African Journal of Emerging Issues (AJOEI). Online ISSN: 2663-9335, Vol (2), Issue 11, Pg. 53-78 2020.

Kutschera, I. and Ryan, M. Implications of Intuition for Strategic Thinking: Practical Recommendations for Gut Thinkers. SAM Advanced Management Journal, 74(3), pp. 12-20. (2009).

Lawrence, E.. Strategic Thinking: A Discussion Paper. Public Services of Commission of Canada. (1999)

Liedtka, J. Strategic thinking: Can it be taught? Long Range Planning, 31(1), pp. 120-129. (1998).

Liedtka, J. Linking Strategic Thinking with Strategic Planning. Strategy and Leadership, 26(4), pp. 30- 35. (1998).

Mainardes, E.W.,Ferreira, J.J., and Raposo, M.L. Strategy and Strategic Management Concepts: are they recognised by Management Students? E&M Ekonomie a Management, 17(1), pp.44-61. (2014). http://dx.doi.org/10.15240/tul/001/2014-1-004

Mintzberg, H. The Fall and Rise of Strategic Planning. Harvard Business Review, 72(1), pp. 107-114. (1994).

Mintzberg, H. The Rise and Fall of Strategic Planning. London, United Kingdom: Prentice Hall. (1994a).

Nasution, Mustafa Edwin; Usman, Hardius. Proses Penelitian Kuantitatif. Jakarta: Lembaga Penerbit Universitas Indonesia. (2008).

O'Shannassy, T. Strategic Thinking: A Continuum of Views and Conceptualisation. RMIT School of Business, (1999).

O'Shannassy, T. Lessons from the Evolution of the Strategy Paradigm. Journal of the Australia and New Zealand Academy of Management, 7(1), pp. 25-37. (2001).

O'Shannassy, T. Modern Strategic Management: Balancing Strategic Thinking and Strategic Planning for Internal and External Stakeholders. Singapore Management Review, 25(1), pp. 53-67. (2003).

Parnell, John and Lester, Donald L. Toward A Philosophy of Strategy: Reassessing Five Critical Dilemmas in Strategy Formulation and Change, Strategic Change, 12, 291-303 (2003).

Parnell, John A. Strategic Philosophy and Management Level. Management Decision, 43(2), 157-170. (2005).

Parnell, John A; Lester, Donald L. Strategic Philosophy And High Performance: Implications For Managers of SME. Journal of Business and Entrepreneurship; 18, 1 (2006).

Petrus, B.. Environmental dynamism: The implications for operational and dynamic capabilities effects. Management Sciences. Nauki o Zarządzaniu, 24(1), 28-36. (2019).

Pisapia, J., Reyes-Guerra, D. and Coukos-Semmel, E. Developing the Leader's Strategic Mindset: Establishing the Measures. Leadership Review, 5(1), pp. 41-68. (2005).

Raimond, P. Two Styles of Foresight: Are We Predicting the Future or Inventing It? Long Range Planning. 29(2), pp. 208-214. (1996).

Rukin. Metodologi Penelitian Kualitatif. Sulawesi Selatan: Yayasan Ahmar Cendekia Indonesia (2016).

Sugiyono. Metode Penelitian Kuantitatif Kualitatif dan R&D. Bandung: Alfabeta (2018).

Tavakoli, I.; Lawton, J. Strategic thinking and knowledge management. Handbook of Business Strategy, 6(1), pp.155-160. (2005).

Thomas, James B.; McDaniel Jr., Reuben R. Interpreting Strategic Issues: Effects of Strategy and the Information-Processing Structure of Top Management Teams. The Academy of Management Journal, Vol. 33, No. 2 (Jun., 1990), pp. 286-306 (1990).

Tregoe, Benjamin B.; Zimmerman, John W. Strategi Manajemen. Jakarta: Erlangga (1980).

Yang J, Zhang F, Jiang X, Sun W. Strategic Fflexibility, Green Management, and Firm Competitiveness in An Emerging Economy. Technol Forecast Soc Chang. 2015. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.techfore.2015.09.016

Zahra, Shaker A.; Nambisan, Satish. Entrepreneurship and strategic thinking in business ecosystems. Business Horizons, Volume 55, Issue 3 (2012).

Biography

Heru Santosa Hadiyanto Currently he is working as a Senior Faculty Member in Management Program, BINUS Business School Undergraduate Program, Bina Nusantara University. He completed undergraduate program in Maranatha Christian University, Bandung, Indonesia; Master's degree in Magister Management Program at Tarumanagara University, Jakarta, Indonesia; and completed Doctor of Management at Doctor of Research in

Management at BINUS Business School, Bina Nusantara University, Jakarta, Indonesia. He has long experiences in financial industry as Division Head. He lectures in management topic such as Strategic Management, Human Resources Management, Entrepreneurship, and Leaderships in BINUS Business School, Bina Nusantara University, Jakarta, Indonesia. His interest in research and areas of expertise are in strategic management, entrepreneurship, and human capital management.