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Thanks for sharing your perspective and interpretation regarding this topic. As discussed in class we need to make sure we have a good format to communicate our intentions and our position for strategy. Too often we find ourselves explaining rather than strategizing. In class we discussed the distinction between a grand strategy and a generic strategy. However, within your document we did not emphasize these two and visibly discuss the parameters of each.

***Additional reading:***

* [Nandakumar, M. K., Ghobadian, A., & O'Regan, N. (2011). Generic strategies and performance - Evidence from manufacturing firms. *International Journal of Productivity and Performance Management,*60(3), 222-251.](http://search.proquest.com.contentproxy.phoenix.edu/docview/855079495/fulltextPDF/13C785375BE1A6804A7/2?accountid=35812)

We had an addition reading that had some very good typologies you could use as frameworks and measurements regarding the strategies you mentioned. I was a bit concerned that we did not establish criteria and typologies for the strategies communicated.

***I am sharing an example from the additional reading provided:***

Galbraith and Schendel (1983) Strategy types for industrial

products:

(1) Low commitment (1) This is a strategy of low commitment. This strategy type coincides with the harvest strategy type for consumer products

(2) Growth (2) A growth strategy for firms with a strong commitment to their products. Investment is very high and there is a

strong commitment to expand market position

(3) Maintenance (3) This is a hybrid strategy combining the characteristics of a continuity strategy with those of a cost reduction strategy

(4) Niche or specialisation (4) Specialisation strategy similar to that of consumer goods organisations. Superior quality posture, high pricing policies and narrow product line with only marginal emphasis on promotional activities are some of the characteristics of this strategy

***Which approach are you taking towards developing the strategy needs to be stated as well:***

In the self-typing approach, senior managers of the organisation are asked to characterise the organisation’s strategies. According to Conant et al. (1990) there could be two types of self-typing. In the normal self-typing approach, respondents are asked to classify their organisation as a particular strategic type based on paragraph

descriptions of various strategy typologies explained earlier. The other one is the self-typing approach complemented by investigator-specified decision rules. In this approach, the extent to which a firm’s strategy is conformed to a particular strategic type is assessed using multi-item Likert-type scales intended to measure each of the strategic types in a particular typology.

In the external assessment approach, the self-typing measures of strategy are confirmed by obtaining the ratings of individuals external to the organisation like competitors, consultants, industry analysts and expert panels. While using objective indicators, there is no reliance on the perceptions of either the managers of the organisation or external individuals. Instead the objective indicators approach uses quantifiable published data