



# De-Strategizing Paradigm in Strategic Management: The Philosophical Foundations

Nima Eskandarinia <sup>a</sup>

<sup>a</sup> Department of Public Administration, Islamic Azad University, Science and Research Unit, Tehran, Iran.

---

## ARTICLE INFO

Received: 2023/06/20

Revised: 2023/08/25

Accept: 2023/09/06

### Keywords:

*De-Strategizing,  
Philosophical  
Analysis, Axiology,  
Epistemology,  
Ontology.*

## ABSTRACT

Different theories of competitive advantage can be attributed to one of five common paradigms including resource-based view, industrial organization approach, entrepreneurial perspective, transaction cost approach and behavioral perspective. Each of these paradigms has its own philosophical foundations. In other words, all these paradigms are different from each other in terms of logic, axiology, ontology, epistemology and methodology. In recent years, some scholars have made fundamental criticisms to the scientific structure and theoretical hypothesis of competitive advantage and strategic management. Therefore, the purpose of this research is the philosophical analysis of the current competitive advantage paradigms, as well as the philosophical analysis of the criticisms of strategic management theories and finally the introduction of a new paradigm under the title of de-strategization. In order to conduct this research, the method of qualitative content analysis of articles has been used. The qualitative content analysis of the articles that criticized the science of strategy and the theories of competitive advantage continued until reaching theoretical saturation, and the collection of articles was also selected by purposeful sampling based on the degree of suitability with the purpose of the research. The findings of this research show that a new paradigm that is different from the five existing paradigms in terms of logic, axiology, epistemology, ontology and methodology is being formed. In this new paradigm, unlike all five previous paradigms, the definitive and linear relationship between the three components including strategy creation, gaining competitive advantage and achieving premium performance is challenged. In addition, in the paradigm of de-strategization, not only the competitive advantage does not have a strong link with the success of the organization, but there are evidences about the organizations without competitive advantage and even with a competitive disadvantage, which were able to achieve success and desired performance.

---

## 1. Introduction

The resource-based view, the industrial organization, the transaction cost, the entrepreneurship, and the current behavioral view are some paradigms that are potentially associated with different theories of competitive advantage (Eskandarinia, 2021, 83–86; Ascher, Silva, Polowczyk & Damiao da Silva, 2018, 2–5; Powell, Rahman & Starbuck, 2010, 314–320).

---

<sup>a</sup> Corresponding author email address: [nimaeskandarinia@yahoo.com](mailto:nimaeskandarinia@yahoo.com) (N. Eskandarinia).

Available online 09/06/2023

2676-3311/BGSA Ltd.

All the numerous theories of competitive advantage are recognized to be built on the cornerstone of strategic management and strategy creation. In other words, if senior managers are interested in succeeding while accomplishing a distinctive performance in their industry, they must engage in the strategic management process; without a strategy, they cannot gain a competitive advantage. Consequently, it might be claimed that a linear and strong link between the three components including strategy, competitive advantage, and performance has been thought to be definite and indisputable in all contemporary paradigms of strategic management (Ateljević, Kulović, Đoković & Bavčić, 2023, 10-41; Johnson, Whittington, Regnér, Angwin & Scholes, 2020, 32-47; Mintzberg, & Waters, 1985, 260-270; Mintzberg, Ahlstrand, & Lampel, 2020, 14-30; Nayak, Bhattacharyya & Krishnamoorthy, 2023, 660-670; Porter, 2008, 81-89; Porter & Lee, 2015, 1681-1684; Powell, 2018, 306-312; Teoh, Teoh, Tan, & Ibrahim, 2023, 990-998; Vinardi, 2023, 12-200; Eskandarinia, 2021, 42-48 ).

Despite the differences in opinion among strategy professionals, there is a strong agreement among them concerning the requirement of strategy creation and competitive advantage to attain better performance (Ateljević, Kulović, Đoković, & Bavčić, 2023, 10-50; Eskandarinia, 2021, 42-50; Johnson, Whittington, Regnér, Angwin, & Scholes, 2020, 32-47; Mintzberg & Waters, 1985, 260-270; Nayak, Bhattacharyya & Krishnamoorthy, 2023, 660-670; Porter, 2008, 81-89; Porter & Lee, 2015, 1681-1684; Rumelt, 2022, 2-7; Teoh, Teoh, Tan & Ibrahim, 2023, 990-1000 ).

Michael E. Porter, for instance, has emphasized subjects including the need for a strategy for businesses, competitive strategy, and employing industry structure analysis to develop a strategy (Porter, 2008, 81-89; Porter & Lee, 2015, 1681-1684). In a separate investigation, Henry Mintzberg clarified the emerging nature of strategies (Mintzberg & Waters, 1985), and he also described the Ten Schools of Thought model in terms of three more general prescriptive, descriptive, and integrative approaches (Mintzberg, Ahlstrand & Lampel, 2020, 14-300).

According to Richard Rumelt (Rumelt, 2022, 4-7), a creative strategy should be developed by organizations rather than one that emphasizes sustaining the status quo situation. Jack Welch consistently stressed the importance of strategy and competitive advantage, even expressing that it is preferable not to compete if you don't have a competitive advantage (Slater & Prichard, 1998, 70-18).

Furthermore, the findings of a September 2022 study revealed that 280 out of 390 CEOs in different organizations in Tehran and the suburbs of Tehran agreed that organizations could not

attain a competitive advantage without developing a strategy so they most emphatically fail (Eskandarinia, 2022, 1-23). According to the findings of the McKinsey consulting group research (Lovallo & Sibony, 2010, 3-8), 53% of a company's success can be attributed to the quality of its strategy. However, in recent years, a contradictory current of thought has emerged that promotes De-Strategizing and fails to attribute organizational success or failure to the factor of competitive advantage (Eskandarinia, 2021, 41-58; Eskandarinia, 2021, 30-47; Eskandarinia, 2023; Grandy & Mills, 2004, 1153-1170; Miller, 1992, 24-35; Powell, 2017, 162-190). For instance, the results of latest research by Thomas C. Powell (Powell, 2017, 162-190; Powell, 2018, 151-165) and Eskandarinia (Eskandarinia, 2021, 41-58; Eskandarinia, 2021, 30-47; Eskandarinia, 2022, 1-23) demonstrate companies with a competitive advantage and businesses that have developed strategies have not only failed to attain superior performance, but have also been confronted with confusion, crises, performance decline, and even bankruptcy. On the other hand, despite lacking a competitive advantage and not adhering to strategic analysis, certain businesses have experienced substantial accomplishments.

Furthermore, plenty of critiques have been expressed to strategic management and strategy creation in recent years, such as the Icarus dilemma (Cunha & Putnam, 2019; Jarzabkowski, 2004; 529-559). ; Miller, 1992, 24-35; Miller & Le Breton-Miller, 2021, 1899-1914), exploiting Competitive Disadvantage Blind Spot (Eskandarinia, 2023), multiple-concept exploitation (Eskandarinia, 2021, 30-47), the mistakes of overlooking competitive weaknesses (Powell, 2017, 170), and Strategic Burnout (Eskandarinia, 2021, 52) were demonstrated. As a result, the issue of what organizations should do to succeed and achieve optimum performance occurs: should they develop a strategic plan, can they operate without a competitive advantage, and if the policy of developing a strategy and gaining a competitive advantage fails then how De-Strategizing may be carried out to contribute to success and the achievement of the intended outcomes.

The current article is significant since it explains the philosophical foundation of De-Strategizing paradigm and provides solutions to these problems. The organization's success and outstanding performance are every CEO's most crucial and essential challenges. Therefore, the study's outcomes and results are beneficial not only for CEOs of organizations but also for investigators in the field of strategy because they offer fresh perspectives into how it creates a paradigm of de-strategizing. So, the purpose of this article is to introduce new paradigm naming

de-strategization philosophical foundation including axiology, epistemology, ontology, methodology and logic. Although to show its philosophical differences with other paradigms.

## **1.1. Research literature**

According to the present research subject matter, which is associated with introducing the newly emerging concept of De-Strategizing in strategic management, the current paradigms of competitive advantage, all of which have promoted the strategy creation process and accept competitive advantage as an essential component, must be addressed. It is defined as unavoidable and necessary for the organization's success. The resource-based view, industrial organization, transaction cost, entrepreneurship, and the current behavioral view (Eskandarinia, 2021, 82-100; Ascher, Silva, Polowczyk & Damiao da Silva, 2018, 2-5; Powell, Rahman & Starbuck, 2010, 314-320) are described in the following section.

### **1.1.1. The theoretical literature of the research**

#### **1.1.1.1. Resource-based view**

The resource-based view, which was initially proposed by Penrose (1959) and received favorable reviews by researchers involving Barney, Peteraf, Wernerfelt, and Rumelt (Eskandarinia, 2021, 82-100; Ascher, Silva, Polowczyk & Damião da Silva, 2018, 1-20) points out that organizations must depend on their internal resources, such as human capital, Technology, and physical assets, along with intangible assets including brand and culture, to be able to create a strategy and accomplish a competitive advantage. According to the underlying premises of this paradigm, organizations cannot operate at their best without access to valuable, unique, and scarce resources (Eskandarinia, 2021, 82–100; Powell, Rahman, & Starbuck, 2010, 313–350). The dynamic capabilities approach, which is often categorized under the resource-based paradigm, was suggested in the 1990s by researchers including David Teece (1997), Prahalad, and Hamel (Herold, Heller, Rozemeijer & Mahr, 2023, 425–440). These scholars suggest that organizations must be strategically flexible to promptly adapt their internal resources and skills in response to rapid changes and uncertainties in the competitive environment (Herold, Heller, Rozemeijer & Mahr, 2023).

This paradigm's ontology is economical, entirely idealistic, and logical; its epistemology is founded on the concepts of microeconomics and military strategy, and its axiology depends on the efficient and flexible management of valuable resources and capabilities. It employs a range of quantitative and qualitative approaches as methodology. Consider that the paradigm's unit of

analysis relies on the organization's resources (Eskandarinia, 2021; Powell, Rahman, and Starbuck, 2010; Ascher, Silva, Polowczyk, and Damio da Silva, 2018).

#### **1.1.1.2. Industrial organization view**

Michael Porter introduced the industrial organization view, additionally referred to as the industry-based view (Eskandarinia, 2021, 82-100; Powell, Rahman, and Starbuck, 2010, 313-350; Ascher, Silva, Polowczyk, and Damio da Silva, 2018, 1-20). According to this paradigm, an organization's strategy is determined by the nature and structure of the industry. The organization can develop its strategy by determining the opportunities and threats presented by the industry and the competition environment (Ascher, Silva, Polowczyk & Damio da Silva, 2018, 1–20; Eskandarinia, 2021, 82–100; Powell, Rahman & Starbuck, 2010, 313–350). Porter is not the only scholar to accept the industrial organization concept; Mason and Bain have additionally supported it (Powell, Rahman & Starbuck, 2010, 313–350; Ascher, Silva, Polowczyk & Damio da Silva, 2018, 1–20). Except for the fact that the source of competitive advantage is more often assigned to the industry's structure than to the resources inside the organization, this paradigm also relies on the assumption that organizations without a competitive advantage cannot attain superior performance. Regarding ontology, this paradigm is economical, entirely rational, and idealistic. In terms of epistemology, it employs the principles of microeconomics and military strategy. In addition, this paradigm employs numerous quantitative and qualitative methods. The industry is the unit of analysis in the industry-based paradigm. Therefore, it represents a macro level of analysis compared to the source-based view (Eskandarinia, 2021, 82-100; Powell, Rahman, and Starbuck, 2010, 313-350; Ascher, Silva, Polowczyk, and Damio da Silva, 2018, 1-20).

#### **1.1.1.3. Entrepreneurship view**

McGrath, among other researchers, agrees with the Schumpeterian paradigm (Ascher et al., 2018, 1-20; McGrath, 2023, 10-17; McGrath & MacMillan, 2000; Slater & Prichard, 1998, 50).

Such a paradigm strongly emphasizes how innovations, a belief in entrepreneurship, and opportunism result in the development of an effective strategy and the emergence of competitive advantage. As a result, competitive advantage will result from the number, speed, and flexibility of the innovation process (Powell, Rahman, & Starbuck, 2010, 313–350; Ascher, Silva, Polowczyk, & Damio da Silva, 2018, 1–20). This paradigm is economically based, entirely rational, and idealistic in its ontology; scientifically, it employs Everett Rogers' Diffusion of Innovation Theory as epistemology; economically, it is founded on the centrality of innovation;

and methodologically, it draws from a wide range of quantitative and qualitative approaches. It is important to keep in mind that the organization and the entrepreneur within it serve as the unit for investigation in the entrepreneurship paradigm (Eskandarinia, 2021, 82–100; Powell, Rahman, & Starbuck, 2010, 313–350; Ascher, Silva, Polowczyk, & Damio da Silva, 2018, 1–20).

#### **1.1.1.4. Transaction cost view**

This view, proposed by Williamson, Coase, Jensen, and Meckling, relates the development of a successful strategy to the company's transaction costs. In other words, an organization may gain a competitive advantage mainly if it is effective at regulating its transaction costs (Powell, Rahman, & Starbuck, 2010, 313–350; Ascher, Silva, Polowczyk, & Damio da Silva, 2018, 1–20). This paradigm's ontology seems economic, entirely rational, and idealistic; it employs the Agency Theory and the Stakeholders Theory regarding epistemology, and its axiology is founded on cost and benefit. Transaction cost view utilizes both quantitative and qualitative approaches. In such a paradigm, the transaction or exchange serves as the unit of analysis (Eskandarinia, 2021, 82–100; Powell, Rahman, and Starbuck, 2010, 313–350; Ascher, Silva, Polowczyk, and Damio da Silva, 2018, 1–20).

#### **1.1.1.5. The behavioral paradigm**

Powell introduced the behavioral paradigm in 2011. Unlike the other four paradigms centered on economics, entirely rational analysis, and idealism, the behavioral paradigm pays attention to the cognitive biases and errors of decision-makers to create an effective strategy. Such a paradigm considers more sensible presumptions on the behaviors and choices made by organizational decision-makers, including bounded rationality, satisfactory choice, conflict of interests, and people's will. This paradigm describes both individual and group cognitive process in strategic management. Yet, it fails to argue against the logic of competitive advantage or strategy creation. Instead, it emphasizes the need for organizations to take the necessary steps to debias their strategic decision-making process to prevent cognitive errors when creating strategies. As a result, it is presumed that the organization will be successful if cognitive biases are avoided during the process of developing a strategy (Powell, 2011, 1484–1499; Powell, 2017, 162–190; Powell, 2018, 306–312; Powell, 2018, 151–158; Powell & Arregle, 2007, 60–70; Powell & Puccinelli, 2012, 207–214; Powell, Lovallo & Fox, 2011, 1370–1380; Powell et al., 2011)

The behavioral paradigm is non-economic (neo-economic), rational-emotional, and realistic from an ontological standpoint. Qualitative analyses and experimental methods determine individual

and collective errors in the strategic management process. This paradigm evaluates the cognitive errors of strategists or decision-makers at the micro level (Powell, 2011, 1484-1499; Powell & Puccinelli, 2012, 207-214; Powell et al., 2011, 1370 - 1370). Its epistemology is based on neuroscience, behavioral science & neo economics and its axiology relates to debiasing strategic decision-making process (Ascher, Silva, Polowczyk, & Damio da Silva, 2018).

### **1.1.2. Experimental research literature**

It appears that the behavioral paradigm was first proposed by individuals like Powell, Jarzabkowski, Whittington, McKay, and Eskandarinia a few years ago (Eskandarinia, 2022, 1-23; Eskandarinia, 2023; Jarzabkowski, Seidl, & Balogun, 2022, 1533-1550; Johnson et al., 2020, 40; MacKay, Chia & Nair, 1340; Powell, 2017, 170). Investigation on De-Strategizing began with investigations that questioned the rationality of competitive advantage and the development of strategy in organizations (Eskandarinia, 2022, 1-23; Högberg & Willermark, 2023, 285; Powell, 2002, 873-880; Cunha et al., 2017, 140-157; Rabetino, Kohtamäki & Federico, 2021, 154) before moving on to articles that focused on strategy in practice. A published essay addressed the contradiction of strategy creating-de-strategizing (Eskandarinia, 2023). The scientific foundation for this new paradigm is discussed in the following sections.

Thomas Powell (Powell, 2002, 878; Powell, 2003, 288) was the first to suggest that strategy must be investigated without regard to ontology and epistemology.

Hyperrealism during studies has led to an analysis of competitive advantage that is economic. Powell claims that the relationship between strategy, competitive advantage, and superior performance is illogical and that some organizations have succeeded despite not having a strategy or a competitive advantage. On the other hand, Powell states that certain companies using a strategy and a competitive advantage have been justified in being unsuccessful. Grandy and Mills (Grandy & Mills, 2004, 1154) compared the technique to Simulacra and Hyperreality a year after Powell's papers were published. These scholars concluded that strategic management ideas are associated with idealistic rational thinking via the postmodern interpretation of Jean Baudrillard and subsequent historical assessment of strategic management literature.

A group of scholars to disparage the strategy creation view has adopted the phrase "Icarus dilemma." The competence trap, which demonstrates how reputed organizations with a competitive advantage failed, is called the "Icarus dilemma" (Miller, 1992, 24-35; Miller & Le Breton-Miller, 2021, 1901). For instance, Miller (1992, 30) cited companies with exceptional

performance and enduring competitive advantages yet either suffered severe crises or collapsed and declared bankruptcy. Such companies involve Apple, General Motors, IBM, Caterpillar, and Procter & Gamble. Regardless of having a competitive advantage and exceptional performance, such companies failed due to factors including hubris, disorganization, denial of the facts, excessive development and indulgence, disregarding technological advancements, and neglecting the customer's needs. Miller termed this the Icarus dilemma. In her most recent study (Miller & Le Breton-Miller, 2021, 1908), Miller details the pitfalls of resource-based view and competitive advantage creation. These pitfalls include the transformation of strengths into weaknesses, apathetic leadership, arrogance, false self-confidence, learning loss, excessive heterogeneity, misplaced acquisitions, and inertia. According to Miller (Miller, 1992, 24-35; Miller & Le Breton-Miller, 2021, 1901), organizations without a competitive advantage may operate superior for various reasons, including high commitment, effort, motivation, and adaptability. Using strategic analysis and gaining a competitive advantage, a new study has ultimately illustrated how Kingfisher Airlines fell victim to the Icarus dilemma (Sulphey, 2020, 118–124).

Researchers utilized paradox analysis to clarify the paradoxes of strategy creation in response to critiques of the process. The word paradox refers to the inherent inconsistencies involved in developing an approach. For instance, Waldman and Sparr (2023) addressed the paradoxes associated with the diversity strategy, involving the paradox of diversity-integration and diversity-destructive effects (caused by organizational culture) (Waldman & Sparr, 2023, 180), Dmitrieva et al. (2022) have highlighted the paradox of product development-service delivery strategy (Dmitrieva et al., 2022, 147), and Cunha and his colleagues (2017) have compared strategy. They noted the loss of employee motivation due to unachievable objectives (Cunha et al., 2017: 150). Eskandarinia (2023) divided the paradoxes of strategy development into four distinct groups in one of the most current studies: strategy knowledge, effort-result, strategy-following, or following essential activities, as well as the job stress paradox. Researchers additionally address the organization environment evaluation paradox (Bidstrup & Hansen, 2014, 32), the organization, belonging, performing paradox (Jarzabkowski & Van de Ven, 2013, 250), strategic partnership paradox (Jraisat et al., 2022, 3495), and globalization strategy paradox (Tippmann, Monaghan, & Reuber, 2022, 1–10).

The final form of strategy creation criticism relates to the cognitive failing of organizational executives. We can include the error of the blind spot of competitive loss (Eskandari-Nia, 1402)

and numerous strategic thinking (Eskandarinia, 2021, 40) among the most significant exploits associated with creating a strategy and obtaining a competitive advantage. The blind spot error of competitive loss refers to the tendency of organizational leaders to focus exclusively on their organization's strengths out of egoistic tendencies, failing to recognize their company's strategic losses and competitive weaknesses (Eskandarinia, 2023). To further complicate matters, multiple perceptions are a cognitive phenomenon that arises when senior managers and other members of an organization have different and even conflicting ideas regarding the nature of the strategy being implemented.

According to the criticisms of developing a strategy previously addressed, researchers began offering suggestions for enhancing organizational performance without considering the two central tenets of strategic management: developing a strategy and gaining a competitive advantage. These models lack the ontology and science of strategic management and theories of competitive advantage. Instead of conducting macro-level strategic analyses, the industry and the organization are shifting their attention to the individual behaviors and actions of their members, which have an even greater effect on the organization's success and the quality of its performance (Eskandarinia, 2022, 1-23; Jarzabkowski, 2004, 530; Jarzabkowski et al., 2022, 1540; Mackay et al., 2021, 1342; Mueller, 2018, 21; Powell, 2017, 170; Rouleau & Cloutier, 2022, 729). Leverage activities are often defined as actions taken by an organization's members that significantly positively influence the organization's success and enhancement of company performance (Eskandarinia, 2022, 1–23; Powell, 2017, 180). Strategy in practice (Jarzabkowski, 2004, 534; Jarzabkowski et al., 2022, 1590; Mackay et al., 2021, 1360; Mueller, 2018, 16-30; Powell, 2017, 181; Rouleau & Cloutier, 2022, 730) and Pragmatism Strategizing (Eskandarinia, 2022, 18) are two such models in which human behavior is the primary focus of analysis. Such models are thus entirely distinct from theories of competitive advantage in terms of epistemology since they depend on a set of interdisciplinary sciences rather than economic knowledge, including sociology, anthropology, political science, paradox theory, and organizational behavior, and in terms of ontology since they are individual-oriented and action-oriented rather than economic.

While all prior paradigms have supported a connection between strategy, competitive advantage, and performance, the current paradigm shifts the emphasis from industry and competitive analysis to employees' strategic practices and activities. Eskandarinia (2022), Jarzabkowski (2004, 530), Jarzabkowski (et al., 2022, 1540), Mackay (et al., 2021, 1342), Mueller (2018), Powell (2017),

Rouleau & Cloutier (2022, 729), and Jarzabkowski (et al., 2022) employ post-qualitative, critical, narrative research and ethnographic methods to enhance the logic of leverage-performance activities.

Rouleau & Cloutier (2022) suggested the administration model of managerial activities and collective activities using sociological analysis and with the aid of sensemaking theories, Social Structuration, and Practice Theory following the emergence of pragmatist strategizing models or strategy in practice, which are free from epistemology and ontology of strategic management (Rouleau & Cloutier, 2022, 730). With the aid of action theory, Jarzabkowski and his associates (2022) proposed a method whereby, after determining the strategic activities of each organization member, it is decided which individual, in what manner, using what tool, and in what manner the strategic activity leads to Excellence performance of the organization (Jarzabkowski et al., 2022, 1540). The management model of individual and group actions resulting in value creation and innovation was also put out by Högberg and Willermark (2023) with an examination of action theory (Högberg & Willermark, 2023, 288). Through post-qualitative studies, Powell (2017, 180) and Eskandarinia (Eskandarinia, 1401, 1402) offered a critical and ethnographic approach to managing leveraging activities.

## **2. Material and Methods**

According to the objective of the study, which is to highlight the distinctive ontology, epistemology, axiology, methodology and logic of the De-Strategizing paradigm in comparison to earlier paradigms, the qualitative method of content analysis and purposeful sampling until theoretical saturation to compile novel Persian and English articles that concentrate on strategy paradoxes, philosophical critiques of competitive advantage theories, and postmodern implications for strategy is used. The evolving paradigm of De-Strategizing has been discussed after two steps of coding the data from the articles' content. After extracting the raw data from the texts for the qualitative content analysis method, convergent data is merged in the initial coding stage, the combined data is summarized and analyzed in the second coding stage, and the findings are published. Table 2 (Kuckartz & Rädiker, 2023, 11-300) illustrates these phases.

### **2.1. Research validity**

To improve the validity of the qualitative content analysis study, focus on 1. Theoretical diversity of the articles, 2. Originality of the articles, 3. Theoretical saturation, and 4. Correct data coding (Kuckartz & Rädiker, 2023, 312). As a result, publications written in Persian and English by

numerous specialists like Whittington, Jarzabkowski, Rouleau, Chia, Eskandarinia, and Powell have been mentioned to meet the requirements for theoretical diversity. The majority of references are from the past five years in compliance with the usage of new publications, and the two-step procedure of qualitative data coding was additionally implemented.

### 3. Results and Discussion

The collection of articles implemented for qualitative content analysis is presented in Table 1, in addition to the numbering of the data gathered from such articles. The stages of primary coding, secondary coding, and results are displayed in Table 2, employing this data numbering.

**Table 1.** Articles used for content analysis

Source	Subject	Extracted information as data and data numbers
Powell (2002)	Criticism of the Nature, ontology, and Epistemology of strategic management	The philosophy of strategy is now grappling with challenges related to the conceptualization of reality (ontology) and the nature of knowledge (epistemology). The concept of competitive advantage warrants critical examination and calls for a shift toward the pragmatic philosophy of strategy (1).
		Using a critical methodology, I addressed strategy research's ontological and epistemological underpinnings in this and my prior essay (2).
		In practice, the logic of strategy creation, obtaining a competitive advantage, and attaining superior performance is frequently contested and questioned (3).
		Lack of competition or a competitive advantage does not always result in an organization's failure; otherwise, such organizations may also attain better performance (4).
		While this study should be pragmatic, strategy studies have grown to rely heavily on semantics (5).
		A steady competitive advantage will undoubtedly result in superior performance, and an organization lacking a competitive advantage will undoubtedly fail to accomplish superior performance (6). This is according to the logic of competitive advantage and the strategic management methodology.
		This claim that businesses can only prosper if they have valuable, uncommon, and unique resources is demonstrably false (7).
		The intricate field of mathematics has been included in strategic management via the research conducted by Boston and Igor Ansoff. It is argued that the current philosophical approach should be replaced by pragmatism.
		Analysis of strategy should be undertaken apart from its ontology and epistemology. A pragmatic analysis is used in this situation and is more grounded in reality (9).
		The existing body of research on strategic management fails to adequately clarify the connection and correlation between competitive advantage and organizational performance (10).
Powell (2003)	Criticism of strategic management's nature, ontology, and Epistemology	Strategy scholars aim to characterize strategy by either oversimplifying or under-simplifying reality (11).
		Strategic management idealism has produced meta-reality rather than actual reality (12).
		I aim to critique this work's logic of strategy and competitive advantage using critical and postmodern analysis (13).
		Neo-economic, psychological, behavioral, and sociological analysis should replace the logic and positivist approaches of the 1990s in the results and theories of strategic management and competitive advantage (14).

Source	Subject	Extracted information as data and data numbers
Grandy and Mills (2004)	Criticism of Strategic Management's nature, ontology, and Epistemology	<p>Strategic management is entangled in the economy, pure rationality, and idealistic reasoning (15). The actuality of strategy is better understood by theories like social structuring, sensemaking, and postmodernism (16).</p> <p>Competitive advantage-better performance and competitive disadvantage-weak performance are not logically related, and this connection has to be updated (17).</p> <p>In contrast, competitive loss inspires desire, more effort, and tenacity, ultimately improving the organization's performance (18). Competitive advantage may result from characteristics like inertia, a poor culture, pride, and disregard for the customer, which can result in operational weakness. Scholars accomplishing research on strategy and competitive advantage demonstrated a tendency to manipulate terminology and detach themselves from practicality and pragmatism (19).</p> <p>This study's methodology is critical and postmodern (20). Strategic management has evolved into a discipline taught in all business schools during the last three decades, and its models, such as SWOT analysis and value chain, have become well known. However, over time, the reality of strategy has been simplified. (21).</p> <p>The notion of strategy, models for strategic management, and these concepts must contend with meta-reality or pretense (22). The rationale, economic, and planning-based foundations of strategic management. The only way for the organization to succeed, according to strategic management ideas, is to use strategy. These analyses are linear (23).</p> <p>The literature about strategic management is characterized by an idealized and rationalized perspective, which posits that a well-defined plan is crucial for achieving success. In contrast, the absence of a strategy always leads to failure (24).</p> <p>According to Richard Rumelt, it solely seeks academic, teaching, and theorizing objectives and is not a scientific method accepted by pragmatism, as in medicine. There is a misperception that everyone with a strategic plan is knowledgeable and educated and that anyone without a strategy would unquestionably be destroyed, claims Knights and Morgan (25).</p> <p>The intricate and divergent nature of ontology and epistemology within strategic management has rendered this discipline unfeasible and lacking in practicality (26).</p> <p>The inadequate and inaccurate portrayal of the essence of strategy has resulted in the emergence of meta-reality and pretense around the field of strategic management (27).</p> <p>The mission statement among the cohort of global blue chip corporations failed to foster cohesion and achievement, resulting in ambiguity, diverse interpretations, confusion, and impediments (28). Another hyperrealistic pretension of strategic management is strategic leadership, which leads to the formation of superhuman views of the leader's power and prevents other members of the organization from contributing to raising the organization's performance (29).</p> <p>Numerous companies that have employed the well-known value chain and SWOT analyses cannot point to any discernible improvements in performance (30).</p> <p>The issue of feigning strategy has been driven by three currents of thinking from consultants, top managers, and universities (academic research) (31).</p>
Rabetino et al. (2020)	Criticism of the Nature, ontology, and Epistemology of strategic management	<p>Incomplete explanations of common assumptions regarding strategy, organizational environment, corporation, and strategist are found in strategic management research. The first widespread misunderstanding in the literature on strategic management is that strategy is unquestionably the key to an organization's success, and that achievement cannot be attained without it. The second misconception is that strategic analysis may be used to comprehend and forecast an organization's complex, dynamic, and ambiguous external environment.</p> <p>The fourth common misunderstanding concerns the organization's strategist, who is believed to be an economic, rationalist, and superhuman-minded individual. The third common misconception is that</p>

Source	Subject	Extracted information as data and data numbers
		companies have an economic nature and rational-logical behaviors that unquestionably follow the strategy. 32).
Eskandarinia (2021)	Introducing the idea of neo-strategy and criticizing the nature, ontology, and epistemology of strategic management	Since non-economic assumptions and the actual behavior of decision-makers have not been considered, all prevalent strategic management paradigms are founded on the assumptions of total rationality, economic behavior, and financial utility (33). This study was conducted using a reproducible qualitative experimental approach (34). Strategic burnout is caused by the problems of restricted rationality, unpleasant decisions, strategic management stickiness, and intention reversal (35).
Miller (1992)	Criticism of strategic management and competitive advantage through ITT business analysis (Icarus issue or competency trap)	The theoretical frameworks employed in this article include behavioral rationality, the utilitarianism of Bentham, the perspective theory of Kahneman and Tversky, and Powell's neurostrategy (36). A case study and historical analysis were the foundation for the qualitative research methodology (37). Several of the firms listed in this article—including IBM, ITT, P&G, Chrysler, Apple, General Motors, Caterpillar, and Eastern Airlines—have failed due to their attempts at innovation, market expansion, diversity, and growth (38). In the ITT firm, diverse variety, decentralization, and acquisition of other companies provide a competitive advantage, resulting in a lack of financial and management competence to oversee enterprises and high bureaucracy, overconfidence, pride, and perfectionism (39). Well-known corporations such as Airbus, Merck, and Arthur Andersen experienced failure despite possessing a competitive edge due to erroneous analysis, hubris, and an inability to capitalize on emerging possibilities (40). The existing theories on competitive advantage are insufficient in providing a comprehensive explanation for the performance of organizations (41). Achieving a competitive advantage does not directly or significantly correlate with financial success, rising revenue, rising market share, or rising stock value (42). Due to their competitive advantage, firms with a competitive advantage failed (43).
Powell and Arregle (2007)	Strategic management and competitive advantage criticism (Icarus dilemma or competency trap)	According to the investigation conducted by Pfeffer and Sutton, there was a 300 percent performance gap between the worst and best companies among 42 food manufacturing companies that employed nearly identical technologies and knowledge and operated in a similar industry. Consequently, neither industry structure nor internal resources by itself may clarify the accomplishments of an organization and performance (44). Several prominent companies, such as Jeep, Fiat, and Boeing, have encountered controversy, financial crises, and collapse, despite implementing strategic approaches and possessing competitive advantages (45). Organizations without a competitive advantage, and even those with a competitive shortage, have the potential to attain exceptional performance via effective management of important activities and the avoidance of mistakes (46).
Sulphey (2020)	Analysis of Kingfisher Airlines' strategic management and competitive advantage (Icarus dilemma or competency trap)	The present investigation employs a historical overview and a case study of the Kingfisher Company (47). The Kingfisher firm, which possessed a competitive edge and pursued a growth and development plan, went bankrupt due to failing to focus on competition changes and disregarding consumer demands (48).
Miller & Le Breton-Miller (2021)	Strategic management and competitive	Strategic management focuses primarily on the macro-level analysis unit, the industry, and the organization. In contrast, the micro-level analysis unit consists of the actions and behaviors of managers and organization members (49).

Source	Subject	Extracted information as data and data numbers
	advantage: (Icarus dilemma or competency trap)	Strategic strength may result in arrogance, self-confidence, neglect, difference, severe risk-taking, and excessive development; on the other hand, lack of competition results in increased motivation, effort, and creativity, challenging the widely accepted logic of competitive advantage, which states that strategic strengths result in superior performance and weaknesses result into weak performance (50).
		This essay uses critical analysis as its method (51).
		It is essential to employ social and sociological theories, such as Giddens's social structure theory, Bourdieu's habit theory, and action theory, in the theoretical framework and body of knowledge of strategic management in addition to management sciences and economics (52).
		The rational and economic logic of strategic management theories must be balanced with consideration of social, sociological, and behavioral logic (53).
	Strategic management and competitive advantage: (Icarus dilemma or competency trap)	Examining the ontology and epistemology of social theories and sociology is crucial in understanding and applying strategic assumptions. Examining ideas about social structure and habits (54) allows recognition of several realities within strategy research, such as the competency trap, the Icarus dilemma, bounded rationality, perceptual errors, and institutional homogeneity.
Jarzabkowski (2004)		The investigation and evaluation of the patterns, communal and personal actions, and the everyday and customary duties of managers, organization strategists, and employees will provide a comprehensive understanding of the field of strategy science (55).
		Furthermore, incorporating political science into sociology, including the ideas proposed by the Carnegie Mellon school and Weick's social learning theories, may significantly contribute to the depth and complexity of strategic theories (56).
		Strategy's essence is manifested via examining macro, medium, and micro levels of analysis (57).
		The focus of strategic thinking should shift from monitoring the actions of competitors, the industry, and the organization to observing the behaviors and actions of individuals (58).
	Paradox analysis of strategy and competitive advantage critique	The chosen research methodology involves a longitudinal study of the Telco firm (59).
Jarzabkowski et al. (2013)		Strategic management is constantly confronted with the inherent contradictions of differentiation-integration, strategic goals-control, and the balance between preserving the status quo and fostering innovation and transition (60).
		The mission of strategic management cannot be accomplished (61).
	Paradox analysis of strategy and competitive advantage critique	Identifying strategic goals generates several paradoxes. The first paradox is that objectives become increasingly stringent and unattainable as time passes. The second paradox is that strategic goals are established in the present for an unknowable future, causing anxiety and tension. The third paradox relates to individual and team performance expectations. A performance regarded as outstanding today is regarded as satisfactory tomorrow and average in the future (62).
Cunha et al. (2017)		Tesla was significantly engaged in the damage brought by the paradoxes of strategic goals (63).
		The current study employs a critical and postmodern approach to analysis (64).
	Paradox analysis of strategy and competitive advantage critique	Companies struggle with the paradox that their competitive edge declines when they expand and adopt a globalization strategy. This is due to challenges with political and cultural limitations, the size of markets, the variety of customer needs, and financial constraints. (65).
Tippmann et al (2022)		The paradox theory should be considered while properly analyzing strategic management (66).
		A case study of eight companies that used the development strategy and dealt with its paradoxes constitutes the research methodology (67).
	Paradox analysis of strategy and competitive advantage critique	The cornerstone of strategic analysis, the assessment, and the study of the organization's environment generate a contradiction since ambiguity, dynamism, and uncertainty will impede analyses like SWOT (68).
Bistrup & Hansen (2014)		A Danish mining firm is the research technique (69).

Source	Subject	Extracted information as data and data numbers
Jraisat et al. (2022)	Paradox analysis of strategy and competitive advantage critique	<p>The case studies of five companies that used strategic partnerships as their primary strategy served as the foundation for the research methodology (70).</p> <p>Alliances and strategic partnerships typically produce paradoxes, including cultural conflict, conflict of interests, power-seeking, and a need to gain a business partner rather than synergy (71).</p> <p>The methodology relies on paradox analysis (72).</p> <p>The paradox theory must be utilized to analyze businesses' strategy, competitive advantage, and success (73).</p>
Cunha and Putnam (2019)	Paradox analysis of strategy and competitive advantage critique	<p>The dilemma of the relationship between an organization's strategy and its performance is intricately tied to how success is measured. Success is subjective and encompasses several dimensions, making it very difficult to measure or articulate only in terms of financial indicators like profit, sales, or market share. Furthermore, attaining success in a certain domain will result in a divergence from obtaining success in a different domain (74).</p> <p>Hence, it is imperative to refrain from defining strategy logic solely regarding absolute success, performance, or competitive advantage. Instead, it is crucial to acknowledge that success and performance are subject to a relative and incremental nature. Consequently, the evaluation of success and performance should be conducted gradually and continuously, considering the management of activities that contribute to the creation of value (75).</p> <p>The industry's macro analysis unit and the organization's intermediate analysis unit have been tied to the substance and character of the strategy. In contrast, individuals' analysis level has received fewer considerations (76).</p>
Mackay, Chia & Nair (2020)	Paradox analysis of strategy and competitive advantage critique	<p>The socio-cultural setting should be considered while analyzing the method (77).</p> <p>For the analysis of strategy in action, action theory is a valuable theory (78).</p> <p>According to Bourdieu and Weick's sociological theories, investigators have a suitable degree of macro and micro analysis to study strategy (79).</p> <p>The logic of strategic management's long-term planning should be replaced with action, behavior, and habit analysis (80).</p> <p>The science of strategy and its practice diverge significantly (81).</p> <p>Phronetic iterative method (82) is the foundation of the research methodology. Implementing strategic management and strategy formulation process gives rise to four paradoxes in strategy: strategy knowledge, effort-result, following strategy-following essential tasks, and work stress (83).</p> <p>In strategic management, it is recommended to use several theoretical frameworks such as paradox theory, neo-strategy, cognitive diversity, postmodernism, and action theory (84).</p>
Eskandarinia (2023)	The paradox of de-strategizing strategy	<p>The development of a strategic plan and the establishment of a competitive advantage results in the identification and exploitation of a competitive disadvantage's blind spot. This blind spot arises from the leaders' inability to acknowledge their weaknesses, as they are primarily focused on their strengths, driven by pride, a sense of ownership, arrogance, and excessive self-confidence. Moreover, it is often regarded as an extreme viewpoint (85).</p> <p>De-strategizing reasoning is more effective than strategy creation logic (86).</p>
Eskandarinia (2021)	criticism of the ideological, economic, and intellectual arguments for competitive advantage	<p>Methodology: narrative research (87)</p> <p>The nature of competitive advantage is social and sociological (88).</p> <p>The micro-macro analysis level should supplant the macro analysis level in strategic management (89).</p> <p>Organizational behavior theories and sociology, such as symbolic interactionism, sensemaking, the Pygmalion effect, and habitus, contribute to the competitive advantage body of knowledge (90).</p> <p>The relationship between competitive advantage and historical, cultural, and social contexts (91).</p>

Source	Subject	Extracted information as data and data numbers
		Analyzing people's behaviors in organizations is more relevant than the value of a rational-economic study of competitive advantage since the market and organizations comprise individuals who exhibit non-economic behaviors (92).
Powell (2017)	Pragmatic strategizing	Concha y Toro, a company involved in manufacturing and selling drinks, has effectively put a practical plan into practice. This firm retained its top-tier performance in the industry without using any common strategy analysis. (93). Concha y Toro's organization decided to manage individuals' small but significant actions rather than the logic of a significant plan (94). The chess syndrome involves strategic management, which chases the creation of a grand plan. Still, strategy is more like climbing a mountain in that it demands realism, labor, and action (95). Organizations should specify a particular number of leverage activities and continuously regulate and manage these activities to accomplish success in place of strategic management (97).
Rouleau & Cloutier (2022)	Social and administrative management rather than strategic management	When using the theory of action in place of strategic management, consideration should be given to managerial activities, including organization, improvement, and development and the regular social interactions inside the organization. It is important to consider which activities are valuable, who should carry them out, and what resources and tools may be used (98).
Santos et al. (2020)	Methodology of pragmatic strategy	In the discipline of pragmatic strategy, phenomenology, ethnography, narrative research, and foundational data theory are frequently employed methodologies (99). The pragmatic strategy analysis unit is both micro and macro, and rather than concentrating on the organization, it emphasizes its people's daily tasks and activities (100).
Mueller (2018)	The pragmatic application of Goffman's drama theory in strategic decision-making	Strategy practice may gain insight from Erving Goffman's Dramaturgy Theory (101). The use of strategy is similar to staging a play on a stage. The play will never be presented if it is not appealing to, understandable, practical, ethical, and rational for its audience or the organization's members. Consequently, while choosing the activities, these factors should be considered. We may expect this show's success if it is worthwhile in the eyes of the organization's members (102).
Hogberg and Willermark (2023)	Concentrate on pragmatic strategy in a time of rapid change	It is preferable to utilize a pragmatic strategy rather than strategic management in an era that depends on continual changes, innovation, Technology, and unpredictability (103). The pragmatic deconstruction-unsimulacra technique of research methodology (104)
Eskandarinia (2022)	Pragmatic habituation application instead of strategic management	Concentrating on a durable competitive advantage and implementing a long-term, forward-looking strategy is illogical since the true nature of organizations, competition, and industry is transient and unstable (105). The sociological ideas of symbolic interactionism, meaningfulness, and habit theory should be useful for strategic management (106). The organization may be put on the road to success by institutionalizing work practices that create value (107).

The phases of data coding used to implement the logic of the new de-strategizing paradigm are presented in Table 2. The main coding step refers to identifying, classifying, and combining convergent data using content analysis. Following the secondary coding phase, the conclusions and findings are presented when the collected information is summarized.

**Table 2.** Data coding process

Number of data according to Table 1	Primary coding	Secondary coding (summarization)	The results and findings
1,2,3,4,5 7,8,9,10 11,12,15 17,19,21 22,23,24 25,26,27 31,32,33 35,41,42 43,46,49 50,53,54 55,57,58 60,61,65 66,71,74 75,76,77 80,81,83 85,86,88 89,91,92 95,96,97 98,100,103, 105	<p>The results and findings of recent studies demonstrate that specialists have contested and questioned the nature, significance, existential philosophy, and concepts of strategic management, strategy, and competitive advantage. The ideal, logical, and economic link between strategy, competitive advantage, and organizational success has been undermined. Over time, scholars, universities, and consultants have simplified and altered the idea of strategy and competitive advantage and combined it with mathematical philosophy, optimization, modeling, and planning. Consequently, meta-reality and pretense have been developed to clarify why real existence is not a strategy. In this unrealistic interpretation and conception, it is presumed that any manager with a strategy and competitive advantage is intelligent and clever.</p> <p>In contrast, anyone who lacks a strategy is condemned. According to this radical viewpoint, competitive advantage will undoubtedly result in superior performance and success, whereas the absence of competitive advantage or competition will result in inferior performance and failure. However, it is important to note that the assumptions behind the strategy, the organizational environment, the firm, and the strategist have not been adequately and comprehensively elucidated. Much emphasis has been placed on analyzing industries, competition, and organizations within the realm of strategy and competitive advantage research. However, it is essential to recognize that the essence of strategy encompasses both macro and micro levels of study.</p> <p>Inherent inconsistencies, paradoxes, and inadequate assumptions characterize the conventional understanding of strategy and competitive advantage.</p> <p>It is essential to evaluate the strategy from a pragmatic perspective. In the pragmatic perspective of strategy, the unit of analysis consists of people's routines, behaviors, works, and actions. Individuals perform valuable activities through their work, behaviors, and actions, which may contribute to an organization's success. The essence of strategy is not what occurs within an industry, organization, or at the level of competition but rather what individuals do.</p>	<p>The idea of competitive advantage is absent from strategy in practice, and the macro study of an industry, organization, or competitor is given less consideration than the micro examination of people's actions, words, behaviors, and habits. Organizational success in practice results from managing activities that provide value at the micro level.</p>	<p>The ontology of the de-strategizing paradigm</p>
16,36,52 56,66,73 78,79,84 90,101,102 106	<p>The body of knowledge of strategy in practice, which is devoid of common economic and managerial theories of strategic management and competitive advantage, is comprised of Bourdieu's social theories and habitual sociology, Giddens' social structuring, Carl Weick's sensemaking, Symbolic interactionism, Bourdieu's action, Goffman's drama theory, Pygmalion's work and social learning, Kahneman &amp; Tversky's</p>	<p>Strategic management and competitive advantage are entirely distinct from the science of strategic practice. The strategic management body of knowledge is more closely associated with economic and managerial</p>	<p>Epistemology of the de-strategizing paradigm</p>

Number of data according to Table 1	Primary coding	Secondary coding (summarization)	The results and findings
6,13,14 20,34,37 47,51,59 64,70,72 82,87,99 104	<p>Prospect Theory, and Bentham's utility theory, Cognitive theory, paradox theory, postmodern theory, and political science theory are all theories taught at Carnegie Mellon University.</p> <p>The typical approaches utilized in the prevalent paradigms of strategic management and competitive advantages are often quantitative and positive. Ground-breaking and useful methodologies include narrative research, phenomenology, ethnography, foundational data, critical techniques, paradox analysis methods, and novel post-qualitative approaches.</p>	<p>theories. In contrast, the science of strategy in practice encompasses various sociological, anthropological, neo-economic, organizational behavior and psychology, political science, postmodern, and paradox theories.</p> <p>The positivist and survey methodologies typical in strategic management are distinct from how strategy is implemented. The strategy methodology employs qualitative, postmodern, critical, and paradox analysis techniques.</p>	Methodology of the de-strategizing paradigm
7,17,46 50,86	<p>According to research findings, de-strategizing policy is more effective than policy creation. In the logic of de-strategizing, there is no linear relationship between strategy-competitive advantage-company performances because there are examples of companies that accomplished success regardless of lacking a competitive advantage, having a competitive deficiency, and not adhering to the strategic management process. On the other hand, numerous companies fail to succeed despite having a strategy and a competitive advantage.</p> <p>As a result, under the logic of de-strategizing, 1. Strategy in action, 2. Avoiding strategy creation, 3. Focusing on crucial and leveraged activities, and 4. Shifting to the management of critical and leveraged activities is significant and beneficial.</p>	<p>Regarding value and logic, strategy in practice prioritizes de-strategizing, averting strategy creation, and focusing on the administration of essential activities.</p>	The logic and axiology of the de-strategizing paradigm
28,29,30 38,39,40 44,45,47 48,63,67 93,94	<p>Numerous examples of well-known companies that experienced crisis, failure, or bankruptcy despite developing a strategy and gaining an advantage over their competitors. Global Blue Chip, IBM, ITT, P&amp;G, Chrysler, Apple, General Motors, Caterpillar, Eastern Airlines, Airbus, Merck, Arthur Anderson, Jeep, Fiat, Boeing, King Airlines, Fisher, and Tesla are among these corporations.</p> <p>In contrast, companies, including Concha Toro, maintained their performance and attained success without developing a strategy or gaining a competitive advantage.</p> <p>In contrast, the study's findings demonstrated that neither industry structure nor internal resources contributed to competitive advantage and better performance among 43 food production enterprises operating in the same sector and using the same technology and expertise. The researchers discovered a performance gap of 300 percent between the lowest and best firms.</p>	<p>Several companies have experienced disaster, failure, or bankruptcy despite having a strategic plan and a competitive advantage. In contrast, other businesses without a strategy or an advantage were able to succeed exceptionally well.</p>	<p>Examples of businesses that follow strategic management, gain competitive advantage and then fail. On the other hands, examples that don't create strategy, don't have competitive advantage and also have disadvantage.</p>

### **3.1. Philosophical foundation of de-strategizing as a new paradigm: ontology, epistemology, axiology, methodology and logic**

It is possible to identify the development of a new paradigm in strategic management depending on the results of the qualitative content analysis of the articles presented in Tables 1 and 2. This new paradigm, which the researcher called the de-strategizing paradigm, differs significantly from the present five paradigms, namely the resource-based view, the industrial organization view, the entrepreneurship, the transaction cost view, and the behavioral view in terms of ontology, epistemology, methodology, axiology, and logic. Igor Ansoff, Michael Porter, Penrose, Wernerfelt, Bain, Schumpeter, and Boston consultants all contributed to developing common conceptions of competitive advantage and strategic management have mathematics and economical background. Due to the expertise of these individuals, who have backgrounds in mathematics and economics, logical and rational mathematical analysis, quantitative analysis, and economic modeling have permeated strategic management and scientific disciplines.

The first four paradigms, the resource-based view, the industrial organization view, the entrepreneurial view, and the transaction cost paradigm, are likely founded on economic and logical principles and idealism because of the founders' (mathematicians and economists) views. The rational and algebraic logic of strategy creation, obtaining a competitive advantage, and superior performance can be observed in these four paradigms, although fundamental distinctions exist between them. In the industrial organization paradigm, for instance, the organization's strategy is affected by the industry's structure, and the industry's profitability will result in acquiring a competitive advantage and accomplishing optimal performance. However, in the resource-oriented paradigm, a set of resources, capabilities, and competencies within the organization involving Technology achieves a competitive advantage and optimal performance. The behavioral approach is the fifth paradigm, and it differs from the perspectives of the other four paradigms in that it is based on the ideas of Daniel Kahneman and Thomas Powell, who adhere to the logic of behavioral economics and neuroscience. According to the behavioral paradigm, eliminating strategic decisions biases can achieve a competitive advantage.

However, the de-strategizing paradigm relies on an essential and dissimilar premise that there is no connection between developing a strategy and gaining a competitive advantage and premium performance. In essence, industry, organization, and competition analysis units are not appropriate and comprehensive levels of analysis to determine the reality of strategy. Competitive advantage

is not a good predictor of organizational success and superior performance. On the other hand, competitive disadvantage is not a predictor of organizational failure. In this new paradigm, macro and micro levels of study are combined. The organization's members' activities, routines, habits and behaviors within a social, cultural, and historical framework serve as the primary analytical unit. In plainer words, outstanding performance may be attained through controlling organizational members' actions, behaviors, activities, and habits that create value at the organizational level.

Consequently, in the de-strategizing paradigm, close consideration is paid to the activities of the organization's actors so that the overall performance of the organization is improved via the management of these social and managerial activities, rather than emphasizing the process of strategic management, strategic analysis, and seeking a competitive advantage. It should be highlighted that this paradigm views organizational success and performance as relative concepts. In other words, an organization's performance is never compared to its competitors or the industry's performance. Instead, the focus is on the gradual and continuous enhancement of the organization's performance using the management of its members' actions, works, and behaviors. The de-strategizing paradigm exhibits distinct pragmatic characteristics in ontology, using a part-to-whole framework and a non-idealistic relational nature. This paradigm diverges from absolute rational-economic logic and incorporates more realistic neo-economic, neo-classical, political, and sociological logic. In contrast to the earlier five paradigms, this paradigm is based on a wide variety of social, sociological, anthropological, behavioral, psychological, and political theories, including the Carnegie school's political behavior theories, sensemaking theory, action theory, social learning theory, paradox theory, utilitarianism theory, and prospect theory.

Regarding values, priority is given to the micro-level management of the social and managerial activities of the organization's players rather than the industry structure, competitive advantage, and resources. Therefore, the players' acts and behaviors under this paradigm rather than their strategy or competitive advantage are what matters. Finally, from the standpoint of technique, this new paradigm differs from conventional paradigms in that it emphasizes post-qualitative, critical, and qualitative methodologies while still using certain qualitative and descriptive approaches.

#### **4. Conclusion**

By introducing the philosophical foundation of de-strategizing paradigm, a new paradigm in strategic management, this study offered novel insights for strategy academics and senior managers of organizations. The present study is significant and valuable since it has the potential

to enhance organizational strategic activities in the future and to generate original papers on the subject of de-strategizing. Furthermore, it can be claimed that the present study is entirely novel and has opened a new window to the science and practice of strategy by challenging the traditional paradigms of strategic management. Compared to current paradigms from a larger body of knowledge, including social theories and sociology, political science, paradox theory and practice theory the de-strategizing paradigm offers more realistic assumptions about how organizations thrive and attain better performance.

The present article analyzes new findings concerning the theoretical foundations and background discussed in prior research revealing significant disparities. Specifically, the article introduces a novel paradigm known as the de-strategizing paradigm, which diverges substantially from the five paradigms previously examined. This section covers the theoretical underpinnings of the study. According to the resource-based view, organizations gain a competitive advantage and achieve superior performance by collecting valuable and distinctive resources, capabilities, and competencies. In addition, a significant relationship exists between the development of strategy, attainment of competitive advantage, and overall company performance. However, in the de-strategizing paradigm, the connection between strategy, competitive advantage, and performance is weak. Moreover, attaining competitive advantage is not considered a crucial objective in this paradigm, as it may result in organizational failure.

From the perspective of the industrial organization approach, the success and strategy of an organization are determined by the industry's structure. This approach emphasizes the logical relationship between strategy formulation, competitive advantage, and performance. However, in the de-strategizing paradigm, the primary focus of analysis shifts from the industry to social and managerial activities. The individuals comprising the organization's actors are integral to the analysis unit, and the organization's performance is closely tied to the activities, behaviors, and habits demonstrated by these actors. The entrepreneurial approach elucidates how the strategic use of entrepreneurial innovation and opportunism may result in attaining competitive advantage and eventually realizing optimum performance. This approach diverges from the new paradigm's pragmatic technique and microanalysis level. The subject matter has been acquired. The behavioral paradigm shares similarities with the de-strategizing paradigm regarding its neo-economic and psychological rationale. However, it is important to acknowledge that, akin to other paradigms, the behavioral paradigm also advocates for strategy development, albeit with a particular emphasis

on exploitation. The elimination of mistakes and errors is vital in the process of strategy construction. However, the de-strategizing paradigm prioritizes the avoidance of strategy development. This paradigm incorporates neo-economic and psychological reasoning and social, sociological, and political science logic.

The de-strategizing paradigm diverges from the study conducted by Powell, Jarzabkowski, Whittington, et al. Eskandarinia, as discussed in the literature review. These studies discuss certain aspects of the ideas and theoretical frameworks associated with the de-strategizing paradigm. However, they exhibit a limited perspective on the overall scope of this paradigm. Various scholars have explored different perspectives on the topic at hand. Powell has discussed the pragmatic strategy, while Eskandarinia has examined managing habits and behaviors. Jarzabkowski and his colleagues have concentrated on applying action theory, and Rouleau & Cloutier have underscored the significance of managing social and managerial activities. Several attempts have been made to address the concept of de-strategizing; however, none of these attempts have fully understood its overall nature, its various ideas, and the diverse range of approaches used in its study.

This study provides recommendations for organizational managers and scholars in the strategy domain. According to the empirical findings and outcomes, strategists and managers within organizations should consider the limitations and drawbacks associated with prevalent models and frameworks of conventional strategic management paradigms, such as portrait and SWOT analyses. This is because relying solely on these models for strategy formulation and attaining competitive advantage may prove ineffective and potentially lead to crises and failures. Scholars and experts in strategy are recommended to exercise caution when using strategic analyses and techniques that focus on generating competitive advantage. It is advisable to avoid undue reliance on such studies.

Consultants often exhibit bias and tend to advocate for the use of conventional models and patterns in the realm of strategic management. Therefore, consultants should approach novel models, practical strategies, and de-strategizing recommendations with an open-minded and critical mindset and embrace these innovative ways. The dissemination of knowledge and awareness among individuals and organizational leaders is crucial to identify potential challenges and constraints associated with the de-strategizing method. This may be achieved via increased publishing and communication efforts.

To facilitate future study in the domain of de-strategizing, it is recommended to identify and examine organizations that have implemented this model. This analysis aims to ascertain the merits, areas for improvement, and practical constraints associated with this method. It is advisable to do a longitudinal study to evaluate the long-term viability of organizations using pragmatic strategies and de-strategizing techniques to ascertain if their success is transient or enduring. A reduced rate of speed characterizes the pace of the activity. Furthermore, it is possible to research the essential abilities required for de-strategizing or de-strategizing thinking. This may be achieved via the implementation of surveys or by conducting interviews with individuals who employ pragmatic strategizing and de-strategizing methodologies.

This study's primary constraints are the resonance and the generalizability of findings. Given the novelty and limited availability of the de-strategizing paradigm and its associated literature, it is imperative to acknowledge the need for more investigation and research. Additional research should be conducted to explore and expand upon this paradigm and its theoretical underpinnings. One of the constraints of the present study is its external validity, which refers to the extent to which the results may be generalized to other circumstances. The current paradigms of strategic management and its associated theories have significant importance and relevance for scholars and organizational managers. Incorporating rules, theories, models, and ideas from this emerging paradigm into an organization is widely practiced. The process requires a significant amount of time.

### References:

- [1] Ascher, D., Silva, W., Polowczyk, J., & Damião da Silva, E. (2018). Neurostrategy: An advance through the paradigm epistemological in strategic management. *Academy of Strategy Management Journal*, 17(2), 1-20. URI: <https://bazawiedzy.ue.poznan.pl/info/article/UEP0bff468b556349c4b94195b2cbfd04bf/>
- [2] Ateljević, J., Kulović, D., Đoković, F., & Bavčić, M. (2023). *Business Strategy and Competitive Advantage: A Reinterpretation of Michael Porter's Work*. Taylor & Francis.
- [3] Bidstrup, M., & Hansen, A. M. (2014). The paradox of strategic environmental assessment. *Environmental Impact Assessment Review*, 47, 29-35. doi.org/10.1016/j.eiar.2014.03.005
- [4] Cunha, M. P. E., & Putnam, L. L. (2019). Paradox theory and the paradox of success. *Strategic organization*, 17(1), 95-106. doi.org/10.1177/1476127017739536
- [5] Dmitrijeva, J., Schroeder, A., Bigdeli, A. Z., & Baines, T. (2022). Paradoxes in servitization: A processual perspective. *Industrial Marketing Management*, 101, 141-152. doi.org/10.1016/j.indmarman.2021.12.007
- [6] Eskandarinia, N. (2021). Neo-Strategy Theory: Concepts, Assumptions and Applications. *Strategic Management Researches*, 27(80), 41-58. DOR: <https://dorl.net/dor/20.1001.1.22285067.1400.27.80.2.1> (In Persian)
- [7] Eskandarinia, N. (2021). Recognizing competitive advantage theory: Narrative research of Lionel Messi's biography. *An Approach to Business Management*, 2(2), 82-100. doi.org/10.52547/jabm.2.2.82 (In Persian)
- [8] Eskandarinia, N. (2021). Strategy As Thoughts Multiplicity: The Innovative Participatory Learning Metaphor-Drama Research. *Journal of Advertising and Sales Management*, 2(3), 30-47. doi.org/10.52547/jabm.2.3.30 (In Persian)
- [9] Eskandarinia, N. (2022). Strategy As Pragmatic Habituation: An Innovative Pragmatic Deconstruction-Unsimulacra Research. *Journal of Advertising and Sales Management*, 2(3), 1-23. doi.org/10.52547/jabm.3.2.1 (In Persian)

- [10] Eskandarinia, N. (2023). The strategy creation de-strategization paradox: examining the basic duality using Phronetic iterative qualitative method. *Strategic Management Researches*, 29(88). (In Persian)
- [11] Grandy, G., & Mills, A. J. (2004). Strategy as simulacra? A radical reflexive look at the discipline and practice of strategy. *Journal of management studies*, 41(7), 1153-1170. doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-6486.2004.00470.x
- [12] Herold, S., Heller, J., Rozemeijer, F., & Mahr, D. (2023). Dynamic capabilities for digital procurement transformation: a systematic literature review. *International Journal of Physical Distribution & Logistics Management*, 53(4), 424-447. doi.org/10.1108/ijpdlm-12-2021-0535
- [13] Högberg, K., & Willermark, S. (2023). Strategic responses to digital disruption in incumbent firms—a strategy-as-practice perspective. *Journal of Computer Information Systems*, 63(2), 281-292. doi.org/10.1080/08874417.2022.2057373
- [14] Jarzabkowski, P. (2004). Strategy as practice: recursiveness, adaptation, and practices-in-use. *Organization studies*, 25(4), 529-560. doi.org/10.1177/0170840604040675
- [15] Jarzabkowski, P., Lê, J. K., & Van de Ven, A. H. (2013). Responding to competing strategic demands: How organizing, belonging, and performing paradoxes coevolve. *Strategic organization*, 11(3), 245-280. doi.org/10.1177/1476127013481016
- [16] Jarzabkowski, P., Seidl, D., & Balogun, J. (2022). From germination to propagation: Two decades of Strategy-as-Practice research and potential future directions. *human relations*, 75(8), 1533-1559. doi.org/10.1177/00187267221089473
- [17] Johnson, G., Whittington, R., Regnér, P., Angwin, D., & Scholes, K. (2020). *Exploring strategy*. Pearson UK.
- [18] Jraisat, L., Jreissat, M., Upadhyay, A., Sajjad, F., & Balodi, K. C. (2022). Paradox of strategic partnerships for sustainable value chains: Perspectives of not-for-profit actors. *Business Strategy and the Environment*, 31(7), 3491-3508. doi.org/10.1002/bse.3101
- [19] Kuckartz, U., & Rädiker, S. (2023). *Qualitative Content Analysis: Methods, Practice and Software*. SAGE.
- [20] Lovallo, D., & Sibony, O. (2010). The case for behavioral strategy. *The McKinsey Quarterly*.
- [21] MacKay, B., Chia, R., & Nair, A. K. (2021). Strategy-in-Practices: A process philosophical approach to understanding strategy emergence and organizational outcomes. *Human Relations*, 74(9), 1337-1369. doi.org/10.1177/0018726720929397
- [22] McGrath, R. G. (2023). Innovation preservation and cultivation: where to locate transformational projects. *Strategy & Leadership*, 51(1), 10-17. doi.org/10.1108/sl-10-2022-0099
- [23] McGrath, R. G., & MacMillan, I. C. (2000). *The entrepreneurial mindset: Strategies for continuously creating opportunity in an age of uncertainty* (Vol. 284). Harvard Business Press. doi.org/10.1007/bf03396662
- [24] Miller, D. (1992). The Icarus paradox: How exceptional companies bring about their own downfall. *Business Horizons*, 35(1), 24-35. doi.org/10.1016/0007-6813(92)90112-m
- [25] Miller, D., & Le Breton-Miller, I. (2021). Paradoxical resource trajectories: When strength leads to weakness and weakness leads to strength. *Journal of Management*, 47(7), 1899-1914. doi.org/10.1177/0149206320977901
- [26] Mintzberg, H., & Waters, J. A. (1985). Of strategies, deliberate and emergent. *Strategic management journal*, 6(3), 257-272. doi.org/10.1002/smj.4250060306
- [27] Mintzberg, H., Ahlstrand, B., & Lampel, J. B. (2020). *Strategy safari*. Pearson UK. doi.org/10.1108/ws.1999.07948bae.002
- [28] Mueller, F. (2018). Taking Goffman seriously: Developing strategy-as-practice. *Critical Perspectives on Accounting*, 53, 16-30. doi.org/10.1016/j.cpa.2017.03.009
- [29] Nayak, B., Bhattacharyya, S. S., & Krishnamoorthy, B. (2023). Integrating the dialectic perspectives of resource-based view and industrial organization theory for competitive advantage—a review and research agenda. *Journal of Business & Industrial Marketing*, 38(3), 656-679. doi.org/10.1108/jbim-06-2021-0306
- [30] Pina e Cunha, M., Giustiniano, L., Rego, A., & Clegg, S. (2017). Mission impossible? The paradoxes of stretch goal setting. *Management Learning*, 48(2), 140-157. doi.org/10.1177/1350507616664289
- [31] Porter, M. E. (2008). The five competitive forces that shape strategy. *Harvard business review*, 86(1), 78-93.
- [32] Porter, M. E., & Lee, T. H. (2015). Why strategy matters now. *N Engl J Med*, 372(18), 1681-1684. doi.org/10.1056/nejmp1502419
- [33] Powell, T. C. (2002). The philosophy of strategy. *Strategic Management Journal*, 23(9), 873-880. doi.org/10.1002/smj.254
- [34] Powell, T. C. (2003). Strategy without ontology. *Strategic Management Journal*, 24(3), 285-291. doi.org/10.1002/smj.284
- [35] Powell, T. C. (2011). Neurostrategy. *Strategic Management Journal*, 32(13), 1484-1499. doi.org/10.1002/smj.969
- [36] Powell, T. C. (2017). Strategy as diligence: Putting behavioral strategy into practice. *California Management Review*, 59(3), 162-190. doi.org/10.1177/0008125617707975

- [37] Powell, T. C. (2018). Absence-neglect and the origins of great strategies. *Strategy Science*, 3(1), 306-312. doi.org/10.1287/stsc.2017.0037
- [38] Powell, T. C. (2018). Romantics, Mercenaries, and Behavioral Rationality. In *Behavioral Strategy in Perspective* (Vol. 39, pp. 151-165). Emerald Publishing Limited. doi.org/10.1108/s0742-332220180000039011
- [39] Powell, T. C., & Arregle, J. L. (2007). Firm performance and the axis of errors. *Journal of Management Research*, 7(2), 59-77.
- [40] Powell, T. C., & Puccinelli, N. M. (2012). The brain as substitute for strategic organization. *Strategic Organization*, 10(3), 207-214. doi.org/10.1177/1476127012452823
- [41] Powell, T. C., Lovallo, D., & Fox, C. R. (2011). Behavioral strategy. *Strategic Management Journal*, 32(13), 1369-1386. doi.org/10.1002/smj.968
- [42] Powell, T. C., Rahman, N., & Starbuck, W. H. (2010). European and North American origins of competitive advantage. In *The globalization of strategy research* (pp. 313-351). Emerald Group Publishing Limited. doi.org/10.1108/s0742-3322(2010)0000027014
- [43] Rabetino, R., Kohtamäki, M., & Federico, J. S. (2021). A (re) view of the philosophical foundations of strategic management. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, 23(2), 151-190. doi.org/10.1111/ijmr.12244
- [44] Rouleau, L., & Cloutier, C. (2022). It's strategy. But is it practice? Desperately seeking social practice in strategy-as-practice research. *Strategic Organization*, 20(4), 722-733. doi.org/10.1177/14761270221118334
- [45] Rumelt, R. P. (2022). Getting strategy wrong—and how to do it right instead. *The McKinsey Quarterly*.
- [46] Santos, L. L. D. S., Tureta, C., & Felix, B. (2020). A qualitative method proposal for the study of strategy as practice. *Revista de Administração Contemporânea*, 25 (2). doi.org/10.1590/1982-7849rac2021190353.en
- [47] Slater, R., & Prichard, M. J. (1998). Jack Welch and the GE way (pp. 52-53). New York: McGraw-Hill. doi.org/10.1016/s0007-6813(99)80026-3
- [48] Sulphey, M. M. (2020). How Icarus Paradox Doomed Kingfisher Airlines. *Vision*, 24(1), 118-124. doi.org/10.1177/0972262919897646
- [49] Teoh, B. A., Teoh, P. C., Tan, H. C., & Ibrahim, A. (2023). What is next for sustainable competitive advantages in pandemic outbreak context. *International Journal of Productivity and Performance Management*, 72(4), 986-1000. doi.org/10.1108/ijppm-06-2021-0336
- [50] Tippmann, E., Monaghan, S., & Reuber, R. A. (2022). Navigating the paradox of global scaling. *Global Strategy Journal*. doi.org/10.1002/gsj.1435
- [51] Vinardi, C. (2023). *Business Strategy with Hoshin Kanri*. Springer Nature. doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-20963-5
- [52] Waldman, D. A., & Sparr, J. L. (2023). Rethinking diversity strategies: An application of paradox and positive organization behavior theories. *Academy of Management Perspectives*, 37(2), 174-192. doi.org/10.5465/amp.2021.0183