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Many researchers have over the years made attempts to explain and bring convergence on the understanding of the linkage among the variables and/or constructs of strategy, structure and environment. They have generally concluded that although they are closely linked their relationship remains complex and iterative and is not as easy as theory seem to suggest. This paper tries, in light of this complexity on the linkage among the variables existing to bring to light through an in-depth examination of both empirical and theoretical literature review from 47 published studies over the last 40 years. The paper explores and synthesizes the relationship among each pair of variable, explores the impacts of the variables on firm performance and eventually draw suggestions that will be able to direct future research hoping to offer a route towards a complete and simpler understanding of the organizations. Finally, this paper purposes to bring a familiarization to the whole concept of configuration theory in management and strategy research by developing a definition centrality on how the constructs of configuration are causally connected.
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INTRODUCTION

Design choices about an organization’s architecture represent some of the most powerful strategic levers available to the top management of the modern corporation. However, we know surprisingly little about the antecedents and consequences of those choices. It is accepted that optimal design choice is contingent on environmental and internal fit considerations, but the precise connections need revisiting. Most of the theoretical knowledge base in this area is decades old, but this situation has begun to change due to conceptual and methodological innovations in the study of organizations in recent years. Besides this, there is an even greater need to understand how the organization architect adapted will influence or align with the organizations strategy and based on environmental perspective how the three will impact on the corporate performance. Several researchers have identified lack of this understanding as the gap creating the “missing link”.

Attempts to resolve this missing linkage through empirical research has ended up with contradictory conclusions. Hence, there is need to continue with research endeavours, particularly in developing countries, in an attempt to obtain concrete evidence.

Background information

For many years both researchers and practitioners have attempted to learn why some organizations achieve higher levels of performance than others. Empirical studies have suggested that the success of an organization seldom depends upon a single factor but rather it largely stems from the ability to reach and maintain a viable balance among a combination of different factors. To address this, several studies have centered upon relationships between different variables within organizational context and process. A small body of research indicates that success depends upon a contingent relationship between environment and strategy. Likewise these studies indicate that strategist must pay close attention to structure when elaborating the strategic plans; not to take structure into account is to
condemn the firm to inefficiency.

A mismatch between strategy and the structure will lead to inefficiency in all cases meaning a less than optimal input/output ratio and therefore affect performance (Chandler, 1962; Child, 1975). To date though there remains very few studies available that have focused upon the broader issue of the joint influence of these factors upon organizational performance. It is for this reason that researchers are thus interested in the relationship between strategy and structure in organization. Interestingly, despite the near universal recognition of Chandler’s insight and most widely held view that structure follows strategy, there are studies that have also suggested the alternative as true (Hall and Saisa, 1980; Fredrickson, 1986; Russo, 1991). Importantly, they concluded that strategy, structure and environment are closely linked although their relationship remains complex and iterative which makes the debate continue.

A review of literature indicates that most studies have dwelt on measures of performance in relation to individual variables or separately thus failing to demonstrate how these variables may interact to form a strong linkage. Overall, these unresolved issues suggest a lack of specific understanding in diverse literatures of the fundamental linkages between strategy structure, environment and performance, and how they interact with one another. This is the gap that needs to be address by exploring the theoretical conceptual relationship between this constructs while at the same time offering a critical evaluation of major aspects defining meanings of the constructs including the social dynamics through which strategy is shaped and the environmental dynamism. This will also necessitate modification of the existing models which will take into account the linkage paradigm and its effects on corporate performance.

Strategic management orientation
Strategy as a concept is the core concept of strategic management. There are four orientations of strategy management in practise according to literature. The first is that of strategy as a framework within which decisions are made and taken. Accordingly, strategy has been viewed as a set of decision making rules for guidance of organizational behaviour, determination of basic long term goals and objectives, adoption of action, and allocation of resources necessary for carrying out these goals, and the planning and coordinating of growth (Tregoe & Zimmermann, 1980; Robert, 1993). The second orientation proposes that purpose of strategy is to provide directional cues to the organization that enable it to achieve its objectives while responding to the opportunities and threats in the environment (Schendel and Hofer 1979; Rumelt et al. 1995).

The third orientation is that introduced by Quin (1980) where he identifies strategy as the pattern or plan that integrates organization major goals, policies and action sequences into a cohesive whole. This in line with the works of Andrew (1971) and Thompson and Strickland (1992) and Mintzberg (1994) who also view strategy as managerial action plan for achieving objectives. Lastly based on the assertion that firms if not all organizations are in competition for their survival. Porter (1996, 1998) introduced the concept of competitive strategy where he argued that competitive strategy is about being different. Strategy is basically about competition and the means by which an organization tries to gain competitive advantage.

Concept of strategy
The central concept in the field of strategic management is that of strategy and it has continued to elude a common definition and operationalization (Hambrick, 1980). It is generally believed that the concept of strategy has its antecedents in the military discipline. Within its original context, it was simply understood as a military means to a political end. The concept of strategy in military and political context has remained prominent throughout history and has been discussed by many scholars, numerous militarists and political theorists (McKiernan, 2006).

The first treatise on strategy is found in the Asian history and summed up in Sun Tzu’s classic “The Art of War” written about 500 BC (Sun Tzu, 1988). Other early heritage of strategy can be traced from organizational theory to democratic reforms of Kleisthenes (508 BC) in Athens and Musashi’s “Book of the Five Rings”, written in the early 1600’s in Japan.(McKiernan, 1996). It was only through the rise of political institutions such as Government and Churches which used other forms of leverage such as trade and religious dogma that strategy began to widen beyond the realms of the military.

The need for the concept of strategy in business became greater after World War II, as business moved from a relatively stable environment into a rapidly changing and competitive environment. One of the early writers to relate the concept of strategy to business was Von Neumann in 1944. Later in 1947 together with Morgenstern, they developed the “Theory of Games”. This had to do with giving rise to hope that general theory of competitive behaviour would emerge bringing conceptual insight into competition and collaboration/bargaining between and within firms.

Over the past 50 years, the concept of strategy has penetrated the business segments and has been accepted as a management tool for achieving strategic targets. The many definitions given on the concept of strategy can all be captured through definition given by Chandler (1962) in which he emphasized the determination of basic long term goals and objectives, the adoption of courses of action to achieve them, and the allocation of resources as being central to the concept of strategy.

In business environment several dimensions may be
associated with the term strategy. The existence of these dimensions as seen from above definitions is an indication of why so many tools and frameworks exist for strategy. The variety of so many conceptual frameworks and tools in the area of strategy development cannot be regarded as mutually exclusive but must be seen as mutually supportive. It follows that those definitions which take a holistic approach to strategy capture its meaning better than those which take isolated view. In this respect, the time which they are defined is not a factor (Feurer and Chaharbaghi, 1995).

Camillus (2008) describes strategy as a wicked problem which he says is not the degree of difficulty but rather has innumerable cause, is tough to describe and doesn’t have the right answer. He concludes that to effectively deal with wicked issues, executives must explore and monitor the assumptions behind their strategies bringing in the human and social aspects. This aspect is best demonstrated by Lovas and Ghosal (2000) in their paper strategy as a guided evolution. They emphasize incorporation of an important yet realistic role of top management in shaping the direction and outcomes of an evolutionary process within the firm and incorporate human and social capital as critical units of selection within the process.

Figure 1. summarizes several dimensions and gives examples.

**Organization Structure**

The concept of structure is usually understood to imply a configuration of activities that is characteristically enduring and persistent; the dominant feature of organizational structure is its patterned regularity. Yet descriptions of structure have typically focused on very different aspects of such patterned regularity. Some have sought to describe structure as a formal configuration of roles and procedures, the prescribed framework of the organization. Others have described structure as the patterned regularities and processes of interaction (Ranson, Hinings and Greenwood, 1980).

Following from the works of Weber (1946) on bureaucracy, structure can be defined as a formal dimension of framework depicted by precise and impersonal tasks, rules and authority relations. The explicit purpose of such formally circumscribed frameworks remains to achieve more calculable and predictable control of organizational performance (Meyer, 1972; Child, 1972, 1977). This forms the first major school of thought on structure. Out of this school Ghoshal et al. (1994) and, Habib and Victor (1991) proposed a simple way of describing organizational structure. Another popular approach is the mechanistic organic continuum of structures. Mechanistic model implies a hierarchical, rigid structure in which power and authority are centralized at the hands of the top management and the designers of work processes. Organic model as structure types enjoy considerable autonomy and have a high degree of discriminality when making certain decisions (Barney, 2002; David et al., 2002).

There is however the second school of thought. They
break with the typical conception of structures as a formal framework counter posed to the interactive patterns of organizational members. Drawing upon Bourdieu (1971, 1977, 1979) and Giddens (1976, 1977, 1979, 1984), they stress the way structures are continually produced and recreated by members so that the structures embody and become constitutive of their provinces of meaning. Such an analysis must incorporate not only relations of meaning and power but also the mediation of contingent size, technology, and environment. The creativity of members in the face of contextual constraint can only be assessed by setting the analysis in a temporal, historical dimension. Other scholars who reinforce these arguments from their studies include Nightingale and Toulouse (1977) Hall and Saias (1980)

According to Delmas and Toffel (2009) organizational architecture can be divided into explicitly mandated formal structures (incentives, information processing structures and authority relationships) and emergent informal structures (culture, social networks and communities). Later process scholars have acknowledged that administrative procedures are contextualized by social, political and cultural factors (Lovas and Ghosal, 2000). The above arguments ties up with the structuration theory’s and the famous “duality of structure”. (Giddens 1979, 1984). Jarzabkowski (2008) concludes that top managers may draw upon existing structures in the process of altering them, suggesting a more dynamic structurational process which is continuous and can be either sequential or simultaneously applied.

From the works of Rice and Mitchell (1973), there is an increase in need for a hybrid system of defining structure in research. Weick (1976) and March and Oslen (1976) admit that although they may be loosely coupled the position and activities make little structural sense though quite arbitrary. As such organizational structure, therefore describes both the prescribed framework and realized configurations of interactions and the degree to which they are mutually constituted and constituting (Fombrun, 1986).

Environmental context
Environmental context represents an outer environment within which or to influence which, the elements of organizational strategy are blended. Organization theorists emphasize that organizations must adapt to their environment if they are to remain viable. As such a greater need to clearly identify both the components and dimensions of the environment and clearly define them exists. However, one of the shortcomings of much of the theoretical and empirical research on organizational environments has been the failure clearly to conceptualize organizational environment or the elements comprising it (Lawrence and Lorsch, 1967; Thompson, 1967; Terrebery, 1968).

Dill (1962) in one of the earliest attempts to define the environment commented that it is all elements not formally defined as belonging to the organization. Duncan (1972) defined environment as the totality of physical and social factors that are taken directly into consideration in the decision-making behavior of individuals in organizations. This brings into play the behavioral theory of perception of organizational members. A differentiation is made therefore between the internal environment which consist of those relevant physical and social factors within the boundaries of the organization or specific decisions units that are taken directly into considerations in the decision making behavior of individuals in the system. The external environment is the factors outside the boundaries.

Duncan (1972) is credited with the introduction of the empirical construct of environmental perception of uncertainty, degrees of complexity and dynamic environment where behavioral aspects of individuals differ with some having high tolerance for ambiguity and uncertainty than others leading to perception. He identified two dimensions of the environment, namely the simple – complex dimension and the static – dynamic dimension. However, Downey et al. (1975) contradicted Duncan assertions and concluded that uncertainty is an attribute of an individual’s behavior trait and environment rather than an attribute of the physical environment that physical environment attributes should not be used as criterion for uncertainty measure. The works of both has been developed further by Tan and Litschert (1994) who concluded that organizational environments reflect two prominent perspectives. The first perspective is that of information uncertainty, it indicates that as the environment becomes less munificent or more hostile, firms are subjected to greater uncertainty.

Finally, the environment may also be viewed as a multidimensional construct with conceptual and empirical studies having identified several specific environmental dimensions, which include dynamism, complexity and hostility (Dess and Beard, 1984; Child, 1972; Mintzberg, 1979; Miller and Friesen, 1978). Environmental complexity and dynamism have been closely linked to the information uncertainty perspective (Lawrence and Lorsch, 1967; Thompson, 1967), while hostility has been tied to the resource dependence perspective (Aldrich, 1979). The perspectives offer a better understanding of the impact of each environmental dimension on the formulation of a firm’s strategy. (Miles and Snow, 1978; Miller and Friesen, 1982).

Environmental analysis
The unresolved issue among researchers on how environment can be analyzed has been a source of equivocal empirical results. Some researchers have treated the environment as an objective fact independent of firms (Aldrich, 1979) while others have treated the construct as perceptually determined and enacted
surprisingly an open question with few studies using unquestionably assumed (March and Sutton, 1997).

appropriateness, in no matter what form is definition are rarely explicitly justified; instead, its construct has acquired a central role as the deemed goal. However, the definition of organizational performance is common in management research that its structure and of the modern industrial activity. Performance is so Firm performance and its measurement
The organizational performance construct is probably the most widely used dependent variable, in fact it is the ultimate dependent variable of interest for any researchers concerned with just about any area of management yet it remains vague and loosely defined (Richard et al, 2009; Rodgers and Wright, 1998). The construct has acquired a central role as the deemed goal of the modern industrial activity. Performance is so common in management research that its structure and definition are rarely explicitly justified; instead, its appropriateness, in no matter what form is unquestionably assumed (March and Sutton, 1997). However, the definition of organizational performance is surprisingly an open question with few studies using consistent definitions and measures (Adam and Ebert, 1987; Kirby, 2005). Hersey and Blanchard (1998) argued that performance has multiple meanings depending on the discipline and they have given some of the definitions based on management scientists, marketers, accountants and economists. Although firm performance plays a key role in strategic research, there is considerable debate on appropriateness of various approaches to the concept utilization and measurement of organization performance. The complexity of performance is perhaps the major factor contributing to the debate.

Out of literature are three common approaches to organization performance measurement namely the objective measures of performance that tend to be quantitative, the subjective measures that tend to be qualitative therefore judgemental and usually based on perception of respondent, and triangulation. The objective and subjective approaches can also be differentiated in terms of ends and means. Objective measures focus on end results while subjective measures focus on the process or means by which ends results are achieved (Cohen, 1993). Lastly, there is the call for triangulation from multiple measures of multidimensional performance construct and the application of longitudinal analysis both of which have a marginal effect on management literature (Postma and Zwart, 2001, Richard et al., 2009, Ailawadi et al, 2004).

It is critical to note that management research on performance has been locked into three methodological paradigms. That is sociology (survival analysis), psychology (psychometric techniques) and economics (econometrics). This forms the foundation of the new trends of performance measurement that is done on a triple bottom line of economic, social and environmental assessment scale.

Empirical literature review
In trying to understand strategy, structure, environment linkage and corporate performance this section takes an in-depth insight into empirical literature with an aim of creating a clear and simpler understanding of configuration – performance linkage. Focus is on empirical literature so as to see how first configuration is jointly produced by organizational (strategy and structure) and environmental attributes that are critical to a firm in any industry, and second to evaluate if configuration out of both organizational and environmental attributes has any impact on corporate performance.

Strategy structure relationship: What shapes what?
Since Chandlers (1962) classic, the relationship between strategy and structure has been subject of both empirical and conceptual studies with aim and intention to show the direct or indirect link from strategy to structure. Chandler (1962) formed the basis of the structure follows strategy paradigm which was later tested and confirmed
in Britain (Chanon, 1973), France (Pooley-Dias, 1972) and Germany (Thanheiser, 1972). Rumelt (1974) was then able to show how the match influenced performance. In all these cases strategy was characterized mainly in terms of breath of markets either as diversified or undiversified. Structure on other hand was largely according to its divisionalized or departmentalized form and nature of controls.

Firms which are able to achieve a fit between their strategy and structure can create a significant competitive advantage, while firms that do not have a fit are left vulnerable to external changes and internal inefficiencies. As a result, firms with a fit between strategy and structure should perform better than those without such a fit. Organizations face not only an "entrepreneurial" problem (which strategy to adopt), but also an "administrative" problem (the selection of structures that are consistent with the strategy). They argue that, over time, strategy and structure reinforce each other: organizations choose an administrative system that is consistent with their strategy and then find that this system continues to propel them in the same strategic direction (Miles and Snow 1984). This is supported by Chakravarthy (1982) who found out that organizations having different levels of adaptation would utilize different strategies to match their structural arrangements. Using Miles and Snow's (1978) strategy typology, Chakravarthy argued that organizations with a high-level of adaptation would exhibit a prospector strategy and organic structure while organizations with a low-level of adaptation would adopt a defender strategy and a mechanistic structure.

Galan and Sanches – Bueno (2009) after reviewing 10 years data from 1993 to 2003 with context to Spanish organizations concluded that strategy leads structure and structure leads strategy however the former is stronger than the latter. They also concluded that, the relationship between diversification strategy and multidimensional structure postulated by Chandler (1962) focusing on administrative efficiency remains applicable to today’s market only that it requires broadening based on current circumstances. In architecture form follows function. In business, structure follows strategy. In essence, the company decides what its (hopefully) unique approach to marketplace is and structures an organization that best fits that approach. (Abbot, 2009).

STRATEGY AND ENVIRONMENT LINKAGE
A consistent characteristic of the strategy paradigm, regardless of perspective is the assumption of a link between a firm's strategic profile and its external context (Venkatraman and Prescott, 1990). The strategic choice perspective asserts that this linkage has significant implications for performance (Miller and Friesen, 1983), yet empirical evidence is inconsistent and limited to results that reflect market driven economies.

It is further posited that the fit between environmental dimensions and strategic orientation will lead to better organizational performance (Venkatraman and Prescott, 1990). Consistent with this perspective, Mintzberg (1973) defines strategy as a patterned stream of decisions, which focus on a set of resource allocations that are employed in an attempt to reach a position consistent with a firm's environment.

The evidence supporting a relationship between the environment-strategy coalignment and performance is compelling (Smith and Grimm, 1987; Miller and Friesen, 1978, 1983; Miles and Snow, 1978; Venkatraman, 1990; Venkatraman and Prescott, 1990). In particular for firms that operate in competitive environments, the strategy literature indicates that there is a need for a distinctive strategic orientation in order to exploit critical environmental resources and achieve a competitive advantage (Child, 1972; Miller and Friesen, 1983; (Luo and Yu, 1991).

Structure and environment linkage
Over the last decade, environmental issues have become increasingly significant to policy makers in both the political and the business world (Avilla and Bradley, 1993; Ladd, 1994). Globally, governments are increasingly seen to be adopting environmentally aware measures, to regulate the activity of corporations and consumers alike. For the business community, the issue has been how seriously to regard the need for environmentally aware strategies. The environment is increasingly perceived to be affecting bottom line performance, and this presents a fundamental conundrum for the business strategist. A decision is required as to the position a company adopts in relation to the environment. This position may be located anywhere across a continuum ranging from adopting a policy of compliance with existing or future regulations, to attempting to adopt a management strategy (Ghobadian et al., 1995).

Literatures on population ecology of organizations contend that the environment selects out various common organization forms. There are only a rather limited number of possible strategies and structures feasible in any type of environment. In either event the repertoire of viable configurations will tend to happen relatively quickly in short bursts and that once reached, a fairly stable set of configurations will exist over a long period (Karake, 1996). Organizations with too little structure lack enough guidance to generate appropriate behaviors efficiently while organizations with too much structure are too constrained and lack flexibility Okhuysen and Eisenhardt, 2002; Baker and Nelsen, 2005; Siggelkow, 2002; Martin and Eisenhardt, 2000; Rindova and Kotha, 2001; Rivkin and Siggelkow, 2003; Rowley, Behrens, and Krackhardt, 2000).

This is found coherent to structure legitimization by Pavis et al. (2009) who elaborate that entrepreneurial organizations that have narrow structures find the challenge in any environment the same, they need to gain enough strength in the structure before failure.
ensues. For Lowell and Rumelt (2009), in this uncertainty businesses have to do more of what is working out and less of what is not. It is foolhardy to think that one can see the future and design strategies for response. One reason why results from research regarding the interrelationships between organizational form, response to environmental change, and performance may be mixed is that prior research has had the tendency to focus on changes between organizational forms as opposed to also examining changes within organizational form (Fox-Wolfgang, Boal, and Hunt, 1998). Given that organizations can respond to emerging environmental conditions by making changes either within their current form or by changing to another form, the current study examines both within-form and between-organizational-form changes (Davis, Eisenhardt and Bingham, 2009).

STRATEGY STRUCTURE ENVIRONMENT AND PERFORMANCE LINKAGE

Any research domain that contains the study of firms from a strategic management perspective has firm strategy formulation and implementation decisions pointed out as the key in explaining superior performance. Conceptually, this relationship is purported to be within the paradigm that explains the effect of environment, strategy and structure on firm performance. This leads to either the historically dominant approach which focuses on empirical classification of organizations in order to define inductively a set of configurations appropriate to a given context or the deductively derived configurations which apply broadly and are not dependent on particular industry contexts.

Configuration approach

The concept of organizational configuration has been increasingly used in publications on performance of companies. Although promising in this context, the study of organizational configurations encompasses a variety of research streams (Ketchen, 1997; Ferguson, 1999). It remains a very tempting thing to use this concept because it is a vehicle to describe certain characteristics or dynamics of organizations. As a concept it is gaining high recognition in organizational research but even more specific in strategic management “Configuration approach” or archetypes, gestalts, consistency or fit indicates that a firm’s performance will depend on the degree of adjustment existing between organizational context and organization structure remembering that no single form of organization exists that is ideal for every situation (Donaldson, 2006; Zott and Amit, 2008). Ketchen et al. (1997) argue that certain strategies are usually associated with some specific organization structures in particular environments. This can be due to the fact that strategy, structure and environment have some complimentary aspects and what really guides firm success is an appropriate adjustment between this three (Miller et al., 2002; Snow et al., 2005).

Fiss (2008) concluded that the study of organizational configuration which he defines as commonly occurring clusters of attributes of organizational strategies, structure and processes forms a central pillar of both organizational research and strategic management literature. Likewise continuing attention to configuration theories stem from their multidimensional nature, acknowledging the complexity and interdependent nature of organization, where fit and competitive advantage frequently rest not on a single attribute, instead on relationship and complimentary between multiple characteristics (Burton and Obel, 2004; Miller, 1996; Siggelkow, 2002). However, Pertusa-Ortega et al. (2009) in their study evaluating strategy, structure, environment and firm performance in Spanish firms noted a contradiction. To them even when both internal and external adjustments are combined, statistical analysis indicated a contradiction to the fact that completely adjusted firms have a better performance.

Although many studies have included one or more of these sets of variable, to date no study has remained true to Miles and Snow’s contention that optimal performance is a complex interaction of these factors. Also no study has taken the Miles and Snow variables and operationalized them in a model that can test whether the contingencies they posit in theory hold in practice. Studies of private firms investigated whether the effects of strategy are moderated by environment (Davies and Walters, 2004; Luo, 1999). Strategy and Organizational structure (Jennings and Seaman, 1994; Miller and Toulouse, 1986). Processes (Slater, Olson and Hult, 2006). Public sector works (Andrews, Boyne and Walker, 2006; Meier, O’Toole, Boyne and Walker, 2007). Grinyer et al. (1980) in their study analyzing the strategy, structure, environment and firm performance in 48 UK companies concluded that strategy — structure linkage is stable and positive and fit between strategy and structure was found to be negatively correlated with perceived environmental hostility but unrelated to financial performance. Meier et al.(2007) while testing this in several hundreds public organization over a period of six years indicated that at least for those organizations the contingency relationship proposed by Miles and Snow do not hold.

Miller and Friesen (1983) summarized their findings by arguing that successful archetypes adopted differing strategies to cope with differing environments. Management must be able to scan and interpret the environment and make decisions appropriate for both internal arrangement and external alignment. Lenz (1980) found that the combination of environment, strategy, and organizational structure in high-performance firms differed significantly from that of low- performance firms. Similarly, Hambrick (1983) found that alternative strategies did not lead to equal success within an industry. Thus the current literature suggests that different strategies may have different performance
implications.

Astley (1983) indicated that organizations tend to change their elements in a manner that either extends a given configuration or moves it quickly to a new configuration that is preserved for a long time. Piecemeal changes will often destroy the complementary among many elements of configurations and will thus be avoided. Only when change is absolutely necessary or extremely advantageous will organizations be tempted to move concertedly and rapidly from one configuration to another that is broadly different. Such changes, because they are expensive will not be undertaken very frequently. Consequently organizations will adhere to their configurations for fairly long periods.

It is important to note that from above arguments, both theoretical and empirical arguments have been deservedly influential, but more comprehensive and systematic tests are still required. Proper testing requires incorporating the interaction and doing so will serve to demonstrate further that the world of organizations and their strategies do not sort itself out quite as neatly as theory seems to suggest. Results may be mixed with hints of contingencies and complications. Sluismans (2005) concludes that it is not only because of the increasing use of the concept of configuration, but mainly because of this apparent usability in getting closer to the truth as to how things in organizations happen that this concept deserves to be explored. However even with all these, common agreement on what configurations are and how they are used practically is still lacking.

Co-alignment approach

Co-alignment referred to also as consistency, contingency, ‘fit’ is emerging as an important organizing concept in organizational research (Aldrich, 1979), including strategic management (Venkatraman and Camillus, 1984; Venkatraman, 1990). This concept’s relevance to strategic management research stems from a view that the strategy concept relates to the efficient alignment of organizational resources and capabilities with environmental opportunities and threats (Bourgeois, 1980). In general, co-alignment refers to the match between (or among) a set of theoretical dimensions. Its role in the organizational theory literature is important from two different perspectives. First is the descriptive perspective which specifies the existence of relationships among a set of theoretically-related variables without any explicit linkage to performance. Second is the normative perspective which develops an explicit link between co-alignment and performance (Venkatraman, 1990).

Co-alignment, which presupposes the underlying “fit” among environmental and organizational variables, has its roots in the design and environmental schools of strategy and organization theory. The environmental school propounded by Mintzberg (1973), Hannan and Freeman (1977), and Miller, Droge and Toulouse (1988) suggests that the environment is the central actor in the strategy making process. The organization must respond to its environments, or else be selected out. The design school proposes a model of strategy making in which a match or fit is sought between internal capabilities and external possibilities. The two works that were influential in the development of this school include ‘leadership and administration’ by Selzenick (1957) and ‘strategy and structure’ by Chandler (1962).

The development of a scheme powerful enough to compare and contrast all the differing perspectives may be a difficult task. Nevertheless, Venkatraman and Camillus (1984) proposed a conceptual scheme for classifying major schools of thought. Two dimensions underlie the proposed scheme. These include the conceptualization and the domain of fit in strategic management. Regarding the conceptualization of fit, they argued that although strategy has been conceptualized in different ways, one fundamental distinction underlies most conceptualizations on whether the focus should be on the content of strategy or on the process of strategy making. The other dimension addresses the domain of fit. They observed that because strategic management presently serves as a meeting ground for researchers rooted in different disciplinary orientations, the field is marked by great diversity in concepts, terminology and methods of inquiry. Using the classical organization-environment juxtaposition, Venkatraman and Camillus (1984) distinguished three categories of the domain, namely: internal, external, and integrated.

From the foregoing, it is evident that the various propositions on performance implications of environment-strategy relationship rest on the general notion of co-alignment, which is a central anchor for strategic management research (Miles and Snow, 1978; Venkatraman and Camillus, 1984). However, Venkatraman and Prescott (1990) warn that its use in theory construction is limited unless considerable attention is provided to link the articulation of the theoretical position with appropriate operationalization schemes. Specifically, in researching the effects of environment-strategy co-alignment, Venkatraman and Prescott (1990) pointed out the emergence of two important issues. First are the problems surrounding the conceptualization and operationalization of environments and strategy; and second, is the development of an appropriate analytical scheme for systematically measuring the degree of co-alignment and its impact on performance.

CONCEPTUAL MODEL

A conceptual model presented in figure 2 captures the relationships between and among the various variables underpinning the linkage of strategy, structure, environment and performance as discussed in the foregoing sections of the literature review. The conceptual framework suggests interrelationships between and among key variables in this study viz:
strategy, structure, environment and performance. The intervening/moderating factors which are likely to influence the interpretation process are of behavioural, cultural and institutional theory perspectives which are environment in context.

SUMMARY OF EMPIRICAL LITERATURE REVIEW AND KNOWLEDGE GAPS
The studies reviewed above presented mixed findings regarding the relationship between variables of strategy, structure, environment and firm performance. While a number of them found a positive relationship between the variables and performance, others found the opposite. One possible explanation for this situation could be the variety of methodologies and definitions of variables. Another explanation could be the study contextual factors that were not captured by the models employed. Most of these studies were carried out in different countries and different managerial regimes. Table 1

The studies reviewed also seem to examine the direct relationship between the individual variables or specific set of the variables and performance. As such they have overlooked testing the variable interactions, their relations and causal linkage of all of them and consequently the joint impacts on firm performance. As such critical organizational context and implementation issues are ignored. Lastly the studies reviewed have reflected weaknesses in variable definitions and operationalization. Besides limited statistical analysis and ignoring of human elemental factors.

CONCLUSION
The theoretical framework for strategy, structure and environment that has been tested in the past is today under serious scrutiny. Managers are leading more through uncertainty than ever before. Even governments have been drawn back to pay special attention and even bail out businesses. The magnitude of this era will be realized when the fog has faded and new nexus for strategy structure alignment is being sought. The resultant demand is to build flexibility into the strategy process, with a portfolio of initiatives from which best choices shall be made adaptable to the new environment pattern. Firms which are able to achieve a fit between their strategy and structure can create a significant competitive advantage, while firms that do not have a fit are left vulnerable to external changes and internal inefficiencies. Thus under the global economic crisis, the fit between these constructs is likely to be the key focus scholars and practitioners.

Despite this logical explanation empirical results have been mixed. Some researchers have found support for the configurations–performance relationship others report no connection. This equivocality has created concern about the appropriateness of future inquiry. Indeed, in reference to the most prominent approach to configurations strategic groups it has been suggested that it may be necessary to abandon this concept and redirect attention toward other potential determinants of performance. Before research on configurations and performance is abandoned, plausible alternative explanations for the lack of findings should be examined. The role of statistical power in extant research provides one such alternative. Statistical power is, in essence, the probability that an empirical test will detect a relationship when a relationship, in fact, exists.

Specific longitudinal empirical studies in small and medium enterprises more especially in emerging
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year &amp; Journal</th>
<th>Author and journal title</th>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Findings</th>
<th>Gaps/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
### Table 1. Continues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2008- Conference paper at 24th EGOS colloquium in Amsterdam</th>
<th>Fiss, P.C</th>
<th>Configuration of Strategy, Structure and Environment: A Fuzzy Set Analysis of High Technology Firms.</th>
<th>Strategy: Cost leadership, Differentiation. Structure: Formalization, Centralization, Administrative Complexity, Size. Environment: Rate of change, uncertainty. Performance: ROA (pre-tax profit)</th>
<th>Demonstrated existence of several equifinal configurations around grouped samples. Found that pure systems of strategy gave high performance as opposed to hybrid types.</th>
<th>Focused on some measures while excluding others like operationalization of environmental characteristics. Study was on high technology sector only. There is need for cross-industry data.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Economies is recommended to assess the strategy-structure-environment configurations that have been experienced in the changing environment over the economic crisis period being experienced and also provide the linkage to context and the measures. This will be expected to be a significant contribution in knowledge in this area as no other study seems to have considered this holistic approach. Specific recommendation is to test the configuration linkages raised above by examining empirically the situation of SMEs in Kenya which is not only a non-western context but also a country where studies on small and medium enterprises have been globally acknowledged (ILO 1971, Parker and Torres, 1995).
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