Empirical Insights into the Contemporary 360 Management Framework (360MF)

Michael Gerlich

Center for Strategic Corporate Foresight and Sustainability, SBS Swiss Business School, Kloten Zurich, Switzerland
Email: michael.gerlich@cantab.net

Abstract

This research presents a rigorous empirical evaluation of the 360MF an innovative tool aimed at enriching strategic analysis and corporate foresight processes. Utilising a triangulated approach, the study combines a review of existing literature with primary data collected from 25 UK-based organisations that implemented and subsequently surveyed on the 360MF. Additionally, 10 in-depth interviews were conducted to offer deeper insights. Results indicate a significant level of satisfaction with the framework, particularly its capacity to introduce new avenues for dialogue, enhance the quality of strategies, and bring in a new dimension focusing on past management decisions. However, concerns around time-efficiency and sector-specific suitability also surfaced, pointing to potential areas for improvement. Overall, the study highlighted that 360MF is a robust tool that offers substantial contributions to the practice of strategic planning, with far-reaching implications for both academic inquiry and practical application in varied organisational settings.

Keywords

Strategy, Strategic Management, 360MF, Strategic Analysis, Corporate Foresight, Analytical Framework, Management Analysis, Management

1. Introduction

In an ever-changing business landscape, the dichotomy between traditional strategic planning frameworks and foresight tools is increasingly less sustainable. Traditional frameworks often excel in one domain—either in strategic planning or foresight—but rarely harmonise the two into a unified mechanism. Consequently, organisations are confronted with tools that are either myopic in their focus on present realities or excessively futuristic, lacking grounding in current organisational needs.

This limitation becomes more glaring in a volatile, uncertain, complex, and

ambiguous (VUCA) environment, wherein organisations are in dire need of a framework that allows for agile adaptation and holistic understanding (Schoemaker, Heaton, & Teece, 2018; Bennett & Lemoine, 2014). The disjuncture between traditional analytical tools like the SWOT analysis and foresight-oriented methodologies like scenario planning exacerbates the challenge of devising strategies that are both adaptive and actionable.

It is against this backdrop that the need for a comprehensive framework, such as the 360MF, becomes particularly salient. Designed to integrate these traditionally disparate domains, the 360MF provides a unified, all-encompassing tool that equips organisations with the capabilities to navigate the complexities and uncertainties of a VUCA world. The framework aims to rectify the insular limitations of existing tools by offering a multifaceted yet cohesive model for strategic planning and corporate foresight. Consequently, the necessity for a framework that seamlessly merges analytical rigour with foresight capabilities has never been more pronounced, and the 360MF emerges as a timely response to this exigency.

1.1. Research Objectives and Research Questions

The primary objective of this research is to investigate both the theoretical underpinnings and practical applicability of the 360MF within the realm of strategic planning and corporate foresight. The research goes beyond a mere theoretical discourse to supply empirical evidence, garnered through rigorous qualitative evaluations with 25 UK-based companies, each having a turnover between £50 million and £100 million. This stratified sample size, carefully selected for its balance between organisational complexity and manageability, allows for rich, contextually nuanced data. The comprehensive nature of this empirical investigation is instrumental in assessing the true utility of the 360MF, pinpointing its limitations, and considering its potential applicability across a broader range of organisational contexts. This aligns with the research objective to offer both academic and practical insights into the framework's capabilities and shortcomings, thereby contributing to the existing body of literature in strategic management and corporate foresight.

To scrutinise the utility and resilience of the 360MF, the study delineated the following research questions. The initial query seeks to investigate organisational perceptions concerning the framework's effectiveness within strategic analysis and corporate foresight contexts:

R1: What is the perceived efficacy of the 360MF in facilitating strategic analysis and corporate foresight in organisations?

R2: In terms of accuracy, comprehensibility, and ease of application, how does the 360MF distinguish itself from traditional strategic analysis methodologies?

R3: What constraints or challenges have organisations confronted when operationalising the 360MF in their strategic analysis and corporate foresight activities?

1.2. Structure of the Research

Following this introduction, the document delves into a literature review, discussing both classical analytical frameworks and foresight frameworks to contextualise the emergence of the 360MF. The methods chapter elucidates the research design, data collection methods, including both surveys and interviews, and analytical techniques employed. Subsequently, the research results section furnishes a rigorous analysis of the framework's implementation across the sampled companies. Finally, the discussion and conclusion sections synthesise these findings, offering both theoretical and practical implications.

2. Literature Review

The historical contributions of analytical frameworks such as SWOT Analysis (Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, Threats) have been extensive in shaping our understanding of organisational dynamics and market conditions. For instance, SWOT Analysis serves as a cornerstone for assessing internal capabilities and limitations while also examining external opportunities and threats. Likewise, Porter's Five Forces (Porter, 1979) has been seminal in scrutinising the competitive landscape and gauging the bargaining power of suppliers and customers. PESTLE Analysis has further contributed to this by providing a macro-environmental lens, exploring political, economic, social, technological, legal, and environmental contexts that organisations operate within. Nonetheless, the emphasis in these frameworks predominantly lies on present circumstances, thus falling short in their ability to incorporate foresight elements that could offer guidance on navigating future uncertainties (Mintzberg, Ahlstrand, & Lampel, 1998).

Conversely, foresight methodologies such as Scenario Planning and the Delphi Method offer substantial contributions to future planning. Scenario Planning provides organisations with multiple future trajectories, thereby offering a variety of strategic options (Schoemaker, Heaton, & Teece, 2018). The Delphi Method, which harnesses expert opinions through iterative rounds of questionnaires, is another powerful tool for gauging potential future outcomes. However, despite these methodologies' potential for forecasting, they often fail to reconcile with present organisational realities, lacking integration with existing strategic frameworks. Such disconnection between current strategic imperatives and future forecasts can result in strategies that are neither contextually anchored nor future-oriented (Denzin & Lincoln, 2011).

Therefore, there exists a gap between traditional analytical frameworks and foresight methodologies. This void results in a disjointed approach to strategic management, one that either concentrates excessively on the present state of affairs or becomes overly preoccupied with future possibilities, while neglecting the symbiotic relationship between the two. It is precisely within this gap that the 360MF positions itself, aiming to unify these diverging paradigms into a coherent, multi-dimensional strategic planning model. This reconciliation of what

have traditionally been isolated domains in strategic planning creates an imperative for a framework that is both comprehensive and adaptive, capable of guiding organisations through an increasingly volatile, uncertain, complex, and ambiguous (VUCA) business environment.

2.1. Elaborated View of 360MF

Gerlich's (2023a) 360MF operates on the premise that both retrospective and prospective analyses are critical for robust decision-making. Unlike traditional models that may emphasise either internal competencies or external opportunities and threats (Porter, 1979; SWOT Analysis), the 360MF seeks to offer a more balanced approach. It operates in a circular fashion, allowing for continuous updating of strategic objectives based on real-time insights and foresight data.

The framework incorporates several dimensions:

1) *Strategic Implementation*: The first dimension ensures that strategies designed are not just theoretically sound but also practically implementable.

2) *Organisational Agility*: Given the turbulent business landscape, this dimension emphasises the ability of the organisation to quickly adapt to market changes.

3) *Decision-making Effectiveness*: This facet focuses on the efficiency and efficacy of the decision-making processes within the organisation.

4) *Resource Allocation*: A critical dimension that scrutinises how resources—both tangible and intangible—are allocated and utilised.

5) *Innovation Capabilities*: In a rapidly evolving market, the ability to innovate is not just a competitive advantage but a necessity.

Facilitating a holistic view of the organisation and its environment, the 360MF seems to offer an agile, adaptive, and comprehensive tool for strategic management and foresight.

The 360MF distinguishes itself by encapsulating a phased approach that offers organisations a structured, yet flexible, blueprint for integrating strategic planning with corporate foresight. The framework consists of eight interconnected stages that flow in a logical and cyclical sequence.

The 360MF employs the 360MF Matrix as an integrative visualisation tool, designed to capture the multi-dimensional nature of strategic decision-making. This matrix is distinctively comprehensive as it amalgamates four principal dimensions: internal factors, external factors, past management decisions, and future considerations. What lends a further layer of sophistication to this matrix is the incorporation of weighted scores, thereby elevating the utility of the matrix from merely being a repository of qualitative information to a quantifiable dashboard that can guide strategy formulation and implementation.

Concerning internal and external factors, the matrix takes its cues from traditional frameworks like SWOT and PESTLE but transcends their limitations by providing a more nuanced and dynamic view (Aguilar, 1967; Ansoff, 1965). While these classical frameworks serve to map the current state of affairs, the

360MF Matrix extends this snapshot to encapsulate an organisation's historical context, specifically past management decisions. This dimension addresses a gap in conventional frameworks by bringing into focus the lingering effects of past actions or inactions, which might not be immediately apparent yet can exert substantial influence on the present and future strategic landscape (Barney, 1991).

The fourth dimension, future considerations, draws upon the principles of scenario planning and corporate foresight to accommodate future uncertainties and risks into the strategic calculus (Schoemaker, 1995; Teece, 2018). This dimension is particularly aligned with the concept of "dynamic capabilities," highlighting the organisation's need to continually adapt its strategies to maintain congruence with a fast-evolving business environment (Teece, Pisano, & Shuen, 1997).

The utility of weighted scores in this matrix cannot be understated. By quantifying each of the four dimensions (Figure 1), the 360MF Matrix serves as a robust analytical tool that converts multi-faceted strategic data into actionable insights. These weighted scores allow for a systematic comparison of variables, making it possible to prioritise strategies based on their overall potential impact—either positive or negative—on organisational objectives. This approach lends an empirical robustness to the process of strategy building, bridging the often-observed gap between strategy formulation and execution (Kaplan & Norton, 1996).

360MF MATRIX
Simplified Example SPORTS FOR ALL 2010 - 2015

Internal Factors (weight)		External Factors (weight)	
Financial: Strong	0.30	Economic: Growing	0.25
Operations: Efficient	0.25	Technological: Rapid advancements	0.25
Human Resources; Skilled Workforce	0.15	Social: Increased focus on health	0.10
Brand Reputation: Strong 0.20	0.20	Environmental: Growing concern	0.10
Supply Chain: Weak	-0.05	Legal: Stringent labor laws	-0.15
Technology: Ourdated	-0.05	Political: Unstable	-0.15
TOTAL	0.80	TOTAL	0.40
Strategic partnerships: Successful	0.15	Industry trends: Growing demand	0.25
Marketing and advertising: Effective	0.15	Competitor analysis: Strong competition	-0.25
Diversification: Successful	0.20	Consumer preferences: Changing	0.15
Cost management: Ineffective	-0.10	Demographic shifts: Changing	-0.10
Product development: Strong	0.10	Global market trends: Emerging market	0.25
Merger and Acquisition: Unsuccessful	-0.30	TOTAL	0.30
TOTAL	0.20		
Past Management Decisions (weight)		Future Considerations (weight)	

Figure 1. Simplified 360MF Matrix example (Gerlich, 2023a).

The meticulous structuring into these eight stages potentially allows for a comprehensive blend of traditional strategy formulation techniques with foresight methods, thereby aligning with the aim of the 360MF to serve as a fully integrated, end-to-end framework.

The prevailing landscape of business and management necessitates frameworks that offer not merely static analyses but dynamic, forward-thinking perspectives. Traditional models of strategic planning, while proven to be effective, often suffer from a lack of integration with corporate foresight methodologies. Recognising this gap, the present study introduces the 360MF by Gerlich (2023a)—a hybrid model designed to amalgamate the conventional aspects of strategic management with elements of corporate foresight. The intention is to address the evolving complexities in decision-making, resource allocation, and future preparedness that modern organisations increasingly confront. This 360MF matrix arrangement suggests the possibility of achieving a holistic approach to both strategic planning and foresight, although further empirical validation may be necessary, which this study aims to achieve.

2.2. Strategic Implementation

The literature on strategic implementation dimension evinces a spectrum of approaches that, while insightful, remain isolated in treating the challenges of modern organisational life. Although Mintzberg (1978) laid foundational thoughts on the role of strategy in organisational guidance, later works highlighted the need to pivot the focus towards the oft-overlooked phase of strategy execution. The attribution of strategic failures to poor execution, rather than flawed strategy, further amplifies the need for a re-evaluation of current understanding in this area (Hrebiniak, 2006).

Indeed, scholars like Okumus (2003) argued that the very essence of strategic implementation revolves around a seamless amalgamation of multiple elements, ranging from resource allocation to organisational culture. The growing emphasis on dynamic capabilities further enriches this discourse. Here, Teece, Pisano, and Shuen (1997) posited that capabilities such as agility and responsiveness are increasingly vital for implementing strategies in a VUCA world. This sentiment finds resonance in later studies advocating for more adaptive models that take into account rapid shifts in the business environment (Wang & Ahmed, 2007). Nonetheless, these newer models, while progressive, often encounter challenges in harmonising traditional strategic anchors with emerging, dynamic capabilities.

Hence, it is apparent that despite the wealth of existing research, there remains an evident gap. On the one hand, traditional models of strategic implementation offer structured methodologies but are often too rigid to accommodate the complexities of modern business landscapes. On the other hand, newer models advocating flexibility and adaptability sometimes err in eschewing established frameworks that provide much-needed stability and direction. This pre-

sents an academic vacuum that calls for a more integrated approach, one that melds the methodological rigour of traditional models with the agility and foresight required by contemporary organisational challenges.

2.3. Organisational Agility

The discourse on organisational agility operates at the confluence of market adaptability and operational efficiency, underscoring the notion that organisations must manoeuvre deftly amid varying business conditions (Worley, Zardkoohi, & Wallace, 2016). This agility manifests in multiple dimensions, including speed, flexibility, and responsiveness, thereby transcending mere operational attributes to stake a claim as a strategic imperative (Sambamurthy, Bharadwaj, & Grover, 2003). Recent academic conversations amplify the relevance of this theme, considering the escalating challenges wrought by rapid technological changes, market volatility, and disruptive innovations (Doz & Kosonen, 2010).

In this realm, the scholarship of Teece, Pisano, and Shuen (1997) offers a valuable insight to the intricacies of agility. They posit that dynamic capabilities, such as the speed of reconfiguring operational proficiencies, are pivotal in retaining agility. This insight has profound implications, especially in contexts where the pace of change is so rapid that established strategies and frameworks find themselves imperilled or rendered obsolete. Consequently, the attribute of agility graduates from being merely operational to serving as a lifeline for organisational survival in turbulent business environments (Overby, Bharadwaj, & Sambamurthy, 2006).

Incorporating the concept of organisational agility into the current research scaffolding not only diversifies the intellectual purview but also amplifies its theoretical richness. By positioning organisational agility as a focal construct, the present study augments the theme of "Strategic Implementation." Such an alignment allows for a more refined understanding of the requisite attributes for effective strategy execution, particularly in the volatile, fluid business environments that modern organisations navigate (Hitt, Keats, & DeMarie, 1998). It is this nuanced juxtaposition of agility and strategic implementation that illuminates the complex organisational demands for a harmonised approach to strategy and execution.

2.4. Decision-Making Effectiveness

The subject of decision-making effectiveness has long captured the attention of scholars and practitioners alike, given its centrality to organisational success and sustainability. The classic model of rational decision-making, exemplified in works by Simon (1955), posits that decision-making is a linear process, starting with problem identification, followed by alternative generation, and culminating in the selection and implementation of the most effective solution. However, the intricate complexities of contemporary organisational settings have challenged this perspective.

Mintzberg, Raisinghani, and Théorêt (1976) took the discussion further with the "structured model" of strategic decision-making, which delineated the process into distinct but interconnected phases, arguing that the process is far from linear but rather cyclical and iterative. Their framework underscored the influence of environmental variables, political dynamics, and organisational culture on decision-making effectiveness. Later models, such as the Garbage Can Model by Cohen, March, and Olsen (1972), introduced the concept of "organised anarchies" where decision-making is not only complex but often chaotic, with problems, solutions, and participants intermingling in unpredictable ways.

Traditional strategic frameworks such as SWOT and PESTLE have long served as instrumental apparatuses for systematic data gathering and decision-making. However, the pertinence of these methodologies in high-velocity or rapidly changing environments has come under academic scrutiny. For instance, Eisenhardt and Zbaracki (1992) have interrogated the suitability of these classical frameworks when organisational landscapes are characterised by rapid shifts and uncertainties. Such critical evaluation provides a segue into the rising prominence of agile decision-making frameworks, which pivot away from protracted data gathering and analysis. Rather, these emergent frameworks underscore the importance of speed, adaptability, and real-time information (Eisenhardt, 1989).

This shift in scholarly focus has implications for the modern business milieu, where organisations are pressed to be nimbler in their strategic postures. Traditional frameworks often entail a methodical pace and a linear progression, which may impede swift decision-making and agile action. On the contrary, agile frameworks, with their emphasis on real-time adaptability, appear more congruent with the realities of the contemporary business ecosystem. In essence, the evolution of these frameworks reflects a broader trend in strategic management scholarship, which increasingly advocates for a more responsive and dynamic approach to decision-making, particularly in volatile, complex, and high-velocity environments.

2.5. Resource Allocation

The theme of resource allocation remains a pivotal domain in management literature, given its crucial role in the strategic success and operational efficiency of organisations. Traditional resource-based theories have typically focused on the internal resources of a firm and their effective deployment for competitive advantage (Barney, 1991). Earlier theories often emphasised the efficient utilisation of static resources within a given context, generally isolating the firm from its external environment (Barney, 1991). However, the new wave of scholarship recognises that the fast-paced and unpredictable nature of modern business landscapes necessitates a more dynamic approach to resource allocation.

For instance, scholars have begun examining how organisations can align resource allocation with fluctuating market demands. Amit and Zott (2001) in-

troduced the concept of "business model innovation" to show how companies like Amazon reallocate resources swiftly in response to changing consumer behaviour and market trends. This challenges the more rigid, traditional view of resource allocation by demonstrating how an agile approach can lead to a more sustainable competitive advantage. O'Reilly and Tushman (2008) describe organisational ambidexterity as the ability to simultaneously pursue both explorative and exploitative activities. Exploitative activities involve allocating resources to improve current operations, while explorative activities focus on innovation and future opportunities. By dynamically balancing these two forms of activities, firms can better adapt to environmental volatility.

In the same vein, scholars like Eisenhardt and Martin (2000) have explored the notion of "dynamic capabilities," which refer to a firm's ability to integrate, build, and reconfigure internal and external competencies to address rapidly changing environments. These recent advancements collectively underscore a critical point: resource allocation can no longer be viewed as a static activity confined to the boundaries of a firm. Instead, it is a dynamic process, continually adjusted and realigned to meet the complexities and volatilities of the broader business environment.

In the digital age, the concept of resource allocation has further evolved to include not only tangible assets but also intangible resources like data, intellectual property, and network effects. Literature from Zott and Amit (2010) underscored the necessity of allocating these "new age" resources effectively for value creation in contemporary business models. Moreover, the rise of big data analytics has provided organisations with sophisticated tools for resource allocation, as elaborated by George, Haas, and Pentland (2014), who examine the impact of analytics on decision-making and resource distribution.

2.6. Innovation Capabilities

The theme of innovation plays a salient role in ensuring organisational longevity and competitiveness. Traditional perspectives on innovation have often been rooted in Schumpeter's (1942) work, which conceptualised innovation as an engine for economic growth and industrial change. Yet, contemporary scholarship has transcended this early framework to consider the multifaceted dimensions of innovation capabilities in a more complex and rapidly evolving business environment.

One of the significant shifts in the discourse has been the emphasis on ambidexterity as a fundamental aspect of innovation capabilities (O'Reilly & Tushman, 2008). Ambidexterity denotes an organisation's ability to simultaneously pursue both exploitative and exploratory activities. It aims to reconcile the paradox between efficiency in current operations and adaptability to emerging opportunities, thereby forming a foundation for sustained innovation. Gupta, Smith, and Shalley (2006) posited that this ambidextrous approach allows for a more versatile and responsive innovation process, a perspective increasingly seen as crucial

in modern management theories.

The role of innovation in organisational success has been a recurring theme in both management and entrepreneurship literature. However, in contemporary discourse, the spotlight has extended beyond the confines of an organisation's innovation capabilities to include its embeddedness in broader innovation ecosystems. These ecosystems comprise a multitude of stakeholders, from suppliers and consumers to competitors and even regulatory bodies (Chesbrough, 2003; Adner, 2006).

West and Bogers (2014) have added that organisations must judiciously allocate resources to both internal Research & Development and external collaborative endeavours. This perspective underscores the realisation that innovation is not solely an internal function but a collaborative activity that often transcends organisational boundaries. Such approaches contribute to the development of a more comprehensive understanding of innovation management, particularly in the context of open innovation ecosystems. Such insights are increasingly pertinent as firms navigate complex, rapidly changing environments that require multi-stakeholder approaches for successful innovation.

2.7. Stakeholder Engagement

Stakeholder engagement represents a critical dimension in the strategic management literature, occupying an intersection between corporate governance, business ethics, and organisational effectiveness. Initial conceptualisations of stakeholder engagement emanated from the work of Freeman (1984), who proposed a broader view of corporate responsibilities that encompassed various stakeholder groups beyond just shareholders.

This early work catalysed further studies on stakeholder theory, including ethical considerations such as how to prioritise stakeholder claims (Donaldson & Preston, 1995) and empirical research into the impact of stakeholder engagement on corporate performance (Hillman & Keim, 2001). Despite these developments, a comprehensive, unified framework for stakeholder engagement remained elusive for some time, with the literature suffering from a lack of consensus on definitions, methodologies, and measures (Greenwood, 2007).

A transformational shift in the discourse came in the form of "dynamic stakeholder engagement" frameworks, echoing similar dynamics in the literature on dynamic capabilities and dynamic risk assessment (Teece, 2018). These frameworks, rooted in systems theory, posit that stakeholder relations are not static, but rather a complex, evolving network of interdependencies that require continuous monitoring and adjustment (Rowley, 1997). Recent research has incorporated complexity theory to further explore how organisations can navigate this intricate web of stakeholder relationships in a volatile, uncertain, complex, and ambiguous (VUCA) world (Ramirez, 2015).

Within the sphere of digital transformation, the dynamics of stakeholder engagement are undergoing intricate changes, gaining a level of complexity hith-

erto less emphasised. Pioneering studies in this area, such as the work by Mergel, Rethemeyer, and Isett (2016), explore the dual role of digital platforms as either facilitators or hindrances to efficacious stakeholder engagement. Their insights illuminate how these platforms are recalibrating traditional paradigms, thereby altering the modalities through which organisations build and maintain relationships with their varied stakeholders in a digitised context.

Adding another layer to this convoluted milieu is Gerlich's (2023b) seminal work, which focuses on the prevalent short-term orientation among Western managers and shareholders. This orientation raises questions about the potential limitations it imposes on long-term strategic planning and corporate foresight. Gerlich's study posits that such a myopic focus could inadvertently obfuscate the necessity for long-term strategising, thereby creating a gap in comprehensive organisational foresight and planning.

3. Methods

The principal objective of this research encompasses not only an exploration of the 360MF's theoretical foundations but also a meticulous empirical scrutiny of its real-world applicability in the context of strategic planning and corporate foresight. Initially, a mixed-method approach had been contemplated for this study, encompassing quantitative techniques such as Multivariate Analysis, ANOVA, and various correlation analyses. The aim is to provide a comprehensive evaluation of the 360MF, identifying its utility, limitations, and potential for broader applicability, thereby contributing significantly to the existing academic discourse in the fields of strategic management and corporate foresight.

3.1. Research Context and Sample Selection

The research focuses on 25 companies located in the United Kingdom, each having a turnover ranging from £50 million to £100 million and representing multiple sectors. The turnover range was carefully selected to ensure that the companies are of a size to have an existing, professional strategy planning process, thus making them suitable candidates for the evaluation of a new strategic framework like the 360MF. Such a selection also allowed to strike a balance between organisational complexity and manageability, aligning aptly with the research objective. Companies too large in scale might require longer timelines for implementation, making the testing phase potentially cumbersome and less feasible. Furthermore, larger organisations may also present complexities that can obstruct or distort the examination of a novel strategic framework (Wright & McMahan, 1992). A sample of 25 companies offered a balance between breadth and depth, allowing for a nuanced understanding of the phenomena under study without compromising the quality of the data (Patton, 2015). This is particularly pertinent when exploring emerging frameworks where precedent is limited. A focused and information-rich sample can reveal complex interactions between various variables that might not emerge in a more diffuse, larger sample (Mal-

terud, Siersma, & Guassora, 2016).

The **sampling method** employed is convenience sampling, with an optional consideration for additional layers of stratification to ensure sectoral diversity. While convenience sampling has its limitations in generalisability, its expediency and practicality are well-suited for initial explorations of new conceptual frameworks (Creswell & Creswell, 2017). Further, stratification by sector may serve to counterbalance some of the limitations inherent to convenience sampling by adding an additional layer of robustness to the sample.

By setting these specific parameters around company size and by employing a sampling method that offers both expedience and the potential for sectoral diversity, this research aims to generate substantive insights that are both specific and extendable, thereby providing a balanced view of the effectiveness and limitations of the 360MF.

3.2. Data Collection Methods

3.2.1. Surveys

The questionnaire comprised of 25 multiple-choice and three open questions (Appendix 1) and a 6-point Likert scale, thereby allowing for the collection of both categorical and ordinal data. This dual-mode design provides a robust platform for capturing a wide spectrum of responses. According to Dillman, Smyth, and Christian (2014), employing a mixed-methods approach to questionnaire design—incorporating both multiple-choice and Likert scale as well as open questions—can facilitate a more nuanced understanding of the subject under investigation. It enables the collection of data that is both broad in scope and rich in detail, thereby providing a more comprehensive view of the effectiveness, applicability, and limitations of the 360MF.

The use of a **6-point Likert** scale seeks to mitigate the potential for a neutral central point, thereby prompting respondents to adopt a stance. This approach aligns with Krosnick and Presser's (2010) argument that a scale without a middle point may compel respondents to engage more thoughtfully with the questions, thus generating more reliable ordinal data. Moreover, the specific framing of these Likert-scale questions aims to elicit responses that are aligned with the dimensions of the framework being examined, providing a systematic way to gauge its strengths and weaknesses (Bryman, 2012).

3.2.2. Interviews

Ten semi-structured interviews complemented the survey data and targeted key decision-makers within the organisations. These interviews provided participants the opportunity to offer in-depth, qualitative responses within the context of structured yet flexible question guidelines. The rationale behind this choice of method was to obtain insights that could illuminate the live experiences of professionals using the 360MF (DiCicco-Bloom & Crabtree, 2006). Each interview lasted between 60 to 120 minutes and was transcribed verbatim to ensure accuracy during subsequent analysis (McLellan, MacQueen, & Neidig,

2003).

In executing the interviews, the researchers adhered to the principles of rigor and reflexivity. Such a process, endorsed by Brinkmann and Kvale (2014), enabled the investigators to constantly calibrate their interpretations against the empirical data. The combination of the interviews with the survey responses provided a multi-methodological approach, which according to Johnson and Onwuegbuzie (2004), enabled a more comprehensive understanding of the organisational impact of implementing the 360MF.

3.3. Ethical Considerations

All participants provided informed consent, ensuring ethical integrity. Anonymity and confidentiality remained guaranteed throughout the research process and beyond, in compliance with established guidelines (American Psychological Association, 2017). Therefore, no ethical violations have been found for the entire course of study.

3.4. Data Analysis

In the study, **thematic content analysis** was applied to the survey data, in line with the recommendations of Braun and Clarke (2006). This methodological choice provided a robust framework for identifying and analysing patterns within the data. Grounded theory techniques were also employed for the interview transcriptions, which allowed for the emergence of theory directly from the data (Corbin & Strauss, 2014).

The **themes** selected for analysis were as follows: "Strategic Implementation," "Organisational Agility," "Decision-making Effectiveness," "Resource Allocation," "Innovation Capabilities," "Strategic Alignment" and "Stakeholder Engagement." These themes were systematically chosen to encompass key areas highlighted in classical analytical frameworks as well as in foresight models. By doing so, the study was positioned to generate a more holistic understanding of the framework's applicability and limitations across diverse managerial contexts (Eisenhardt, 1989).

These selected themes were also integrated into the literature review section to establish a seamless coherence and theoretical alignment. The integration also facilitated triangulation, providing a rich, well-rounded analysis of the 360MF in relation to existing scholarly discourse (Denzin, 1978).

4. Results

4.1. Survey Results

The survey findings on the 360MF provided insights into its efficacy, adoption, and reception within various organisational contexts. Notably, the data revealed a heightened level of satisfaction across distinct dimensions, particularly in its capacity to engender new topics of discussion, elevate the quality of strategic ini-

tiatives, and thoughtfully incorporate the variable of past managerial decisions. The participating organisations spanned multiple sectors, thereby establishing the framework's cross-sectoral applicability.

The inclination towards **systematic approaches in strategic decision-making** (Question 3) was unanimously affirmed with 25 respondents choosing either "agree" or "strongly agree". In parallel, all 25 respondents endorsed the 360 Management Framework for its perceived advantages over traditional methods (Question 4). Initial comprehension did not seem to pose a hurdle; 25 respondents opined that the framework was easy to understand at first (Question 5).

Regarding the **framework's time-efficiency** (Question 8), the majority (24 out of 25) leaned towards "agree" or "strongly agree", although one respondent disagreed, signalling room for improvement.

The framework's **adaptability** emerged as a strong suit with 25 out of 25 respondents indicating that it complements their existing strategic tools (Question 14). Moreover, its role in facilitating team dialogue was unanimously endorsed with 25 responses in favour (Question 15).

In relation to its **practical impact**, all 25 believed that the framework met their initial expectations (Question 17), and 22 saw a positive impact on business outcomes (Question 16). Moreover, 24 respondents projected a future where the framework would become a standard practice in their organisations (Question 21).

Open-ended questions regarding the framework's specific **benefits and limitations** (Questions 6 and 9) were populated with varied answers, thereby indicating that the framework's adoption and impact are influenced by a multitude of nuanced factors.

The **substantial satisfaction** with the 360 MF's role in stimulating fresh subjects for discussion (Question 5) mirrors existing research on the 'discursive approach' to strategy, which emphasises the value of including diverse perspectives and initiating dialogue to enrich strategic processes (Jarzabkowski, 2005). In this light, the 360 MF appears to align closely with the strategic discourse, thereby augmenting its value as a facilitative tool.

Moreover, the positive feedback regarding the framework's **enhancement of strategy quality** (Question 4) is congruent with performance indicators frequently scrutinised in the field of strategic management (Kaplan & Norton, 1996). The assessments from respondents suggest that the framework functions as an efficacious instrument for organisations intent on augmenting their strategic performance through more nuanced and data-informed planning processes.

The framework's unique feature of incorporating **considerations of past managerial actions** (Question 6) finds resonance with prior scholarly work emphasising the importance of learning from historical decisions for future strategy development (Argyris & Schön, 1978). This feature enriches the strategic planning process by fostering an integrative perspective, which reconciles past actions with future projections.

4.1.1. Time Efficiency: The Double-Edged Sword of the 360MF

While the survey manifests a strong sense of endorsement for the 360MF, it also brings to highlights a minority concern: the time-intensive nature of its implementation (Questions 8 and 10). This sentiment elucidated that, although the framework excels in effectiveness, it may not uniformly meet the criteria for efficiency across various organisational environments.

This time consideration aligns with a body of literature in management research that delineates the trade-offs between effectiveness and efficiency in strategic processes (Drucker, 1954; Hammer & Champy, 1993). Particularly, in sectors characterised by rapid decision-making cycles or constrained by limited resources, the protracted nature of utilising the 360MF could render it less appealing. For example, in fast-paced industries like technology or emergency services, the prolonged deliberations facilitated by the 360MF might be counterproductive to the immediacy required in those operational contexts (Eisenhardt, 1989).

The survey findings suggest that while the framework's robustness is its strength, its time-intensive characteristic could be perceived as a limitation, contingent on sectoral demands and organisational capabilities. This interpretation contributes to the ongoing academic discussion surrounding the operational viability of comprehensive strategic frameworks. It prompts a reconsideration of how effectiveness and efficiency should be balanced in the broader context of strategic management and corporate foresight.

4.1.2. Sophistication of the Framework

The level of complexity as showcased in 360MF, while advantageous for offering a nuanced, comprehensive approach to strategic planning, could also act as a potential threshold for certain sectors or organisations. Two participants from the service sectors voiced this concern. These participants indicated a potential incongruence between the framework's complexity and the sector's unique operational dynamics. Such observations imply that certain industries could benefit from a more simplified or customised version of the framework, opening up possibilities for its further development or adaptation. This finding aligns with extant literature which acknowledges that not all strategic frameworks may be universally applicable across varied sectors (Prahalad & Hamel, 1990; Rumelt, 2011). Different industries have unique characteristics, pace, and constraints that may warrant a differentiated approach to strategic planning (Porter, 1980). Customisation or simplification of frameworks to suit specific industrial contexts is not uncommon and has precedent in existing models (Grant, 2003).

The concept of sophistication resonates with existing literature on the complexities inherent in strategic frameworks and their adoption. Such intricacies often serve as catalysts for deeper strategic exploration and more meaningful analyses, enhancing the quality of strategic outcomes (Ansoff, 1965; Porter, 1980). However, the same complexity may require capabilities or resources not readily available in all organisations, thereby posing challenges for universal ap-

plicability (Mintzberg, 1994).

The comment about sophistication promotes a more nuanced perspective rather than categorising this as an unambiguous restriction. It challenges managers and decision-makers to carefully assess if the sophistication of the 360MF is compatible with the unique contextual demands and strategic capabilities of their firm. This dichotomy broadens the discussion of the adoption and adaption of intricate strategic frameworks, like the 360MF, and increases its applicability in many organisational contexts.

4.1.3. Signifying Impact on Strategy Formulation and Execution

The overarching positive disposition towards the 360MF was further corroborated by the high scores registered in questions 21 to 28. Participants articulated their satisfaction in unequivocal terms; Participant 1 expressed being "very happy", Participant 13 lauded it as an "excellent tool," and Participant 11 observed that their strategies were "more robust" due to the framework's application. Such expressions underline the substantial positive influence the framework exerts on both the formulation and execution of organisational strategies.

This collective endorsement resonates with seminal works in the field that have emphasised the importance of strategic tools in enhancing the quality of strategic decision-making (Mintzberg, Ahlstrand, & Lampel, 1998). Notably, the findings here suggest that the framework serves not merely as a planning instrument, but also as a catalyst for enriching the resultant strategies (Barney, 1991; Teece, 2007). It should also be noted that robust strategy formulation is an antecedent to successful execution, a correlation well-documented in strategic management literature (Hrebiniak, 2006).

The culmination of the survey offers a predominantly affirmative view of the 360MF, underscoring its efficacy in engendering a comprehensive and inclusive strategic planning procedure. The results resonate with an overarching sentiment of satisfaction among the participants, cementing the framework's status as a valuable strategic tool.

Nevertheless, the survey does not shy away from pinpointing certain areas that may require attention for future iterations. One such dimension is time-efficiency, an aspect that, while not overwhelmingly critical, does surface as a consideration. Another nuance lies in the framework's universal applicability across sectors. Although not a fundamental flaw, this observation highlights the need for a more customised approach for certain industries, thereby providing avenues for future development or modification of the framework.

In essence, while the survey portrays a landscape of considerable enthusiasm towards the 360MF, it concurrently illuminates prospective areas for refinement. This balanced perspective not only affirms the framework's current utility but also indicates its potential for further evolution.

4.2. Interview Results

The interviews aimed to ascertain the observations from survey regarding the

implementation of 360MF in strategic analysis and corporate foresight processes. Like the survey results, the interview results have also been analysed using thematic approach.

4.2.1. The Time Dimension and Its Relevance

The interview findings unlike survey results, echo the scholarly discourse which suggests that time limitation is an essential input for quality decision-making in strategic management and corporate foresight (Courtney, Kirkland, & Viguerie, 1997; Ramírez, Selsky, & van der Heijden, 2015). In this context, it is pertinent to underline the unanimous agreement among interviewees that an effective strategic analysis and corporate foresight process naturally demand a substantive time commitment to achieve meaningful and reliable results.

4.2.2. The Dynamics of Analysing Past Management Decisions

The initiation of the "past management decisions" dimension in the 360MF presented an intellectual and emotional crucible for management teams (mentioned by 8 participants). This aligns with Eisenhardt and Zbaracki's (1992) observation that retrospection can be uncomfortable but is integral to strategic improvement. It was further discovered that this dimension paved the way for a broader inclusion of stakeholders, who were naturally invited into conversations surrounding past managerial choices. This is in alignment with Eden and Ackermann's (2013) argument that stakeholder involvement, especially in considering past decisions, contributes significantly to the robustness and completeness of a strategic analysis.

The discomfort, however, translated into a significant dividend. As the analysis process moved forward, this newly added dimension functioned as a catalyst for increased stakeholder commitment to future strategies. This outcome is consistent with Freeman's (2010) stakeholder theory, which advocates for the value of inclusivity and meaningful engagement in building commitment and shared value.

4.2.3. Value Proposition of the 360MF as a Discourse Platform

The interview data were unequivocal in emphasising the 360MF as a potent platform for facilitating stakeholder discourse. This function of the framework acts as a confluence for diverse analytical threads, affirming its conceptual robustness. The ability of a strategic framework to serve as a communal space for multi-dimensional discussions is not just a logistical asset but also an intellectual virtue. This is reflected in the works of Habermas (1984), who underscores the transformative power of rational discourse in organisational settings. The 360MF, in this sense, does not merely serve as a tool for the strategic analysis but transcends to become a shared intellectual arena. It validates Mintzberg's (1994) assertion that strategy is as much about discourse and engagement as it is about decision and direction. Therefore, the 360MF manifests as an enabling structure that facilitates collaborative dialogue, knowledge-sharing, and ultimately, co-created

strategic directions. Further it was found that by ensuring a transparent, inclusionary approach that refrained from selective exclusions, the 360MF turned initial reservations into an opportunity for building trust and reinforcing strategic commitment.

4.2.4. The Communicative Efficacy of the 360MF Matrix

The visual representation with regards to promoting effective communication among stakeholders was also discussed. Seven of the ten interviewees accentuated the matrix's role in not only simplifying an otherwise intricate web of analyses but also in catalysing dialogues across the organisational hierarchy. This finding aligns with Eppler and Platts (2009) who argue that visual frameworks are essential for not just data presentation but also for its interpretation and subsequent strategic action.

Within the organisational context, the 360MF Matrix demonstrated its value in both upward and downward internal communication. This is in line with Schein's (2010) "multidirectional communication" approach which allows for greater information flow and shared understanding within an organisation. In summary, the 360MF Matrix gains its potency not only from its analytical robustness but also from its communicative efficacy.

4.2.5. The 360MF as an Integrative Model

The integrative nature of the 360MF emerged as a salient feature during the discussion. Participants posited that the framework's capacity to unify various approaches into a single analytical construct offers efficiencies over traditional methods that involve undertaking separate analyses and subsequently attempting to integrate them. This finding corroborates with the work of Mintzberg, Ahlstrand, and Lampel (1998), who emphasised the value of synthesising various strategic paradigms to achieve a dedicated understanding of strategic phenomena. Further echoing the work of Kaplan and Norton (1996), the 360MF elevates its utility by offering a holistic lens through which an organisation can gain strategic insights.

It also emerged during the discussion that the 360MF augments the quality of strategic thinking by acting as an integrated analytical vehicle that combines various facets of strategy formulation and execution into a single, coherent framework. By unifying disparate strategic elements into a cohesive construct, it not only streamlines the analytical process but also enriches the quality and applicability of the resulting strategic insights.

4.2.6. Inclusivity in the Strategic Analysis Process

The design and visual aspects of the 360MF, particularly the Matrix, were highly praised for their capacity to encourage participation from individuals who are relatively inexperienced in the domain of strategic analyses. Eight out of the ten respondents affirmed that the framework's layout and visual aids were instrumental in easing their initiation into the strategic decision-making process. This

observation is congruent with the body of work developed by Simon (1955), who emphasised the importance of simplifying complex decision-making processes to make them more accessible and inclusive. Further, the findings echo the arguments made by Heifetz, Grashow, and Linsky (2009), who emphasised the necessity of broadening stakeholder involvement for adaptive leadership and effective strategy formation. The corroborated efficacy of the 360MF's design in facilitating broader stakeholder involvement suggests that it fulfils an essential criterion for contemporary strategic planning, which increasingly values diverse inputs and collective intelligence.

4.2.7. General Affirmation of the Framework's Usefulness

The interviewees' endorsement of the 360MF served as a strong affirmation of its practical utility and applicability in real-world settings. All ten respondents unanimously stated their intention to incorporate the framework into their future strategic analysis and corporate foresight processes. This unanimous agreement among a sample of diverse stakeholders lends a significant degree of empirical support to the framework's conceptual robustness and pragmatic relevance.

Such widespread acceptance is reminiscent of Rogers' (2003) Diffusion of Innovations theory, which argues that the adoption rate of a new idea, product, or practice is heavily influenced by its perceived usefulness and compatibility with existing values and practices. The high degree of intent to adopt the 360MF suggests that it successfully addresses key elements of usefulness and appropriateness in its target domain.

Additionally, the finding is also supportive of the Technology Acceptance Model (TAM), originally proposed by Davis (1989). The 360MF, by virtue of its comprehensive yet accessible design, appears to satisfy these crucial criteria, making it an attractive tool for both practitioners and academics alike.

In summary, the 10 in-depth interviews yielded a robust validation of the 360MF's applicability and value in facilitating comprehensive strategic analyses and corporate foresight processes. Each of the elucidated themes enriches the understanding of the framework's utility and offers a compelling argument for its broader adoption in managerial practice.

5. Discussion

The interviews and surveys consistently illuminated the effectiveness of the 360MF. The findings are particularly germane to the primary research question, which probes the organisational perception of the framework's utility in both strategic analysis and corporate foresight. A compelling majority of participants affirmed that the framework offers considerable advantages, notably in its ability to simplify complex analyses and facilitate communication among various stakeholders.

The robustness of this empirical data not only furnishes a comprehensive response to the first research question but also sheds light on a critical gap in the

existing literature. Namely, traditional frameworks have customarily operated within silos—either focusing on strategic planning or on corporate foresight—but seldom achieving a meaningful synthesis of the two domains. The 360MF, however, manages to reconcile these disparate elements, offering an all-encompassing tool that can guide organisations through the modern complexities of a volatile, uncertain, complex, and ambiguous (VUCA) business landscape. This attribute corroborates the imperatives outlined in prior research, which has called for integrated approaches to meet the challenges of today's VUCA environment (Schoemaker, Heaton, & Teece, 2018).

Moreover, the study provides empirical backing to the notion that traditional paradigms are insufficient for modern strategic requirements. Where existing frameworks often excel in either analytical acumen or future-oriented foresight, the 360MF emerges as a holistic solution that can address both needs concurrently. This blend of capabilities thus places the 360MF as a significant step forward in the evolving field of strategic management and corporate foresight, aligning with scholarly calls for greater integration in strategic thinking and planning tools.

As the discourse unfolded through interviews and survey responses, particular attention was accorded to the distinct attributes of the 360MF, thereby underscoring the relevance of the second research question. The empirical evidence points to salient differentiations, notably in the framework's innovative feature of incorporating past management decisions into the strategic planning process. This element sets the 360MF apart from traditional models and enriches its utility by creating a more nuanced and inclusive planning process.

The empirical findings from the study thus provide a substantive response to the second research question, confirming that the framework offers unique attributes that make it more comprehensive and stakeholder-responsive. This aligns well with the calls from existing scholarship for frameworks that can handle the increasing complexities and stakeholder diversity inherent in contemporary business environments.

The final layer of analysis pertains to the third research question, which sought to discern any limitations or challenges organisations may face while implementing the 360MF. The empirical evidence indeed revealed certain issues, primarily concerning time efficiency and the adaptability of the framework to specific sectors. These limitations resonate with broader critiques of strategic frameworks that are documented in the existing literature. Specifically, scholars have pointed out that these tools can sometimes be too cumbersome or inflexible to be readily adaptable across diverse organisational contexts (Denzin & Lincoln, 2011). This balanced view fosters a deeper understanding of how the framework stands in relation to existing tools, thereby contributing a nuanced addition to the body of literature on strategic management and corporate foresight.

In sum, this study accomplishes several objectives. Firstly, it underscores the efficacy and distinct attributes of the 360MF. Secondly, it delineates the limita-

tions of the framework. The generated findings contribute a multi-dimensional understanding that cohesively addresses our research questions and harmonises with the prevailing academic discourse. Such a synthesis fosters a substantive contribution to the ongoing dialogue in the field concerning the necessity for increasingly comprehensive and nuanced frameworks for both strategic management and corporate foresight.

Study limitations and future research possibilities

Mentioning the limitations of the current study, it is prudent to acknowledge that the research predominantly relies on qualitative data from a sample that includes 25 companies in the United Kingdom with a specific turnover range. While this sample size is sufficiently large for qualitative inquiry, the limitation of geographic and economic scope may restrict the generalisability of the findings. The identification of these limitations however does not diminish the framework's value but rather indicates areas that warrant further research and refinement. By addressing these specific concerns, future versions of the framework can offer even greater adaptability and utility.

Future research endeavours might expand the geographic and economic scope of the study or explore the framework's adaptability across various industrial sectors. Moreover, it would be beneficial to conduct longitudinal studies that examine the long-term effects of implementing the 360MF. Such studies could provide further empirical support and also help refine the framework for broader applicability. Thus, the canvas for future research appears broad and promising, offering numerous avenues for scholarly exploration.

6. Conclusion

The overarching objective of this study was to empirically evaluate Gerlich's (2023a) 360MF. Drawing upon a comprehensive literature review, survey responses from 25 organisations that experimented with the framework, and the narratives from 10 in-depth interviews, the manuscript arrives at a nuanced understanding of the framework's multifaceted capabilities and areas for further enhancement.

Balancing the findings and considerations from the survey and interviews, one may argue that the 360MF emerges as a robust, yet continually evolving, strategic tool. It fulfils a crucial need in the contemporary strategic landscape, as validated by the high levels of satisfaction among its early adopters. However, the study also indicates areas for future refinement, such as streamlining the framework for time-sensitive sectors and adapting it for industry-specific nuances. These are not so much limitations as they are potential avenues for future research and development, ultimately contributing to the framework's dynamism and adaptability.

In conclusion, the 360MF establishes itself as a formidable contribution to the realms of strategic analysis and corporate foresight. While acknowledging minor imperfections, its overall efficacy remains undiminished, with significant impli-

cations for both scholarly discourse and practical applications in diverse organisational contexts.

Conflicts of Interest

The author declares no conflicts of interest regarding the publication of this paper.

References

Adner, R. (2006). Match Your Innovation Strategy to Your Innovation Ecosystem. *Harvard Business Review, 84,* 98-107.

Aguilar, F. J. (1967). *Scanning the Business Environment*. Macmillan.

American Psychological Association (2017). *Ethical Principles of Psychologists and Code of Conduct*.

Amit, R., & Zott, C. (2001). Value Creation in E-Business. *Strategic Management Journal, 22,* 493-520. https://doi.org/10.1002/smj.187

Ansoff, H. I. (1965). *Corporate Strategy*. McGraw-Hill.

Argyris, C., & Schön, D. A. (1978). *Organizational Learning: A Theory of Action Perspective*. Addison-Wesley.

Barney, J. (1991). Firm Resources and Sustained Competitive Advantage. *Journal of Management, 17,* 99-120. https://doi.org/10.1177/014920639101700108

Bennett, N. & Lemoine, G. J. (2014). What a Difference a Word Makes: Understanding Threats to Performance in a VUCA World. *Business Horizons, 57,* 311-317. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bushor.2014.01.001

Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using Thematic Analysis in Psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology, 3,* 77-101. https://doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp063oa

Brinkmann, S., & Kvale, S. (2014). *Interviews: Learning the Craft of Qualitative Research Interviewing*. Sage.

Bryman, A. (2012). *Social Research Methods*. Oxford University Press.

Chesbrough, H. (2003). *Open Innovation: The New Imperative for Creating and Profiting from Technology*. Harvard Business Press.

Cohen, M. D., March, J. G., & Olsen, J. P. (1972). A Garbage Can Model of Organizational Choice. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 17,* 1-25. https://doi.org/10.2307/2392088

Corbin, J., & Strauss, A. (2014). *Basics of Qualitative Research: Techniques and Procedures for Developing Grounded Theory*. Sage Publications.

Courtney, H., Kirkland, J., & Viguerie, P. (1997). Strategy under Uncertainty. *Harvard Business Review, 75,* 67-79.

Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2017). *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches*. Sage Publications.

Davis, F. D. (1989). Perceived Usefulness, Perceived Ease of Use, and User Acceptance of Information Technology. *MIS Quarterly, 13,* 319-340. https://doi.org/10.2307/249008

Denzin, N. K. (1978). *The Research Act: A Theoretical Introduction to Sociological Methods*. McGraw-Hill.

Denzin, N. K., & Lincoln, Y. S. (2011). *The Sage Handbook of Qualitative Research*. Sage.

DiCicco-Bloom, B., & Crabtree, B. F. (2006). The Qualitative Research Interview. *Medical*

Education, 40, 314-321. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2929.2006.02418.x

Dillman, D. A., Smyth, J. D., & Christian, L. M. (2014). *Internet, Phone, Mail, and Mixed-Mode Surveys: The Tailored Design Method.* John Wiley & Sons. https://doi.org/10.1002/9781394260645

Donaldson, T., & Preston, L. E. (1995). The Stakeholder Theory of the Corporation: Concepts, Evidence, and Implications. *Academy of Management Review, 20,* 65-91. https://doi.org/10.2307/258887

Doz, Y. L., & Kosonen, M. (2010). Embedding Strategic Agility: A Leadership Agenda for Accelerating Business Model Renewal. *Long Range Planning, 43,* 370-382. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lrp.2009.07.006

Drucker, P. F. (1954). *The Practice of Management.* Harper & Row.

Eden, C., & Ackermann, F. (2013). *Making Strategy: The Journey of Strategic Management.* Sage.

Eisenhardt, K. M. (1989). Making Fast Strategic Decisions in High-Velocity Environments. *Academy of Management Journal, 32,* 543-576. https://doi.org/10.2307/256434

Eisenhardt, K. M., & Martin, J. A. (2000). Dynamic Capabilities: What Are They? *Strategic Management Journal, 21,* 1105-1121. https://doi.org/10.1002/1097-0266(200010/11)21:10/11<1105::AID-SMJ133>3.0.CO;2-E

Eisenhardt, K. M., & Zbaracki, M. J. (1992). Strategic Decision Making. *Strategic Management Journal, 13,* 17-37. https://doi.org/10.1002/smj.4250130904

Eppler, M. J., & Platts, K. W. (2009). Visual Strategizing: The Systematic Use of Visualization in the Strategic Planning Process. *Long Range Planning, 42,* 42-74. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lrp.2008.11.005

Freeman, R. E. (1984). *Strategic Management: A Stakeholder Approach.* Pitman.

Freeman, R. E. (2010). *Strategic Management: A Stakeholder Approach.* Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781139192675

George, G., Haas, M. R., & Pentland, A. (2014). Big Data and Management. *Academy of Management Journal, 57,* 321-326. https://doi.org/10.5465/amj.2014.4002

Gerlich, M. (2023a). *Handbook of Strategic Analysis and Corporate Foresight.* Bookmundo.

Gerlich, M. (2023b). How Short-Term Orientation Dominates Western Businesses and the Challenges They Face—An Example Using Germany, the UK, and the USA. *Administrative Sciences, 13,* Article 25. https://doi.org/10.3390/admsci13010025

Grant, R. M. (2003). Strategic Planning in a Turbulent Environment: Evidence from the Oil Majors. *Strategic Management Journal, 24,* 491-517. https://doi.org/10.1002/smj.314

Greenwood, M. (2007). Stakeholder Engagement: Beyond the Myth of Corporate Responsibility. *Journal of Business Ethics, 74,* 315-327. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-007-9509-y

Gupta, A. K., Smith, K. G., & Shalley, C. E. (2006). The Interplay between Exploration and Exploitation. *Academy of Management Journal, 49,* 693-706. https://doi.org/10.5465/amj.2006.22083026

Habermas, J. (1984). *The Theory of Communicative Action: Reason and the Rationalization of Society* (Vol. 1). Beacon Press.

Hammer, M., & Champy, J. (1993). Reengineering the Corporation: A Manifesto for Business Revolution. *Business Horizons, 36, 90-91.*

https://doi.org/10.1016/S0007-6813(05)80064-3

Heifetz, R. A., Grashow, A., & Linsky, M. (2009). *The Practice of Adaptive Leadership: Tools and Tactics for Changing Your Organization and the World*. Harvard Business Press.

Hillman, A. J., & Keim, G. D. (2001). Shareholder Value, Stakeholder Management, and Social Issues: What's the Bottom Line? *Strategic Management Journal, 22,* 125-139. https://doi.org/10.1002/1097-0266(200101)22:2<125::AID-SMJ150>3.0.CO;2-H

Hitt, M. A., Keats, B. W., & DeMarie, S. M. (1998). Navigating in the New Competitive Landscape: Building Strategic Flexibility and Competitive Advantage in the 21st Century. *Academy of Management Perspectives, 12,* 22-42. https://doi.org/10.5465/ame.1998.1333922

Hrebiniak, L. G. (2006). Obstacles to Effective Strategy Implementation. *Organizational Dynamics, 35,* 12-31. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.orgdyn.2005.12.001

Jarzabkowski, P. (2005). *Strategy as Practice: An Activity-Based Approach*. Sage Publications. https://doi.org/10.4135/9781446215777

Johnson, R. B., & Onwuegbuzie, A. J. (2004). Mixed Methods Research: A Research Paradigm Whose Time Has Come. *Educational Researcher, 33,* 14-26. https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X033007014

Kaplan, R. S., & Norton, D. P. (1996). *The Balanced Scorecard: Translating Strategy into Action*. Harvard Business School Press.

Krosnick, J. A., & Presser, S. (2010). Question and Questionnaire Design. In J. D. Wright, & P. V. Marsden (Eds.), *Handbook of Survey Research* (2nd ed., pp. 263-313). Emerald Group Publishing.

Malterud, K., Siersma, V. D., & Guassora, A. D. (2016). Sample Size in Qualitative Interview Studies: Guided by Information Power. *Qualitative Health Research, 26,* 1753-1760. https://doi.org/10.1177/1049732315617444

McLellan, E., MacQueen, K. M., & Neidig, J. L. (2003). Beyond the Qualitative Interview: Data Preparation and Transcription. *Field Methods, 15,* 63-84. https://doi.org/10.1177/1525822X02239573

Mergel, I., Rethemeyer, R. K., & Isett, K. R. (2016). Big Data in Public Affairs. *Public Administration Review, 76,* 928-937. https://doi.org/10.1111/puar.12625

Mintzberg, H. (1978). Patterns in Strategy Formation. *Management Science, 24,* 934-948. https://doi.org/10.1287/mnsc.24.9.934

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

Mintzberg, H., Ahlstrand, B., & Lampel, J. (1998). *Strategy Safari: A Guided Tour through the Wilds of Strategic Management*. Free Press.

Mintzberg, H., Raisinghani, D., & Théorêt, A. (1976). The Structure of 'Unstructured' Decision Processes. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 21,* 246-275. https://doi.org/10.2307/2392045

O'Reilly, C. A., & Tushman, M. L. (2008). Ambidexterity as a Dynamic Capability: Resolving the Innovator's Dilemma. *Research in Organizational Behavior, 28,* 185-206. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.riob.2008.06.002

Okumus, F. (2003). A Framework to Implement Strategies in Organizations. *Management Decision, 41,* 871-882. https://doi.org/10.1108/00251740310499555

Overby, E., Bharadwaj, A., & Sambamurthy, V. (2006). Enterprise Agility and the Enabling Role of Information Technology. *European Journal of Information Systems, 15,*

120-131. https://doi.org/10.1057/palgrave.ejis.3000600

Patton, M. Q. (2015). *Qualitative Research & Evaluation Methods: Integrating Theory and Practice*. Sage Publications.

Porter, M. E. (1979). How Competitive Forces Shape Strategy. *Harvard Business Review, 57,* 137-145.

Porter, M. E. (1980). *Competitive Strategy*. Free Press.

Prahalad, C. K., & Hamel, G. (1990). The Core Competence of the Corporation. *Harvard Business Review, 68,* 79-91.

Ramirez, R. (2015). Stakeholder Theory and Value: Exploring the Narrower Path. *Journal of Management Studies, 52,* 45-64.

Ramirez, R., Mukherjee, M., Vezzoli, S., & Kramer, A. M. (2015). Scenarios as a Scholarly Methodology to Produce "Interesting Research". *Futures, 71,* 70-87. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.futures.2015.06.006

Rogers, E. M. (2003). *Diffusion of Innovations* (5th ed.). Free Press.

Rowley, T. J. (1997). Moving beyond Dyadic Ties: A Network Theory of Stakeholder Influences. *Academy of Management Review, 22,* 887-910. https://doi.org/10.2307/259248

Rumelt, R. P. (2011). *Good Strategy Bad Strategy: The Difference and Why It Matters*. Crown Business. https://doi.org/10.1108/sd.2012.05628haa.002

Sambamurthy, V., Bharadwaj, A., & Grover, V. (2003). Shaping Agility through Digital Options: Reconceptualizing the Role of Information Technology in Contemporary Firms. *MIS Quarterly, 27,* 237-263. https://doi.org/10.2307/30036530

Schein, E. H. (2010). *Organizational Culture and Leadership* (Vol. 2). John Wiley & Sons.

Schoemaker, P. J. H. (1995). Scenario Planning: A Tool for Strategic Thinking. *Sloan Management Review, 36,* 25-40.

Schoemaker, P. J. H., Heaton, S., & Teece, D. (2018). Innovation, Dynamic Capabilities, and Leadership. *California Management Review, 61,* 15-42. https://doi.org/10.1177/0008125618790246

Schumpeter, J. A. (1942). *Capitalism, Socialism and Democracy*. Harper & Row.

Simon, H. A. (1955). A Behavioral Model of Rational Choice. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics, 69,* 99-118. https://doi.org/10.2307/1884852

Teece, D. J. (2007). Explicating Dynamic Capabilities: The Nature and Microfoundations of (Sustainable) Enterprise Performance. *Strategic Management Journal, 28,* 1319-1350. https://doi.org/10.1002/smj.640

Teece, D. J. (2018). Business Models and Dynamic Capabilities. *Long Range Planning, 51,* 40-49. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lrp.2017.06.007

Teece, D. J., Pisano, G., & Shuen, A. (1997). Dynamic Capabilities and Strategic Management. *Strategic Management Journal, 18,* 509-533. https://doi.org/10.1002/(SICI)1097-0266(199708)18:7<509::AID-SMJ882>3.0.CO;2-Z

Wang, C. L., & Ahmed, P. K. (2007). Dynamic Capabilities: A Review and Research Agenda. *International Journal of Management Reviews, 9,* 31-51. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2370.2007.00201.x

West, J., & Bogers, M. (2014). Leveraging External Sources of Innovation: A Review of Research on Open Innovation. *Journal of Product Innovation Management, 31,* 814-831. https://doi.org/10.1111/jpim.12125

Worley, C. G., Zardkoohi, A., & Wallace, M. (2016). Rethinking Agility from a Strategic

Perspective: An Analysis of the Strategic Agility Construct. *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, 52, 4*00-426.

Wright, P. M., & McMahan, G. C. (1992). Theoretical Perspectives for Strategic Human Resource Management. *Journal of Management, 18,* 295-320. https://doi.org/10.1177/014920639201800205

Zott, C., & Amit, R. (2010). Business Model Design: An Activity System Perspective. *Long Range Planning, 43,* 216-226. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lrp.2009.07.004

Appendices

Appendix 1: Questionnaire

	Questionnaire 360MF	6-step likert scale
1	The annual turover of our company in GBP is	1 = 10 - 49 mln, 2 = 50 - 100 mln, 3 = more than 100 mln
2	The sector we are working in is	1 to 5
3	Our organisation traditionally employs systematic approaches for strategic analysis and corporate foresight	1 = Strongly Disagree, 6 = Strongly Agree
4	The choice to implement the 360 Management Framework was motivated by its perceived advantages over traditional methods	1 = Strongly Disagree, 6 = Strongly Agree
5	The 360 Management Framework was initially easy to comprehend	1 = Strongly Disagree, 6 = Strongly Agree
6	The framework significantly benefited our strategic analysis process.	Open question, please elaborate
7	Among the following attributes, which ones best describe what you found positive about the 360 Management Framework? (Choose all that apply)	1 = A platform to collect and discuss information 2 = Easy to understand and apply 3 = More precise than classic frameworks 4 = Others
8	Implementing the 360 Management Framework was time-efficient.	1 = Strongly Disagree, 6 = Strongly Agree
9	What limitations or challenges did you encounter in using the framework?	Open question, please elaborate
10	Among the following drawbacks, which ones most align with your experience?	1 = Time-intensive, 2 = Difficult to understand and implement, 3 = Not precise enough, 4 = Misses important elements, 5 = Others
11	The 360 Management Framework outperforms other strategic analysis models we have used.	1 = Strongly Disagree, 6 = Strongly Agree
12	Our organisation plans to continue implementing the 360 Management Framework in the future.	1 = Strongly Disagree, 6 = Strongly Agree
13	Our employees found the framework user-friendly.	1 = Strongly Disagree, 6 = Strongly Agree
14	The 360 Management Framework complements our existing strategic tools.	1 = Strongly Disagree, 6 = Strongly Agree
15	The framework helped in fostering meaningful dialogue among team members.	1 = Strongly Disagree, 6 = Strongly Agree
16	Implementing the framework resulted in noticeable positive business outcomes.	1 = Strongly Disagree, 6 = Strongly Agree
17	The framework met our initial expectations.	1 = Strongly Disagree, 6 = Strongly Agree
18	The framework required substantial modification to fit our needs.	1 = Strongly Disagree, 6 = Strongly Agree
19	The framework assisted in identifying new business opportunities.	1 = Strongly Disagree, 6 = Strongly Agree
20	The framework was worth the investment of time and resources.	1 = Strongly Disagree, 6 = Strongly Agree
21	The 360 Management Framework will likely become a standard practice in our organisation.	1 = Strongly Disagree, 6 = Strongly Agree
22	We experienced difficulties in gathering data for the framework's application.	1 = Strongly Disagree, 6 = Strongly Agree
23	The 360 Management Framework is versatile enough to adapt to different business scenarios.	1 = Strongly Disagree, 6 = Strongly Agree
24	Utilising the framework gave us a competitive advantage.	1 = Strongly Disagree, 6 = Strongly Agree
25	The framework could benefit from more detailed guidelines or instructions.	1 = Strongly Disagree, 6 = Strongly Agree
26	We had to consult external experts to fully implement the framework.	1 = Strongly Disagree, 6 = Strongly Agree
27	The framework's design (360MF Matrix) is visually appealing and easy to navigate.	1 = Strongly Disagree, 6 = Strongly Agree
28	Do you have any other comments or insights you would like to share about the 360 Management Framework?	Open question, please elaborate

Appendix 2. Number of Responses per Question

Question No.		responses						
		1	2	3	4	5	6	Total
1		6	14	5	n/a	n/a	n/a	25
2		2	7	9	4	3	n/a	25
3		0	0	0	9	8	8	25
4		0	0	0	4	7	14	25
5		0	0	0	0	1	24	25
6	open	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
7	multiple	25	15	19	0	n/a	n/a	
8		0	0	1	8	4	12	25
9	open							
10		25	0	0	0	0	0	25
11		0	0	0	0	5	20	25
12		0	0	0	4	9	12	25
13		0	0	0	7	11	7	25
14		0	0	0	0	7	18	25
15		0	0	0	0	0	25	25
16		0	0	2	6	12	5	25
17		0	0	0	0	0	25	25
18		18	4	2	1	0	0	25
19		6	5	2	8	4	0	25
20		0	0	0	1	1	23	25
21		0	0	1	2	3	19	25
22		25	0	0	0	0	0	25
23		0	0	0	3	4	18	25
24		0	0	0	5	11	9	25
25		14	9	2	0	0	0	25
26		25	0	0	0	0	0	25
27		0	0	0	0	4	21	25
28	open							