

BRIDGING THE STRATEGY-EXECUTION GAP THROUGH DATA INTEGRATION: THE STRIDE FRAMEWORK

Renāte Indrika¹

¹EKA University of Applied Sciences, Riga, Latvia, e-mail address: renate.indrika@gmail.com,

ORCID: 0009-0009-2248-9867

Received 17 April 2026; accepted 25 May 2026

Abstract

Research purpose. Contemporary strategic management literature has developed rich but largely specialized streams addressing strategy formulation, resource configuration, dynamic capabilities, execution systems, and data-driven decision-making. Despite these advances, persistent fragmentation remains between strategic intent, operational execution, and analytical validation. The purpose of this study is to develop and conceptually justify STRIDE as an integrative cyclical architecture of strategic management capable of structurally aligning these dimensions.

Design / Methodology / Approach. The study adopts a conceptual theory-building design grounded in structural comparative analysis. Representative strategic management frameworks are examined across six predefined architectural dimensions: strategic intent, tactical translation, resource alignment, implementation mechanisms, data integration, and evaluation. The comparison serves to identify structural discontinuities and integrative gaps within dominant paradigms.

Findings. The analysis suggests that existing frameworks tend to specialize in particular structural components rather than provide a fully integrated governance architecture. Based on this architectural assessment, STRIDE is developed as a synthesis model that embeds strategic direction, operational coordination, analytical validation, and evaluative recalibration within a unified recursive system.

Originality / Value / Practical implications. The study contributes to strategic management theory by introducing architectural completeness as a criterion for systemic alignment. Rather than extending a single paradigm, STRIDE integrates fragmented domains into a coherent cyclical governance framework, offering a structured foundation for future empirical validation and practical application.

Keywords: strategic management; strategy-execution gap; data integration; managerial architecture; conceptual framework

JEL codes: D23; L20; M10

Introduction

Strategic management theory has undergone significant development over the past decades, evolving from positioning-based approaches toward resource-oriented, dynamic, and data-driven perspectives. Increasing environmental volatility, digital transformation, and institutional complexity have intensified the demand for adaptive governance structures capable of aligning long-term strategic direction with operational responsiveness (Schilke, Hu and Helfat, 2018; Teece, 2018). Despite these theoretical advancements, organizations continue to experience persistent difficulties in translating strategic intent into consistent execution. Strategy implementation remains one of the most critical yet insufficiently resolved challenges in management research (Tawse and Tabesh, 2021; Cândido and Santos, 2019).

Simultaneously, the expansion of digital infrastructures and analytics capabilities has reshaped expectations regarding evidence-based decision-making. Empirical research demonstrates that firms with developed data analytics capabilities tend to achieve superior performance outcomes (Gupta and George, 2016; Wamba et al., 2017). However, analytics is frequently conceptualized as a parallel

* Corresponding author. E-mail: renate.indrika@gmail.com

functional domain rather than a structurally embedded element of the strategic management cycle (Ransbotham et al., 2022). As a result, strategy formulation, execution, data validation, and evaluative processes often remain fragmented managerial processes.

This dual structural gap - between strategy and execution, and between analytics and strategic integration - suggests the absence of a coherent managerial architecture capable of systematically aligning these dimensions within a continuous adaptive system.

The objective of this study is to develop and conceptually justify STRIDE as an integrative cyclical architecture of strategic management and to demonstrate, through comparative theoretical analysis, how it structurally addresses the strategy–execution gap while embedding data as an intrinsic component of the strategic management cycle.

Based on this objective, the study advances the following theoretical proposition:

A strategic management architecture that structurally integrates strategic intent, tactical translation, resource alignment, implementation governance, embedded data validation, and evaluative feedback within a continuous cyclical system can address the persistent strategy-execution gap and the analytics–strategy gap identified in contemporary management literature.

To examine this proposition, the paper adopts a conceptual theory-building design grounded in structural comparative analysis. Representative strategic management frameworks are evaluated across six predefined architectural dimensions, enabling systematic identification of structural discontinuities and integrative gaps.

The analysis suggests that dominant paradigms tend to specialize in particular structural components rather than provide a fully integrated governance architecture. Based on this architectural assessment, STRIDE is developed as a synthesis model that embeds strategic direction, operational coordination, analytical validation, and evaluative recalibration within a unified recursive system.

The remainder of the paper is structured as follows. The next section reviews key theoretical streams in strategic management and highlights structural discontinuities. The subsequent section describes the research methodology. The research results present the comparative matrix and develop STRIDE as an integrative cyclical architecture. The paper concludes with theoretical implications, managerial contributions, and directions for future research.

Literature Review

Positioning and Competitive Strategy

Positioning theory constitutes one of the foundational pillars of strategic management. Porter's analytical frameworks conceptualize competitive advantage as a function of industry structure and strategic positioning choices (Porter, 1980; 1996). By introducing the five forces model and generic strategies, positioning theory provided a systematic approach to aligning organizational strategy with external environmental determinants.

Subsequent empirical research has confirmed the relevance of industry effects in explaining firm performance differentials (McGahan and Porter, 1997). Positioning-based logic emphasizes deliberate strategic planning and rational choice, reinforcing the centrality of strategic intent in managerial practice.

However, despite its conceptual clarity, positioning theory remains predominantly formulation-oriented. It provides limited structural guidance regarding the mechanisms through which strategic intent is translated into coordinated operational action. Execution is typically treated as a subsequent managerial challenge rather than as an integral architectural component of the strategy itself. Reviews of strategy implementation research indicate that such separation between formulation and execution contributes to persistent implementation gaps (Tawse and Tabesh, 2021).

Furthermore, positioning theory does not explicitly incorporate data integration as a structural element of strategic governance. While environmental analysis may rely on information inputs, analytics is not embedded within a cyclical feedback system linking strategic direction and adaptive recalibration. As a result, positioning theory offers strong directional logic but lacks systemic architectural continuity.

Resource-Based View and Dynamic Capabilities

The resource-based view (RBV) fundamentally reshaped strategic management theory by shifting the analytical focus from external industry structure to internal firm heterogeneity. Barney (1991) conceptualized sustained competitive advantage as deriving from valuable, rare, inimitable, and non-substitutable resources. The resource-based perspective has also evolved through knowledge-based interpretations of the firm, emphasizing organizational knowledge as a strategically significant resource underpinning competitive advantage (Grant, 1996). This perspective introduced configurational logic and emphasized firm-specific assets as primary drivers of performance differences. Empirical studies have confirmed the explanatory power of resource heterogeneity in accounting for competitive advantage (Crook et al., 2008). Subsequent empirical reviews further confirmed the explanatory power of the resource-based perspective across diverse organizational contexts (Newbert, 2007). However, RBV has been criticized for its relatively static orientation, particularly in contexts characterized by rapid technological change and environmental turbulence.

Dynamic capabilities theory emerged as a response to this limitation. Teece, Pisano and Shuen (1997) and later Teece (2018) conceptualized dynamic capabilities as the firm's ability to sense opportunities, seize them, and reconfigure assets accordingly. This framework emphasizes adaptive capacity and systemic transformation under uncertainty. Content-analytic reviews demonstrate that dynamic capabilities significantly advance understanding of organizational adaptation and renewal (Schilke, Hu and Helfat, 2018). Zollo and Winter (2002) further argue that dynamic capabilities emerge through deliberate learning mechanisms that enable organizations to codify experience and systematically improve organizational routines. Winter (2003) distinguished dynamic capabilities from ordinary capabilities, emphasizing their role in purposeful organizational adaptation under changing environmental conditions. Nevertheless, despite its emphasis on adaptation and organizational renewal, dynamic capabilities research often operates at a high level of abstraction. It identifies the processes of sensing and reconfiguring but does not fully specify the structural governance architecture that systematically links strategic intent, tactical translation, implementation coordination, and data-driven evaluation within a continuous managerial loop. Related research has highlighted absorptive capacity as a mechanism through which organizations recognize, assimilate, and exploit external knowledge to support strategic adaptation (Volberda et al., 2010).

Thus, RBV provides configurational depth, and dynamic capabilities introduce adaptive logic; however, both perspectives remain partially detached from a fully integrated executional and analytical architecture.

Strategy Implementation and Execution Research

Strategy implementation research developed in response to the persistent gap between strategic planning and realized outcomes. Hrebiniak (2005) argues that execution requires alignment across organizational structure, incentives, communication systems, and leadership mechanisms. Kaplan and Norton (2008) advanced the Balanced Scorecard (BSC) as a framework linking strategic objectives to operational measures and performance indicators. The Balanced Scorecard introduces strategic maps and key performance indicators (KPIs) as instruments of alignment and control. Empirical research indicates that structured performance measurement systems can improve strategic clarity and organizational coordination (Hoque, 2014). However, recent systematic reviews suggest that strategy implementation remains conceptually fragmented (Tawse and Tabesh, 2021). Cândido and Santos (2019) identify structural misalignment, communication breakdowns, and insufficient feedback systems as primary sources of strategy failure.

While execution frameworks emphasize control and measurement, they often conceptualize analytics primarily as performance-tracking instruments rather than as embedded structural elements of strategic governance. Furthermore, tactical translation - the structured decomposition of strategic intent into

coordinated, resource-aligned initiatives - remains insufficiently formalized. As a result, execution systems may enhance operational discipline without resolving systemic fragmentation between strategic formulation, adaptive learning, and data integration.

Data-Driven and Evidence-Based Management

The rapid expansion of digital infrastructures and big data analytics has profoundly influenced contemporary management practice. Research consistently demonstrates that firms developing strong analytics capabilities achieve superior performance outcomes (Gupta and George, 2016; Wamba et al., 2017). These studies conceptualize analytics as a multidimensional capability combining technological infrastructure, human expertise, and managerial integration. Brynjolfsson and McElheran (2016) provide empirical evidence that data-driven decision-making is positively associated with productivity gains and improved organizational performance. Evidence-based management scholarship similarly advocates systematic reliance on empirical data to reduce cognitive bias and managerial error (Rousseau, 2006). Despite these advances, analytics capabilities are frequently implemented as specialized functional domains rather than as structurally embedded elements of the strategic management cycle (Ransbotham et al., 2022). Consequently, although analytics enhances decision quality and operational visibility, it does not inherently resolve structural fragmentation between strategic intent, implementation processes, and adaptive evaluation. The literature therefore demonstrates strong empirical support for analytics capabilities but limited architectural integration within strategic governance systems.

Synthesis: Structural Fragmentation in Strategic Management Theory

Across the reviewed streams, a pattern of conceptual specialization becomes evident. Positioning theory clarifies strategic direction; RBV emphasizes resource configuration; dynamic capabilities introduce adaptive processes; execution research develops implementation systems; analytics scholarship strengthens data-based decision-making. Each stream contributes theoretical depth. However, none offers a fully integrated cyclical managerial architecture that simultaneously aligns strategic intent, tactical translation, resource configuration, operational implementation, embedded analytics, and adaptive evaluation within a unified systemic structure.

This structural fragmentation underpins the dual gap identified in the Introduction and establishes the theoretical necessity for an integrative architectural synthesis - which the STRIDE framework seeks to provide.

Taken together, these streams offer substantial theoretical depth. Yet when examined from an architectural perspective, they appear less complementary than often assumed.

Research Methodology

Research Design and Theoretical Orientation

This study adopts a conceptual theory-building research design grounded in structural comparative analysis. The objective of the research is not empirical hypothesis testing but architectural integration. Specifically, the study seeks to identify systemic discontinuities across dominant strategic management frameworks and to reconstruct them into a coherent cyclical governance architecture.

Conceptual research is particularly appropriate when addressing fragmentation across theoretical domains and when the purpose is integrative synthesis rather than variable-based causal modeling (Jaakkola, 2020). Strategic management scholarship has evolved into specialized streams - positioning theory, resource-based logic, dynamic capabilities, execution systems, and analytics research - each offering partial explanations of organizational performance. However, systematic integration at the architectural level remains limited.

The present research therefore adopts an architectural lens, evaluating whether existing frameworks structurally embed key dimensions of strategic governance within a continuous adaptive system.

Framework Selection Criteria

The selection of frameworks for comparative analysis followed three structured criteria:

1. Theoretical centrality - frameworks must hold foundational status within strategic management literature and demonstrate high citation impact.
2. Paradigmatic distinctiveness - each selected framework represents a conceptually different stream of strategic thought.
3. Structural relevance - the framework must explicitly engage with at least one core dimension of the strategic management process.

Based on these criteria, six representative structural archetypes were selected:

- Porter's positioning theory (competitive strategy paradigm),
- Resource-Based View (Barney, 1991),
- Dynamic Capabilities (Teece, 2018),
- SWOT analysis (strategic diagnostic configuration; Hill, T., & Westbrook, R., 1997),
- PDCA cycle (process improvement architecture rooted in continuous improvement principles; Deming, 1986),
- Balanced Scorecard (execution and performance management system).

These frameworks collectively capture dominant orientations across strategic intent, resource configuration, adaptation, implementation systems, and evaluative mechanisms.

STRIDE is subsequently introduced as an architectural synthesis derived from comparative analysis rather than as a competing model within one paradigm.

Definition of Architectural Dimensions

To enable systematic evaluation, the study defines six structural dimensions synthesized from recurring constructs in contemporary strategic management literature:

1. Strategic Intent – articulation of long-term direction and competitive positioning (Porter, 1996).
2. Tactical Translation – structured decomposition of strategic objectives into coordinated operational initiatives.
3. Resource Alignment – configuration and deployment of tangible and intangible assets required to support strategic execution (Barney, 1991).
4. Implementation Mechanisms – governance structures, coordination systems, and managerial processes enabling execution (Kaplan and Norton, 2008).
5. Data Integration – embedded analytical validation within managerial decision processes, ensuring that data informs both operational and strategic adjustments (Gupta and George, 2016).
6. Evaluation – systematic performance measurement and recursive feedback mechanisms enabling strategic recalibration.

Cyclical continuity is treated not as a separate structural element, but as an architectural property of the system, reflecting the extent to which these dimensions operate within an integrated adaptive loop.

These dimensions represent integrative governance components rather than isolated managerial activities. The underlying assumption is that architectural completeness requires simultaneous structural presence of these elements within a unified managerial logic.

Comparative Structural Evaluation Procedure

Each selected framework was evaluated against the six architectural dimensions using a standardized structural presence logic:

- “+” indicates explicit structural incorporation of the dimension,
- “-” indicates absence,
- “Partial” indicates indirect or incomplete integration.

For analytical consistency, a dimension was coded as “+” only when the framework explicitly incorporated the respective element as an intrinsic structural component of its governance logic. “Partial” was assigned when the dimension appeared indirectly, episodically, or without formalized integration into a recursive managerial cycle. “–” indicated the absence of explicit structural incorporation within the original framework architecture.

The objective of this evaluation is not to rank theoretical sophistication or empirical validity, but rather to examine the degree of architectural integration across frameworks. This distinction is critical: certain frameworks may reference performance indicators or adaptive processes without structurally integrating them into a recursive governance cycle.

The binary heuristic serves as an analytical simplification to identify systemic fragmentation. Similar structural mapping approaches are commonly used in conceptual synthesis research to reveal architectural discontinuities (Jaakkola, 2020).

The results of this evaluation are presented in Table 1.

Architectural Synthesis Logic

The comparative matrix reveals consistent specialization across theoretical streams. Positioning theory emphasizes strategic direction but under-specifies implementation governance and feedback integration. RBV provides configurational depth yet remains executionally abstract. Dynamic capabilities advance adaptive logic but do not fully formalize structural translation mechanisms. Execution frameworks integrate measurement systems but often treat analytics as instrumental overlays. Process cycles such as PDCA provide recursive logic yet lack strategic anchoring.

These discontinuities demonstrate that fragmentation occurs not at the level of theoretical robustness but at the level of structural integration.

STRIDE is therefore developed as an architectural synthesis rather than an incremental extension. The synthesis process follows three integrative principles:

1. Structural embedding - each dimension must function as an intrinsic architectural component rather than as an auxiliary tool.
2. Recursive continuity - governance processes must operate within a continuous adaptive loop.
3. Systemic alignment - strategic intent, operational execution, analytics, and evaluation must be structurally interdependent.

Through this reconstruction, STRIDE addresses the dual structural gap identified in the literature: the separation between strategy formulation and execution, and the separation between analytics capability and strategic governance.

Analytical Rigor

To enhance analytical transparency, the study distinguishes between explicit structural integration and functional supplementation. In other words, while certain frameworks may incorporate performance indicators or analytical tools, these elements are considered structurally integrated only if they operate within a recursive decision cycle that informs strategic recalibration.

The evaluation criteria were applied consistently across all frameworks in order to reduce interpretive bias. The intention of this analysis is not to establish a normative ranking of models, but to map their architectural scope and degree of structural integration. By shifting attention from theoretical superiority to systemic completeness, the study enables a cross-paradigmatic comparison grounded in architectural coherence rather than paradigm preference.

Methodological Limitations

As a conceptual comparative study, the research does not empirically test the performance implications of STRIDE. The study therefore does not rely on primary empirical datasets or statistical hypothesis testing but instead applies comparative architectural synthesis across established strategic management

frameworks. The binary structural logic simplifies complex theoretical constructs and may not fully capture nuanced variations within each framework. Furthermore, although the selected models represent dominant paradigms, the comparative sample is not exhaustive.

STRIDE should not be interpreted as a universal replacement for existing strategic frameworks, but rather as an integrative architectural synthesis intended to improve structural alignment across fragmented managerial domains.

Future research may extend this architectural synthesis through empirical case studies, longitudinal implementation analysis, or quantitative testing of structural alignment and performance outcomes.

Research Results

Comparative Structural Analysis

The results of the comparative structural evaluation are presented in Table 1.

Table 1. Comparative structural dimensions of strategic management frameworks (Source: author's elaboration)

Model	Strategy	Tactics	Resources	Implementation	Data	Evaluation	Cyclical
Porter (Positioning)	+	-	-	-	-	-	-
RBV	-	-	+	-	-	-	-
Dynamic Capabilities	+	-	+	-	-	-	Partial
SWOT	+	-	+	-	-	-	-
PDCA	-	-	-	+	+	+	+
Balanced Scorecard	+	-	-	+	+	+	Partial
STRIDE	+	+	+	+	+	+	+

The matrix highlights a clear pattern of structural specialization across dominant strategic management frameworks. It is important to emphasize that the purpose of this comparison is not to question the theoretical robustness of existing models, but rather to assess the extent of their structural integration from an architectural perspective.

Positioning theory offers a strong articulation of strategic intent and competitive direction. However, it provides limited guidance on how strategy is systematically translated into coordinated operational action or embedded within recursive evaluation mechanisms.

The Resource-Based View shifts the focus toward internal asset configuration and competitive heterogeneity yet remains comparatively underdeveloped in specifying governance structures for execution and ongoing analytical feedback.

Dynamic capabilities introduce an adaptive logic centered on sensing, seizing, and reconfiguring. While adaptation is conceptually central, the framework operates at a relatively high level of abstraction and does not fully formalize the structural mechanisms through which strategy is translated, validated, and recursively recalibrated within an explicit governance cycle.

SWOT analysis functions primarily as a diagnostic configuration tool linking internal and external factors. Its structure remains static and does not inherently provide mechanisms for implementation or continuous feedback integration.

Process-oriented approaches such as PDCA demonstrate strong cyclical continuity and emphasize implementation, measurement, and feedback. However, they lack explicit strategic anchoring and competitive resource logic.

The Balanced Scorecard partially bridges strategy and execution and introduces systematic performance measurement. Yet analytics within this framework often function as a performance-tracking instrument rather than as a continuously embedded validation layer informing structural strategic adjustment.

Against this background, STRIDE differs in that it explicitly incorporates all evaluated dimensions within a unified cyclical architecture, ensuring structural interdependence between strategic direction, operational coordination, data validation, and evaluative recalibration.

Table 2. Comparative positioning of STRIDE and dominant strategic management frameworks (Source: author's elaboration)

Framework	Primary Focus	Main Strength	Key Structural Limitation
Porter's Positioning Theory	Competitive positioning and industry analysis	Strong strategic direction and external market orientation	Limited integration of implementation, analytics, and adaptive feedback
Resource-Based View (RBV)	Internal resources and competitive advantage	Strong resource configuration logic	Weak executional and evaluative integration
Dynamic Capabilities	Adaptation and organizational renewal	Emphasis on flexibility and environmental responsiveness	High conceptual abstraction and insufficient structural operationalization
SWOT Analysis	Strategic diagnosis	Simple integration of internal and external factors	Static and non-cyclical structure
PDCA Cycle	Process improvement and control	Strong recursive implementation and evaluation logic	Lack of strategic anchoring and competitive perspective
Balanced Scorecard	Strategy execution and performance measurement	Alignment between objectives and KPIs	Analytics primarily used as performance tracking rather than embedded governance logic
STRIDE Framework	Integrative strategic governance architecture	Structural integration of strategy, tactics, resources, implementation, data, and evaluation within a continuous adaptive cycle	Requires empirical validation across organizational contexts

The comparative positioning presented in Table 2 further demonstrates that dominant strategic management frameworks tend to specialize in isolated dimensions of governance. In contrast, STRIDE is conceptualized as an integrative architecture that structurally embeds strategic direction, tactical coordination, resource alignment, implementation governance, analytical validation, and evaluative feedback within a continuous adaptive cycle.

Identification of Structural Gaps

The comparative results indicate two systemic structural discontinuities.

First, a strategy-execution gap persists across positioning and resource-based paradigms. Strategic intent is clearly articulated, yet translation into coordinated operational action remains under-structured. Execution research attempts to bridge this gap but frequently treats strategic formulation and operational control as sequential rather than structurally integrated processes.

Second, an analytics-strategy gap is observable in data-driven management literature. Although analytics capabilities improve decision quality and performance measurement, they are often implemented as specialized functions external to the strategic governance architecture. Consequently, data informs decisions episodically rather than continuously recalibrating strategic intent.

These two gaps collectively reflect architectural fragmentation rather than theoretical weakness. Each framework contributes depth within its domain, yet none fully integrates direction, translation, execution, validation, and adaptation within a recursive systemic configuration.

STRIDE as Integrative Cyclical Architecture

STRIDE emerges from the architectural synthesis of the structural discontinuities identified in the comparative analysis. Unlike the examined frameworks, which demonstrate specialization across isolated dimensions of strategic governance, STRIDE integrates strategic intent, tactical translation, resource alignment, implementation mechanisms, embedded data validation, and evaluative feedback within a unified recursive structure.

Unlike existing strategy execution models, STRIDE is not limited to implementation control or performance measurement, but conceptualizes strategy, execution, analytics, and evaluation as structurally interdependent governance layers within a recursive adaptive architecture.

The framework conceptualizes these elements not as sequential managerial stages but as interdependent structural layers operating within a continuous adaptive loop. The architectural configuration of STRIDE as a cyclical governance system is illustrated in Fig. 1.



Fig. 1. STRIDE as an integrative cyclical architecture of strategic management (Source: author's elaboration)

Unlike sequential models, STRIDE conceptualizes these elements as structurally interdependent layers:

- Strategy establishes directional coherence.
- Tactics formalize operational translation.
- Resources ensure configurational viability.
- Implementation operationalizes coordinated action.
- Data provides continuous analytical validation.
- Evaluation enables recursive recalibration.

Each component functions both as an output of prior stages and as an input to subsequent recalibration, ensuring cyclical continuity.

Crucially, data is not treated as a measurement overlay but as an intrinsic structural element operating throughout the cycle. Analytical validation continuously informs tactical adjustment, resource reconfiguration, and strategic reconsideration.

This recursive configuration transforms strategic management from a segmented managerial sequence into an adaptive governance architecture. For example, a manufacturing company experiencing declining operational efficiency may use STRIDE to align long-term strategic objectives with tactical production adjustments, resource reallocation, implementation monitoring, real-time operational data

analysis, and continuous evaluative feedback. In this configuration, data does not merely measure outcomes retrospectively but actively informs adaptive managerial recalibration throughout the strategic cycle.

Resolution of the Dual Structural Gap

By embedding tactical translation between strategy and implementation, STRIDE structurally bridges the strategy-execution gap. Strategic intent is no longer isolated from operational mechanisms but is decomposed into coordinated initiatives supported by aligned resources and governed implementation systems.

Simultaneously, by embedding data within the core cycle rather than positioning it as an auxiliary capability, STRIDE resolves the analytics-strategy gap. Data becomes a structural validation layer continuously informing decision-making across all stages.

The resulting architecture enables:

- Continuous alignment between long-term direction and operational action,
- Data-informed recalibration of strategic priorities,
- Systemic integration of evaluative and adaptive processes,
- Recursive adaptive governance under environmental volatility.

Thus, the findings suggest that architectural completeness - rather than theoretical depth within individual paradigms - is critical for resolving persistent strategic misalignment. While the integrative logic of STRIDE appears structurally coherent, its practical applicability requires empirical validation in diverse organizational contexts.

Conclusions

This study sets out to address a persistent structural challenge in strategic management theory: the fragmentation between strategy formulation, operational execution, and data-driven evaluation. Despite significant advances across positioning theory, the resource-based view, dynamic capabilities research, execution systems, and analytics scholarship, the comparative analysis demonstrates that these streams remain structurally specialized rather than architecturally integrated.

The findings reveal the existence of a dual structural gap. First, the strategy-execution gap persists due to insufficient formalization of tactical translation and governance mechanisms linking strategic intent to operational implementation. Second, an analytics-strategy gap arises from the frequent conceptualization of data capabilities as parallel functional domains rather than as embedded structural components of the strategic management cycle.

By conducting a structural comparative evaluation across six architectural dimensions, the study identifies systemic discontinuities and develops STRIDE as an integrative cyclical architecture. STRIDE synthesizes strategic direction, tactical decomposition, resource alignment, implementation governance, data validation, and evaluative feedback within a continuous adaptive loop. Unlike sequential or functionally segmented models, STRIDE embeds each component as an intrinsic structural element, ensuring recursive alignment and systemic coherence.

Theoretical Contribution

The main theoretical contribution of this study lies in redirecting attention from paradigm-specific depth toward architectural completeness as a criterion of strategic coherence. Rather than proposing an alternative strategy model within an existing theoretical stream, the research advances a higher-order integrative framework that reconstructs fragmented domains into a unified governance structure.

The concept of architectural completeness introduced in this study offers a novel evaluative lens for assessing strategic management frameworks. By operationalizing structural integration across predefined dimensions, the research contributes a replicable methodology for future integrative theory development.

Furthermore, the study extends existing discussions on strategy implementation and analytics integration by demonstrating that these challenges represent interconnected architectural issues rather than isolated managerial deficiencies.

The integrative logic of STRIDE further supports the theoretical proposition that organizations operating with architecturally integrated governance systems may demonstrate stronger strategic alignment under conditions of environmental volatility and increasing managerial complexity.

Managerial Implications

From a practical perspective, the findings suggest that organizational underperformance may stem not from flawed strategy or inadequate analytics capability per se, but from structural misalignment between these elements. Managers operating in volatile and data-intensive environments require governance systems that integrate direction-setting, operational coordination, and analytical validation within a recursive decision cycle.

STRIDE provides a structured managerial logic applicable across business, public-sector, and educational organizations. By embedding tactical translation and data validation as intrinsic governance layers, organizations can enhance strategic coherence, reduce implementation drift, and improve adaptive responsiveness.

Methodological Implications

Methodologically, the study demonstrates the value of architectural comparative analysis for identifying systemic discontinuities across strategic management frameworks. The evaluation matrix offers a transparent basis for cross-framework comparison and may be extended in future integrative research.

Limitations and Future Research

Several limitations should be acknowledged. As a conceptual study, the research does not empirically test the performance implications of STRIDE relative to existing frameworks. The study therefore does not rely on primary empirical datasets or statistical hypothesis testing, but instead applies comparative architectural synthesis across established strategic management frameworks. The binary structural coding simplifies complex theoretical constructs and may not capture nuanced variations within individual paradigms. Additionally, although the selected frameworks represent dominant strategic streams, the comparative sample is not exhaustive.

Future research may extend the present study in several directions. Empirical case studies could examine the practical implementation of STRIDE in different organizational contexts. Longitudinal research may assess whether architectural integration correlates with improved strategic alignment and performance stability. Quantitative studies may operationalize architectural completeness as a measurable construct and test its relationship with adaptive capability and organizational outcomes.

In conclusion, this study argues that resolving persistent strategic misalignment requires architectural integration rather than incremental refinement of isolated managerial functions. By conceptualizing strategic management as a cyclical adaptive governance system, STRIDE contributes a structurally coherent foundation for navigating complexity in contemporary organizational environments.

References

- Barney, J. (1991). Firm resources and sustained competitive advantage. *Journal of Management*, 17(1), 99-120. <https://doi.org/10.1177/014920639101700108>
- Brynjolfsson, E., & McElheran, K. (2016). The rapid adoption of data-driven decision-making. *American Economic Review*, 106(5), 133-139.
- Cândido, C. J. F., & Santos, S. P. (2019). Implementation obstacles and strategy failure. *Baltic Journal of Management*, 14(1), 39-63. <https://doi.org/10.1108/BJM-01-2018-0013>

- Crook, T. R., Ketchen, D. J., Jr., Combs, J. G., & Todd, S. Y. (2008). Strategic resources and performance: A meta-analysis. *Academy of Management Journal*, 51(6), 1141-1154. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amj.2008.34489664>
- Deming, W. E. (1986). *Out of the crisis*. MIT Press.
- Grant, R. M. (1996). Toward a knowledge-based theory of the firm. *Strategic Management Journal*, 17(S2), 109-122. <https://doi.org/10.1002/smj.4250171110>
- Gupta, M., & George, J. F. (2016). Toward the development of a big data analytics capability. *Information & Management*, 53(8), 1049-1064. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.im.2016.07.004>
- Hill, T., & Westbrook, R. (1997). SWOT analysis: It's time for a product recall. *Long Range Planning*, 30(1), 46-52. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0024-6301\(96\)00095-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0024-6301(96)00095-7)
- Hrebiniak, L. G. (2005). *Making strategy work: Leading effective execution and change*. Wharton School Publishing.
- Hoque, Z. (2014). 20 years of studies on the balanced scorecard. *The British Accounting Review*, 46(1), 33-59. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bar.2013.10.003>
- Jaakkola, E. (2020). Designing conceptual articles: Four approaches. *AMS Review*, 10(1-2), 18-26. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13162-020-00161-0>
- Kaplan, R. S., & Norton, D. P. (2008). *The execution premium*. Harvard Business School Press.
- McGahan, A. M., & Porter, M. E. (1997). How much does industry matter? *Strategic Management Journal*, 18(S1), 15-30. [https://doi.org/10.1002/\(SICI\)1097-0266\(199707\)18:1<15::AID-SMJ916>3.0.CO;2-1](https://doi.org/10.1002/(SICI)1097-0266(199707)18:1<15::AID-SMJ916>3.0.CO;2-1)
- Newbert, S. L. (2007). Empirical research on the resource-based view. *Strategic Management Journal*, 28(2), 121-146. <https://doi.org/10.1002/smj.573>
- Porter, M. E. (1980). *Competitive strategy*. Free Press.
- Porter, M. E. (1996). *What is strategy?* Harvard Business Review, 74(6), 61-78.
- Ransbotham, S., Kiron, D., LaFountain, B., & Khodabandeh, S. (2022). The analytics mandate. *MIT Sloan Management Review*.
- Rousseau, D. M. (2006). Is there such a thing as evidence-based management? *Academy of Management Review*, 31(2), 256-269. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.2006.20208679>
- Schilke, O., Hu, S., & Helfat, C. E. (2018). Quo vadis, dynamic capabilities? *Academy of Management Perspectives*, 32(4), 390-402. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amp.2017.0012>
- Tawse, A., & Tabesh, P. (2021). Strategy implementation review. *Management Decision*, 59(4), 845-865. <https://doi.org/10.1108/MD-01-2020-0134>
- Teece, D. J. (2018). Business models and dynamic capabilities. *Long Range Planning*, 51(1), 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(7), 509-533. [https://doi.org/10.1002/\(SICI\)1097-0266\(199708\)18:7<509::AID-SMJ882>3.0.CO;2-Z](https://doi.org/10.1002/(SICI)1097-0266(199708)18:7<509::AID-SMJ882>3.0.CO;2-Z)
- Volberda, H. W., Foss, N. J., & Lyles, M. A. (2010). Absorbing the concept of absorptive capacity. *Organization Science*, 21(4), 931-951. <https://doi.org/10.1287/orsc.1090.0503>
- Wamba, S. F., Gunasekaran, A., Akter, S., Ren, S. J.-f., Dubey, R., & Childe, S. J. (2017). Big data analytics and firm performance. *Journal of Business Research*, 70, 356-365. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2016.08.009>
- Winter, S. G. (2003). Understanding dynamic capabilities. *Strategic Management Journal*, 24(10), 991-995. <https://doi.org/10.1002/smj.318>

Zollo, M., & Winter, S. G. (2002). Deliberate learning and dynamic capabilities. *Organization Science*, 13(3), 339-351. <https://doi.org/10.1287/orsc.13.3.339.2780>

Declaration of generative AI in scientific writing

During the preparation of this work, the author used ChatGPT (OpenAI) for language refinement, structural editing, and stylistic improvement of the manuscript. The conceptual development, analytical framework, interpretation of findings, and all academic arguments were independently developed by the author. After using this tool, the author carefully reviewed, revised, and verified the content and takes full responsibility for the accuracy and integrity of the publication.