Strategy typology formation through strategic group change in Indonesian banking industry

by Ayi Ahadiat

Submission date: 30-Jun-2020 12:04AM (UTC-0700)
Submission ID: 1351692071
File name: Ayi_Ahadiat-Garcombs_Paper_2012.pdf (574.05K)
Word count: 9405
Character count: 52010

Strategy typology formation through strategic group change in Indonesian banking industry

Ayi Ahadiat[1], Basu S. Dharmmesta[2], T. H. Handoko, B. M. Purwanto

Abstract

The research aims to assess the formations and changes of strategy typologies through identifying the strategic group change in Indonesian Banking Industry. Samples of the research are 126 Indonesian banking firms, which survived from 1999 to 2007, consists of government owned banks, forex and non forex[3] private national banks, regional development banks, mixed banks, and foreign banks. Resource based strategic grouping, through utilizing cluster analysis technique, has identified the stable strategic time periods (STTPs), so that the occurrence, extinction, or survival of strategic group, and recognize the strategic group membership composition change can be identified.The results indicate that changes in strategic group number and membership were influenced by the strategic choices along the strategic dimensions of strategic group. In conclusion, conservative strategy is the most dominant strategy that implemented by banking firms, followed by speculative and progressive strategy. Indonesian banking firms found to be very less opportunistic in implementing their strategies

Keywords: strategic group, typology, change.

Background

A fundamental research question in strategic management, that always interesting to be studied, is why company different one from another? What makes a dominant strategy of different in companies' performance? These questions raised in a variety of studies that try to provide an explanation with the strategic changes approach (Short et al., 2007; Mas-Ruiz et al., 2005; Mehra, 1996; Fuente-Sabate et al., 2007; Vicente-Lorente and Zuniga-Vicente, 2006; Galan-Zazo and Zuniga-Vicente, 2003; Ahadiat, 2011, 2012).

The strategic group change as a form of organizational alignment is performed through managing tangible and intangible asset, which is by doing so a company can create its competitive advantage (Aaker, 1989). In one hand, some organizations are very dependent to their environment in acquiring the necessary resources (Aldrich, 1979; Pfeffer and Salancik, 1978). In another hand, some organizations are capable to manage their dependence by using the enactment strategy (Thompson, 1967; Hofer and Schendel, 1978). However, because the environment of business has relatively strong influence, therefore, whenever a fundamental change takes place, organizations within the certain environment should change their strategies as well (Thompson, 1967)

The difference in strategy implies a difference in performance. Companies with strategic similarity can be categorized into groups of a certain strategy, so it is basically a strategic group is an identification strategic selection by the company. Issues or the main question in this research is the dimension of any strategy on which to base forming strategic

[1] *First writer is permanent lecturer at Deparment of Management Faculty of Economics and Business University of Lampung. Email: ayi.ahadiat@gmail.com.*

[2] *Second to fourth writers are professor and permanent lecturers at Department of Management Faculty of Economics and Business University of Lampung,*

[3] *Forex stands for foreign exchange*

groups and what dominant strategies are selected for superior in the constellation of the rivalry among the companies in the industry (Ahadiat, 2011).

In strategic group change study, researchers have difficulties to come up with a consensus on the drivers of strategic change and degree of manageability (Vicente-Lorente and Zuniga-Vicente, 2006). Consequently, the studies in strategic change in the last two decades have resulted in various perspectives, with inconclusive or idiosyncratic findings of researches (Rajagopalan and Spreitzers, 1996). The most dominant approach in strategic change study recently is an environmental resources approach (Dess and Beard, 1984; Campbell, 1969; Aldrich and Pfeffer, 1976; Aldrich and Reiss, 1976; Pfeffer and Salancik, 1978). The main cause of divergence in research findings is differences theoretical perspectives that contribute most of confusion in conceptualization or in defining the strategic change. The condition has triggered to deepen the understanding on strategic change from the role of tangible and intangible resources perspective in strategic group change.

The central idea of the strategic group lies in the group differences caused by different strategic positions taken by the company. This idea will add to the understanding of the researchers or specialist of strategic management on why firms in different groups applying different strategies, where the dynamics can be further explained by the differences in performance among firms (Leask, 2004).

Strategic groups by Mehra (1996) divided into market-based view of strategic group and resource-based view of strategic group. Porter (1980) defines strategic groups as the number of companies that use a similar strategy based on certain strategic dimensions. Strategic group representing industrial enterprises of different positions separated by mobility barrier with an underlying assumption that the success of companies in the industry depends on the structure of intra-industry. Strategic group studies revealed by Porter (1980) based on a market perspective. Based on the resource-based view (RBV) as promoted by Barney (2001, 1991, 1997), Penrose (1959), Peteraf (1993) and Wernerfelt (1994, 1995), the company is in fact a collection of parts of the resources, skills and expertise, and routines that apply to conduct its business so as to provide results in the form of sustainable competitive advantage. The underlying assumptions of RBV, the company has a set of resources, skills and expertise, and routines that protects itself from imitating efforts by others and provide the basis for the creation of a better return.

From the above conceptual discussion, the issue of this research is how strategic group influenced by strategic change and how the strategic group change create the formation of strategic mobility.

Market-driven strategic group

Market-based Strategic Group was first revealed by Hunt (1972) in his dissertation by identifying similarities in the behavior of firms in the configuration of a particular industry sector. Hunt (1972) based his study on the vertical integration, product diversification and differentiation, the study was reviewed by Porter (1979) and Newman (1978), which state that the aspect of vertical integration significantly different in terms of size and level. In the early development, the concept of strategic groups (Hunt, 1972) was questioned in term of weaknesses of structure conduct and performance (SCP) perspective or paradigm. SCP view argues that the company optimal strategy in an industry will differentiate the performance from other companies, as the application of business scale function (Bain, 1956; Leask, 2004). SCP paradigm affects the strategic concept in two folds: the theory of mobility barrier

(Caves and Porter, 1977), and the theory of intra-industry competition (Porter, 1976, 1979). Grouping structure in this industry tend to be persistent and limited by mobility barriers that is the structural or strategic barriers to protect company from the potential rivals enter the existing group (Caves and Porter, 1977).

The view of mobility barriers (Caves and Porter, 1977) derived from Bain (1956) argued that the sustained performance differences caused by intra-industry barriers that impede the transfer between groups with opposing market position, these barriers also guard against a decline in a company's competitive advantage due to competition and imitation (Leask, 2004). Like a fortress, a strategic group that creates a barrier so that other companies cannot enter the group, through collective activities of the company's strategic group members.

The presence of strategic groups in the industry is expected to affect the performance of the industry and the company through the process of rivalry between groups, and through the presence of asymmetric mobility barriers between groups. Groups protected by barriers higher and the relative isolation of the rivalry in the industry will enjoy a superior performance compared to other (Porter, 1979). In essence, the appeal of the group's strategic paradigm of mobility barriers is how this paradigm can explain intra-industry performance variation.

Strategic dimensions underlying the distinction between companies in forming a group linked to the market position and resource commitments that have been made to support the market position (Ruiz, 1998). Cool and Schendel (1987) define strategic groups as a group of firms competing in an industry based on a combination of resource commitments and the scope of the same. Porter (1979) defines strategic groups as a set of companies with a semblance of a strategy or an isolated group of companies with the common mobility barriers. Strategic group researchs, with the topic of mobility barriers further developed by Lee et al. (2002). The development of research based on cognitive aspects by Peteraf and Shanley (1997), Dranove et al. (1998), McNamara et al. (2002), and McNamara et al. (2003).

To determine whether the company's entry into the group is done by determining the characteristics of the reference group strategy on companies that use similar strategies, and the difference between groups is relatively very sharp (McGee and Thomas, 1986). Caves and Porter (1977) state that companies in a strategic group will resemble one another and recognize the interdependence of each other. This statement provides guidance on how to identify similarities between the strategies of the company when the company changed its strategy group (Fiegenbaum et al., 1990; Ramaswamy and Li, 1997).

Resource-based strategic group

Resource-based strategic group revealed after the new understanding that competitive success is not built from products only but also from the depth of knowledge as a basis for the development of competencies (Prahalad and Hamel, 1990). Superior products are the products that make up a sustainable competitive advantage (Barney, 1991; Peteraf, 1993). Based on the resource, the strategic group is a group of companies that compete in an industry by placing a strategic resource configuration of the same unit (Mehra, 1996). Hatten and Hatten (1987) also stated that the strategic group is a grouping of organizations has a common strategy to use similar resources. Grouping does not connote that physical group happens to be one organization and not a union of group strategic competitive force some companies, but this is only to provide comfort in the analysis, as performed by Simon (1964) who advocate the strategy and objectives as a convenient way to perform analyzes.

Patterns, nature, and intensity of competition in the majority of the industry have changed since the strategic group found. In the reality of global competition, the traditional strategic recipe is no longer relevant. Competitors who are not successful in developing a strategy based on the product, but in-depth knowledge related to core skills being developed (Prahalad and Hamel, 1990). A superior product does not provide a sustainable competitive advantage, if it can easily be re-engineered (reverse engineered), cloned, or a little be exceeded (Quinn et al, 1990).

Competitive advantage is created, generated by the unique resources at the corporate level that cannot be easily reproduced by competitors, such as innovative marketing resources and distribution methods, advanced process technologies, logistics capabilities, organizational structure matching, administrative procedures and so on. These resources accumulated over a specific time period for the implementation of strategic focus seriously. So competitive advantage is the product of historical strategic choices and resource commitments made by the firm (Dierickx and Cool, 1989). Therefore, it can be stated that the systematic differences between the companies is the result of strategic resource selection, that is, the decision to invest to build units (bundles) that are difficult and expensive resource if emulated. This resource unit is the foundation for the success of product market strategy. Furthermore, because the company will move more comfortably in the 'neighborhood' with what is already known very well (Cyert and March, 1963); the units of these resources may also limit flexibility to change the company's competitive strategic posture. Therefore, given the resources that hinder the effectiveness of strategic action exists, it can be said that the accumulation of resources in the form of competence is the real source of competitive advantage companies.

Market-based vs. resource-based strategic group

When strategic groups derived from observed product market strategy, the strategic group may not necessarily represent the competitive realities. The phenomenon that can form a stable and competitive position could be maintained in the "uncertainty" immitability resource companies. Thus, the effective mobility of resources creates a barrier, not a market position (Mehra, 1996). Therefore, resources that can explain the success of a company rather than product market position, and because of the strategic framework was first developed to explain the locus of corporate profitability, the RBV can be an alternative view to the definition and operationalization of strategic groups (Mehra, 1996). From the above argument Mehra (1996) propose the definition of strategic groups as a group of companies that compete in an industry by placing a configuration of units of the same resource. This is similar to McGee and Thomas (1986) who propose to use a set of resources as a basis for identification of the company's strategic group.

According to Amit and Schoemaker (1993), of resources that deliver results for the company (firm rent generating resources) are (1) resource expressed as a valuable resource in the industry, which is referred to as a strategic factor of the industry, and (2) resource company that has different characteristics (idiosyncratic) with others. So companies that use strategic industrial similar resource configuration will form a strategic group (Mehra, 1996).

Hatten and Hatten Further (1987) explains that the group here is a tool for industry segments that make up the set (set) companies where competition, and performance measures to be relevant to one against the other. In the conceptual space between the companies and industries that are imaginary, the definition of this group is to be a meeting point for research in strategic management and industrial organization (McGee and Thomas, 1986). They also explained that the strategy can be a powerful tool that can be used by strategic analysts in: (1) collecting information to characterize individual firms are usually not detected in studies that use industry averages and aggregates the data, (2) investigate some of the company's simultaneously, thereby investigated the effectiveness of strategic actions in a wider variety than just one company alone, (3) summarize information in order to raise key dimensions to the analysis of auxiliaries, for example, this analysis can facilitate the study of the consequences of the collective motion several companies The same strategic competitive or strategic direction to verify the similarity of firms in an industry.

Each resource-based strategic group formation is expected to be more stable than the product market strategic group. It is because generally transform an enterprise resource takes much longer time than changes in the product market (Dierickx and Cool, 1989). Furthermore, because the stability of clustering is a prerequisite to detect any differences in performance between groups (Cool and Schendel, 1987), is also expected a durable consequences in performance can be attributed to the strategic resources.

Strategic group move

Strategic changes can be viewed as a move from one strategic group to another strategic group. Strategic group shift or strategic mobility or strategic move is a form of strategic change measured discretely when there is a change in the membership of a group move to other strategic groups between periods (Fiegenbaum and Thomas, 1990). Changes of corporate resources are used to indicate a change in strategy that will result in a strategic shift (Dierickx and Cool, 1989). Strategic shift construct is defined as a change in estimate of the company's strategy (Vicente-Lorente and Zuniga-Vicente, 2006). Fiegenbaum and Thomas (1990) define strategic change as a discrete variable that represents a shift or strategic displacement or strategic move from one group to another group in the 'Stable Strategic Time Periods' (SSTPs), as also discussed by Fuente-Sabate et al. (2007), Vicente-Lorente and Zuniga-Vicente (2006), Fiegenbaum et al. (1990), Fiegenbaum et al. (2001).

Harrigan (1985) propose a way to analyze the strategic through the identification of boundaries between strategic groups as an alternative to the old thinking based on the industrial economy in the company's view that the industry is homogeneous but have different share and market segments. Strategic grouping by cluster analysis method is a way to know the dynamics of an industry as companies become more similar or more different from each other. Thus it can be seen that the nature of competition in the industry so that managers can learn the different approaches used by competitors in the market. This analysis is useful for managers to carry out assessment with respect to: (1) the attraction of market opportunities for the company or for competitors, (2) the ability to exploit the changes in the industry, and (3) also exploit opportunities to enhance long-term profitability. In banking research Amel and Rhoades (1988) applied cluster analysis to find differences in intra-industry profit is mainly due to differences in strategic groups rather than differences in efficiency.

Many studies have shown that many companies take the pressure if she needs differ with other strategic (strategic difference) or similar in the selection strategy (strategic similarity). The company chose the same strategy with the company in one industry, merely to reduce the activity of the competition and to give legitimacy to the existence of the company in an industry or business. The final results are expected from reducing the differences and enhance legitimacy is enhanced performance. However, longitudinal empirical research on commercial banks showed the company will perform better than others with different fixed strategies but have a high legitimacy in the industry (Deephouse, 1999). Intra-industry heterogeneity is a necessary condition of the occurrence of strategic groups, but the condition of adequacy is the extent of the group's companies in the same strategy. So the existence of strategic groups depending on the degree of homogeneity of firms in the industry (Barney, 1986; Barney and Hoskisson, 1990).

If it is understood that the group is seen as a strategic similarities in the strategies used, the formation of a strategic group is not inadvertent. According to Deephouse (1999), a company taking strategic similarity or difference is merely in order to achieve the desired performance. The difference of the two is on the approach to achieve such performance. Companies that take a strategic equality aims to achieve the conformation or industry recognition (strategic conformity), while companies take strategic inequality has a goal to reduce the tension of competition. Good company will pursue strategic similarity or dissimilarity as a strategic attempt to balance and solely for improving performance. Using a sample of banking companies in the United States, the findings of the study Deephouse (1999) suggests that companies should take a different strategy altogether or very similar. To be different or the same need to change the membership of the company from a strategic group into other strategic groups. Strive to be different or to be the same is the process of strategic mobility or strategic shift or strategic move, which is a strategic change.

The main implication of the strategic group is not related to the company's ability to create a stable market segments and profitable through the efforts of collusion. However, the strategic group represents a series of strategic positions that companies can take and use as a reference point. The position of the company within a group may have implications for performance (McNamara et al., 2003). Strategic position depends on the strategic dimension "occupied" or relied upon by the organization in achieving competitive advantage.

Research methods

Research settings

In this research, the banking industry in Indonesia was chosen as the scope or research setting, based on several considerations: (1) the banking industry in Indonesia is a very dynamic industry. Decline in the economic conditions of the late 1990s that led to a financial crisis, triggered by an unhealthy banking sector, resulting in weak macroeconomic fundamentals Indonesia. Since the political and economic reforms that began in 1998 took place in Indonesia, banking companies are forced to make fundamental changes, generally related to organizational structure and core features of the business, (2) banking company believed to be the institution responsible for the operation of the Indonesian economy . As a highly regulated industry, the banking sector dealing with government regulatory changes continuously, where the banking sector must "comply" with regulations for business sustainability, (3) quality of the banking sector's performance in the role as a financial intermediary is at a level below the expectations of the world businesses, governments, and the general public.

Sample

The sample was selected from the population of banks in Indonesia, in the category of Government Banks (Parser), National Private Commercial Bank Foreign Exchange, the National Private Commercial Bank Non-Foreign Exchange, Regional Development Banks, Bank Mixes, and Foreign Banks. By 2007 there were 129 banks that survive in business. Of this amount adequate to sample as many as 126 banks.

Level and unit of analysis

Strategic group research usually takes place at the level of the organization, whereas this study uses unit analysis of the banking company. Usage levels and units of analysis similar to previous studies intended to support the process of falsification and accumulated knowledge of the hypotheses to be tested.

Strategic dimension

Identified groups forming strategic dimension of competitive strategy run by the banking company, the strategy associated with three different decisions: (a) the type of financial products and services offered by the banking company, (b) Customer segments served, and (c) Scope commitment from the banking companies (Galan-Zazo and Zuniga-Vicente, 2003). The decision on the banks established competitive strategy in terms of its market segment. The selection strategy dimension refers to the study Galan-Zazo and Zuniga-Vicente (2003) and Amel and Rhoades (1988). For this study, the selection of strategic dimensions taken from the strategy represents the strategic behavior of banks in Indonesia.

Strategic dimensions as a determinant or forming strategic groups are classified into four strategic variables. In forming strategic groups, the main assumption underlying the strategic variable is the composition on each bank represents a difference of financial products and services that apply to each market segment. Variables selected forming strategic groups of variables that indicate the strategy funds (lending strategy) banking company. The strategic allocation of funds is a (resource allocation) that aims to implement different strategies in order to achieve a particular performance (Barney and Clark, 2007; David, 2009; Thompson et al., 2010). The grants can be categorized in form of intermediation and disintermediation (Eisenbeis, 1985; Mian, 2003; Smith and Walter, 2003; Walter, 2002).

Any kind of distribution of funds is a strategy for the creation of profits according to specific market segments, namely: 1) Segment of the Central Bank or the Bank Indonesia Certificates (SBI), 2) segments inter-bank loans, 3) Investment segment, and 4) Segment Intermediation. Except for segment 4, as intermediation activities, segments 1, 2, and 3 are bank disintermediation activities. Table 1 shows a set of strategic dimensions that will be used for the formation of strategic groups.

Table 1: Strategic Dimensions for Market-based Strategic Group

Strategic dimension	Operationalization	Market Segment (Business Strategy)
V-P1	Placements in Bank Indonesia/Total assets	Market segments SBI (SBI)
V-P2	Account in other banks/Total assets	Segment of the interbank market (ABNK)
V-P3	Securities/Total assets	Investment market segment (INVS)
V-P4	Loans/Total assets	Segment of the loan market (KRDT)

Conceptual explanations of each segment are:

1. SBI is a money market instrument issued by Bank Indonesia to maintain the stability of the rupiah. SBI is securities issued by Bank Indonesia as short-term debt instruments with discount system (Taswan, 2010). Just like SBI, In the United States money market

instruments referred to as treasury bills, short-term debt instrument that is issued by the federal government to finance its development and governance for maturity period of 3, 6, and 12 months. The instrument is the most popular and actively traded (Mishkin, 2004). In terms of banking companies, channeling funds through SBI is an alternative strategy to take advantage when the return or profit resulting from SBI exceeds other alternatives (or credit intermediation, call money or interbank lending, or investing in other securities). The nature of the SBI is a risk-free investment, rate of SBI as the rate of return or the return has been determined by the Bank. On several occasions SBI lending rates higher than the benchmark BI rate. Due to the level of certainty of obtaining high returns, the banking companies channeling funds through SBI bank can be regarded as conservative. Matching of a conservative strategy in the banking company is at manufacturing defender strategy (Miles and Snow, 1978). Defender is the choice of adaptation strategies suggests companies tend to maintain harmony or alignment with the environment that provide stability and cost efficiency in any implementation strategy.

2. Interbank loan is a short loan, also known as the call money, is a short-term placement of funds between banks (in days). Call money is bank instruments to address the deficiency or excess of short-term funds on a temporary basis. For banks that put short loans are recorded on the assets, the bank is the creditor. As for the receiving bank loans placement brief note on liabilities, banks are debtors. Interbank lending or call money by Demiralp et al (2006), Smith and Walter (2003), and Mishkin (2004) referred to as the overnight interbank loan interbank loan daily (overnight loans) are distributed in the inter-bank market or the national federal level . Interbank loan or Call money is an instrument that is relatively widely used by the banking company other than SBI. In this study, inter-bank lending from the perspective of banks to lend, so that the data in terms of banking assets in the balance sheet. Lending between banks that are short an opportunistic bank steps, namely the excess funds be used to provide short-term return when there is demand call money. Matching banking firm opportunistic strategy is reactor strategy at manufacturing (Miles and Snow, 1978). Reactor is an adaptation strategy choices tend to be reactive and show the company was forced to change to adjust to the situation that occurs sustainability is assured in any implementation of the strategies.
3. Investment in capital market instruments such as stocks and bonds is a banking company's efforts to earn interest, dividends, and capital gains (Mishkin, 2004; Taswan, 2010; Kaufman, 1985). In general, the Indonesian banking firm own shares of other companies based on the motivation that can be traded to obtain capital gains and only a small number of banking companies that own shares of other companies in order to control ownership. Since stock prices are fluctuating or volatile, therefore, banking companies channeling funds through investment measures can be regarded as speculative bank. Although not exactly the same, the equivalent of a speculative strategy in the banking company is a manufacturing company analyzer strategy (Miles and Snow, 1978). Analyzer is a strategic choice adaptation showed some activity the company has a portfolio of business, where the business unit was stable and there is also a fluctuating or varying.
4. Intermediation or disbursement of funds through credit is the main task of the banking company (Mishkin, 2004; Taswan 2010). Intermediation by the banking company is mandated by the banking law, in which the bank holding company's role as an agent of development. Intermediation by channeling funds through a credit bid to shore up the progress of the real sector of the economy. With the characteristics of development, then the intermediary bank can be regarded as a progressive bank. Matching of progressive strategy in the banking company is the manufacturing enterprise strategy prospectors (Miles and Snow, 1978). A prospector is choice of adaptation strategies exhibiting

companies tend to try to capitalize on the opportunities of the development of the business environment.

The main reason for the selection of four strategic variables, not only because the same approach is supported by previous studies, this variable refers to, Galan-Zazo and Zuniga-Vicente (2003) and Amel and Rhoades (1988), but also because the four variables dominant contribute to the formation of the advantages of the placement resource or productive assets banking company in Indonesia.

Analysis techniques

An analytical technique used in this study is a cluster analysis using the K-Means Cluaster Method, which is in SPSS V16. The analysis was conducted through three stages of strategic group formation. The first stage is the selection of the company's strategic dimensions of the bank, followed by a second stage of identifying strategic groups in the Indonesian banking sector between the years 1999-2007 as well as identifying stable strategic time periods (SSTPs), and ended by the third stage is the comparison group and the market-based strategic resource. Each stage steps as detailed in Table 2. Previous studies using similar stages are Fuente-Sabate et al. (2007), Vicente-Lorente and Zuniga-Vicente, (2006), Fiegenbaum et al. (1990), Fiegenbaum et al. (2001), Fiegenbaum and Thomas (1990).

Table 2. Determination Procedure of Strategic Group Move

Stages	Steps
Stage 1: Selection of Strategic Dimensions of Corporate Bank	**Step 1:** Reviewing the literature and research results in the Strategic Group.
Stage 2: Identifying strategic groups between the years 1999-2007	**Step 1:** Clustering bank into a strategic group for any period of time or SSTPs strategic stability. By using the K-Means Cluster Analysis,
	Step 2: Determining the number of clusters by looking at the value of F-test of the average variable greatest strategic or significant P-Value
Stage 3: Comparison of the strategic and resource-based market	**Step 1:** Interpretation and characterization of strategic group membership over time both market-based and resource-based

Having identified the group from year to year, the next step is the interpretation and characterization of strategic groups, and then does the naming. The purpose of the strategic group name is to identify the strategies implemented by banking companies in each strategic group. Strategic group naming procedure is as follows:

1. Create a range for the mean or average data every year strategic variable scale research with very high, high, medium, low and very low. The scale up of this range indicates the intensity of the distribution of funds according to their respective market segments.
2. Determine the average value of each scale for strategic variable in each year.

3. Identification of each cluster or strategic group of based on the scale value for each strategic variable in each year.
4. Create names for each cluster based on the identification of the value scale. Naming is seen from the highest scale scores for each strategic variable. A basic concept of naming is by considering the strategic group motivations in choosing segment served. The naming of each cluster or strategic group uses guidelines as in Table 3.

Table 3. Naming Guidelines of the Strategic Group (Cluster)

	Segment Fund Placement	Segment SBI	Interbank Segment	Segment Investment	Segment Intermediation
Intensity Distribution of funds	Very High (ST)	Conservative Superior	Very Opportunistic	Very Speculative	Progressive Superior
	Height (T)	Conservative	Opportunistic	Speculative	Progressive
	Medium (SD)	Relatively Conservative	Relative Opportunistic	Speculative relative	Relative Progressive
	Low (R)	Conservatives Inferior	Less Opportunistic	Less Speculative	Progressive Inferior
	Very Low (SR)	X	Not Opportunistic	Not Speculative	X

Strategic group with the highest scale scores become the main feature in the segment SBI strategic variable, then the group is called a strategic group of superior conservative bank. Gradation of intensity below it can be assessed when the intensity is at a high level then the bank becomes conservative category, while the moderate level category to be relatively conservative, while at low levels to be conservative inferior category, for a very low intensity level was not assessed.

Strategic group with the highest scale scores that characterize the main strategic variable on interbank lending segment (call money), then the group is called a strategic group of banks is very opportunistic. Gradation of intensity below it can be assessed when the intensity is at a high level then the bank becomes opportunistic category, while at moderate levels to be relatively opportunistic category, when it is at low levels to be less opportunistic category, for a very low intensity level categoryy is opportunistic.

Strategic group with the highest scale scores that characterize the main strategic variable in the investment segment of the stock, then the group is called with the bank's strategic highly speculative. Gradation of intensity below it can be assessed when the intensity is at a high level then the bank becomes speculative category, while at the level of being a relatively speculative category, when it is at low levels to be less speculative category, for very low levels of intensity becomes speculative category.

Strategic group with the highest scale scores that characterize the main strategic variable intermediation segment, then the group is called the group of strategic superior progressive bank. Gradation of intensity below it can be assessed when the intensity is at a high level then the bank becomes progressive category, while at the level of being a relatively progressive category, while at low levels become progressively inferior category, for a very low intensity level was not assessed.

Results and discussion

Sample Description and Data

The mean ratio of the placement of funds in the four study variables toward total assets in 126 banking companies as sample showed an increase ranging from 41% in 1999 (baseline year) to 83% in 2007 (end of study). Starting from the beginning of the study, intermediation segment is the largest fund placements in Indonesia's banking business operations, in 1999 the ratio amounted to 20.55% of this segment increased to 28.95% in 2002, then increased significantly to 50.00% in 2003 to 2007 the ratio of intermediation segment still achieved an average above 50%. Investment segment is the second highest ratio reached 16.33% in 1999 and 11.45% in 2000, then declined drastically ranged from 2% to3% from 2001 to 2007. SBI segment showed the phenomenon contrary to the investment segment; in 1999 the ratio reached 2.87% rising to 7.61% in 2000, increased dramatically to 15% to 26% starting in 2001 to 2007. While inter-bank segments have ratios ranging from 1% to 2.29% from 1999 to 2007. The overall development of the ratio of the mean of four strategic variables to total assets can be seen in Table 4.

Table 4. Development of Strategic Variable Mean Ratio to Total Assets Year 1999-2007

Year	Mean Ratio Value for Each Segment				Mean Total Ratio
	SBI Segment	Interbank Segment	Investment Segment	Intermediation Segment	
1999	2.87%	1.33%	16.33%	20.55%	41.09%
2000	7.61%	1.08%	11.45%	24.48%	44.61%
2001	15.05%	1.93%	2.31%	27.00%	46.29%
2002	16.27%	1.42%	2.07%	28.95%	48.71%
2003	22.01%	1.94%	3.73%	50.00%	77.68%
2004	22.34%	2.01%	3.61%	52.45%	80.42%
2005	19.51%	2.29%	3.47%	52.84%	78.11%
2006	24.49%	2.15%	3.00%	50.17%	79.81%
2007	26.94%	1.63%	2.83%	51.87%	83.27%

Source: Indonesian Banking Directory (processed data)

Strategic Mobility

The results of cluster analysis showed a shift in the strategic group membership is mainly due to the number of clusters vary from year to year. Rise and fall of the number of clusters to change the composition of the membership of the cluster. In 1999, strategic clusters or groups with the most members present in cluster 3 with a total membership of 38 banks, while the cluster with the smallest number of members is the fifth cluster which is only 1 bank. In 2000, a strategic group with the largest membership are in cluster 2 with a total membership of 78 banks, while the cluster with the smallest number of members is cluster 1 that 10 banks.

Table 5. Shifting Strategic Group Membership

Year	1999		2000		2001		2002		2003		2004		2005		2006		2007	
∑ Cluster[1]	5 Cluster		3 Cluster		6 Cluster		4 Cluster		4 Cluster		6 Cluster		5 Cluster		5 Cluster		5 Cluster	
Cluster	∑Mbr[2]	%	∑Mbr	%	∑Mbr	%	∑Mbr	%	∑Mbr	%	∑Mbr	%	∑Mbr	%	∑Mbr	%	∑Mbr	%
1	32	25%	10	8%	40	32%	7	6%	32	25%	8	6%	6	5%	4	3%	5	4%
2	26	21%	78	62%	14	11%	26	21%	44	35%	29	23%	50	40%	49	39%	54	43%
3	38	30%	38	30%	3	2%	56	44%	15	12%	10	8%	10	8%	19	15%	16	13%
4	29	23%			23	18%	37	29%	35	28%	52	41%	9	7%	4	3%	3	2%
5	1	1%			44	35%					2	2%	51	40%	50	40%	48	38%
6					2	2%					25	20%						
Total	**126**	**100%**	**126**	**100%**	**126**	**100%**	**126**	**100%**	**126**	**100%**	**126**	**100%**	**126**	**100%**	**126**	**100%**	**126**	**100%**

Notes: 1. Cluster Σ is the number of clusters, 2. Σ mbr is the number of members in a particular cluster

Source: Data processed

In 2001, cluster or strategic group with the largest membership are in cluster 5 with a total membership of 44 banks, while the cluster with the smallest number of members of cluster 6 is the only 2 banks. Similarly, in 2002 and 2007 occurred dynamic cluster membership changes.

Typology of strategic group

Classification of the name of the group obtained from the analysis of the strategic naming essentially derived from 4 (four) categories of the main strategies in the banking industry, namely: 1) conservative strategy category, 2) progressive strategy category; 3) category opportunistic strategies, and; 4) category of speculative strategies.

1999 from five clusters identified there are 56% of banking companies in the speculative category, 23% of companies in the category of progressive banking; corporate banking and 26% fall into the category opportunistic. In 2000 of 3 clusters, 62% of companies in the category of progressive banking, 30% of companies in the category of speculative banking, corporate banking and 8% in the conservative category. Year 2001 of 6 clusters, 35% of companies in the category of progressive banking, 33% of companies in the category of opportunistic banks, 29% of companies in the category of conservative banking. 2002 from four clusters were identified there were 44% of companies in the category of progressive banking, 35% of companies in the category of conservative banking, corporate banking and 21% fall into the category opportunistic. In 2003 of four clusters identified there are 63% of companies in the category of progressive banking, corporate banking and 37% in the conservative category. 2004 from 6 clusters were identified; there were 66% of companies in the category of progressive banking and 34% in the conservative category. 2005 from five clusters identified 55% of the banking company in the category of conservatives, 40% of companies in the category of progressive banking, corporate banking, and 5% in the speculative category. 2006 from five clusters identified there are 57% of banking companies in the category of conservatives, 40% of companies in the category of progressive banking, corporate banking, and 3% in the speculative category. In 2007 there are 55 clusters of 5% of banking companies in the category of conservatives, and 43% of companies in the category of progressive banking. Range category or typology of the conservative strategy and progressive conservative and progressive inferior to superior, and of not opportunistic and speculative to very opportunistic and speculative, decomposes in Table 6.

Changing strategy typology suggests strategic changes occur in the presence of the group's strategic shift. In the 1999 period was dominated by the banking company strategy typology speculative, progressive, and opportunistic. A change in strategic pattern in 2000 is not too big a progressive strategy to dominate followed by a speculative strategy. Opportunistic strategy in 2001-2002 characters seen on most banking companies, while the conservative and progressive strategy remains prominent. Period 1999-2002 looks very prominent strategic change it is because this is a time period of bank restructuring or recovery period post-1998 economic crisis.

Table 6: Typology of Strategies and Strategic Group Members Year 1999-2007.

No	Typology	1999		2000		2001		2002		2003		2004		2005		2006		2007	
		∑ Mb	%	∑ Mb	%	∑ Mb	%	∑Mb	%	∑Mb	%	∑ Mb	%	∑ Mb	%	∑ Mb	%	∑ Mb	%
A	**Conservative**	**0**	**0%**	**10**	**8%**	**37**	**29%**	**44**	**35%**	**47**	**37%**	**43**	**34%**	**70**	**56%**	**72**	**57%**	**69**	**55%**
1	Conservative Superior							7	6%	15	12%	10	8%	10	8%			16	13%
2	Conservative			10	8%	37	29%							51	40%	68	54%		
3	Relatively Conservative							37	29%	32	25%	33	26%					48	38%
4	Conservatives Inferior													9	7%	4	3%	5	4%
B	**Opportunistic**	**26**	**21%**	**0**	**0%**	**42**	**33%**	**26**	**21%**	**0**	**0%**	**0**	**0%**	**0**	**0%**	**0**	**0%**	**0**	**0%**
5	Very Opportunistic					2	2%												
6	Opportunistic																		
7	Relative Opportunistic																		
8	Less Opportunistic																		
9	Not Opportunistic	26	21%			40	32%	26	21%										
C	Speculative	**71**	**56%**	**38**	**30%**	**3**	**2%**	**0**	**0%**	**0**	**0%**	**0**	**0%**	**6**	**5%**	**4**	**3%**	**3**	**2%**
10	Very Speculative	1	1%													4	3%	3	2%
11	Speculative	32	25%	38	30%									6	5%				
12	Speculative relative	38	30%			3	2%												
13	Less Speculative																		
14	Not Speculative																		
D	Progressive	**29**	**23%**	**78**	**62%**	**44**	**35%**	**56**	**44%**	**79**	**63%**	**83**	**66%**	**50**	**40%**	**50**	**40%**	**54**	**43%**
15	Progressive Superior											2	2%	50	40%				
16	Progressive											52	41%			50	40%	54	43%
17	Relative Progressive									44	35%								
18	Progressive Inferior	29	23%	78	62%	44	35%	56	44%	35	28%	29	23%						
	Total	126	100%	126	100%	126	100%	126	100%	126	100%	126	100%	126	100%	126	100%	126	100%

Source: Data Processed

While the dominance of the 2003-2004 period is very prominent progressive strategy with most maintaining a conservative strategy, this period and the commencement of the implementation of risk management policies the Indonesian Banking Architecture. 2005-2007 period, with the application of risk management and supported by the establishment of the Deposit Insurance Agency, Single Presence Policy, and CAR are more conservative banking strategies with most still choose to progressive.

Discussion and conclusion

Strategic changes in the form of strategic mobility (strategic mobility) are indicated by a shift in the strategic setting has not been much studied in Indonesia, but this research has started on setting America and Europe, using the alcoholic beverage industry, insurance, banking and business schools (Hunt, , 1972; Dierickx and Cool, 1989; McGee and Thomas, 1986; Caves and Porter, 1977; Short et al., 2007; Mas-Ruiz et al., 2005; Mehra, 1996; Fuente-Sabate et al., 2007; Vicente -Lorente and Zuniga-Vicente, 2006; Galan-Zazo and Zuniga-Vicente, 2003; Cool and Schendel, 1987; Hatten and Hatten, 1987).

This study uses the settings Indonesian banking firm found that strategic changes in the strategic shift in approach that uses strategic dimensions of the placement of funds in SBI segment, the segment between banks, investment segment, and a segment of the loan or credit, after cluster analysis identified a SSTPs and Non SSTPs . In the year 1999-2002 is Non SSTPs or a turbulent period which saw every year there is a strategic change. Meanwhile, after a change in banking regulations such as API, LPS, Risk Management, SPP and CAR from 2004 till SSTPs in 2007 can be achieved. Identification approach has been used also in previous studies (Fuente-Sabate et al., 2007; Vicente-Lorente and Zuniga-Vicente, 2006; Galan-Zazo and Zuniga-Vicente, 2003). From the analysis of the typology of conservative strategy is the dominant strategy followed by progressive and speculative strategies, Indonesian banks are not many companies are choosing strategic opportunistic.

Previous researches using a sample of banks do not dig the dynamics of strategic change through the strategic shift of the strategic pattern or strategic typology chosen by the strategic group. With detecting typology strategy used (conservative, opportunistic, speculative, and progressive) can be seen clearly respond to the strategic selection of market segments in accordance with the allocation of resources or the placement of funds. So it can be seen that the resources allocated to provide a competitive advantage in the segment where (Peteraf, 1993; Barney, 2001, 1991, 1997; Barney and Clark, 2007; Penrose, 1959, and Wernerfelt, 1994, 1995).

With the discovery of strategic mobility patterns through the strategic shift difference can be said to be strategic different and strategic similar among banking companies identified in Indonesian context using framework by Deephouse (1999). Naming strategic group that gave rise to the company's strategy typology is an attempt provides Indonesian banking alternative formulation thoughts on the efforts of existing typologies by Miles and Snow (1978) or (Porter, 1980 and 1985).

References

Ahadiat, A. (2010). "Pengujian Model Integrasi Perspektif Adaptif dan Inersia Perubahan Strategik: Studi Empiris Pada Bank-Bank Swasta Nasional di Indonesia." *Proceeding Seminar Akbar Forum Manajemen Indonesia "Management: Future Challenges" FEB UNAIR* Surabaya, 02-03 November 2010, ISBN 2086-0188.

Ahadiat, A. (2010). "Komparasi Kelompok Strategik Berbasis Pasar dan Berbasis Sumberdaya," *Prosiding Kolokium dan Seminar Nasional Program MSi dan Doktor Fakultas Ekonomika dan Bisnis Universitas Gadjah Mada*, Yogyakarta, 10-11Desember 2010, ISBN 978-602-97500-1-0.

Ahadiat, A. (2011). "Analisis Kelompok Strategik dan Formulasi Strategi Dominan Perusahaan Perbankan Indonesia" presented on the 6th Doctoral Journey in Management, July 7th – 2011 at Faculty of Economics University of Indonesia, Depok

Ahadiat, A. (2012). *Peran Sumberdaya Berwujud dan Tidak Berwujud Dalam Pergeseran Kelompok Strategik Pada Industri Perbankan Indonesia,* Disertasi Doktor Manajemen Strategik FEB UGM.

Amel, D.F., and Rhoades, S.A. (1988). "Strategic groups in banking." *The Review of Economics and Statistics*. Vol Pp 685-689

Amit, R. and Schoemaker, P. J. H. (1993) "Strategic Assets and Organizational Rent." *Strategic Management Journal*, Vol. 14, No. 1

Barney, J.B. (1991). "Firm resources and sustained competitive advantage." *Journal of Management*. 17(1): 99-120

Barney, J.B. (2001). Is the resource-based view a useful perspective for strategic management research? Yes. *Academy of Management Review* 26(1): 41–56.

Barney, J.B. (2002). *Gaining and Sustaining Competitive Advantage 2nd ed*. Prentice Hall, NJ.

Barney, J. B. and Clark, D. N. (2007). *Resource-Based Theory: Creating and Sustaining Competitive Advantage,* Oxford University Press Inc., New York

Barney, J.B. and Hoskisson, R.E. (1990). "Strategic group: untested assertion and research Proposals", *Managerial and Decision Economics.* Vol 11. No 3: 187-198

Brown, M. (1982). "Administrative succession and organizational performance: The succession effect. " *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 27: 1-16.

Burgelman, R.A. (1991). "Intra-organizational ecology of strategy making and organizational adaptation: Theory and field research." *Organization Science*. vol. 2. p.239-262

Burns, M. J. (1978). *Leadership,* Harper, New York, NY.

Calori, R., and Atamer, T. (1990). "How French managers deal with radical change." *Long Range Planning***.** 23: 44-55.

Campbell, D., (1969). “Variation and selective retention in socio-cultural evolution.” *General Systems*. 16: 69-85

Carroll, G. R. (1984). “Dynamics of publisher succession in newspaper organizations. “ *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 29: 93-113.

Carroll, G., and Hannan, M.T. (1989). ”Density delay in the evolution of organizational population: A model and five empirical tests.” *Administrative Science Quarterly*. 34: 411-430

Castrogiovanni, G.J. (1991). “Environmental munificence: A theoretical assessment.” *Academy of Management Review*. 16: 542-565.

Caves, R. E., and M. E. Porter (1977). “From entry barriers to mobility barriers: Conjectural decisions and contrived deterrence to new competition”, *Quarterly Journall of Economics,* 91 pp. 241-262.

Caves, R. E., and M. E. Porter (1978). “Market structure, oligopoly, and stability of market shares,” *Journal of Industrial Economics,* pp. 289-313.

Cool, K., and Dierickx, I. (1993). “Rivalry, strategic groups and firm profitability.” *Strategic Management Journal.* Vol. 14.1: 47-59

Cool, K., and Schendel, D. (1987). “Strategic group formation and performance: The case of the U.S. pharmaceutical industry, 1963-1982.” *Management Science.* Vol.33.9: 1102-1124

Cyert R.M., and March, J.G. (1963). *A Behavioral theory of the firm*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall

D’Aveni, R. (1994). *Hyper-competition: Managing the dynamic of strategic maneuvering*. New York: The Free Press.

Dagnino, G. B., Levanti, G. and Li Destri, A. M. (2008). "Evolutionary dynamics of inter-firm networks: A complex systems perspective." Baum, J. A. C. dan Rowley, T. J., Network Strategy, *Advances in strategic management.* Vol 25, Emerald, UK.

Darwin, C. (1936). *The origin of species*. New York: Modern Library

David, F. (2009). *Strategic Management: Concepts & Cases* 12th Edition. Pearson Education, Inc. Prentice Hall, New York

Deephouse, D. L. (1999). “To be different or to be the same? It’s a question (and theory) of strategic balance.” *Strategic Management Journal*. 20: 147-166

Demiralp, S., Preslopsky B., and Whitesell, W. (2006). “Overnight interbank loan markets.” *Journal of Economics and Business*, vol. 58, issue 1, pages 67-83.

Dierickx, I., and Cool, K. (1989). “Asset stock accumulation and sustainability of competitive advantage,” *Management Science,* pp. 1504-1513.

Eisenbeis, R. A. (1985). “Inflation and Regulation: The Effects on Financial Institutions and Structure” in Aspinwall, R. C., and Eisenbeis, R. A. (1985). *Handbook for Banking Strategy*, Wiley Inter science Publication, New York.

Eisenhardt, K. M. and Martin, J. A. (2000). “Dynamic capabilities: What are they?” *Strategic Management Journal*. 21: 1105-21

Evered, R. (1983). “So, What is Strategy?” *Long Range Planning*. 16 (June): 57-72

Fiegenbaum A. (1987). “Dynamic aspects of strategic groups and competitive strategy: Concepts and empirical examination in the insurance industry. “In Fiegenbaum A; Sudharshan D, and Thomas, H. (1990). *Journal of Management Studies*. Vol. 27(2): 133–48.

Fiegenbaum, A., Sudharshan, D., and Thomas, H. (1990). “Strategic time periods and strategic groups” research: Concepts and an empirical example.” *Journal of Management Studies.* Vol. 27(2): 133–48.

Fiegenbaum, A., and Thomas, H. (1990). “Strategic Groups and Performance: The U.S. Insurance Industry, 1970-80,” *Strategic Management Journal*, Vol. 11. 197-215

Fiegenbaum, A., Thomas, H., dan Tang M. J. (2001). “Linking Hypercompetition and Strategic Group Theories: Strategic Maneuvering in the US Insurance Industry.” *Managerial and Decision Economics*. Vol. 22: 265-279

Fuente-Sabate, J.M., Julio Rodrıguez-Puerta, J., Vicente-Lorente, J. D., and Zu´niga-Vicente, J.A., (2007). Do Stable Strategic Time Periods Exist? Towards New Methodological and Theoretical Insights, *Managerial and Decision Economics.* 28: 171–180

Galan-Zazo, J. I., and J. A. Zuniga-Vicente (2003). “Resources and strategic change in an unstable industry: The case of Spanish private banking”, *European Business Journal*, 15(2), pp. 79–93.

Harrigan, K. R. (1981). “Deterrents to divestiture.” *Academy of Management Journal*. 21: 306-323.

Harrigan, K. R. (1985). “An Application of Clustering for Strategic Group Analysis.” *Strategic Management Journal,* 6(1), 55-73

Harris, D. dan Helfat C. E. (1997). "Specificity of CEO human capital and compensation." *Strategic Management Journal*. 18(11): 895–920.

Hatten, K. J., and Hatten, M. L., (1987). “Strategic Groups, Asymmetrical Mobility Barriers and Contestability.” *Strategic Management Journal*. Vol. 8, 329-342.

Hunt, M. S. (1972). *“Competition in the major home appliance industry 1960-1970”,* PhD dissertation. Harvard University In Mehra, A. (1996). “Resource and market based determinants of performance in the U.S. banking industry.” *Strategic Management Journal,* 17: 307-322.

Kaufman. G. G. (1985). “The Securities Activities of Commercial Banks”. in Aspinwall, R. C., dan Eisenbeis, R. A. (1985) *Handbook for Banking Strategy* , Wiley Inter science Publication, New York.

Leask, G. (2004). *Strategic Group and The Resource Based View: Natural Complements Enhancing Our Understanding of The Competitive Process*. Aston Business School. Birmingham, UK. ISBN 1854495097.

Lee, J., Lee, K., and Rho, S. (2002) “An Evolutionary Perspective on Strategic Group Emergence: A Genetic Algorithm-Based Model.” *Strategic Management Journal,* 23. 727-746.

Mas-Ruiz, J. F., Nicolau-Gonzalbez, J. L., dan Ruiz-Moreno, F. (2005). “Asymmetric Rivalry Between Strategic Groups: Response, Speed of Response and Ex Ante Vs Ex Post Competitive Interaction in The Spanish Bank Deposit Market.” *Strategic Management Journal*, 26: 713–745

McGee, J., and Thomas, H. (1986). “Strategic Groups: Theory, Research and Taxonomy.” *Strategic Management Journal*, 27.2, 141-160

McGrath, R., Chen, M., and MacMillan. (1998). “Multimarket maneuvering in uncertain spheres of influence: Resource diversion strategies.” *Academy of Management Review*. 23 (4): 724-741

McNamara, G., Deephouse, D. L., and Luce, R. A. (2003). “Competitive Positioning Within and Across A Strategic Group Structure: The Performance of Core, Secondary, and Solitary Firms.” *Strategic Management Journal*, 24: 161-181.

McNamara, G., Luce, R. A., and Thompson (2002). “Examining The Effect of Complexity in Strategic Group Knowledge Structures on Firm Performance.” *Strategic Management Journal*, 23: 153–170

Mehra, A. (1996). “Resource and market based determinants of performance in the U.S. banking industry.” *Strategic Management Journal*, 17: 307-322.

Mintzberg, H. (1978). ”Patterns in Strategy Formation.” *Management Science*. 24 (9): 934-948

Mintzberg, H. (1987). “The Strategy Concept I: Five Ps For Strategy.” *California Management Review*. Fall: 11-24

Mishkin, F. S. (2004). *The economics of money, banking, and financial markets*—7th ed. The Addison-Wesley series in economics. New York.

Newman, H. N. (1978). “Strategic groups and structure/performance relationship,” *Review of Economics and Statistics*. 56. 417-427

Penrose, E. T. (1959). *The theory of the growth of the firm.* John Wiley & Sons, Inc. New York.

Peteraf, M. A. (1993). “The Cornerstones of Competitive Advantage: A Resource-Based View.” *Strategic Management Journal.* 14-3: 179-192.

Peteraf, M. A., and Barney, J. B. (2003). “Unraveling the Resource-based Triangle.”

Managerial and Decision Economics, 24: 309–23.

Peteraf, M. A., and Shanley, M. (1997). "Getting to Know You: A Theory of Strategic Group Identity." *Strategic Management Journal*. Summer Special Issue, 165-186.

Porter, M. (1979). "Structure within industries and companies" performance," *Review of Economics and Statistics*. 61. 214-227.

Porter, M. E. (1980). *Competitive strategy*. New York. The Free Press.

Porter, M. E. (1985). *Competitive advantage: Creating and sustaining superior performance*. New York. The Free Press.

Porter, M. E. (1991). "Toward of a Dynamic Theory of Strategy." *Strategic Management Journal*. Vol. 12. Winter: 95-117.

Powell and Dent-Micallef, A. (1997). "Information Technology as Competitive Advantage: The Role of Human, Business, and Technology Resources," *Strategic Management Journal,* 18: 375–405.

Prahalad, C. K., and Hamel, G. (1990). "Core Competence of the Corporation." *Harvard Business Review* (May-June), 71-91.

Quinn, J. B. (1980). *Strategies for change: Logical incrementalism*. Homewood, IL: Irwin.

Quinn, J. B., Doorley, T. L., and Paquette, P. C. (1990). 'Beyond products: Services-based strategy. *Harvard Business Review*, pp. 58-67.

Ramaswamy, K. and Li, M. (1997). "Strategic change among U.S. business schools: A strategic group analysis." *Journal of Education for Business*; 72, 6: 343-347

Reger, R., and Huff, A. (1993). "Strategic groups: A cognitive perspective." *Strategic Management Journal,* 14: 103-124.

Ruíz, J. M. (1998). "Dynamic analysis of competition in marketing Strategic groups in Spanish banking" *European Journal of Marketing,* 32,3/4, 252-278

Rumelt, R. P., Schendel, D., and Teece, D. J. (1991). "Strategic management and economics," *Strategic Management Journal*, Winter Special Issue, 12, pp. 5-29.

Rumelt, R. P., Schendel, D., and Teece, D. J. (1994). *Fundamental Issues in Strategy: A Research Agenda.* Harvard Business School Press, MA.

Rumelt, R. P. (1974). "Strategy, structure and economic performance." *Harvard Business School.* Boston. MA.

Rumelt, R. P. (1979). "Evaluation of Strategy: Theory and Models," in Schendel, D. E. and Hofer, C. W., eds. *Strategic Management: A New View of Business Policy and Planning.* Boston, MA: Little Brown

Rumelt, R. P. (1984). “Towards a Strategic Theory of the Firm.” in R. Lamb (ed.), *Competitive Strategic Management*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, pp. 556–70.

Short, J. C.; Ketchen, Jr. D. J.; Palmer, T. B. and Hult, T.M. (2007). “Firm, Strategic Group, and Industry Influence on Performance.” *Strategic Management Journal,* 28: 147–167

Simon, H. A. (1964) “On the concept of organizational goal,” *Administrative Sciences Quarterly*, 9 (I). pp. 1-22.

Smith, K.G., Ferrier, W. J., and Ndofor, H. (2001). “Competitive Dynamics Research: Critique and Future Directions,” in Hitt, M. A., Freeman, R. E., and Harrison, J. S. *The Blackwell Handbook of Strategic Management Eds*. London: The Blackwell

Smith, K. G., and Grimm, C. M. (1987). “Environmental variation, strategic change and firm performance: A study of railroad deregulation.” *Strategic Management Journal*. 8: 363-376.

Smith, K., Grimm, C., Young, G. and Wally, S. (1997). Strategic groups and rivalrous firm behavior: Towards reconciliation. *Strategic Management Journal*. 18:2, 149–157

Smith, K. G., Gannon, M. J., and Grimm, C. M. (1992). “An organizational information-processing profile of first movers.” *Journal of Business Research*. 25: 231-242.

Smith, R. C., and Walter, I. (2003). *Global Banking* 2nd ed. Oxford University Press, Inc., New York.

Taswan (2010). *Manajemen Perbankan: Konsep, Teknik dan Aplikasi*, UPP STIM YKPN, Yogyakarta

Thompson, A., Strickland, A. J., dan Gamble, J. (2010). *Crafting and Executing Strategy*. 17th ed. McGraw-Hill

Vicente-Lorente, J.D., and Zuniga-Vicente, J.A., (2006). “Testing the Time-Variancy of Explanatory Factors of Strategic Change,” *British Journal of Management*, Vol. 17, 93–114

Walter, I. (2002). “Strategies in Financial Services, the Shareholders and the System is Bigger and Broader Better?” *NYU Working Paper* No. FIN-02-025. Available at SSRN: http://ssrn.com/abstract=1294203

Wernerfelt, B. (1984). “A resource-based view of the firm.” *Strategic Management Journal*. 5 (2): 171-180

Wernerfelt, B. (1995). “A resource-based view of the firm: ten years after.” *Strategic Management Journal*. 16 (3): 171-174

Zuniga-Vicente, J. A., Fuente-Sabate, J. M. and Suarez-Gonzalez, I. (2005).”Facilitating and inhibiting factors behind strategic change: Evidence in the Spanish private banking industry, 1983–1997”, *Scandinavian Journal of Management*, 21(3), pp. 235–265.

Zuniga-Vicente, J. A., and Vicente-Lorente, J. D. (2006) “Strategic Moves and Organizational Survival in Turbulent Environments: The Case of Spanish Banks (1983–97),” *Journal of*

Management Studies 43:3.

Zuniga-Vicente, J. A., and Vicente-Lorente, J. D. (2004) "Time dependency of exploratory factors of strategic change: An exploratory longitudinal study." Academy of Management Best Conference Paper 2004 OMT: J1

_________________ (2008). *Pinjaman Singkat* http://id.wikipedia.org/wiki/ Pinjaman_singkat Halaman ini terakhir diubah pada 06:48, 28 Februari 2008.

Strategy typology formation through strategic group change in Indonesian banking industry

ORIGINALITY REPORT

5%	3%	1%	2%
SIMILARITY INDEX	INTERNET SOURCES	PUBLICATIONS	STUDENT PAPERS

PRIMARY SOURCES

1	mafiadoc.com Internet Source	3%
2	Submitted to Fakultas Ekonomi Universitas Indonesia Student Paper	1%
3	AJAY MEHRA. "RESOURCE AND MARKET BASED DETERMINANTS OF PERFORMANCE IN THE U.S. BANKING INDUSTRY", Strategic Management Journal, 04/1996 Publication	1%

Exclude quotes	Off	Exclude matches	< 1%
Exclude bibliography	On		

Strategy typology formation through strategic group change in Indonesian banking industry

GRADEMARK REPORT

FINAL GRADE

/0

GENERAL COMMENTS

Instructor

PAGE 1

PAGE 2

PAGE 3

PAGE 4

PAGE 5

PAGE 6

PAGE 7

PAGE 8

PAGE 9

PAGE 10

PAGE 11

PAGE 12

PAGE 13

PAGE 14

PAGE 15

PAGE 16

PAGE 17

PAGE 18

PAGE 19

PAGE 20

PAGE 21

PAGE 22