

**TABLE 1  
COMPARISON OF STRATEGY APPROACHES**

	<b>Porter (1985)</b>	<b>Miles &amp; Snow (1978)</b>	<b>Miller &amp; Friesen (1978)</b>	<b>Venkatraman (1989a)</b>
<b>Description</b>	4 Strategic Types: Cost Leadership Differentiation Cost Focus Differentiation Focus	4 Strategic Types: Defender Prospector Analyzer Reactor	10 Strategic Types: Adaptive Firm - Moderate Challenge Adaptive Firm - Very Challenging Dominant Firm Giant Under Fire Entrepreneurial Conglomerate Innovator Impulsive Firm - Running Blind Stagnant Bureaucracy Headless Giant Swimming Upstream	6 Strategy Dimensions: Aggressiveness Analysis Defensiveness Futurity Proactiveness Riskiness
<b>Criteria</b>				
Consistent with Strategic Choice Perspective	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Compatible with Competitive Business-Level Strategy	Yes	Yes	Somewhat	Yes
Measurement Properties	Issues of mutual exclusivity	Issues of mutual exclusivity	Only as good as the data used for the cluster analysis	Designed specifically to address measurement concerns
Consistent with a pattern in a stream of actions	Position oriented	Acceptable	Position oriented	Acceptable