



Strategic Management PhD Seminar MHR 870 – Spring 2012

Instructor: [Russ Coff](#)
Email: RCoff@bus.wisc.edu
Class time: W 9:30-12, room 4151 (except on 4/11)
Phone: (608) 263-6437
Office Hrs: by appointment

Course Overview and Objectives

This doctoral level strategy seminar invites students to explore drivers of performance heterogeneity among firms. Why do some firms out-perform others? The topic is integrative in that the answer draws on theory from economics, sociology, and even psychology as well as management and organizational theory that is interdisciplinary. In studying this topic, we will also focus on the process of conducting management research. What is the anatomy of a scholarly contribution and how does one conduct research in this field?

Learning Objectives

The primary overarching goal is to help doctoral students become independent scholars who are knowledgeable in the field of strategic management. Specifically, students will be able to:

1. Develop an understanding of the concepts, theory, and research in strategic management;
2. Summarize, integrate, and evaluate and research in strategic management;
3. Develop new ideas and/or approaches that advance this research literature and that might serve as starting points for publishable research papers; and
4. Master research process skills critical to success in an academic career such as the ability to think clearly and communicate effectively both orally and in written form.

Seminar Format and Assignments

Like other seminars you have taken, the assignments are built around understanding the readings and generating new research directions. The grading falls into the four areas reflected in the table to the right. Each is examined below.

Class preparation and participation (30%)

You are expected to be an active (and constructively critical) participant in all class sessions. Preparation before class is essential, and an important part of the evaluation of performance will be based on student preparedness and internalization of concepts as evidenced by in-class discussion. This component of the grade has three key elements: preparation of reading assignments before class, participation in

Component	% of Grade
Class preparation and participation	30%
Discussion leader	10%
Pseudo comp outlines	10%
Research “proposal”	50%

class discussion, and contributing by offering feedback to one of your classmates on his/her research proposal.

Annotated bibliography of readings. Preparation includes developing and maintaining the annotated bibliography of key readings that you started in prior seminars. This will serve as a database to help you study for comprehensive exams as well as class. Each entry should be less than one page but generally more than a brief abstract. At minimum, it should include the paper's main contribution in your own words. You may then go on to note interesting questions or methods to which you may refer later. I will collect these each week. I don't expect that you will read all of the supplemental readings (marked with *). However, if you decided to pursue the topic in your research, these are books and articles you should read on your own to get greater depth.

Participation in discussions. Doctoral seminars are very small so the quality of the learning experience depends greatly on each person. A student who sits back and listens (however intently) is likely to detract from others' learning experience. Your class contributions should go well beyond "I liked this reading" and "I didn't like that one" (although these reactions are important). Try to dig deeper and ask questions like:

- ✓ What is missing?
- ✓ What relevant questions aren't answered?
- ✓ What are the article's broader implications?
- ✓ What assumptions does this perspective make about people? Firms? Markets?
- ✓ How tenable are those assumptions?
- ✓ You might also want to compare and contrast the articles on the questions above: How are these articles similar or different?
- ✓ What studies should be done to develop theory in the area under discussion?

Review of classmate's term project. Part of your class preparation will include providing feedback on a classmate's paper. The fact that this will not be a blind review process should sensitize you to the need for constructive feedback. While the confidentiality of a blind review process gives the reviewer the freedom to provide frank, direct, and undiluted feedback without fear of negative consequences. Nevertheless, this confidentiality is not a license to be rude, insulting, or inappropriate. Rather, you should keep your criticisms constructive – i.e., focused on specific, concrete changes that could realistically improve the rough draft, taking into account all of the constraints on this term project assignment and on research projects in general. The peer review should be about 2 to 3 pages long.

For further advice on reviewing, please see the Academy of Management Journal's "Guidelines for Reviewers" web page at: http://aom.pace.edu/amjnew/reviewer_guidelines.html. You will receive the rough draft for you to review at class meeting #8. Please submit two printed, stapled copies of your peer review at class meeting #9.

Discussion leader (10%)

Each student will be assigned to serve as discussion leader for one class session. The discussion leader's task is to:

1. *Summarize background literature as a starting point.* Each topic is the culmination of years of research. In order to analyze the current papers, we must begin with an understanding of the earlier literature on the topic. As such, begin with a brief summary of the key points from the optional supplemental readings – explaining what the main issues, ideas, debates, and results are. Don't try to cover everything. Rather you should cover the key aspects that put the assigned readings in the proper perspective.

2. *Prepare assigned readings.* Thoroughly prepare to discuss each of the assigned readings. Each seeks to contribute to theory and empirically test the predictions offered. The discussion leader should be prepared to discuss all aspects of the theoretical and methodological contribution for each paper. Note that the papers are listed in alphabetical order – you will have to consider what order makes more sense.
3. *Plan and lead discussion.* Ok, you’ve done the analysis but please don’t think of it as a lecture – we have 2½ hours together and it will be deadly. Rather, plan to lead discussion so that the most critical points emerge. For example, you might prepare a sequence of questions and/or activities that will lead participants to integrate and compare the papers, develop their own mental maps of the literature, and seek out new and “interesting” research opportunities.

I will hand out a brief set of suggestions for discussants and facilitators ([that Karl Weick prepared](#)). This should help you to both organize the papers and engage the class in an active discussion.

At least 24 hours before a class that you are scheduled to lead, please send me your outline of the session or have a planning meeting with me. This will be your opportunity to describe and explain how you intend to lead your portion of the class session, and to get feedback and approval for your plan.

“Pseudo-Comp” question outlines (10%)

I have included “pseudo-comp” questions on the syllabus for each topic that force you to integrate the readings across sessions or explore how one might use data to test theories. This involves preparing detailed outlines to address two of these questions. They are “comp-like” in that they extend across sessions and often link to other areas of the literature (and perhaps even other seminars you have taken). That is, most questions on comprehensive exams require you to integrate literature covered in multiple research seminars. Rather than writing a complete answer to the question (≈15pgs), your task is to develop a detailed outline for how you would answer it. The outline should include cites (to assigned readings and other relevant sources) along with a few words to indicate why the citation fits in that point in your discussion/argument.

Original research project (50%)

You are required to prepare a 10 to 20 page term project that is a *proposal* for a research project. If executed, this could become the basis of a publishable paper or dissertation. It should be aimed at either adding new knowledge to the strategy field or bringing a new perspective to existing findings. Either way, it should be executed in a way that would be “interesting” in the sense of the Murray Davis “That’s Interesting” article.

Format. This research paper should adhere to the format and submission guidelines provided by the Academy of Management Journal (see http://aom.pace.edu/amjnew/style_guide.html for details), and should be organized roughly as follows:

- 1) Your introduction should identify the existing “conversation” you are joining, what is missing from this conversation, and how you intend to fill that gap. If your first two pages don’t clearly explain your point, and why it is important, most readers will lose interest – especially reviewers.
- 2) A “Theory” section where you review the literature needed to put your contribution into focus. Then develop, explain, and justify your unique contribution. A complete theory

would include three main elements – what causes what, why and how, and under what conditions:

- a. What causes what? An empirically falsifiable prediction, with Independent and dependent variables that are clearly articulated and defined.
 - b. Why and how? A logical and internally-consistent causal mechanism, which provides a bridge or a process through which the assumptions and boundary conditions provided in part (c) below will lead naturally to the prediction provided in part (a) above.
 - c. Under what conditions? A clear statement of the bare minimum set of assumptions and boundary conditions that must be fulfilled in order for the causal mechanism in part (b) above to apply, and in order for the prediction in part (a) above to be derived. (Imposing additional assumptions and boundary conditions beyond the bare minimum is viewed as undesirable, because it unnecessarily restricts the theory’s range of applicability.)
 - d. Carve out a “bite-sized” contribution. Because it is nearly impossible to develop a complete, new, full-blown, paradigm-shifting theory in the space you will have, you may prefer to aim for making a smaller “bite-sized” contribution to theory, such as:
 - ✓ Articulating a theory’s hidden assumptions or boundary constraints.
 - ✓ Examining interesting special cases, where more and/or stronger predictions can be derived under additional assumptions or boundary constraints.
 - ✓ Finding inconsistencies within a theory.
 - ✓ Articulating previously overlooked points of inconsistency between theories.
 - ✓ Introducing a new construct or variable.
 - ✓ Questioning an existing conceptual construct or variable.
 - ✓ Deriving new predictions from an old theory (or theories).
 - ✓ Synthesizing multiple theories, where the combined whole differs from the sum of the parts – i.e., interaction effects, where the combination of theories generates new and different predictions.
 - ✓ Extending a theory, by considering the consequences of relaxing restrictive assumptions or boundary constraints.
 - ✓ Importing theories, constructs, or variables across levels of analysis.
- 3) A “Methodology” section in which you describe a research design that would be appropriate to test your question or idea, using data that could realistically be collected, organized, and analyzed within a one year time horizon (taking into account the financial constraints, data-access constraints, and time constraints on a typical doctoral student). Although this section will most likely consider how and where you might collect data, it is nevertheless possible that the relevant data might be readily available (e.g., in public databases or in data sets already collected by other researchers), in which case you are strongly encouraged to go ahead and perform the actual data analysis and report the results in the paper, in a separate “Results” section.
- 4) Length: Less is more. I have specified page limits that will push you to be very concise – this can be a special challenge. Accordingly, you should heed the following words of wisdom from the “Notice to Contributors” printed in every issue of Administrative Science Quarterly:

“We are interested in compact presentations of theory and research, suspecting that very long manuscripts contain an unclear line of argument, multiple arguments, or no argument at all. Each manuscript should contain one key point, which the author should be able to state in one sentence. Digressions from one key point are common when authors cite more literature than is necessary to frame and justify an argument.”

Schedule. You should start thinking about your topic early in the semester, and you should discuss your initial thoughts with me, so I can point you towards related work. If your desired topic is covered late in the semester, you will need to read ahead to get started. This term project will probably require you to do additional reading beyond the syllabus. In order to help you structure and pace your work, you must submit intermediate work-in-progress products as outlined below, and the topic of your term project must be approved (so don't get too far along before coordinating with the instructor):

- 1) Term project topic must be approved by me by class meeting #5, either verbally or via e-mail.
- 2) Printed outline of the proposed term project, 2 to 3 pages in length (necessary in order to gain approval of instructor) is due by class meeting #6, but may be submitted earlier. This outline itself will not be graded, but rather will be used to provide developmental feedback. However, failure to submit an outline by the deadline may result in a reduced grade for the term project.
- 3) Two printed copies of a rough draft of the term project, including references, are due by session #8. This rough draft will not be graded but will be used to provide developmental feedback.
- 4) Reviews of the rough drafts will be exchanged at class meeting #9, at which time you will also receive the instructor's feedback.
- 5) Two single-sided printed copies of the completed term project are due by 5/14.

There will be no Incomplete grades given. If you want to further develop and polish the paper, you are encouraged to do so after the end of the semester, but this additional work will NOT be graded by using the “incomplete” grade to extend the term project deadline.

Presentation. At the final session (class #10), you will give a 10-minute presentation about your project. The time limit will be strictly enforced, so you should practice to make sure it isn't too long. In this spirit, you should plan to use no more than 5 slides and don't cram more material in by talking faster or using smaller fonts. Rather than trying to present your entire term project, you should try to sell the audience on what the project is and make them want to see the full paper. Try to achieve the quality one would hope to see in a research presentation at a major academic conference.

One purpose of this class presentation is to facilitate the generation of constructive feedback, ideas, and suggestions from your classmates about your term project. So, at the end of each presentation, there will be a brief period for the class to ask questions, give comments, and offer suggestions.

Overview of Class Topics and Assignments[†]

Date and Topic	Discussion Leader	Assignments/Deadlines
Pre-reading: What does a contribution look like and the life of an academic		Identify preferences (top 5) for which sessions to lead and/or prepare outlines for comp questions Annotated bibliography
Session 1 (2/15/12): What is strategy research about (lay of the land...)?		Annotated bibliography
Session 2 (2/22/12): Current state of the RBV		Annotated bibliography <i>“Pseudo-comp” question:</i> How can firms get the types of resources and capabilities that hold the most promise as a source of competitive advantage ... at a bargain (e.g., less than their value in use)? What type of study would advance this literature?
Session 3 (2/29/12): Dynamic capabilities and adaptation		Annotated bibliography <i>“Pseudo-comp” question:</i> Compare and contrast the theory of dynamic capabilities with organizational adaptation and learning. What do they tell us about what “pieces” must be in place for a firm to have a competitive advantage in a dynamic environment? What type of study would advance this literature?
Session 4 (3/7/12): Boundaries of the firm (Diversification, vertical integration, and M&A)		Annotated bibliography <i>“Pseudo-comp” question:</i> What does the literature tell us about the circumstances under which a multi-business firm might enjoy a competitive advantage? What type of study would advance this literature?
Session 5 (3/14/12): Corporate governance and top management teams		Annotated bibliography Term paper topics must be approved <i>“Pseudo-comp” question:</i> How might the upper echelons perspective be linked to and integrated with the resource-based view? What type of study would advance this literature?
3/21, 3/28, & 4/4 – No class		
Session 6 (4/11/12): Alliance capabilities and networks (Class meets in 5121)		Annotated bibliography Outline for term paper project
Session 7 (4/18/12): Human Capital, mobility and competitive advantage		Annotated bibliography <i>“Pseudo-comp” question:</i> What are the boundary conditions under which one would expect to observe a sustained advantage stemming from human assets? What type of study would advance this literature?
Session 8 (4/25/12): Cognition, framing and strategy		Annotated bibliography Term Paper Draft Due <i>“Pseudo-comp” question:</i> What cognition issues are inherent in the resource-based view? What are the implications for sustainability of such an advantage? What type of study would advance this literature?
Session 9 (5/2/12): Workshop on papers		Reviews Due
Session 10 (5/9/12): Presentations		Final paper due 5/14/12

[†] Click on any of the **session topics** in the table to go to the readings for that session. Class meets in room 4151 except for session 6 (4/11) which meets in room 5121.

Detailed Topics and Reading List
(Supplemental readings indicated by *)

Pre-reading: What does a contribution look like and the life of an academic

- Bartunek, J.M., Rynes, S., and Ireland, R.D. 2006 What Makes Management Research Interesting, and Why Does It Matter? . *Academy of Management Journal* **49**: 9-15 .
- Grant, A.M. and Pollock, T.G. 2011. Publishing in AMJ Part 3: Setting the Hook. *Academy of Management Journal* **54**: 873-879.
- Lehrer, J. 2010. THE TRUTH WEARS OFF: Is there something wrong with the scientific method? *The New Yorker*.
- Glick, W.H., Miller, C.C., and Cardinal, L.B. 2007 Making a life in the field of organizational science *Journal of Organizational Behavior* **28**: 817-835 .
- *Davis, M.S. 1971. That's Interesting! Towards a Phenomenology of Sociology and a Sociology of Phenomenology *Philosophy of the Social Sciences* **1**: 309-344 .

Session 1 (2/15/12): What is strategy research about (lay of the land...)?

- Henderson, A.D., Raynor, M.E., and Ahmed, M. 2012. How Long Must a Firm Be Great to Rule Out Chance? Benchmarking sustained superior performance without being fooled by randomness. *Strategic Management Journal* **33**.
- Porter, M.E. 1996. What is strategy? *Harvard Business Review* **74**: 61-78.
- Nag, R., Hambrick, D.C., and Chen, M.J. 2007. What is Strategic Management, Really? Inductive derivation of a consensus definition of the field. *Strategic Management Journal* **28**: 935-956.
- Ronda-Pupo, G.A. and Guerras-Martin, L.A. 2012. Dynamics of the Evolution of the Strategy Concept 1962–2008: A co-word analysis. *Strategic Management Journal* **33**: 162-188.
- *Barney, J.B. 1991. Firm Resources and Sustained Competitive Advantage. *Journal of Management* **17**: 99-120.
- *Denrell, J. 2004. Random Walks and Sustained Competitive Advantage *Management Science* **50**: 922-934.
- *Jacobsen, R. 1988. The Persistence of Abnormal Returns. *Strategic Management Journal* **9**: 415-430.
- *McEvily, S.K. and Chakravarthy, B. 2002. The persistence of knowledge-based advantage: An empirical test for product performance and technological knowledge. *Strategic Management Journal* **23**: 285.
- *McGahan, A.M. and Porter, M.E. 1997. How much does industry matter, really? *Strategic Management Journal* **18**: 15-30.
- *Brush, T.H., Bromiley, P., and Hendrickx, M. 1999. The Relative Influence of Industry and Corporation on Business Segment Performance: An Alternative Estimate *Strategic Management Journal* **20**.

Session 2 (2/22/12): Current state of the RBV

- Arend, R.J. and Lévesque, M. 2010. Is the Resource-Based View a Practical Organizational Theory? *Organization Science* **21**: 913-933.
- Foss, N.J. 2011. Why Micro-Foundations for Resource-Based Theory Are Needed and What They May Look Like. *Journal of Management* **37**: 1413.
- Markman, G.D., Gianiodis, P.T., and Buchholtz, A.K. 2009. Factor-Market Rivalry. *Academy of Management Review* **34**: 423-441.
- Nag, R. and Gioia, D.A. 2012. From Common to Uncommon Knowledge: Foundations of firm-specific use of knowledge as a resource. *Academy of Management Journal*.
- Ndofor, H.A., Sirmon, D.G., and He, X. 2011. Firm resources, competitive actions and performance: investigating a mediated model with evidence from the in-vitro diagnostics industry. *Strategic Management Journal* **32**: 640.
- Obloj, T. and Capron, L. 2011. Role of resource gap and value appropriation: effect of reputation gap on price premium in online auctions. *Strategic Management Journal* **32**: 447.
- *Amit, R. and Schoemaker, P.J.H. 1993. Strategic Assets and Organizational Rent *Strategic Management Journal* **14**: 33-46 .
- *King, A.W. and Zeithaml, C. 2001. Competencies and Firm Performance: Examining the Causal Ambiguity Paradox. *Strategic Management Journal* **22**: 75-99.
- *Lieberman, M.B. and Montgomery, D.B. 1988. First-Mover Advantages. *Strategic Management Journal* **9**: 41-58.
- *Lippman, S.A. and Rumelt, R.P. 1982. Uncertain Imitability: An Analysis of Interfirm Differences in Efficiency Under Competition. *Bell Journal of Economics* **13**: 418-438.
- *Peteraf, M.A. 1993. The Cornerstones of Competitive Advantage: A Resource-based View. *Strategic Management Journal* **14**: 179-191.
- *Reed, R. and DeFillippi, R.J. 1990. Causal Ambiguity, Barriers to Imitation, and Sustainable Competitive Advantage. *Academy of Management Review* **15**: 88-102.
- *Mahoney, J.T. and Pandian, J.R. 1992. The resource-based view of the firm within the conversation of strategic management. *Strategic Management Journal* **13**: 363-380.
- *Wernerfelt, B. 1984. A Resource-Based View of the Firm. *Strategic Management Journal* **5**: 171-180.

“Pseudo-comp” question: How can firms get the types of resources and capabilities that hold the most promise as a source of competitive advantage ... at a bargain (e.g., less than their value in use)? What type of study would advance this literature?

Session 3 (2/29/12): Dynamic capabilities and adaptation

- Benner, M.J. and Ranganathan, R. 2012. Offsetting Illegitimacy? How Pressures from Securities Analysts Influence Incumbents in the Face of New Technologies. *Academy of Management Journal* **55**.
- Eggers, J.P. 2012. All experience is not created equal: learning, adapting, and focusing in product portfolio management. *Strategic Management Journal* **33**: 315-335.
- Eisenhardt, K.M. and Martin, J.A. 2000. Dynamic capabilities: What are they? *Strategic Management Journal* **21**: 1105-1121.
- Heimeriks, K.H., Schijven, M., and Gates, S. 2012. Manifestations of Higher-Order Routines: The Underlying Mechanisms of Deliberate Learning in the Context of Post-Acquisition Integration. *Academy of Management Journal* **55**.
- Zollo, M. and Winter, S. 2002. Deliberate Learning and the Evolution of Dynamic Capabilities. *Organization Science* **13**: 339-354.
- *Teece, D.J., Pisano, G., and Shuen, A. 1997. Dynamic Capabilities and Strategic Management. *Strategic Management Journal* **18**:7: 509-533.
- *Blyler, M. and Coff, R.W. 2003. Dynamic Capabilities, Social Capital, & Rent Appropriation: Ties that split pies. *Strategic Management Journal* **24**: 677-686.
- *Levinthal, D.A. 1997. Adaptation on rugged landscapes. *Management Science* **43**: 934-950.
- *McNamara, G., Vaaler, P., Devers, C. (2003). Same as it ever was: The search for increasing hypercompetition. *Strategic Management Journal*, 24(3): 261-278.
- *Helfat, C., Finkelstein, S., Mitchell, W., Peteraf, M., Singh, H., Teece, D.J. and Winter, S.G. 2007. Dynamic Capabilities: Understanding Strategic Change in Organizations. *John Wiley & Sons, Inc.*.
- *Wiggins, R.R. & Ruefli, T.W. (2005). Schumpeter's Ghost: Is Hypercompetition Making the Best of Times Shorter? *Strategic Management Journal*, 26(10): 887-911.
- *Burns, T. and Stalker, G.M. 1961. *The Management of Innovation*. London: Tavistock Publications.

“Pseudo-comp” question: Compare and contrast the theory of dynamic capabilities with organizational adaptation and learning. What do they tell us about what “pieces” must be in place for a firm to have a competitive advantage in a dynamic environment? What type of study would advance this literature?

Session 4 (3/7/12): Boundaries of the firm (Diversification, vertical integration, and M&A)

- Kapoor, R. and Adner, R. 2012. What Firms Make vs. What They Know: How Firms' Production and Knowledge Boundaries Affect Competitive Advantage in the Face of Technological Change. *Organization Science* **23**.
- Macher, J.T. and Boerner, C. 2012. Technological Development at the Boundaries of the Firm: A knowledge-based examination of drug development. *Strategic Management Journal* **33**.

- Matusik, S.F. and Fitza, M.A. 2012. Diversification in the Venture Capital Industry: Leveraging Knowledge Under Uncertainty. *Strategic Management Journal* **33**.
- Qian, L., Agarwal, R., and Hoetker, G. 2012. Configuration of Value Chain Activities: The Effect of Pre-Entry Capabilities, Transaction Hazards, and Industry Evolution on Decisions to Internalize. *Organization Science* **23**.
- *Conner, K.R. and Prahalad, C.K. 1996. A resource- based theory of the firm: Knowledge versus opportunism. *Organization Science* **7**: 477-501.
- *Alchian, A.A. and Demsetz, H. 1972. Production, Information Costs, and Economic Organization. *American Economic Review* **62**: 777-795.
- *Barney, J.B. 1988. Returns to Bidding Firms in Mergers and Acquisitions: Reconsidering the Relatedness Hypothesis. *Strategic Management Journal* **9**: 71-78.
- *Campa, J.M. and Kedia, S. 2002. Explaining the Diversification Discount *Journal of Finance* **57**: 1731-1762.
- *Coff, R. 1999. How Buyers Cope with Uncertainty When Acquiring Firms in Knowledge-Intensive Industries: Caveat Emptor *Organization Science* **10**: 144-161 .
- *Coff, R. 2003 Bidding Wars over R&D Intensive Targets: Knowledge, Opportunism and the Market for Corporate Control *Academy of Management Journal* **46**: 74-85 .
- *Hennart, J.-F. 1993 Explaining the Swollen Middle: Why most transactions are a mix of "market" and "hierarchy" *Organization Science* **4**: 529-547 .
- *Masten, S.E. 2002. Modern evidence on the firm. *American Economic Review* **92**: 428.
- *Palich, L.E., Cardinal, L.B., and Miller, C.C. 2000. Curvilinearity in the Diversification-Performance Linkage: An examination of over three decades of research. *Strategic Management Journal* **21**: 155-174.
- *Poppo, L. and Zenger, T. 1998. Testing alternative theories of the firm: Transaction cost, knowledge-based, and measurement explanations for make-or-buy decisions in information services. *Strategic Management Journal* **19**: 853.
- *Robins, J. and Wiersema, M.F. 1995. A Resource-Based Approach to the Multibusiness Firm - Empirical-Analysis of Portfolio Interrelationships and Corporate Financial Performance. *Strategic Management Journal* **16**: 277-299.
- *Silverman, B.S. 1999. Technological Resources and the Direction of Corporate Diversification: Toward an Integration of the Resource-Based View and Transaction Cost Economics. *Management Science* **45**: 1109-1124.
- *Williamson, O.E. 1981. The Economics of Organization: The Transaction Cost Approach. *American Journal of Sociology* **87**: 548-577.
- *Villalonga, B. and McGahan, A. 2005. The Choice Among Acquisitions, Alliances, and Divestitures. *Strategic Management Journal* **26**: 1183-1208.

“Pseudo-comp” question: What does the literature tell us about the circumstances under which a multi-business firm might enjoy a competitive advantage? What type of study would advance this literature?

Session 5 (3/14/12): Corporate governance and top management teams

- Boivie, S., Lange, D.A., McDonald, M.L., and Westphal, J.D. 2011. Me or We: The Effects of CEO Organizational Identification on Agency Costs. *Academy of Management Journal* **54**.
- Geletkanycz, M.A. and Boyd, B.K. 2011. CEO Outside Directorships and Firm Performance: A Reconciliation of Agency and Embeddedness Views. *Academy of Management Journal* **54**.
- Lechner, C. and Floyd, S.W. 2012. Group influence activities and the performance of strategic initiatives. *Strategic Management Journal*.
- Quigley, T.J. and Hambrick, D.C. 2012. When the Former CEO Stays on as Board Chair: Effects on successor discretion, strategic change, and performance. *Strategic Management Journal* **33**.
- *Fredrickson, J. and Iaquinto, A. 1990. How and Where CEOs Matter: Functional Background, Organizational Diversity and Performance in High and Low-Discretion Environments. .
- *Hambrick, D.C. and Mason, P. 1984. Upper Echelons: The Organization as a Reflection of its Top Managers. *Academy of Management Review* **9**: 193-206.
- *Hayward, M.L.A. and Hambrick, D.C. 1997. Explaining the Premiums Paid for Large Acquisitions: Evidence of CEO Hubris *Administrative Science Quarterly* **42**: 103 - 127 .
- *Westphal, J.D. and Khanna, P. 2003. Keeping Directors in Line: Social Distancing as a Control Mechanism in the Corporate Elite. *Administrative Science Quarterly* **48**: 361.
- *Zajac, E. and Westphal, J. 1994. The costs and benefits of managerial incentives and monitoring in large U.S. corporations: When is more not better? *Strategic Management Journal* **15**: 121-142.
- *Zajac, E.J. 1990. CEO Selection, Succession, Compensation and Firm Performance: A Theoretical Integration and Empirical Analysis. *Strategic Management Journal* **11**: 217-230.

“Pseudo-comp” question: How might the upper echelons perspective be linked to and integrated with the resource-based view? What type of study would advance this literature?

No class 3/21, 3/28 or 4/4 (Spring Break)

Session 6 (4/11/12): Alliance capabilities and networks (Class meets in 5121)

- Adegbesan, J. and Higgins, M. 2011. The intra-alliance division of value created through collaboration. *Strategic Management Journal* **32**: 187.
- Li, D., Eden, L., Hitt, M.A., Ireland, R.D., and Garret, R.P. 2012. Governance in Multilateral R&D Alliances. *Organization Science* **23**.
- Mayer, K.J. and Argyres, N.S. 2004. Learning to Contract: Evidence from the Personal Computer Industry. *Organization Science* **15**: 394.

- Reuer, J.J. and Ragozzino, R. 2012. The Choice Between Joint Ventures and Acquisitions: Insights from Signaling Theory. *Organization Science* **23**.
- Yin, X., Wu, J., and Tsai, W. 2012. When Unconnected Others Connect: Does Degree of Brokerage Persist After the Formation of a Multipartner Alliance? *Organization Science* **23**.
- *Ahuja, G. 2000. Collaboration networks, structural holes, and innovation: A longitudinal study. *Administrative Science Quarterly* **45**: 425-455.
- *Burt, R.S. 2004. Structural Holes and Good Ideas. *American Journal of Sociology* **110**: 349.
- *Dyer, J.H. 1996. Does governance matter? Keiretsu alliances and asset specificity as sources of Japanese competitive advantage. *Organization Science* **7**: 649.
- *Gulati, R. 1998. Alliances and networks. *Strategic Management Journal* **19**: 293.
- *Lavie, D. 2007. Alliance portfolios and firm performance: A study of value creation and appropriation in the U.S. software industry. *Strategic Management Journal* **28**: 1187.
- *Oxley, J.E. 1999. Institutional environment and the mechanisms of governance: The impact of intellectual property protection on the structure of inter-firm alliances. *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization* **38**: 283.
- *Podolny, J.M. and Baron, J.N. 1997. Resources and relationships: Social networks and mobility in the workplace. *American Sociological Review* **62**: 673.
- *Uzzi, B. 1997. Social structure and competition in interfirm networks: The paradox of embeddedness. *Administrative Science Quarterly* **42**: 35.
- *Zollo, M., Reuer, J.J., and Singh, H. 2002. Interorganizational routines and performance in strategic alliances. *Organization Science* **13**: 701.

“Pseudo-comp” question: When can alliances be a source of competitive advantage for a firm? What factors determine when a strategic alliance would be superior to an acquisition or organic growth? What type of study would advance this literature?

Session 7 (4/18/12): Human Capital, mobility and competitive advantage

- Campbell, B.A., Ganco, M., Franco, A.M., and Agarwal, R. 2012. Who leaves, where to, and why worry? employee mobility, entrepreneurship and effects on source firm performance. *Strategic Management Journal* **33**: 65–87.
- Crook, T., Todd, S., Combs, J., Woehr, D.J., and Ketchen Jr., D. 2011. Does Human Capital Matter? A meta-analysis of the relationship between human capital and firm performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology* **96**: 443-456.
- Ethiraj, S.K. and Garg, P. 2012. The Division of Gains from Complementarities in Human-Capital-Intensive Activity. *Organization Science* **23**.
- Groysberg, B. and Lee, L. 2009. Hiring Stars and Their Colleagues: Exploration and Exploitation in Professional Service Firms. *Organization Science* **20**: 740.
- Somaya, D., Williamson, I., and Lorinkova, N. 2008. Gone but not Lost: The different performance impacts of employee mobility between cooperators versus competitors. *Academy of Management Journal* **51**: 936.

- Wang, H., He, J., and Mahoney, J. 2009. Firm-specific knowledge resources and competitive advantage: the roles of economic- and relationship-based employee governance mechanisms. *Strategic Management Journal* **30**: 1265.
- *Becker, G.S. 1993 {1964}. Human Capital: A theoretical and empirical analysis, with special reference to education. . #422 }
- *Carmichael, L. 1983. Firm-Specific Human Capital and Promotion Ladders. *Bell Journal of Economics* **14**: 251.
- *Coff, R.W. 1999. When competitive advantage doesn't lead to performance: The resource-based view and stakeholder bargaining power. *Organization Science* **10**: 119-133.
- *Coff, R.W. 1997. Human assets and management dilemmas: Coping with hazards on the road to resource-based theory. *The Academy of Management Review* **22**: 374-402.
- *Groysberg, B., Lee, L., and Nanda, A. 2008. Can They Take It With Them? The Portability of Star Knowledge Workers' Performance. *Management Science* **54**: 1213.
- *Hashimoto, M. and Yu, B.T. 1980. Specific Capital, Employment Contracts, and Wage Rigidity. *Bell Journal of Economics* **11**: 536.
- *Hatch, N.W. and Dyer, J.H. 2004. Human capital and learning as a source of sustainable competitive advantage. *Strategic Management Journal* **25**: 1155.
- *Lazear, E. 2009. Firm-Specific Human Capital: A Skill-Weights Approach. *The Journal of Political Economy* **117**: 914.
- *Song, J., Almeida, P., and Wu, G. 2003. Learning-by-hiring: When is mobility more likely to facilitate interfirm knowledge transfer? *Management Science* **49**: 351-366.
- *Wang, H.C. and Barney, J.B. 2006. Employee Incentives to Make Firm-Specific Investments: Implications for resource-based theories of corporate diversification. *Academy of Management. The Academy of Management Review* **31**: 466-478.

“Pseudo-comp” question: What are the boundary conditions under which one would expect to observe a sustained advantage stemming from human assets? What type of study would advance this literature?

Session 8 (4/25/12): Cognition, framing and strategy

- Benner, M.J. and Tripsas, M. 2012. The Influence of Prior Industry Affiliation on Framing in Nascent Industries: The evolution of digital cameras. *Strategic Management Journal* **33**.
- Kaplan, S. 2008. Cognition, Capabilities and Incentives: Assessing Firm Response to the Fiber-Optic Revolution. *Academy of Management Journal* **51**: 672-695.
- Lovullo, D., Clarke, C., and Camerer, C. 2012. Robust Analogizing and the Outside View: Two empirical tests of case-based decision-making. *Strategic Management Journal* **33**.
- Weber, L., Mayer, K.J., and Macher, J.T. 2011. An Analysis of Extendibility and Early Termination Provisions: The Importance of Framing Duration Safeguards. *Academy of Management Journal* **54**.

- *Gavetti, G. 2005. Cognition and Hierarchy: Rethinking the Microfoundations of Capabilities' Development. *Organization Science* **16**: 599.
- *Kaplan, S. 2008. Framing Contests: Strategy Making Under Uncertainty. *Organization Science* **19**: 729–775.
- *Knight, D., Pearce, C.L., Smith, K.G., and Olian, J.D. 1999. Top management team diversity, group process, and strategic consensus. *Strategic Management Journal* **20**: 445.
- *Ocasio, W. 1997. Towards an Attention-based View of the Firm. *Strategic Management Journal* **18**: 187.
- *Porac, J.F., Thomas, H., Wilson, F., Paton, D., and Kanfer, A. 1995. Rivalry and the industry model of Scottish knitwear producers. *Administrative Science Quarterly* **40**: 203.
- *Tripsas, M. and Gavetti, G. 2000. Capabilities, cognition, and inertia: Evidence from digital imaging. *Strategic Management Journal* **21**: 1147.
- *Weick, K.E. 1995. Sensemaking in Organizations. .

“Pseudo-comp” question: What cognition issues are inherent in the resource-based view? What are the implications for sustainability of such an advantage? What type of study would advance this literature?

Session 9 (5/2/12): Workshop on papers

- Agarwal, R., Echambadi, R., Franco, A.M., and Sarkar, M. 2006. Reap Rewards: Maximizing Benefits from Reviewer Comments *Academy of Management Journal* **49**: 191-196.
- Rynes, Sara L. (2006). Making the Most of the Review Process: Lessons from Award Winning Authors. *Academy of Management Journal*, 49 (2): 189-190.
- Rynes, S.L. 2006. Observations on "Anatomy of an R&R" and other Reflections. *Academy of Management Journal* **49**: 208-214.
- *Beyer, J.M., Chanove, R.G., and Fox, W.B. 1995. The Review Process and the Fates of Manuscripts Submitted to AMJ *Academy of Management Journal* **38**: 1219-1260 .
- *Floyd, S.W., Schroeder, D.M., and Finn, D.M. 1994. "Only if I'm First Author": Conflict over Credit in Management Scholarship *Academy of Management Journal* **37**: 734-747 .

Session 10 (5/9/12): Presentations

