

Management 9087

Doctoral Seminar in Strategy (II)

University of Missouri

Fall 2005

Professor: Todd Chiles
Office: 443 Cornell Hall
Office Hours: By appointment

Phone: 573-884-9709
Email: chilest@missouri.edu
Class: Tues 5:30-8:30pm

I. Course Description

This is the second of two seminars designed to introduce doctoral students to theory and research in strategic management. Do not worry if you have not yet taken the first seminar, because the material we will cover is not cumulative, per se. The seminar begins with some foundational ideas in strategic management and then goes on to explore a variety of dynamic approaches to strategy, emphasizing evolution, process, change, emergence and disequilibrium. The seminar also includes sessions on process methods and scholarly writing.

The course is conducted in a seminar format with students bearing a major responsibility to contribute to each session. Class sessions will be devoted to exploring, discussing, and critiquing a set of readings in an informal, around-the-table setting. My role is primarily that of facilitator. In addition to extensive reading and in-depth class discussion, students will engage in scholarly research, writing and presentation.

II. Content Outline

- Introduction/Overview: Some Theories of Strategy and Strategic Change (Aug 23)
- Some Economic and Sociological Foundations of Strategy (Aug 30)*
- Process Methodology (Sept 6)
- Austrian Economics in Strategic Management (Sept 13)
- Evolution and Learning (Sept 20)*
- Corporate Social Performance and the Evolution of Stakeholder Relationships (Sept 27)
- A “Variation-Selection-Retention” Evolutionary Approach to Strategy (Oct 4)*
- Punctuated Equilibrium and Schumpeterian Dynamics (Oct 11)*
- Time and Improvisation (Oct 20)
- Complexity Theory in Strategic Management (Oct 25)*
- Writing for Scholarly Publication (Nov 1)
- Dynamic Capabilities View: The Emergence and Evolution of Firm Capabilities (Nov 8)*
- Attention-Based View of Strategy (Nov 15)
- Conclusion/Summary: Disequilibrium Perspectives and Directions (Nov 29)
- Student Research Presentations (Dec 6)

III. Course Materials

Students will be responsible for securing articles from the reading list below. Book chapters will be placed on reserve in 403 Cornell Hall.

A course website contains important announcements, ancillary materials, discussion boards, etc. In our first session, we will discuss how we might use this as a tool for running a more effective and efficient seminar. You can log in to Blackboard from the following web page: <https://courses.missouri.edu/>

IV. Course Evaluation

Grades for the course will be based on session participation (30%), session leadership (30%), research paper “introduction” (10%), research paper (20%), and scholarly presentation (10%).

Session Participation. The regular weekly activities of this course will center around the discussion of a set of readings in a particular topical area (see “Readings” below). Scholarship will be evaluated on the basis of your preparation for and participation in class discussion with a focus on your success in communicating and defending your ideas. The following are expected/required:

- (1) Students are expected to read each article carefully and fully, to be prepared to discuss each article in class, and to be a full and active partner in the discussion. Obviously, this means that, for each article, you need to be familiar with the author’s key points, theoretical strain, methodology, primary findings, strengths and weaknesses, and contributions to the literature.
- (2) Students are required to divide up the articles among themselves and prepare a 1-2 page summary for each article, providing the session leader with their summaries *at least* 48 hours in advance of the start of class time. The organization and “look and feel” of article summaries should be standardized, using the format provided in our first session.
- (3) Students are required to post their article summaries to the course website *at least* 24 hours in advance of the start of class time. Failure to do so can negatively impact your grade in the course.
- (4) In addition to simply reading and summarizing articles, you need to think about how to synthesize and extend theoretical concepts across the set of articles, across different topics as they accumulate throughout the term, and across other areas in the field of management. While this will be a key deliverable of the session leader, each session participant should have given this some thought.

Session Leadership. Each student will serve as leader for two sessions during the term. I expect that the session leader will prepare as usual for the class. In addition, session leadership has the following requirements:

- (1) First, the leader will introduce the session by reviewing and constructively critiquing the assigned readings *as a set* (not individually), identifying key theoretical arguments, research questions, and methodologies. Second, the leader will review and critique *each individual article*, identifying a number of specific issues to help facilitate the discussion. Finally, the leader will conclude the session by providing an integrative summary of what we know, the unresolved questions that remain, and what the next theoretical extension might be. For one of the leadership sessions (picking from among the sessions above marked with an asterisk), the leader will also read more deeply on the topic and present 1-3 *concrete* research “next steps.”¹
- (2) The leader will provide overheads to guide the discussion of all the issues in #1 above.
- (3) While the leader is responsible for introducing, maintaining, and concluding the discussion, I do not expect (or want) the discussion leader to deliver a 3-hour lecture on the topic, as the other session participants will be actively contributing to the discussion.
- (4) The leader will prepare a session packet with title page, photocopies of the overheads and *all* article summaries for distribution to seminar participants at the beginning of the class session. All summaries should follow the standardized format discussed in our first session. The title page should include the session topic, course number/name/term, date, and leader’s name. All pages should be stapled together.

Research Paper “Introduction.” You are required to write the introduction to your research paper (after reading Locke and Golden-Biddle’s (1997) *AMJ* article on “constructing opportunities for contribution” (see reading list)) and submit it to me electronically by October 18. You will be assigned one of your classmate’s

¹ It is critical to develop the ability to see opportunities for new research directions when studying the prior literature. Therefore, for the leadership session where you will read more deeply, you must develop 1-3 research “next steps.” Don’t try to develop a full-blown research project and don’t labor over this for days. What I’m looking for is pretty simple: a new direction, a new construct or relationship between constructs, a new process theoretic-approach, a new hypothesis(es), a new/different study that would correct some methodological flaws or fill some theoretical holes in the empirical research. Be brief (i.e., 10-15 minutes), but clearly and concretely convey your ideas.

introductions and are required to critique it after reading the Locke and Golden-Biddle article. Your written critique should be no more than one page, and is due in class on November 1. Please provide two (hard) copies, one for me and one for your classmate.

Research Paper. Your paper should make a contribution to a topic area by providing reviews, syntheses, applications, interpretations, tests, and/or critiques to advance theory development and research practice. Your paper should follow one of the following formats: (1) a *theoretical piece* in the form of an *Academy of Management Review Note*; (2) a *literature review piece* of the type published in the annual review issue of the *Journal of Management*; (3) an *empirical piece* in the form of an *Academy of Management Journal* “research note” or “more extensive contribution.” It is your responsibility to review several published articles of the format you choose so that your paper is “on mark.” Your paper can focus on any topic so long as it relates to the themes covered in the seminar. Topics will need to be approved by the instructor by September 16, and early discussion of areas of interest is encouraged. Papers will be limited to about 20 pages (for *AMR* Notes format) – 30 pages (for *JM* Review format), double-spaced, 12-point Times New Roman font, exclusive of references, tables, figures and appendices. Empirical papers will be limited to 25 pages (for “research notes”) and 40 pages (for “manuscripts that make more extensive contributions”), double-spaced, 12-point Times New Roman font, inclusive of references, tables, figures and appendices. Papers are due at the beginning of class on December 6 with severe penalties for late submission. All papers must conform to the *AMJ* Style Guide.

I strongly encourage you to submit your manuscript (after revising it based on my feedback) to the Academy of Management conference by the January 2006 deadline.

Scholarly Presentation. Each student will deliver a 15-20 minute scholarly presentation (using overheads) based on their research paper, and be prepared to entertain questions for 10 minutes. Please prepare copies of your overheads for all session participants. Presentations will be delivered on December 6.

Student’s overall performance will be evaluated on the following grading scale.

Percentage	Grade
100 – 90%	A
89 – 80%	B
79 – 70%	C
Below 70%	F

V. University Policies

Academic honesty is fundamental to the activities and principles of a university. All members of the academic community must be confident that each person's work has been responsibly and honorably acquired, developed, and presented. Any effort to gain an advantage not given to all students is dishonest whether or not the effort is successful. The academic community regards academic dishonesty as an extremely serious matter, with serious consequences that range from probation to expulsion. When in doubt about plagiarism, paraphrasing, quoting, or collaboration, consult the course instructor.

If you need accommodations because of a disability, if you have emergency medical information to share with me, or if you need special arrangements in case the building must be evacuated, please see me privately after class or at my office.

VI. Readings

Introduction/Overview: Some Theories of Strategy and Strategic Change (Aug 23)

Required

Barney, J. B. 1986. Types of competition and the theory of strategy: Toward an integrative framework. *Academy of Management Review*, 11: 791-800.

Meyer, A. D., G. R. Brooks, J. B. Goes. 1990. Environmental jolts and industry revolutions: Organizational responses to discontinuous change. *Strategic Management Journal*, 11(Summer Special Issue): 93-110.

Some Economic and Sociological Foundations of Strategy (Aug 30)

Session Leader: _____

Required

Porter, M. E. 1979. The structure within industries and companies' performance. *Review of Economics and Statistics*, 61: 214-227. (Read/skim for main ideas.)

Porter, M. E. 1979. How competitive forces shape strategy. *Harvard Business Review*, 57(March-April): 137-145.

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

Hannan M., J. Freeman. 1984. Structural inertia and organizational change. *American Sociological Review*, 49: 149-164.

Child, J. 1972. Organizational structure, environment and performance: The role of strategic choice. *Sociology*, 6: 1-22.

Optional

McNamara, G. M., D. L. Deephouse, R. Luce. 2003. Competitive positioning within and across a strategic group structure: The performance of core, secondary, and solitary firms. *Strategic Management Journal*, 24: 161-181. (next step)

Barney, J. B. 2001. Resource-based theories of competitive advantage: A ten-year retrospective on the resource-based view. *Journal of Management*, 27: 643-650. (next step)

Grant, R. M. 1991. Porter's competitive advantage of nations: An assessment. *Strategic Management Journal*, 12: 535-548. (next step)

Porter, M. E. 1991. Towards a dynamic theory of strategy. *Strategic Management Journal*, 12(Special Issue): 95-117. (next step)

Boeker, W. 1989. Strategic change: The effects of founding and history. *Academy of Management Journal*, 32: 489-515.

Classics

Porter, M. E. 1980. *Competitive Strategy*. New York: Free Press.

Baum, J. A. C., F. Dobbin (eds.). 2000. Economics meets sociology in strategic management. *Advances in Strategic Management*, Vol. 17. (This volume has a nice compilation of classic articles along with commentary pieces.)

Process Methodology (Sept 6)

Session Leader: _____

Required

- Van de Ven, A. H., M. S. Poole. 2005. Alternative approaches for studying organizational change. *Organization Studies*, 26: 1377-1404.
- Langley, A. 1999. Strategies for theorizing from process data. *Academy of Management Review*, 24: 691-710.
- Meyer, A. D., J. B. Goes, G. R. Brooks. 1993. Organizations reacting to hypervolatility. In G. P. Huber, W. H. Glick, eds. *Organizational Change and Redesign*: 66-111. New York: Oxford University Press. (Focus on methods (not content)! That is, the strategies these authors use for theorizing from process data.)
- Lee, T. W., T. R. Mitchell, C. J. Sablinski. 1999. Qualitative research in organizational and vocational psychology. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 55: 161-187. (Read pp. 163-165 and pp. 182-185.)
- Drazin, R., L. Sandelands. 1992. Autogenesis: A perspective on the process of organizing. *Organization Science*, 3: 230-249. (Read the first 6½ pages and the discussion section.)

Optional

- Szulanski, G., J. Porac, Y. Doz (eds.). 2005. Advances in strategy process research. *Advances in Strategic Management*, Vol. 22. (next step)
- Agar, M. 2004. We have met the other and we're all nonlinear: Ethnography as a nonlinear dynamic system. *Complexity*, 10(2): 16-24. (next step)
- Van de Ven, A. H., R. M. Engleman. 2004. Event- and outcome-driven explanations of entrepreneurship. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 19: 343-358. (next step)
- Chiles, T. H. 2003. Process theorizing: Too important to ignore in a kaleidic world. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 2: 288-291.
- Garud, R., A. H. Van de Ven. 2002. Strategic change processes. In A. Pettigrew, H. Thomas, R. Whittington, eds. *Handbook of Strategy and Management*: 206-231. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage. (next step)
- Styhre, A. 2002. How process philosophy can contribute to strategic management. *Systems Research and Behavioral Science*, 19: 577-587. (next step)
- Van de Ven, A. H., M. S. Poole. 2002. Field research methods. In J. A. C. Baum, ed. *The Blackwell Companion to Organizations*: 867-888. Oxford, UK: Blackwell. (next step)
- Pentland, B. T. 1999. Building process theory with narrative: From description to explanation. *Academy of Management Review*, 24: 711-724. (next step)
- Pettigrew, A. M. 1992. The character and significance of strategy process research. *Strategic Management Journal*, 13: 5-16.
- Van de Ven, A. H. 1992. Suggestions for studying strategy process: A research note. *Strategic Management Journal*, 13(Summer Special Issue): 169-192.
- Mintzberg, H. 1979. An emerging strategy of 'direct' research. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 24: 582-589.
- Hayek, F. A. 1967. The theory of complex phenomena. In F. A. Hayek, ed. *Studies in Philosophy, Politics and Economics*: 22-42. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Classics

- Mohr, L. B. 1982. *Explaining Organizational Behavior*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass. (If you want to read this classic book but have limited time, try: "Approaches to explanation: Variance theory and process theory," pp.35-70.)

Austrian Economics in Strategic Management (Sept 13)

Session Leader: Peter Klein

Required

Jacobson, R. 1992. The “Austrian” school of strategy. *Academy of Management Review*, 17: 782-807.

Hill, C. W. L., D. L. Deeds. 1996. The importance of industry structure for the determination of firm profitability: A neo-Austrian approach. *Journal of Management Studies*, 33: 429-452.

Foss, K., N. J. Foss, P. G. Klein, S. G. Klein. (forthcoming). The entrepreneurial organization of heterogeneous capital. *Journal of Management Studies*.

Roberts, P. W., K. M. Eisenhardt. 2003. Austrian insights on strategic organization: From market insights to implications for firms. *Strategic Organization*, 1: 345–352.

Optional

Ferrier, W. J. 2001. Navigating the competitive landscape: The drivers and consequences of competitive aggressiveness. *Academy of Management Journal*, 44: 858-877.

Chiles, T. H., T. Y. Choi. 2000. Theorizing TQM: An Austrian and evolutionary economics interpretation. *Journal of Management Studies*, 37: 185-212.

Ferrier, W. J., K. G. Smith, C. M. Grimm. 1999. The role of competitive action in market share erosion and industry dethronement: A study of industry leaders and challengers. *Academy of Management Journal*, 42: 372-388.

Zaheer, A., S. Zaheer. 1997. Catching the wave: Alertness, responsiveness, and market influence in global electronic networks. *Management Science*, 43: 1493-1509.

Chiles, T. H., J. F. McMackin. 1996. Integrating variable risk preferences, trust, and transaction cost economics. *Academy of Management Review*, 21: 73-99.

Tsoukas, H. 1996. The firm as a distributed knowledge system: A constructionist approach. *Strategic Management Journal*, 17: 11-25.

Young, G., K. G. Smith, C. M. Grimm. 1996. “Austrian” and industrial organization perspectives on firm-level competitive activity and performance. *Organization Science*, 7: 243–54.

Some Foundational Readings

Vaughn, K. I. 1999. Hayek’s theory of the market order as an instance of the theory of complex, adaptive systems. *Journal of Economistes Etudes Humaines*, 9: 241-256. (next step)

Rizzo, M. J. 1996. Introduction: Time and ignorance after ten years. In G. P. O’Driscoll, M. J. Rizzo, *The Economics of Time and Ignorance*, London: Routledge. xiii-xxxiii. (next step)

Vaughn, K. I. 1992. The problem of order in Austrian economics: Kirzner vs. Lachmann. *Review of Political Economy*, 4: 251-274.

Littlechild, S. C. 1986. Three types of market process. In R. N. Langlois, ed. *Economics as a Process: Essays in the New Institutional Economics*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 27-39.

Evolution and Learning (Sept 20)

Session Leader: _____

Required

- Mintzberg, H. 1990. The design school: Reconsidering the basic premises of strategic management. *Strategic Management Journal*, 11: 171-195.
- Pascale, R. T. 2003. "The Honda effect," In H. Mintzberg, J. Lampel, J. B. Quinn, S. Ghoshal, eds. *The Strategy Process*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall. 152-160.
- Barnett, W. P., M. T. Hansen. 1996. The red queen in organizational evolution. *Strategic Management Journal*, 17(Summer Special Issue): 139-158.
- Miller, D., J. Shamsie. 2001. Learning across the life cycle: Experimentation and performance among the Hollywood studio heads. *Strategic Management Journal*, 22: 725-745.

Optional

- Barnett, W. P., E. G. Pontikes. 2005. The red queen: History-dependent competition among organizations. In B. Staw, R. M. Kramer, eds. *Research in Organizational Behavior*. Volume 26 (forthcoming). (next step)
- Lumpkin, G. T. 2005. The role of organizational learning in the opportunity-recognition process. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 29: 451-472. (next step)
- Politis, D. 2005. The process of entrepreneurial learning: A conceptual framework. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 29: 399-424. (next step)
- Barnett, W. P., D. G. McKendrick. 2004. Why are some organizations more competitive than others? Evidence from a changing global market. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 49: 535-571. (next step)
- Crossan, M. M., I. Berdrow. 2003. Organizational learning and strategic renewal. *Strategic Management Journal*, 24: 1087-1105. (next step)
- Farjoun, M. 2002. Towards an organic perspective on strategy. *Strategic Management Journal*, 23: 561-594. (next step)
- Miller, D., J. Shamsie. 1996. The resource-based view of the firm in two environments: The Hollywood film studios from 1936 to 1965. *Academy of Management Journal*, 39: 519-543.
- Mintzberg, H., R. T. Pascale, M. Goold, R. P. Rumelt. 1996. The "Honda effect" revisited. *California Management Review*, 38(4): 78-117.
- Mintzberg, H. 1994. The fall and rise of strategic planning. *Harvard Business Review*, 72: 107-114.
- Ansoff, I. 1991. Critique of Henry Mintzberg's "The Design School: Reconsidering the basic premises of strategic management." *Strategic Management Journal*, 12: 449-461.
- Mintzberg, H. 1991. Learning 1, Planning 0: Reply to Igor Ansoff. *Strategic Management Journal*, 12: 463-466.
- Mintzberg, H., J. A. Waters. 1985. On strategies, deliberate and emergent. *Strategic Management Journal*, 6: 257-272.

Classics

- Mintzberg, H. 1987. Crafting strategy. *Harvard Business Review*, 65: 66-75.
- Quinn, J. B. 1978. Strategic change: "Logical incrementalism." *Sloan Management Review*, 20: 7-21.
- Lindblom, C. E. 1959. The science of "muddling through." *Public Administration Review*, 24: 79-88.

This class session will begin with a discussion, led by Dr. Bluedorn, on the importance and mechanics of scholarly referencing.

Corporate Social Performance and the Evolution of Stakeholder Relationships (Sept 27)

Session Leader: Dan Greening

Required

Wood, D. J. 1991. Corporate social performance revisited. *Academy of Management Review*, 16: 691-718.

Mitchell, R. K, B. R. Agle, D. J. Wood. 1997. Toward a theory of stakeholder identification and salience: Defining the principle of who and what really counts. *Academy of Management Review*, 22: 853-886.

Johnson, R. A., D. W. Greening. 1999. The effects of corporate governance and institutional ownership types on corporate social performance. *Academy of Management Journal*, 5: 564-580.

Jawahar, I. M., G. L. McLaughlin. 2001. Toward a descriptive stakeholder theory: An organizational life cycle approach. *Academy of Management Review*, 26: 397-414.

Optional

Schuler, D. A., M. Cording. (In press). A corporate social performance–corporate financial performance behavioral model for consumers. *Academy of Management Review*.

Greening, D. W., J. Mattingly, K. Evans. 2001. The evolution of stakeholder relationships. *Proceedings of International Association for Business and Society*.

Turban, D., D. W. Greening. 1997. Corporate social performance and organizational attractiveness to prospective employees. *Academy of Management Journal*, 40: 658-672.

Greening, D.W., B. Gray 1994. Testing a model of organizational response to social and political issues. *Academy of Management Journal*, 37: 467-498.

Classics

Freeman, R. E. 1984. *Strategic Management: A Stakeholder Approach*. Boston: Pittman.

Davis, K. 1973. The case for and against business assumption of social responsibilities. *Academy of Management Journal*, 16: 312-322.

Bowen, H. R. 1953. *Social Responsibilities of the Businessman*. New York: Harper.

A “Variation-Selection-Retention” Evolutionary Approach to Strategy (Oct 4)

Session Leader: _____

Required

Burgelman, R. A. 1991. Intraorganizational ecology of strategy making and organizational adaptation: Theory and field research. *Organization Science*, 2: 239-262.

Lovas, B., S. Ghoshal. 2000. Strategy as guided evolution. *Strategic Management Journal*, 21: 875-896.

Zott, C. 2003. Dynamic capabilities and the emergence of intra-industry differential firm performance: Insights from a simulation study. *Strategic Management Journal*, 24: 97-125.

Optional

Foss, N. J. 2003. Bounded rationality and tacit knowledge in the organizational capabilities approach: An assessment and a re-evaluation. *Industrial and Corporate Change*, 12: 185-201. (next step)

Weeks, J., C. Galunic. 2003. A theory of the cultural evolution of the firm: The intra-organizational ecology of memes. *Organization Studies*, 24: 1309-1352. (next step)

Galunic, D. C., J. R. Weeks. 2002. Intraorganizational ecology. In J.A.C. Baum, ed. *The Blackwell Companion to Organizations*, Blackwell Business, Oxford, U. K. (next step)

Lee, J., K. Lee, S. Rho. 2002. An evolutionary perspective on strategic group emergence: A genetic algorithm-based model. *Strategic Management Journal*, 23: 727–746. (next step)

Aldrich, H. E. 1999. *Organizations Evolving*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Barnett, W. P., R. A. Burgelman. 1996. Evolutionary perspectives on strategy. *Strategic Management Journal*, 17(Summer Special Issue): 5-19.

Burgelman, R. A. 1996. A process model of strategic business exit: Implications for an evolutionary perspective on strategy. *Strategic Management Journal*, 17(Summer Special Issue): 193-214.

Burgelman, R. A. 1994. Fading memories: A process theory of strategic business exit in dynamic environments. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 39: 128-152.

Nelson RR. 1994. Recent evolutionary theorizing about economic change. *Journal of Economic Literature*, 33: 48-90.

Burgelman, R. A. 1983. A process model of internal corporate venturing in the diversified major firm. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 28: 223-245.

Classics

Nelson, R., S. Winter. 1982. *An Evolutionary Theory of Economic Change*. Cambridge MA: Belknap Press.

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

Alchian, A. A. 1950. Uncertainty, evolution, and economic theory. *Journal of Political Economy*, 58: 211–221.

Punctuated Equilibrium and Schumpeterian Dynamics (Oct 11)

Session Leader: _____

Required

Romanelli, E., M. L. Tushman. 1994. Organizational transformation as punctuated equilibrium: An empirical test. *Academy of Management Journal*, 37: 1141-1166.

Haveman, H. A., M. V. Russo, A. D. Meyer. 2001. Organizational environments in flux: The impact of punctuational regulatory change on organizational domains, CEO succession, and performance. *Organization Science*, 12: 253-273.

Hill, C. W. L., F. T. Rothaermel. 2003. The performance of incumbent firms in the face of radical technological innovation. *Academy of Management Review*, 28: 257-274.

Optional

Lavie, D. (In press). Capability reconfiguration: An analysis of incumbent responses to technological change. *Academy of Management Review*. (next step)

Rothaermel, F. T., C. W. L. Hill. 2005. Technological discontinuities and complementary assets: A longitudinal study of industry and firm performance. *Organization Science*, 16: 52-70. (next step)

Murry, F., M. Tripsas. 2004. The exploratory processes of entrepreneurial firms: The role of purposeful experimentation. *Advances in Strategic Management*, 21: 45-75. (next step)

Roberts, P. W., R. Amit. 2003. The dynamics of innovative activity and competitive advantage: The case of Australian retail banking, 1981 to 1995. *Organization Science*, 14: 107-122. (next step)

Sabherwal, R., R. Hirschheim, T., Goles. 2001. The dynamics of alignment: Insights from a punctuated equilibrium model. *Organization Science*, 12: 179-197. (next step)

Peng, M. W., C. W. L. Hill, D. Y. L. Wang. 2000. Schumpeterian dynamics versus Williamsonian considerations: A test of export intermediary performance. *Journal of Management Studies*, 37: 167-184. (next step)

Sastry, M. A. 1997. Problems and paradoxes in a model of punctuated organizational change. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 35: 237-275. (next step)

Gersick, C. J. G. 1991. Revolutionary change theories: A multilevel exploration of the punctuated equilibrium paradigm. *Academy of Management Review*, 16: 10-36.

Anderson, P., M. L. Tushman. 1990. Technological discontinuities and dominant designs: A cyclical model of technological change. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 35: 604-633.

Tushman, M. L., P. Anderson. 1986. Technological discontinuities and organizational environments. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 31: 439-465.

Tushman, M. L., E. Romanelli. 1985. Organizational evolution: A metamorphosis model of convergence and reorientation. In L. L. Cummings, B. Staw, eds. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 7: 171-222.

Classics

Schumpeter, J. A. 1942. *Capitalism, Socialism and Democracy*. Harper and Brothers, New York.

Schumpeter, J. A. 1961. *The Theory of Economic Development*. Oxford University Press, New York.

Eldredge, N., S. J. Gould. 1972. Punctuated equilibria: An alternative to phyletic gradualism. T. Schopf, ed. *Models in Paleobiology* San Francisco, Freeman, Cooper, 82-115.

Gould, S. J., N. Eldredge. 1977. Punctuated equilibria: The tempo and mode of evolution reconsidered. *Paleobiology*, 3: 115-151.

Time and Improvisation (Oct 20)

Required

Bluedorn, A. C. 2002. *The Human Organization of Time: Temporal Realities and Experience*. Stanford University Press. (Chapter 1 available at: <http://www.sup.org/book.cgi?isbn=0804741077>.)

Purser, R. E., A. C. Bluedorn, J. Petranker. 2005. The times of cause and flow in organizational change. *Research in Organizational Change and Development*, 15: 1-29.

Crossan, M., M. P. E. Cunha, D. Vera, J. Cunha. 2005. Time and organizational improvisation. *Academy of Management Review*, 30: 129-145.

Optional

Chiles, T. H., A. C. Bluedorn, V. K. Gupta. 2005. Beyond creative destruction and entrepreneurial discovery: A radical Austrian school approach to entrepreneurship. University of Missouri Working Paper.

Abbott, A. 2001. *Time Matters: On Theory and Method*. University of Chicago Press.

Anocona, D., P. Goodman, B. Lawrence, M. Tushman. 2001. Time: A new research lens. *Academy of Management Review*, 26: 645-663.

Anocona, D., G. Okhuysen, L. Perlow. 2001. Taking time to integrate temporal research. *Academy of Management Review*, 26: 512-529.

Ofori-Dankwa, J., S. D. Julian. 2001. Complexifying organizational theory: Illustrations using time research. *Academy of Management Review*, 26: 415-430.

George, J. M., G. R. Jones. 2000. The role of time in theory and theory building. *Journal of Management*, 26: 657-684.

Bird, B. J., G. P. West III. 1997. Time and entrepreneurship. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice* 22(2): 5-9.

Bluedorn, A. C., R. B. Denhardt. 1988. Time and organizations. *Journal of Management*, 14: 299-319.

For this class session, we will attend Dr. Bluedorn's "Corps of Discovery" lecture on Thursday, October 20 at 4:00pm in Cornell Hall's Bush Auditorium. Afterward, we will meet as a class to discuss the three required readings. The location of this class session will be 449 Cornell. (We will not meet on Tuesday October 18.)

Complexity Theory in Strategic Management (Oct 25)

Session Leader: _____

Required

Stacey, R. D. 1995. The science of complexity: An alternative for strategic change processes. *Strategic Management Journal*, 16: 477-495.

Brown, S. L., K. M. Eisenhardt. 1997. The art of continuous change: Linking complexity theory and time-paced evolution in relentlessly shifting organizations. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 42: 1-33.

DeTienne, D. R., C. S. Koberg, K. A. Heppard. 2005. Continuously changing organizations: Scale development and empirical testing of Brown and Eisenhardt (1997). Utah State University Working Paper.

Arthur, W. B. 1996. Increasing returns and the new world of business. *Harvard Business Review*, 74: 100-109.

Optional

Houchin, K., D. MacLean. 2005. Complexity theory and strategic change: An empirically informed critique. *British Journal of Management*, 16: 149-166. (next step)

Caldart, A. A., J. E. Ricart. 2004. Corporate strategy revisited: A view from complexity theory. *European Management Review*, 1: 96-104. (next step)

Colbert, B. A. 2004. The complex resource-based view: Implications for theory and practice in strategic human resource management. *Academy of Management Review*, 29: 341-358. (next step)

Davis, J., K. M. Eisenhardt. 2004. Complexity theory, market dynamism, and the strategy of simple rules. Stanford University Working Paper. (next step)

Chiles, T. H., A. D. Meyer. 2001. Managing the emergence of clusters: An increasing returns approach to strategic change. *Emergence*, 3(3): 58-89.

Dickson, P. R., P. W. Farris, W. J. M. I. Verbeke. 2001. Dynamic strategic thinking. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 29: 216-237.

Carroll, T., R. M. Burton. 2000. Organizations and complexity: Searching for the edge of chaos. *Computational and Mathematical Organization Theory*, 6(4).

Levy, D. L. 2000. Applications and limitations of complexity theory in organization theory and strategy. J. Rabin, G. J. Miller, W. B. Hildreth, eds. *Handbook of Strategic Management*, 2nd ed., New York: Marcel Dekker. (next step)

MacIntosh, R., D. MacLean. 1999. Conditioned emergence: A dissipative structures approach to transformation. *Strategic Management Journal*, 20: 297-316.

McKelvey, B. 1999. Avoiding complexity catastrophe in coevolutionary pockets: Strategies for rugged landscapes. *Organization Science*, 10: 294-321.

Levinthal, D. 1997. Adaptation on rugged landscapes. *Management Science*, 43: 934-950.

Bettis, R. A., C. K. Prahalad. 1996. The dominant logic: Retrospective and extension. *Strategic Management Journal*, 16: 5-14.

Levy, D. 1994. Chaos theory and strategy: Theory, application, and managerial implications. *Strategic Management Journal*, 15(Summer Special Issue): 167-178.

Some Foundational Readings

Juarrero, A. 1999. "Nonequilibrium thermodynamics," *Dynamics in Action: Intentional Behavior as a Complex System*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press. 119-130.

Bak, P., K. Chen. 1991. Self-organized criticality. *Scientific American*, 264: 46-53.

Kauffman, S. A. 1991. Antichaos and adaptation. *Scientific American*, August: 78-84.

Arthur, W. B. 1990. Positive feedbacks in the economy. *Scientific American*, 262: 92-99.

Writing for Scholarly Publication (Nov 1)

Session Leader: Denise Vultee

Required

Ketchen, D. 2002. Some candid thoughts on the publication process (Editorial). *Journal of Management*, 28: 585-590. (Read at least the following three subsections: “Make Clear What You are Adding to the Knowledge Base,” “Avoid Argumentation by Citation,” and “Position Your Paper in the Journal You are Pursuing.”)

Locke, K., K. Golden-Biddle. 1997. Constructing opportunities for contribution: Structuring intertextual coherence and “problematizing” in organizational studies. *Academy of Management Journal*, 40: 1023-1062.

Optional

Starbuck, W. H. 1999. Fussy Professor Starbuck's cookbook of handy-dandy prescriptions for ambitious academic authors or why I hate passive verbs and love my word processor. New York University. <http://pages.stern.nyu.edu/~wstarbuc/Writing/Fussy.htm>

Dynamic Capabilities View: The Emergence and Evolution of Firm Capabilities (Nov 8)

Session Leader: _____

Required

Helfat, C. E., M. A. Peteraf. 2003. The dynamic resource-based view: Capability lifecycles. *Strategic Management Journal*, 24: 997-1010.

Ethiraj, S. K., P. Kale, M. S. Krishnan, J. V. Singh. 2005. Where do capabilities come from and how do they matter? A study in the software services industry. *Strategic Management Journal*, 26: 25-45.

Verona, G., D. Ravasi. 2003. Unbundling dynamic capabilities: An exploratory study of continuous product innovation. *Industrial and Corporate Change*, 12: 577-606.

Optional

Ahuja, G., R. Katila, 2004. Where do resources come from? The role of idiosyncratic situations. *Strategic Management Journal*, 25: 887-907. (next step)

Martin, J. A., K. M. Eisenhardt. 2004. Coping with decline in dynamic markets: Corporate entrepreneurship and the recombinative organizational form. *Advances in Strategic Management*, 21: 357-382.

Lampel, J., J. Shamsie. 2003. Capabilities in motion: New organizational forms and the reshaping of the Hollywood movie industry. *Journal of Management Studies*, 40: 2189-2210. (next step)

Padgett, J. F., D. Lee, N. Collier. 2003. Economic production as chemistry. *Industrial and Corporate Change*, 12: 843-877. (next step)

Winter, S. G. 2003. Understanding dynamic capabilities. *Strategic Management Journal*, 24(Special Issue): 991-995. (next step)

Helfat, C. A., M. Lieberman. 2002. The birth of capabilities: Market entry and the importance of pre-history. *Industrial and Corporate Change*, 11: 725-760. (next step)

Zollo, M., S. G. Winter. 2002. Deliberate learning and the evolution of dynamic capabilities. *Organization Science*, 13: 339-352. (next step)

Rindova, V. P., S. Kotha. 2001. Continuous 'morphing': Competing through dynamic capabilities, form, and function. *Academy of Management Journal*, 44: 1263-1280. (next step)

Cockburn, I. M., R. M. Henderson, S. Stern. 2000. Untangling the origins of competitive advantage. *Strategic Management Journal*, 21(Fall Special Issue): 1123-1145. (next step)

Eisenhardt, K. M., J. A. Martin. 2000. Dynamic capabilities: What are they? *Strategic Management Journal*, 21: 1105-1121.

Helfat, C. E., R. S. Raubitschek. 2000. Product sequencing: Co-evolution of knowledge, capabilities and products. *Strategic Management Journal*, 21(Fall Special Issue): 961-980.

Holbrook, D., W. M. Cohen, D. A. Hounshell, S. Klepper. 2000. The nature, sources and consequences of firm differences in the early history of the semiconductor industry. *Strategic Management Journal*, 21(Fall Special Issue): 1017-1042.

Raff, D. M. G. 2000. Superstores and the evolution of firm capabilities in American bookselling. *Strategic Management Journal*, 21(Fall Special Issue): 1043-1060.

Tripsas, M., G. Gavetti. 2000. Capabilities, cognition, and inertia: Evidence from digital imaging. *Strategic Management Journal*, 21(Fall Special Issue): 1147-1161.

Teece, D. J., G. Pisano, A. Shuen. 1997. Dynamic capabilities and strategic management. *Strategic Management Journal*, 18: 509-533.

Attention-Based View of Strategy (Nov 15)

Session Leader: Chris Tuggle

Required

Leahey, T. H. 2003. Herbert A. Simon: Nobel prize in economic sciences, 1978. *American Psychologist*, 58: 753-755.

Ocasio, W. 1997. Towards an attention-based view of the firm. *Strategic Management Journal*, 18: 187-206.

Ocasio, W., J. Joseph. 2005. An attention based theory of strategy formulation: Linking decision making and guided evolution in strategy processes. In G. Suzlanski, Y. Doz, J. Porac, eds. *Advances in Strategic Management*, 22.

Shane, S. 2000. Prior knowledge and the discovery of entrepreneurial opportunities. *Organization Science*, 11: 448-469. (Read pp. 448-453).

Optional

Yu, J., R. M. Engleman, A. H. Van de Ven. (forthcoming). The integration journey: An attention-based view of the merger and acquisition integration process. *Organization Studies*.

Durand, R. 2003. Predicting a firm's forecasting ability: The role of organizational illusion of control and organizational attention. *Strategic Management Journal*, 24: 821-838.

Hoffman, A. J., W. Ocasio. 2001. Not all events are attended equally: Toward a middle-range theory of industry attention to external events. *Organization Science*, 12: 414-434.

Conclusion/Summary: Disequilibrium Perspectives and Directions (Nov 29)

Session Leader: _____

Required

Davis, J., K. M. Eisenhardt. 2004. Complexity theory, market dynamism, and the strategy of simple rules. Stanford University Working Paper. (Read pp. 1-13.)

Meyer, A. D., V. Gaba, K. Colwell. 2005. Organizing far from equilibrium: Nonlinear change in organizational fields. *Organization Science*. 16(6). (forthcoming).

Stevenson, H., S. Harmeling. 1990. Entrepreneurial management's need for a more 'chaotic' theory. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 5: 1-14.

Bromiley, P., C. Papenhausen. 2003. Assumptions of rationality and equilibrium in strategy research: The limits of traditional economic analysis. *Strategic Organization*, 1: 413-437. (Read pp. 413-426.)

Optional

Lichtenstein, B., K. Dooley, T. Lumpkin. (In press). Measuring emergence in the dynamics of new venture creation. *Journal of Business Venturing*.

Chiles, T. H., A. C. Bluedorn, V. K. Gupta. 2005. Beyond creative destruction and entrepreneurial discovery: A radical Austrian school approach to entrepreneurship. University of Missouri Working Paper.

McKelvey, B. 2004. Toward a complexity science of entrepreneurship. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 19: 313-341.

Chiles, T. H., A. D. Meyer, T. J. Hench. 2004. Organizational emergence: The origin and transformation of Branson, Missouri's musical theaters. *Organization Science*, 15: 499-519.

Hernes, T., T. Bakken. 2003. Implications of self-reference: Niklas Luhmann's autopoiesis and organization theory. *Organization Studies*, 29: 1511-1535.

Tsoukas, H., R. Chia. 2002. On organizational becoming: Rethinking organizational change. *Organization Science*, 13: 567-582.

Fuller, T., P. Moran. 2001. Small enterprises as complex adaptive systems: A methodological question? *Entrepreneurship and Regional Development*, 13: 47-63.

Note: I reserve the right to amend or re-schedule the readings as appropriate.

Student Profile

MGMT 9087 – Fall 2005

Please place
recent photo
here.

Name: _____

Major/Specialization: _____

Student #: _____

Phone Number: _____

MU E-mail Address: _____

What are your research interests: _____

What are your objectives or expectations for this course? _____

Who's on your "wish list"? List the schools at which you would like to be placed when you start your academic career:

- (1) _____
- (2) _____
- (3) _____
- (4) _____
- (5) _____