光华管理学院 Guanghua School of Management | UG&PG 本科研究生项目

Strategy Research: Foundation and Domain

Course No：02803330 Program：Graduate
Credit：2 Instructor：Xiao Ting
Prerequisite： Semester：2017 Fall

Instructor's resume/brief introduction:

Ting Xiao
Dual bachelor degrees in Computer Science and Mathematics
Dual master degrees in Management and Economics, and Graduate Minor in Statistics
Ph.D degree in Business Administration majoring in Strategy

Instructor's contact information
Email: xiaoting@gsm.pku.edu.cn

TA's contact information:
To be notified

Office hour:
After class or by appointment

Course Overview and Objectives

This is a graduate level seminar on selected topics in classics in strategy research. In each class, we will discuss and develop a particular perspective on these topics. The basic purpose of the course is to familiarize students with the basic assumptions, concepts, theories, empirical approaches and their limitations in contemporary research in these areas. Because these are evolving subject areas and undergoing continual change, the boundaries of the field are fuzzy, subjective and open to interpretation and reinterpretation. The idea of the course is to provide an exposure to the major 'lenses' underpinning these phenomena.

The emphasis in this course will be on empirical testing as well as theory building. We will examine some of the fundamental tests of theories. We will also try to push the boundaries of the familiar and new theoretical perspectives, and possibly identify opportunities for cross-fertilization. In each case, we will attempt to derive testable predictions. Finally, we will integrate the various perspectives and attempt to inform the current debates in the field.

Approach

The format of the course will be that of a research seminar meaning active, engaged reading of the week's materials followed by an intensive group discussion. The reading load is reasonable, but the expectation is that each student will come prepared to discuss each article. In addition,

we may have some in class assignments.

When reading the assigned articles, you will find both good points and areas for improvement. While it is important to understand both the good and bad points of the research reported in each article, the following sets of questions should serve as a guide to your preparation of each reading:

- What questions are the authors trying to address? Are these important research questions?
- Does the paper extend existing literature? In what way?
- How is the research question approached? What is the design of the study? If empirical, is the methodology appropriate? Is the operationalization of key variables appropriate? Can you think of other ways to measure key variables?
- What assumptions are made in the paper? Are these assumptions appropriate/ realistic?
- What conclusions are made in the paper? Are these conclusions appropriate given the empirical evidence? Are the conclusions important?
- Could this work be extended or refined? How?
- How does this paper relate to the other papers in the session?

Course Requirements/ Evaluation

The course requirements reflect the primary 'outcome objectives' of this course, namely familiarization with good empirical research, ability to discriminate between good and bad research, and ability to design and conduct superior empirical research. To that end, grading will be based on two broad components:

1. *Research Project (40%):* You will complete a term-paper or proposal for this course by the end of the term based on these selected topics and your interest. This is a broad theme that runs through the whole course. The idea is to identify and develop a theoretical perspective. Once such a perspective has been identified, you should critically appraise the related literature, identify the assumptions/pitfalls and further develop it.

This paper may or may not contain an actual empirical test, though in the absence of an empirical test, you may consider including testable propositions and a well thought-out research design. Alternatively, you could also craft a completely conceptual paper.

Even though the consolidated project is due at the end of the term, I expect that you will develop your ideas throughout the term. For this reason, you will get an opportunity to discuss your progress through the week in each class. Each student will be given up to 5 minutes (or one slide for presentation) in each class session to update the instructor and the rest of the class

regarding the progress made and any challenges encountered.

2. *Class Contribution / Presentations (60%):* The discussions should deal with the following: question or topic, received theory and literature, methods of research, data sources, tests and treatments, alternative approaches, findings and conclusions, presentation style, problems and flaws, implications for theory and meaning to managers.

An active and well-informed discussion is critical to the success of such a course. Consequently, each student will be graded on the frequency and quality of their contribution to such discussions. Each student is responsible to read all the required readings for each session. The emphasis is on the depth of understanding that is embodied in the comments, questions and answers rather than only frequency.

You are expected to read and be able to discuss all the readings in all of the class sessions. However, one student may be responsible for identifying and summarizing the related literature beyond the assigned readings. In other words, while the whole class will read and discuss the assigned readings, one student will summarize the broader literature on the class topic.

Reading List

9/11 6:40-9:30 pm at Guanghua Building 2 Room 459: The Concept of Strategy: Strategy Foundation and Formation

1. Rumelt, Schendel, & Teece (RST), ***Fundamental Issues in Strategy***, 1994, Chapter 1. RST, 1991
2. Lovas, Bjorn, & Sumantra Ghoshal. 2000. Strategy as guided evolution. ***Strategic Management Journal***, 21(9): 875-896.
3. Durand, Rodolphe. 2002. Competitive advantages exist: a critique of Powell. ***Strategic Management Journal***, 23(9): 867-872.
4. Powell, Thomas C. 2002. The philosophy of strategy. ***Strategic Management Journal***, 23(9): 873-880.
5. Hambrick, D. 2007. The Field of Management's Devotion to Theory: Too Much of a Good Thing? ***Academy of Management Journal***, 50: 1346-1352.

9/18 6:40-9:30 pm at Guanghua Building 2 Room 459: Industry, Rivalry and Competitive Dynamics

1. Porter, M.E. 1981. ***Contributions of IO to Strategic Management***. Academy of Management Review.
2. Schmalensee, R. 1985. Do Markets Differ Much? ***American Economic Review***. 75: 341-351.
3. Rumelt, R. 1991. How much does industry matter? ***Strategic Management Journal***, 12, pp. 167-185.
4. McGahan, A.M. & Porter, M.E. 1997. How much does industry matter, really? ***Strategic***

Management Journal, 18: 15-30.
5. Saloner. 1991. Modeling, Game Theory, and Strategic Management. ***Strategic Management Journal***

9/25 6:40-9:30 pm at Guanghua Building 2 Room 459: Transaction Cost Economics

1. Coase, R. 1937. The nature of the firm. ***Economica***, 4: 386-405
2. Alchian, A. A., & H. Demsetz. 1972. Production, Information Costs, and Economic Organization. ***The American Economic Review***, 62: 777-795.
3. Klein, Crawford & Alchian. 1978. Vertical Integration, Appropriable Rents and the Competitive Contracting Process. ***Journal of Law and Economics***, 21: 403
4. Ghoshal, Sumantra, and Peter Moran, 1996, Bad for Practice: A Critique of the Transaction Cost Theory, ***Academy of Management Review***, 21: 13-47.
5. Brusoni, S., Prencipe A. & Pavitt K. 2001. Knowledge specialisation, organisational coupling, and the boundaries of the firm: why do firms know more than they make? ***Administrative Science Quarterly***, 46(4): 597–621

10/9 6:40-9:30 pm at Guanghua Building 2 Room 459: Mid-term Presentation

10/16 6:40-9:30 pm at Guanghua Building 2 Room 459: Resource-based View

1. Barney, J.B. 1986. Strategic Factor Markets: Expectations, Luck, and Business Strategy. ***Management Science***, 32: 1231-1241.
2. Barney, J.B. 1991. Firm resources and sustained competitive advantage. ***Journal of Management***, 17(1): 99-120.
3. Priem, Richard L., & John E. Butler. 2001. Is the resource-based "view" a useful perspective for strategic management research? ***Academy of Management Review***, 26(1): 22-40.
4. 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.
5. Priem, Richard L., & John E. Butler. 2001. Tautology in the resource-based view and the implications of externally determined resource value: Further comments. ***Academy of Management Review***, 26(1): 57-66.

10/23 6:40-9:30 pm at Guanghua Building 2 Room 459: Alliance and Strategic Network

1. Gulati, R. 1995. Social structure and alliance formation patterns: A longitudinal analysis. ***Administrative science quarterly***, 1: 619-652.
2. Powell, W. W., Koput, K. W., & Smith-Doerr, L. 1996. Interorganizational collaboration and the locus of innovation: Networks of learning in biotechnology**.** ***Administrative science quarterly***, 41:116-145.
3. Stuart, T. E. 1998. Network positions and propensities to collaborate: An investigation of strategic alliance formation in a high-technology industry. ***Administrative science quarterly***, 668-698.

4. Ahuja, G. (2000). Collaboration networks, structural holes, and innovation: A longitudinal study. ***Administrative science quarterly***, 45(3): 425-455.
5. Zaheer, A., Gulati, R., & Nohria, N. 2000. Strategic networks. ***Strategic management journal***, 21(3): 203-215.

10/30 6:40-9:30 pm at Guanghua Building 2 Room 459: Routines, Knowledge and Learning

1. Cohen & Bacdayan. 1994. Organizational routines are stored as procedural memory: Evidence from a laboratory study. ***Oganizattion Science,*** 5: 4
2. Becker, Lazaric, Nelson & Winter. 2005. Applying organizational routines in understanding organizational change, ***Industrial and Corporate Change***. 14: 775-791
3. Grant. 1996. Toward a Knowledge-Based Theory of the Firm. ***Strategic Management Journal***
4. Cohen, Wesley M., & Daniel A. Levinthal. 1990. Absorptive capacity: A new perspective on learning and innovation. ***Administrative Science Quarterly***, 35(1): 128-152.
5. Kogut, B. and U. Zander 1992 Knowledge of the Firm, Combinative Capabilities, and the Replication of Technology. ***Organization Science***, 3: 383–397.

11/06 6:40-9:30 pm at Guanghua Building 2 Room 459: Dynamic Capabilities

1. Teece, David J., Gary Pisano, & Amy Shuen. 1997. Dynamic capabilities and strategic management. ***Strategic Management Journal***, 18(7): 509-533.
2. Kathleen M. Eisenhardt & Jeffrey A. Martin. 2000. Dynamic capabilities: what are they? ***Strategic Management Journal***. 21: 1105–1121
3. Teece, D. 2007. Explicating Dynamic Capabilities: the Nature and Microfoundations of (Sustainable) Enterprise Performance. ***Strategic Management Journal***, 28: 1319–1350.
4. Zollo, Maurizio, & Sidney G. Winter. 2002. Deliberate learning and the evolution of dynamic capabilities. ***Organization Science***, 13(3): 339-351.
5. Helfat, Constance E., and Margaret A. Peteraf. 2015. "Managerial cognitive capabilities and the microfoundations of dynamic capabilities." ***Strategic Management Journal*** 36: 831-850.

11/13 6:40-9:30 pm at Guanghua Building 2 Room 459: Innovation and Competitive Advantage

1. Henderson, Rebecca & Clark, Kim B. 1990. Architectural Innovation: The Reconfiguration of Existing Product Technologies and the Failure of Established Firms. ***Administrative Science Quarterly***. 35(1): 9-30.
2. Tripsas, M. 1997. Unraveling the process of creative destruction: Complementary assets and incumbent survival in the typesetter industry. ***Strategic Management Journal***, 18:119-142.
3. Cockburn, I. M., Henderson, R. M., & Stern, S. 2000. Untangling the origins of competitive advantage. ***Strategic management journal***, 21: 1123-1145.

4. Katila, R., & Ahuja, G. 2002. Something old, something new: A longitudinal study of search behavior and new product introduction. ***Academy of management journal***, 45(6): 1183-1194.
5. Argyres, N., Bigelow, L., & Nickerson, J. A. 2015. Dominant designs, innovation shocks, and the follower's dilemma. ***Strategic Management Journal***, 36(2): 216-234.

11/20 6:40-9:30 pm at Guanghua Building 2 Room 459: Knowledge Recombination and Innovation

1. Fleming, L. 2001. Recombinant Uncertainty in Technological Search. ***Management science***, 47: 117–132.
2. Fleming, L. and O. Sorenson 2004. Science as A Map in Technological Search. ***Strategic Management Journal***, 25: 909–928.
3. Galunic, C. and S. Rodan 1998. Resource Recombinations in the Firm: Knowledge Structures and the Potential for Schumpeterian. ***Strategic Management Journal***, 19: 1193.
4. Carnabuci, G. and E. Operti 2013. Where Do Firms' Recombinant Capabilities Come From? Intraorganizational Networks, Knowledge, and Firms' Ability to Innovate through Technological Recombination. ***Strategic Management Journal***, 34: 1591–1613.
5. Kaplan, S., & Vakili, K. (2015). The double-edged sword of recombination in breakthrough innovation. ***Strategic Management Journal***, 36(10): 1435-1457.

11/27 6:30-9:30 pm at Guanghua Building 2 Room 459: Final-term Presentation