

Business Strategy I Business 9770a. Winter Semester 2025

Professor Guy Holburn
Office No. 3324
Tel. Number 519-661-4247
gholburn@ivey.ca

Faculty Assistant: Amy Ribera
Office No. 2319
Tel. Number 519-661-2111
aribera@ivey.ca

Wednesdays 1.30-4.30pm, Room 0130

COURSE DESCRIPTION AND OBJECTIVES

This doctoral seminar surveys core theoretical perspectives and empirical findings in the field of strategic management research. Strategic management addresses the overarching themes of firm behaviour and performance, seeking to explain why some firms systematically outperform others, and the competitive strategies that drive success in the marketplace. The strategy field is vast, so, by necessity, the seminar is an introduction to the major topics of the field, covering one topic per session. The seminar's objectives are as follows:

1. By the end of the course, students should have developed a critical understanding of a) the dominant research questions in the strategy literature, b) the major theoretical lenses and arguments used to make causal predictions, c) empirical designs and methods for assessing causality, d) contributions and limitations of existing research, and e) opportunities for extending and refining current studies.
2. Students should be able to critically assess published academic papers and provide constructive evaluations.
3. Students should be able to communicate their views and ideas on the topics of enquiry both in writing and orally.
4. Students should develop new ideas and research studies that advance the strategic management field.

Course readings are a mix of conceptual, qualitative and quantitative papers, drawn primarily from the top academic journals in management, strategy, international business, and economics, including *Academy of Management Journal*, *Academy of Management Review*, *Administrative Science Quarterly*, *Journal of International Business Studies*, *Organization Science*, *Management Science*, *Strategic Management Journal*, *Strategy Science*, *American Economic Review*, *Journal of Law and Economics*.

Expectations

Since the course is a discussion-based seminar, each student is required to carefully read all the assigned weekly readings (indicated by an asterisk) and to actively participate in class discussions. Students should come to class prepared with their ideas, perspectives and questions about the papers. As a start, students should think about:

- The paper’s assumptions about firms/organizations, markets, individuals, and the plausibility of the assumptions
- The causal arguments and logic underpinning the paper’s predictions, and how persuasive they are
- Contexts and questions for which the paper is particularly relevant
- How the paper connects theoretically with other papers in the session and in prior sessions.

Optional readings are provided for further reference if students wish to delve deeper into a particular topic. Students must attend each weekly session and complete all required assignments.

Course Evaluation

The grade for the course will be assigned based on the following components and weights:

Contribution to class discussions	30%
Weekly integration/presentations/critiques	30%
Research paper	40%

Session integrators: every week, two students will be assigned to act as ‘integrators’ for the session. This involves two tasks: the first is to prepare in advance a set of broad **discussion questions** that will guide students’ preparation for the class as they do the readings. These questions should relate to the topic of the session and readings as a whole. **The integrators must email me the proposed discussion questions by 5pm on Thursday the week before the class** (which is on Wednesday afternoons). I will review the questions and suggest changes. The final discussion questions will be sent to the class by the end of the Friday before the class.

The second task for the integrators is to provide integrative commentary and input during the class discussion that helps the class to understand the readings as a collective whole. Addressing the following points is a good starting point:

1. What are the main research questions, theoretical arguments/frameworks, and empirical methods when looking at the assigned papers collectively? How do the assigned papers relate to one another?
2. At a high level, what do the papers find or conclude?
3. What is a broad constructive critique of the papers as a whole (pros and cons)? What questions remain to be answered?
4. How does the topic of the session relate to other topics in the course?

Paper experts: There will usually be four papers as assigned readings each week. Students are expected to read and prepare all the assigned papers. In addition, every week, a student will be assigned as a paper expert for one of the readings. Experts should invest more time in reading and thinking about their particular paper, and they should prepare a **10-minute (max) Powerpoint presentation (10 slides or less)** that they will deliver during the class. **The goal of the presentation is to provide a critical analysis of the paper and not just a summary** (since everyone will have read the paper and will be familiar with the main contours). Presentations should follow this approximate structure:

1. **Research Question** (1 slide): What is the main research question the paper addresses and how does it relate to existing literature? What is novel here?

2. **Theory** (1-2 slides): What are the main conceptual arguments and causal predictions? Are there important explicit or implicit assumptions? Is the logic reasonable and consistent with assumptions?
3. **Method and Findings** (1-2 slides): Is the selected method appropriate? Does it produce results that reliably answer the question? How valid are the variable constructs and specific estimation techniques? What would be alternative empirical methods?
4. **Strengths** (1-2 slides): What is memorable or compelling – in a good sense – about the paper? What does the paper tell us that is new or unexpected? What are its main contributions to the field?
5. **Concerns** (1-2 slides): What are the primary conceptual, methodological or other weaknesses of the paper? How could the authors or future research address them?
6. **Reflections** (1-2 slides): what did you not understand about the paper that you think is important? How does the paper relate to other papers in the same session?

There will be one presentation per assigned paper during each session. Since the number of students in the course exceeds the number of assigned papers, students who do not present a paper will instead write a 2 page (single-spaced) constructive critique of the paper that addresses the points above.

Presentations and written synopses must be emailed to the instructor and the class by 12pm on the Tuesday before class.

Term paper: Each student will also write a term paper on a topic related to the course. There are two papers options. The first option is to write an original research paper, theoretical or empirical in nature, that makes a novel contribution to the strategy literature. If data collection cannot be performed in time, the paper should clearly identify the motivation and research question, explain the logic of underlying arguments, lay out the propositions, identify the type of data needed to test them, and indicate where/how such data would be collected. Particular attention should be placed on research design and empirical identification. The second option is to write a comprehensive, critical literature review of a topic within nonmarket strategic management. Students will present their paper ideas to the class in the final session of the course. Papers should be no more than 20 pages (double-spaced, excluding exhibits and references) and should be submitted by DATE TBD.

Attendance

Attendance in all sessions of the course is mandatory. A contribution grade of zero will be assigned to missed classes (notification requirements must be met – see below). If a student's absenteeism reaches 25 percent (3 or more classes), s/he will not be eligible to hand in the final research paper, and will fail the course. <http://www.uwo.ca/univsec/handbook/exam/attendance.pdf>. If a student must miss a class for health reasons or religious holidays, s/he must send the instructor an email in advance with the reason for absence.

Academic Integrity and Plagiarism

Scholastic offences are taken seriously and students are directed to read the appropriate policy, specifically, the definition of what constitutes a Scholastic Offence, at the following Web site: http://www.uwo.ca/univsec/pdf/academic_policies/appeals/scholastic_discipline_grad.pdf

All required papers may be subject to submission for textual similarity review to the commercial plagiarism-detection software under license to the University. All papers submitted for such checking will be included as source documents in the reference database for the purpose of detecting

plagiarism of papers subsequently submitted to the system. Use of the service is subject to the licensing agreement, currently between The University of Western Ontario and Turnitin.com (<http://www.turnitin.com>).”

Health and Wellness

As part of a successful graduate student experience at Western, we encourage students to make their health and wellness a priority. Western provides several on campus health-related services to help you achieve optimum health and engage in healthy living while pursuing your graduate degree. For example, to support physical activity, all students, as part of their registration, receive membership in Western’s Campus Recreation Centre. Numerous cultural events are offered throughout the year. Please check out the Faculty of Music web page <http://www.music.uwo.ca>, and our own McIntosh Gallery <http://www.mcintoshgallery.ca> . Information regarding health- and wellness-related services available to students may be found at <http://www.health.uwo.ca>.

Students seeking help regarding mental health concerns are advised to speak to someone they feel comfortable confiding in, such as their faculty supervisor, their program director (graduate chair), or other relevant administrators in their unit. Campus mental health resources may be found at http://www.health.uwo.ca/mental_health/resources.html.

To help you learn more about mental health, Western has developed an interactive mental health learning module, found here: http://www.health.uwo.ca/mental_health/module.html. This module is 30 minutes in length and provides participants with a basic understanding of mental health issues and of available campus and community resources. Topics include stress, anxiety, depression, suicide and eating disorders. After successful completion of the module, participants receive a certificate confirming their participation.

Accessible Education Western

Western is committed to achieving barrier-free accessibility for all its members, including graduate students. As part of this commitment, Western provides a variety of services devoted to promoting, advocating, and accommodating persons with disabilities in their respective graduate program.

Graduate students with disabilities (for example, chronic illnesses, mental health conditions, mobility impairments) are strongly encouraged to register with [Accessible Education Western \(AEW\)](#), a confidential service designed to support graduate and undergraduate students through their academic program. With the appropriate documentation, the student will work with both AEW and their graduate programs (normally their Graduate Chair and/or Course instructor) to ensure that appropriate academic accommodations to program requirements are arranged. These accommodations include individual counselling, alternative formatted literature, accessible campus transportation, learning strategy instruction, writing exams and assistive technology instruction.

A Final Welcome and Request of Students

I welcome individuals of all ages, backgrounds, beliefs, ethnicities, genders, gender identities, gender expressions, national origins, religious affiliations, sexual orientations, ability, and other visible and nonvisible differences. I consider this classroom to be a place where you will be treated with respect. All members of this class are expected to contribute to a respectful, welcoming and inclusive environment for every other member of the class. If it is appropriate to our learning and you feel comfortable doing so, I ask that you share your unique point of view as we explore the course content.

SESSION 1: INTRODUCTION AND CONCEPTS

*Rumelt, R., D. Schendel and D. Teece. 1991. Strategic Management and Economics. *Strategic Management Journal*, 12: 5-29

*Porter, M.E. 1996. What Is Strategy? *Harvard Business Review*, 60–78.

*Ghemawat, P. 2002. Competition and Business Strategy in Historical Perspective. *Business History Review*, 76

*Lieberman M. 2021. Is Competitive Advantage Intellectually Sustainable? *Strategic Management Review* 2(1): 29-46.

*Barney JB, Mackey TB, Mackey A. 2022. Why has it been so hard to define competitive advantage? *Strategic Management Review*. And the response by Lieberman, Moving beyond competitive advantage: A rejoinder to Barney et al.

Casadesus-Masanell, R. and S. Ricart. 2010. From Strategy to Business Models and on to Tactics. *Long Range Planning*, 43: 195—215.

Spulber, D. 1992. Economic Analysis and Management Strategy: A Survey. *Journal of Economics and Management Strategy*, 1(3): 535-574

Hoskisson, R., Hitt, M., Wan, W. and D. Yiu. 1999. Theory and Research in Strategic Management: Swings of a Pendulum. *Journal of Management*, 25(3): 417-456

Porter, M.E. 1991. Towards a Dynamic Theory of Strategy. *Strategic Management Journal*, Winter Special Issue, 95-118

SESSION 2: INDUSTRY ANALYSIS AND MARKET STRUCTURE

*Porter, M.E. 1985. Competitive Advantage, Chapter 1

*Wiggins, R. and T. Ruefli. 2005. Schumpeter's Ghost: Is Hypercompetition Making the Best of Times Shorter? *Strategic Management Journal*

*Adner, R. and Zemsky, P. 2006. A Demand-based Perspective on Sustainable Competitive Advantage. *Strategic Management Journal*, 27: 215-239

*Wang, M. Z. 2023. Changes in Industry and Corporate Effects in the United States, 1978-2019. *Strategic Management Journal*

Khanna, T. and J. Rivkin, 2001. Estimating the Performance Effects of Business Groups in Emerging Markets. *Strategic Management Journal*

Porter, M.E. 1979. How Competitive Forces Shape Strategy. *Harvard Business Review*

Rumelt, R.P. 1991. How Much Does Industry Matter? *Strategic Management Journal*, 12 (3):167–185.

McGahan, A.M. and M.E. Porter. 2005. Comment on Ruefli and Wiggins. *Strategic Management Journal*

Wiggins, R., and T. Ruefli. 2002. Sustained Competitive Advantage: Temporal Dynamics and the Incidence and Persistence of Superior Economic Performance. *Organization Science*

Adner, R., Ruiz-Aliseda, F. and Zemsky, P. 2016. Specialist versus Generalist Positioning: Demand Heterogeneity, Technology Scalability, Endogenous Market Segmentation. *Strategy Science*, 1(3): 184-206

McGahan, A.M. and M.E. Porter. 1997. How Much Does Industry Matter, Really? *Strategic Management Journal*, 18:15–30.

SESSION 3: INDUSTRY DYNAMICS

*Schumpeter, J. 1934. The Theory of Economic Development. Chapter 4.

*Tripsas, M. 1997. Unraveling the Process of Creative Destruction: Complementary Assets and Incumbent Survival in the Typesetter Industry. *Strategic Management Journal*, 18: 119-142.

*Benner, M. and Waldfogel, J. 2016. The Song Remains the Same? Technological Change and Positioning in the Recorded Music Industry. *Strategy Science*, 1(3): 129-147

*Mostafa, R. and S. Klepper. 2018. Industrial Development through Tacit Knowledge Seeding: Evidence from the Bangladesh Garment Industry. *Management Science*, 64(2): 613-632

de Figueiredo, J.M. and B.S. Silverman. 2007. Churn Baby Churn: Strategic Dynamics among Dominant and Fringe Firms in a Segmented Industry. *Management Science* 53: 632-650

Klepper, S. and K. Simons. 2000. The making of an oligopoly: Firm survival and technological change in the evolution of the U.S. Tire Industry. *Journal of Political Economy*.

SESSION 4: THE RESOURCE BASED VIEW OF THE FIRM

*Penrose, E. 1959. Theory of the Growth of the Firm. Chapters 1, 2, 5.

*Barney, J. 1991. Firm Resources and Sustained Competitive Advantage. *Journal of Management*, 17, pp. 99-120.

*Priem, R.L. and J. Butler. 2001. Is the Resource-Based "View" a Useful Perspective for Strategic Management Research? *Academy of Management Review*, 26: 22-40. (Plus response by Barney and "Further Comments" by the same authors)

*Hsu, D. and Ziedonis, R. 2013. Resources as Dual Sources of Advantage: Implications for Valuing Entrepreneurial-Firm Patents. *Strategic Management Journal*, 34: 761-781

Newbert, S.L. 2007. Empirical Research on the Resource-Based View of the Firm: An Assessment and Suggestions for Future Research. *Strategic Management Journal*, 28(2): 121-146.

Dierickx, I. and K. Cool. 1989. Asset Stock Accumulation and Sustainability of Competitive Advantage. *Management Science*, 35(12): 1504-1511.

Peteraf, M. A. 1993. The Cornerstones of Competitive Advantage: A Resource-Based View. *Strategic Management Journal*, 14: 179-191.

Miller, D. and 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(3): 519-543

Wernerfelt, B. 1984. A Resource-based View of the Firm. *Strategic Management Journal*, pp. 171-180.

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.

McEvily, S. and Chakravarthy, B. 2002. The Persistence of Knowledge-Based Advantage: An Empirical Test for Product Performance and Technological Knowledge. *Strategic Management Journal*, 23(4): 285-305.

Barney, J.B., Ketchen, D.J. and M. Wright. 2011. The Future of Resource-Based Theory: Revitalization or Decline? *Journal of Management*, 37(5): 1299-1315

Schmidt, J. and T. Keil. 2013. What makes a resource valuable? Identifying the drivers of firm idiosyncratic resource value. *Academy of Management Review*, 38(2): 206-228

Barney, J.B., Ketchen, D.J. and M. Wright. 2021. Resource-Based Theory and the Value Creation Framework. *Journal of Management*, 47(7): 1936-1955

SESSION 5: DYNAMIC CAPABILITIES

*Barney, J. 2018. Why Resource-Based Theory's Model of Profit Appropriation Must Incorporate a Stakeholder Perspective. *Strategic Management Journal*

*Teece, D., Pisano, G., and A. Shuen. 1997. Dynamic Capabilities and Strategic Management. *Strategic Management Journal*. 18 (7). 509-531.

*Stadler, C., Helfat, C.E. and G. Verona. 2013. The impact of dynamic capabilities on resource access and development. *Organization Science*, 24(6): 1782-1804

*Collis, D. and B. Anand. 2021. The Virtues and Limitations of Dynamic Capabilities. *Strategic Management Review*, 2: 47-78

King, A.A. and C.L. Tucci. 2002. Incumbent Entry into New Market Niches: The Role of Experience and Managerial Choice in the Creation of Dynamic Capabilities. *Management Science*, 48: 171-186.

Stoelhorst, J.W. 2021. Value, Rent and Profit: A Stakeholder Resource-Based Theory. *Strategic Management Journal*

Henderson, R. and J. Cockburn. 1994. Measuring Competence? Exploring firm Effects in Pharmaceutical Research. *Strategic Management Journal*. Winter Special Issue. (15) pp 63-84.

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

Helfat, C.E. and M.A. Peteraf. 2003. The Dynamic Resource-Based View: Capability Lifecycles. *Strategic Management Journal*, 24(10): 997-1010.

Arend, R.J. and P. Bromiley. 2009. Assessing the dynamic capabilities view: Spare change, everyone? *Strategic Organization*, 7(1): 75-90

SESSION 6: TRANSACTION COST ECONOMICS I

*Williamson, O.E. 1979. Transaction Cost Economics: The Governance of Contractual Relations. *Journal of Law and Economics*, 22(2): 233-261

*Williamson, O.E. 1991. Comparative Economic Organization: The Analysis of Discrete Structural Alternatives. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 36(2): 269-296

*Leiblein, M.J. and D.J. Miller. 2003. An Empirical Examination of Transaction- and Firm-level Influences on the Vertical Boundaries of the Firm. *Strategic Management Journal*, 24(9): 839-859

*Nickerson, J. and B. Silverman. 2003. Why Firms Want to Organize Efficiently and What Keeps Them from Doing So: Inappropriate Governance, Performance, and Adaptation in a Deregulated Industry. *Administrative Science Quarterly*.

Coase, R. 1937. The Nature of the Firm. *Economica*, Vol. 4, pp. 386-405.

- Alchian, A.A. and H. Demsetz. 1972. Production, Information Costs, and Economic Organization. *American Economic Review*, 62(5): 777-795
- Klein, B., Crawford, R.G. and A.A. Alchian. 1978. Vertical Integration, Appropriable Rents, and the Competitive Contracting Process. *Journal of Law and Economics*, 21(2): 297-326
- Williamson, O. E. 1981. The Economics of Organization: the Transaction Cost Approach. *American Journal of Sociology*, Vol. 87(3), pp. 548 - 577.
- Hart, O.D. 1988. Incomplete Contracts and the Theory of the Firm. *Journal of Law, Economics, & Organization*, 4(1): 119-139
- Hart, O.D. and J. Moore. 1990. Property Rights and the Nature of the Firm. *Journal of political economy*: 1119-1158
- Masten, S.E., Meehan, J.W. and E.A. Snyder. 1991. The Costs of Organization. *Journal of Law, Economics and Organization*, 7(1): 1-25.
- Ghoshal, S. and P. Moran. 1996. Bad for Practice: A Critique of the Transaction Cost Theory. *Academy of Management Review*, 21(1): 13-47
- Gibbons, R. 1999. Taking Coase Seriously. *Administrative Science Quarterly*.
- Williamson, O.E. 2002. The Theory of the Firm as Governance Structure: from Choice to Contract. *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, Vol. 16, No. 3, Summer 2002, pp. 171-195.
- Tadelis, S. and Williamson, O.E. 2012. Transaction Cost Economics. In R. Gibbons and J. Roberts (Eds.) *The Handbook of Organizational Economics*. Princeton University Press

SESSION 7: TRANSACTION COST ECONOMICS II

- *Oxley, J.E. 1997. Appropriability Hazards and Governance in Strategic Alliances: A Transaction Cost Approach. *Journal of Economics, Law and Organization*, 13(2)
- *Mayer, K. and Nickerson, J. 2005. Antecedents and Performance Implications of Contracting for Knowledge Workers: Evidence from Information Technology Services. *Organization Science*
- *Argyres, N. and Zenger, T. 2012. Capabilities, Transaction Costs, and Firm Boundaries. *Organization Science*, 23(6): 1643-1557
- *Hart, O.D. 1989. An Economist's Perspective on the Theory of the Firm. *Columbia Law Review*, 89(7): 1757-1774
- Argyres, N. 1996. Evidence on the role of firm capabilities in vertical integration decisions. *Strategic Management Journal*, 17: 129-150

Silverman, B. and Ingram, P. 2017. Asset ownership and incentives in early shareholder capitalism: Liverpool shipping in the eighteenth century, *Strategic Management Journal*, 38: 854-875

SESSION 8: EVOLUTIONARY/LEARNING PERSPECTIVE

*Lewin, A.Y., Massini, S., Peeters, C. 2011. Microfoundations of internal and external absorptive capacity routines. *Organization Science*, 22(1): 81-98

*Kogut, B., Zander, U. 1992. Knowledge of the firm, combinative capabilities, and the replication of technology. *Organization Science*, 3(3): 383-397

*Ahuja, G., Katila, R. 2004. Where do resources come from? The role of idiosyncratic situations. *Strategic Management Journal*, 25(8-9): 887-907

*Sorenson, O., McEvily, S., Ren, C.R., Roy, R. 2006. Niche width revisited: Organizational scope, behavior and performance. *Strategic Management Journal*, 27(10): 915-936

Nelson, R.R., Winter, S.G. 1982. *An evolutionary theory of economic change*. Harvard University Press: Cambridge. Chapters 1 and 2.

Cohen, W.M., Levinthal, D.A. 1990. Absorptive capacity: a new perspective on learning and innovation. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 35: 128-152.

March, J.G. 1991. Exploration and exploitation in organizational learning. *Organization Science*, 2: 71-87.

Nickerson, J.A., Zenger, T.R. 2004. A knowledge-based theory of the firm - the problem-solving perspective. *Organization Science*, 15(6): 617-632.

Danneels, E. 2008. Organizational antecedents of second-order competences. *Strategic Management Journal*, 29(5): 519-543

Sutton, J. 2007. Market Share Dynamics and the “Persistence of Leadership” Debate. *American Economic Review*.

Hsu, D.H., Ziedonis, R.H. 2013. Resources as dual sources of advantage: Implications for valuing entrepreneurial-firm patents. *Strategic Management Journal*, 34(7): 761-781

SESSION 9: AGENCY THEORY AND CORPORATE GOVERNANCE

*Jensen, M. and W. Meckling. 1976. Theory of the firm: Managerial behavior, agency costs, and ownership structure. *Journal of Financial Economics*, 3: 305-360.

*Eisenhardt, K. 1989. Agency Theory: An assessment and review. *Academy of Management Review*, 14(1): 57-74.

*Wowak, A., Mannor, M. and K. Wowak. 2015. Throwing caution to the wind: The effect of CEO stock option pay on the incidence of product safety problems. *Strategic Management Journal*, 36(7): 1082-1092.

*Yermack, D. 2006. Flights of fancy: Corporate jets, CEO perquisites, and inferior shareholder returns. *Journal of Finance*, 80(1): 211-242.

Souder, D. and Shaver, M. 2010. Constraints and incentives for making long term corporate investments. *Strategic Management Journal*, 31(12): 1316-1336.

Fama, E. and Jensen, M. 1983. Separation of ownership and control. *Journal of Law and Economics*, 26: 301-325.

SESSION 10: CORPORATE DIVERSIFICATION AND SCOPE

*Montgomery, C.A. 1994. Corporate diversification. *The Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 8(3): 163-178.

*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(8), 1109- 1124.

*Rawley, E., & Simcoe, T. S. 2010. Diversification, Diseconomies of Scope, and Vertical Contracting: Evidence From the Taxicab Industry. *Management Science*, 56 (9), 1534-1550.

*Shaver, J.M. 2011. The benefits of geographic sales diversification: How exporting facilitates capital investment. *Strategic Management Journal*, 32(10): 1046-1060

Qian, L., Agarwal, R., Hoetker, G.P. 2012. Configuration of value chain activities: The effect of pre-entry capabilities, transaction hazard and industry evolution on the decision to internalize. *Organization Science*, 23(5): 1330-1349

Rawley, E. 2010. Diversification, coordination costs, and organizational rigidity: Evidence from microdata. *Strategic Management Journal*, 31(8): 873-891

Wu, B. 2013. Opportunity costs, industry dynamics, and corporate diversification: Evidence from the cardiovascular medical device industry, 1976-2004. *Strategic Management Journal*, 34(11): 1265-1287

Carroll, G. R., Bigelow, L. S., Seidel, M. D. L., and Tsai, L. B. 1996. The fates of de novo and de alio producers in the American automobile industry 1885–1981. *Strategic Management Journal*, 17(S1), 117-137.

Chen, P. L., Williams, C., and Agarwal, R. 2012. Growing pains: Pre-entry experience and the challenge of transition to incumbency. *Strategic Management Journal*, 33(3), 252-276

Teece, D. 1980. Economies of scope and the scope of the enterprise. *Journal of Economic Behavior and Organization*, 1: 223-247

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 Review*, 31(2), 466-476

Wan, W. P., Hoskisson, R. E., Short, J. C., and Yiu, D. W. 2011. Resource-based theory and corporate diversification: Accomplishments and opportunities. *Journal of Management*, 37(5), 1335-1368.

SESSION 11: RECENT COOL STUFF FROM TOP STRATEGY/MANAGEMENT JOURNALS

Student picks

SESSION 12: STUDENT PRESENTATIONS