

**THE UNIVERSITY OF HONG KONG
FACULTY OF BUSINESS AND ECONOMICS**

PhD Course Syllabus

Course Code/Title: STRA6014 – 1A Research Seminars in Strategic Management I

Course Description: This doctoral seminar introduces students to the foundations and applications of major theories used in strategic management and organization theory. The materials covered represent a blend of classic pieces to understand the core assumptions and historical roots of influential management theories, along with recent cutting-edge developments. Each theory or perspective discussion will be divided into two parts – foundations and applications. We will look at seminal articles of each theory as well as recent articles related to its applications in the fields of strategic management and organization theory. The articles within each topic incorporate a variety of approaches, giving us an opportunity to explore different ways of pursuing answers to important issues in strategy research.

Course Objectives:

1. Become familiar with relevant issues and recent debates in strategic management and organization theory.
2. Develop skills in evaluating this literature and think critically about how this area has evolved historically.
3. Link different sessions together and identify new research opportunities/questions.
4. Approach contemporary issues in strategic management and organization theory from several perspectives.
5. Critically evaluate research questions addressed in the readings.
6. Identify and develop an original testable research idea into a paper.
7. Build skills at developing and presenting research ideas.
8. 8. Develop skills at presenting and responding to oral presentations of research.

Pre-requisite: None

Assessment: 100% coursework

Remarks: All PhD courses are non-credit-bearing and will be assessed on a pass/fail basis.

Course Learning Outcomes (CLOs) On completion of this course, students should be able to:	Aligned PLOs*				
	1	2	3	4	5
1. Acquire an in-depth understanding of the theories, concepts, models, and paradigms that collectively form the foundation for strategic management and organization theory	X	X			X
2. Gain the critical review skills in identifying the major assumptions, strengths, and limitations of academic articles	X	X	X		X
3. Develop the critical thinking skills in generating theory-driven research ideas and models	X	X	X		X
4. Obtain the skills of developing and presenting research papers that are publishable at academic journals		X	X	X	

*Programme Learning Outcomes (PLOs) for Research Postgraduate Programme:

1. Demonstrate critical understanding, at an advanced level, of up-to-date knowledge and research methodology of a particular field
2. Implement effective academic and personal strategies for carrying out research projects independently and ethically
3. Contribute original knowledge in response to issues in their specialist area
4. Communicate research findings at a diverse range of levels and through a variety of media
5. Evaluate one's own research in relation to important and latest issues in the field

COURSE DETAILS *(subject to change at instructor's discretion)*

Year/Semester: 2023-24, First Semester
Time/Venue: TBA
Instructor: **Professor Fabrice Lumineau**
 Email: lumineau@hku.hk
 Meetings by appointment

I. Teaching and Learning Activities

In-class and Out-of-class Activities <i>(e.g. lectures, class discussion, papers reading, proposal writing)</i>	Expected hour	% of student study effort
1. Lecture with interactive exercises	30	20%
2. Critical review and research paper	48	32%
3. Self-study	72	48%
Total	150	100%

II. Assessment

Assessment Components <i>(e.g. assignments, proposal, presentation, examination)</i>	Weight	CLOs to be assessed			
		1	2	3	4
1. Class participation	20%	✓	✓	✓	✓
2. Papers discussion	20%	✓	✓	✓	✓
3. Review	10%	✓	✓	✓	✓
4. Final paper	40%	✓	✓	✓	✓
5. Presentation	10%	✓	✓	✓	✓
Total	100%				

1. Class participation (20%)

Attendance is a necessary condition for class participation. It is also important to attend all the classes because the most insightful ideas come primarily from class discussion.

All students are expected to be thoroughly prepared on **all the articles** assigned for the session. You should be ready to talk about the main message and possible extensions of the articles. Good participation includes asking questions, raising original ideas, making constructive comments, and having a positive attitude toward learning.

Everyone is expected to have a thoughtful opinion, and if you do not volunteer to share your ideas, you will be called on to do so. **Being silent is not an option.**

Comments should be inquisitive, thoughtful, and insightful. To make such comments, you will have to prepare well for class and listen carefully to the discussion. You are encouraged to challenge ideas, not individuals. Classroom discussions should be fun, provocative and enlightening, but never insulting or hostile. It is perfectly fine to have strong opinions, but any form of personal attack is unacceptable.

2. Papers discussion (20%)

In each session, papers in the reading list will be assigned to each individual student.

Each discussion leader will have to present an in-depth assessment of the article (for about 10 minutes). **It should not be a summary**, but a scholarly appraisal with special emphasis on the unique qualities (and weaknesses) that enhance or mitigate the contribution of the paper.

Due: *Post your slides (about 4 to 8) on Moodle before 11:59pm the day before your presentation.*

Your review of the article should focus on:

Motivations

- What **question** is the paper addressing? How clear is it? Is it important and/or interesting? Does the paper justify why the question has been inadequately addressed so far? Does it explain how it will improve upon prior research?
- What **framing** is used to position the work with respect to other research?
- How would you **position** the article among the assigned readings or in the field?

Argumentation

- What **style** of persuasion is used to make the work convincing? Does the paper review the literature relevant to the research question? Does it explain how prior literature fails to adequately address the research question?
- Is it clear which **theory** or theories the paper draws from to develop their hypotheses?
- What **assumptions** underlie the work? How valid are they?
- What **data and methods** are used? Do they fit the research question? Are the variables measured in a reasonable way? Are the data collection efforts unbiased?
- Are the **methods** consistent with the theory? Do they control for potential bias? Do their empirical tests rule out alternative explanations?

Implications

- What are your **suggestions** for the authors to solve the issues you raise? What are the possible extensions? How would you proceed?
- What **new findings** does the paper offer? Does it place the paper in the context of the larger literature? What **implications** for theory or practice arise from this research?
- What **problems**, if any, did you find with the paper's findings or conclusions?
- What **next steps** does this work suggest or require?

3 – Review (10%)

During this seminar, we will discuss what a constructive review is and what is expected from reviewers.

You will practice your skills as a reviewer by writing two reviews on your classmates' papers.

Due: *by day before Session 10 - 11:59pm to lumineau@hku.hk*

4 – Final paper (40%)

The goal of the seminar is also to work on a paper within the domain of strategic management and organization theory. This should be a strong start of a project you could submit to a scholarly conference and then a journal. It is also an opportunity to experiment on possible dissertation topics.

The paper should relate to the topics covered in class. As the course progresses, start thinking about what questions you want to pursue for your paper. You do not need to actually get the data and estimate the model.

Your paper should be 15 – 20 pages (12-point font, double-spaced) plus references. Following the format of the papers you will see in our readings, this will require a clear statement of the problem, review of the prior literature, development of a new perspective, approach, theory, hypotheses, and conclusion with discussion of potential strategies for empirical research. Your final paper should include an abstract and a list of four or five keywords. It should be an empirical paper without data and results sections at this stage, but including analyses and results in the paper is highly encouraged.

Due: *by day of Session 9 - 11:59pm to lumineau@hku.hk*

5 - Presentation (10%)

In our last class, you will present your final paper and will get feedback from your colleagues to help improve it. Your presentation should include (1) the model with a key message (one sentence), (2) research gaps, (3) research question, (4) theoretical base, (5) hypotheses, (6) research plan, and (7) potential contributions.

Students will be assessed based on the following performance standards:

Course Grade	Performance Standard
Pass	A+, A, A- Strong evidence of superb ability to fulfil the intended learning outcomes of the course at all levels of learning: describe, apply, evaluate and synthesise
	B+, B, B- Strong evidence of ability to fulfil the intended learning outcomes of the course at all levels of learning: describe, apply, evaluate and synthesise
	C+, C, C- Evidence of adequate ability to fulfil the intended learning outcomes of the course at low levels of learning; such as describe and apply, but not at high levels of learning such as evaluate and synthesise
	D+, D Evidence of basic familiarity with the subject
Fail	F Little evidence of basic familiarity with the subject

III. Course Content and Tentative Schedule

- Session 1 – Doing research in management
- Session 2 – Transaction cost economics
- Session 3 – Trust and relational approaches
- Session 4 – Organizational design
- Session 5 – Organizational learning
- Session 6 – Resource-based view and dynamic capabilities
- Session 7 – Behavioural approaches
- Session 8 – Institutional theory
- Session 9 – Resource dependence
- Session 10 – Presentations

IV. Required/Recommended Readings

Session 1 – Doing research in management

1. Makadok, R., Burton, R., & Barney, J. 2018. A practical guide for making theory contributions in strategic management. *Strategic Management Journal*, 39: 1530–1545.
2. Sutton, R. I., & Staw, B. M. 1995. What theory is not. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 40: 371–384.
3. Suddaby, R. 2010. Editor’s comments: Construct clarity in theories of management and organization. *Academy of Management Review*, 35: 346–357.
4. von Nordenflycht, A. 2023. Clean up your theory! Invest in theoretical clarity and consistency for higher-impact research. *Organization Science*, forthcoming.
5. 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.
6. Tihanyi, L. 2020. From “that’s interesting” to “that’s important.” *Academy of Management Journal*, 63: 329–331.
7. von Krogh, G., Robertson, Q., & Gruber, M. 2023. Recognizing and utilizing novel research opportunities with artificial intelligence. *Academy of Management Journal*, 66: 367–373.

Session 2 – Transaction cost economics

1. Williamson, O. E. 2010. Transaction cost economics: The natural progression. *American Economic Review*, 100: 673–690.
2. Cuypers, I. R., Hennart, J. F., Silverman, B. S., & Ertug, G. 2021. Transaction cost theory: Past progress, current challenges, and suggestions for the future. *Academy of Management Annals*, 15: 111–150.
3. Parmigiani, A. 2007. Why do firms both make and buy? An investigation of concurrent sourcing. *Strategic Management Journal*, 28: 285–311.
4. Lumineau, F., Wang, W., & Schilke, O. 2021. Blockchain governance—A new way of organizing collaborations? *Organization Science*, 32(2): 500–521.
5. Ghoshal, S., & Moran, P. 1996. Bad for practice: A critique of the transaction cost theory. *Academy of Management Review*, 21: 13–47.

Session 3 – Trust and relational approaches

1. Mayer, R. C., Davis, J. H., & Schoorman, F. D. 1995. An integrative model of organizational trust. *Academy of Management Review*, 20: 709–734.
2. Zaheer, A., McEvily, B., & Perrone, V. 1998. Does trust matter? Exploring the effects of interorganizational and interpersonal trust on performance. *Organization Science*, 9: 141–159.
3. Dyer, J. H., & Singh, H. 1998. The relational view: Cooperative strategy and sources of interorganizational competitive advantage. *Academy of Management Review*, 23: 660–679.
4. Salvato, C., Reuer, J. J., & Battigalli, P. 2017. Cooperation across disciplines: A multilevel perspective on cooperative behavior in governing interfirm relations. *Academy of Management Annals*, 11: 960–1004.
5. Keller, A., Lumineau, F., Mellewigt, T., & Arino, A. M. 2021. Alliance governance mechanisms in the face of disruption. *Organization Science*, 32(6): 1542–1570.
6. Uribe, J., Sytch, M., & Kim, Y. H. 2020. When friends become foes: Collaboration as a catalyst for conflict. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 65: 751–794.

Session 4 – Organizational design

1. Joseph, J., & Gaba, V. 2020. Organizational structure, information processing, and decision-making: A retrospective and road map for research. *Academy of Management Annals*, 14: 267–302.
2. Tushman, M. L., & Nadler, D. A. 1978. Information processing as an integrating concept in organizational design. *Academy of Management Review*, 3: 613–624.
3. Albers, S., Wohlgezogen, F., & Zajac, E. J. 2016. Strategic alliance structures: An organization design perspective. *Journal of Management*, 42: 582–614.
4. Puranam, P., Alexy, O., & Reitzig, M. 2014. What’s “new” about new forms of organizing? *Academy of Management Review*, 39: 162–180.
5. Sytch, M., Wohlgezogen, F., & Zajac, E. J. 2018. Collaborative by design? How matrix organizations see/do alliances. *Organization Science*, 29: 1130–1148.
6. Kretschmer, T., Leiponen, A., Schilling, M., & Vasudeva, G. 2020. Platform ecosystems as meta-organizations: Implications for platform strategies. *Strategic Management Journal*, 43: 405–424.

Session 5 – Organizational learning

1. Huber, G. P. 1991. Organizational learning: The contributing processes and the literatures. *Organization Science*, 2: 88–115.
2. Cohen, W. M., & Levinthal, D. A. 1990. Absorptive capacity: A new perspective on learning and innovation. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 35: 128–152.
3. Howard, M., Steensma, H. K., Lyles, M., & Dhanaraj, C. 2016. Learning to collaborate through collaboration: How allying with expert firms influences collaborative innovation within novice firms. *Strategic Management Journal*, 37: 2092–2103.

4. Aranda, C., Arellano, J., & Davila, A. 2017. Organizational learning in target setting. *Academy of Management Journal*, 60: 1189–1211.
5. Argote, L., Lee, S., & Park, J. 2021. Organizational learning processes and outcomes: Major findings and future research directions. *Management Science*, 67: 5399–5429.

Session 6 – Resource-based view and dynamic capabilities

1. Barney, J. 1991. Firm resources and sustained competitive advantage. *Journal of Management*, 17: 99–120.
2. Priem, R. L., & Butler, J. E. 2001. Is the resource-based “view” a useful perspective for strategic management research? *Academy of Management Review*, 26: 22–40.
3. Teece, D. J., Pisano, G., & Shuen, A. 1997. Dynamic capabilities and strategic management. *Strategic Management Journal*, 18: 509–533.
4. Anand, J., Oriani, R., & Vassolo, R. S. 2010. Alliance activity as a dynamic capability in the face of a discontinuous technological change. *Organization Science*, 21: 1213–1232.
5. Helfat, C. E., & Peteraf, M. A. 2015. Managerial cognitive capabilities and the microfoundations of dynamic capabilities. *Strategic Management Journal*, 36: 831–850.
6. Schilke, O., Hu, S., & Helfat, C. E. 2018. Quo vadis, dynamic capabilities? A content-analytic review of the current state of knowledge and recommendations for future research. *Academy of Management Annals*, 12: 390–439.

Session 7 – Behavioural approaches

1. Gavetti, G., Greve, H. R., Levinthal, D. A., & Ocasio, W. 2012. The behavioral theory of the firm: Assessment and prospects. *Academy of Management Annals*, 6: 1–40.
2. Felin, T., Foss, N. J., & Ployhart, R. E. 2015. The microfoundations movement in strategy and organization theory. *Academy of Management Annals*, 9: 575–632.
3. Porac, J. F., Thomas, H., Wilson, F., Paton, D., & Kanfer, A. 1995. Rivalry and the industry model of Scottish knitwear producers. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 40: 203–227.
4. Bouquet, C., & Birkinshaw, J. 2008. Weight versus voice: How foreign subsidiaries gain attention from corporate headquarters. *Academy of Management Journal*, 51: 577–601.
5. Laureiro-Martínez, D., Brusoni, S., Canessa, N., & Zollo, M. 2015. Understanding the exploration–exploitation dilemma: An fMRI study of attention control and decision-making performance. *Strategic Management Journal*, 36: 319–338.
6. Surdu, I., Greve, H. R., & Benito, G. R. B. 2021. Back to basics: Behavioral theory and internationalization. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 52: 1047–1068.

Session 8 – Institutional theory

1. Meyer, J. W., & Rowan, B. 1977. Institutionalized organizations: Formal structure as myth and ceremony. *American Journal of Sociology*, 83: 340–363.
2. DiMaggio, P. J., & Powell, W. W. 1983. The iron cage revisited: Institutional isomorphism and collective rationality in organizational fields. *American Sociological Review*, 48: 147–160.
3. Tolbert, P. S., David, R. J., & Sine, W. D. 2011. Studying choice and change: The intersection of institutional theory and entrepreneurship research. *Organization Science*, 22: 1332–1344.
4. Marquis, C., & Tilcsik, A. 2016. Institutional equivalence: How industry and community peers influence corporate philanthropy. *Organization Science*, 27: 1325–1341.
5. Jeong, Y. C., & Kim, T. Y. 2019. Between legitimacy and efficiency: An institutional theory of corporate giving. *Academy of Management Journal*, 62: 1583-1608.
6. Zhao, E. Y., Fisher, G., Lounsbury, M., & Miller, D. 2017. Optimal distinctiveness: Broadening the interface between institutional theory and strategic management. *Strategic Management Journal*, 38: 93–113.

Session 9 – Resource dependence

1. Hillman, A. J., Withers, M. C., & Collins, B. J. 2009. Resource dependence theory: A review. *Journal of Management*, 35: 1404–1427.
2. Casciaro, T., & Piskorski, M. J. 2005. Power imbalance, mutual dependence, and constraint absorption: A closer look at resource dependence theory. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 50: 167–199.
3. Gulati, R., & Sytch, M. 2007. Dependence asymmetry and joint dependence in interorganizational relationships: Effects of embeddedness on a manufacturer's performance in procurement relationships. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 52: 32–69.
4. Rogan, M., & Greve, H. R. 2015. Resource dependence dynamics: Partner reactions to mergers. *Organization Science*, 26: 239–255.
5. McEvily, B., Zaheer, A., & Kamal, D. K. F. 2017. Mutual and exclusive: Dyadic sources of trust in interorganizational exchange. *Organization Science*, 28: 74–92.
6. Sutton, T., Devine, R. A., Lamont, B., & Holmes, M. 2021. Resource dependence, uncertainty, and the allocation of corporate political activity across multiple jurisdictions. *Academy of Management Journal*, 64: 38–62.

Session 10 – Presentations

1. Verbeke, A., Von Glinow, M.A. & Luo, Y. 2017. Becoming a great reviewer: Four actionable guidelines. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 48: 1–9.
2. Feldman, D. 2004. Editorial: The devil is in the details: Converting good research into publishable articles. *Journal of Management*, 30: 1–6.

3. Colquitt, J. A., & Ireland, R. D. 2009. From the editors: Taking the mystery out of AMJ's reviewer evaluation form. *Academy of Management Journal*, 52: 224–228.
4. COPE. 2017. *Ethical guidelines for peer reviewers*.
https://publicationethics.org/files/cope-ethical-guidelines-peer-reviewers-v2_0.pdf
5. Shaw J. D. 2012. Responding to reviewers. *Academy of Management Journal*, 55: 1261–1263.
6. Campbell, J. T., & Aguilera, R. V. 2022. Why i rejected your paper: common pitfalls in writing theory papers and how to avoid them. *Academy of Management Journal*, 47: 521–527.

V. Course Policy

Class Conduct

Please respect your instructors and your fellow students. You are required to attend all classes on time. If you have to miss a class, please write a formal notice to inform the instructor at least one day before the class.

Attendance

According to FBE policy, students must attend at least 70% of classes in order to pass the course.

Academic Conduct

The University Regulations on academic dishonesty will be strictly enforced! Academic dishonesty is behaviour in which a deliberately fraudulent misrepresentation is employed in an attempt to gain undeserved intellectual credit, either for oneself or for another. It includes, but is not necessarily limited to, the following types of cases:

- a. Plagiarism - The representation of someone else's ideas as if they are their own. Where the arguments, data, designs, etc., of someone else are being used in a paper, report, oral presentation, or similar academic project, this fact must be made explicitly clear by citing the appropriate references. The references must fully indicate the extent to which any parts of the project are not one's own work. Paraphrasing of someone else's ideas is still using someone else's ideas, and must be acknowledged. Please check the University Statement on plagiarism on the web: <http://www.hku.hk/plagiarism/>
- b. Unauthorized Collaboration on Out-of-Class Projects - The representation of work as solely one's own when in fact it is the result of a joint effort.
- c. Cheating on In-Class Exams - The covert gathering of information from other students, the use of unauthorized notes, unauthorized aids, etc.
- d. Unauthorized Advance Access to an Exam - The representation of materials prepared at leisure, as a result of unauthorized advance access (however obtained), as if it were prepared under the rigors of the exam setting. This misrepresentation is dishonest in itself even if there are not compounding factors, such as unauthorized uses of books or notes.

You are expected to do your own work whenever you are supposed to. Incident(s) of academic dishonesty will NOT be tolerated. Cheating or plagiarism of any kind would result in an automatic FAIL grade for the course plus strict enforcement of all Faculty and/or University regulations regarding such behaviour.