Ph.D. Course 40015

STRATEGY

Period: a.y. 2026/27 – II term

Class times: see schedule

Instructor:

Prof. Giada Di Stefano
Dept. of Mgmt. & Tech. – Room 4-E1-01
giada.distefano@unibocconi.it

Course Description.

This is a doctoral-level seminar designed to expose PhD students to some of the most recent and interdisciplinary topics in strategic management research.

The field of strategic management is fundamentally concerned with understanding why some firms perform better than others. To approach this topic, the course is divided into two main parts. We will start by establishing the existence of performance heterogeneity and understanding how different theories have explained it. We will then move to understanding better what makes a decision strategic and what factors contribute to decision-making.

In dealing with these topics, we will draw extensively from related disciplinary research in the fields of economics, sociology, and psychology. We will touch upon a range of different contributions, from the theoretical to the empirical, and from the classic to the current. In terms of methods, we will read papers that employ a variety of methods including qualitative analysis, surveys, experiments, and the analysis of secondary data.

Finally, we will also take the chance to discuss about the review process of a paper of mine dealing with one of the topics covered during the course. This should help you begin to familiarize with the process of getting published.

Course Material

The numbered readings are the only required material for the course. There is also a list of suggested readings (marked with a *) that are meant to provide a range of perspectives and a flavor of the research in different areas in strategy. All the material is available at this link: https://www.dropbox.com/scl/fo/68ggbxosjdjua4wgb9b8t/ALjNIYNbmUDxDkAYTtWw2U?rlkey=4pdo346wdf3ts6dprtwehlrq8&dl=0.

List of topics

- Performance Heterogeneity and Value-based Perspectives
- Competitive Dynamics
- Organizational Adaptation
- Organizational Learning
- Organizational Design
- Organizational and Individual Goals
- The Value of Management
- The Role of Institutions

Assessment Methods

Students will be evaluated based on three criteria:

1. Class Participation and attendance: 40% of final grade

Because of the very nature of the course, you are expected to attend each class and actively participate. Please note that the reading list is composed of a number of mandatory readings (including one or more background readings) and a number of additional readings. The latter are not going to be discussed in class but can be helpful if you want to know more.

During each class, all students are expected to read all the mandatory readings, including the background reading(s). For each reading, I will ask one student to lead the discussion. I am OK with you choosing which discussion to lead (please use this tool to "book" your slot: https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1AJ0myiDdVWPuY6g6NkmefqAIeX5cHdmxlha72DNePzM/edit?usp=sharing), but I expect everyone to have read every single mandatory reading, so expect to be cold called.

If you are leading the discussion, I expect you to be ready to provide a brief overview of the research question, theoretical development, methods and findings (again, with the expectation that everyone has read the paper). I also expect you to be able to provide a critical assessment, starting with what you liked about the paper, to then move what you would have done differently, and potentially to what one could do next.

In preparing each paper, it could be helpful to try and address the following questions:

- Why is this a strategy paper? (as opposed to a paper in OT, OB, or others…)
- Why is this theoretically important to understand? How does it provide insights on how we should think about things differently?
- How confident are you with the results?
- What are the underlying behavioral mechanisms for the effects identified in the paper? How does the paper connect the outcomes with the mechanisms?
- Why do we think that this is economically or socially important? How can it be used and how can it create impact?

2. Idea generation Exercise: 30% of final grade

For one session of the course (at your choice), you are expected to develop a concise presentation that builds on one (or more) of the assigned readings and develops a potential follow-up. You hand in a deck of 3 slides: (1) Background; (2) Research Question; and (3) Research design. Please email it to me by 9am on the day of the class. We will then schedule a one-on-one meeting to discuss your idea in greater detail.

Policy on the use of AI: In line with guidelines from leading academic journals (see, for instance: https://www.aom.org/publications/journals/publishing-with-aom/aom-artificial-intelligence-policy/), you are expected to disclose whether AI tools were used and explicitly confirm that you carefully reviewed, verified, and accepted any AI-involved output. To this end, please include a statement such as the following: "During the production of this work, the author utilized generative artificial intelligence, namely [LIST TOOLS]. These tools were used to [DESCRIBE WHERE, HOW, AND WHY]. The author reviewed all content and asserts the content within this document is factually accurate and free of plagiarism. The author takes full responsibility for the submitted document."

3. Reviewing Exercise: 30% of final grade

During the course, you will have the chance to take a closer look at the publication process by examining the revision process of one paper. This exercise will unfold over 3 sessions and will require you to produce three short reports.

First, you will be asked to read the original submission and write a referee report of this paper (as if you were reviewing for a journal). Follow the AMJ guidelines available at: https://aom.org/research/publishing-with-aom/reviewer-resources (go to "Reviewer resources by journal" and look under "Academy of Management Journal"). Please email the report to me by 9am on the day of class (11/19).

Once you have completed your own review, I will share with you the actual referee reports. You will be asked to read them prior to class and draft a brief response letter, highlighting the three main critical issues emerging from reading the reports, and possible strategies to address them. Please email the 1-page report to me by 9am on the day of class (11/24).

Finally, I will share with you the actual response letter and the resubmitted manuscript. You will be asked to read through them and write a short commentary with the main takeaways from this exercise. Please email the 1-page report to me by 9am on the day of class (11/26).

Policy on the use of AI: In line with guidelines from leading academic journals (see, for instance: https://www.aom.org/publications/journals/publishing-with-aom/aom-artificial-intelligence-policy/), you are expected to exercise your own independent judgment and expertise in evaluating manuscripts as a reviewer. The use of AI should never substitute for your personal assessment of the quality, contribution, or integrity of a submission. To preserve confidentiality and intellectual integrity, you should not upload any portion of a manuscript, including text, figures, or data, into any AI tool or platform. This applies regardless of whether the tool is accessed through a browser, an API, or a locally installed application. You may, however, use AI tools to assist in editing or improving the clarity of their own written reviews. As above, you are expected to disclose whether AI tools were used and explicitly confirm that you carefully reviewed, verified, and accepted any AI-involved output. To this end, please include a statement such as the following: "During the production of this work, the author utilized generative artificial intelligence, namely [LIST TOOLS]. These tools were used to [DESCRIBE WHERE, HOW, AND WHY]. The author reviewed all content and asserts the content within this document is factually accurate and free of plagiarism. The author takes full responsibility for the submitted document."

Faculty Bio.

Giada is a Professor of Strategy at Bocconi University. Her general research interests are in the broad area of strategy and innovation. More specifically, she studies the factors that foster or inhibit the creation and transfer of knowledge, within and across organizations. From a methodological standpoint, her research is prevalently mixed method, with a focus on experiments and field work more broadly. To this end, she has partnered with a number of organizations to conduct experiments "in the wild." Her work is often conducted in the context of creative industries, broadly defined – from gourmet cuisine to science, from computer programming to academia. Her papers have been published in top academic journals including the Academy of Management Journal, Management Science, Organization Science, and Strategic Management Journal. Her research has also been featured on the Financial Times and Forbes. She currently serves as an Associate Editor for the Strategic Management Journal and a Contributing Editor for Strategy Science. She also serves on the board of the Strategic Management Society (SMS) and the Consortium on Competitiveness and Cooperation (CCC). For the Strategic Management Society, she has served as the Program Chair of the Will Mitchell Dissertation Research Grant Program of the Strategic Research Foundation, in the Leadership team for the Competitive Strategy Interest Group, and as a Representative-at-Large and Engagement Officer for the Behavioral Strategy Interest Group. For the Academy of Management, she has served on the Executive Committee for both the STR Division and the TIM Division. Giada joined Bocconi in 2019, after seven years at HEC Paris. Prior to joining academia, she worked as a product manager for L'Oréal Paris.

Session 1: What is Strategy? Performance Heterogeneity and Value-based Perspectives (Tuesday, November 3, 2026: 1.15-3.30pm)

1. Wang, M. Z. (2023). Changes in Industry and Corporate Effects in the U.S., 1978 – 2019. Strategic Management Journal, 44: 477–490. (Please read also the appendix)
   - Schmalensee, R. (1985). Do markets differ much? American Economic Review, 75(3): 341–351.
   - Rumelt RP. (1991). How much does industry matter? Strategic Management Journal, 12(3), 167-185.
   - McGahan AM, Porter ME. (1997). How much does industry matter, really? Strategic Management Journal, 15-30.
   - Bowman EH, Helfat CE. (2001). Does corporate strategy matter? Strategic Management Journal, 22(1), 1-23.
   - Ruefli T, Wiggins R. (2005) Industry, corporate, and segment effects and performance: A nonparametric approach. Strategic Management Journal, 24(9), 861-879.

2. Denrell J, Fang C, Liu C. (2015). Perspective: Chance explanations in the management sciences. Organization Science, 26(3), 923-940.

3. Brandenburger AM, Stuart HW. (1996). Value-based business strategy. Journal of Economics & Management Strategy, 5(1), 5-24.
   - MacDonald G, Ryall MD. (2004). How do value creation and competition determine whether a firm appropriates value? Management Science, 50(10), 1319-1333.
   - Chatain O. (2011). Value creation, competition, and performance in buyer - supplier relationships. Strategic Management Journal, 32(1), 76-102.
   - Luo H. (2014). When to sell your idea: Theory and evidence from the movie industry. Management Science, 60(12), 3067-3086.
   - Gans J, Ryall M. (2016). Value capture theory: A strategic management review. Strategic Management Journal, 38, 17–41.
   - Chatain O, Mindruta D. (2017). Estimating value creation from revealed preferences: Application to value-based strategies. Strategic Management Journal, 38(10), 1964-1985.

4. Sands, DB. (2025). Double-edged stars: Michelin stars, reactivity, and restaurant exits in New York City. Strategic Management Journal, 46(1), 148–176.

Discussion forum: What is Strategy? From positioning to resources to value.

- Wernerfelt B. (1984). A resource-based view of the firm. Strategic Management Journal, 5(2), 171-180.
- Wernerfelt B. (1995). A Resource-based View of the Firm: 10 years later. Strategic Management Journal, 16, 171-174.
- Dierickx I, Cool K. (1989). Asset stock accumulation and sustainability of competitive advantage. Management Science, 35(12): 1504-1511.
- Barney J. (1991). Firm resources and sustained competitive advantage. Journal of Management, 17(1), 99-120.
- Peteraf MA. (1993). The cornerstones of competitive advantage: A resource-based view. Strategic Management Journal, 14(3), 179-191.
- Porter M. (1996). What is strategy? Harvard Business Review, Nov.-Dec. 3-20.
- Priem RL, Butler J. (2001). Is the resource-based "view" a useful perspective for strategic management research?. Academy of Management Review, 26: 22-40.

Session 2: Competitive Dynamics (Thursday, November 5, 2026: 1.15-3.30pm)

Background reading for all: Dyer JH, Singh H. (1998). The relational view: Cooperative strategy and sources of interorganizational competitive advantage. Academy of Management Review, 23, 660–679.

- Brandenburger A, Nalebuff B. (1996). Co-Opetition. In Co-Opetition. New York: Doubleday. 11–39 (Chapter 2).
- Hoffmann W, Lavie D, Reuer JJ, Shipilov A. (2018). The interplay of competition and cooperation. Strategic Management Journal, 39, 3033– 3052.

1. Park SH, Russo MV. (1996). When competition eclipses cooperation: An event history analysis of joint venture failure. Management Science.
   - Schrader S. (1991). Informal technology transfer between firms: cooperation through information trading. Research Policy, 20, 153-170.
   - Faems D, Janssens M, Madhok A, Looy BV (2008) Toward an integrative perspective on alliance governance: Connecting contract design, trust dynamics, and contract application. Academy of Management Journal, 51(6), 1053–1078.
   - Jarvenpaa SL, Majchrzak A (2016) Interactive self-regulatory theory for sharing and protecting in interorganizational collaborations. Academy of Management Review, 41(1): 9–27.

2. Ingram P, Roberts PW. (2000). Friendships among competitors in the Sydney hotel industry. American Journal of Sociology, 106(2), 387-423.

3. Grohsjean T, Kober P, Zucchini L. (2016). Coming Back to Edmonton: Competing with Former Employers and Colleagues. Academy of Management Journal, 59(2), 394-413.
   - Almeida P, Kogut B. (1999). Localization of knowledge and the mobility of engineers in regional networks. Management Science, 45(7), 905–917.
   - Song J, Almeida P, Wu G. (2003). Learning–by–hiring: When is mobility more likely to facilitate interfirm knowledge transfer? Management Science, 49(4), 351–365
   - Singh J. (2005). Collaborative networks as determinants of knowledge diffusion patterns. Management Science.
   - Chan TY, Li J, Pierce L. (2014). Learning from peers: Knowledge transfer and sales force productivity growth. Marketing Science, 33(4), 463-484
   - Hoetker G, Agarwal R. (2007). Death hurts, but it isn't fatal: The postexit diffusion of knowledge created by innovative companies. Academy of Management Journal, 50(2), 446-467.

4. Panico C. (2024). Value creation, value appropriation, and cooperation in team production. Academy of Management Review, 49(3), 562-578.

Session 3: Organizational Adaptation (Tuesday, November 10, 2026: 1.15-3.30pm)

Background reading for all: Nelson RR, Winter SG. (1982). An evolutionary theory of economic change. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press. Introduction and chapters 4 and 5.

1. King AA, Tucci CL. (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.
   * Tripsas M. (1997). Surviving radical technological change through dynamic capability: Evidence from the typesetter industry. Industrial & Corporate Change, 6 (2), 341–377.
   * Teece DJ, Pisano G, Shuen A. (1997). Dynamic capabilities and strategic management. Strategic Management Journal, 18(7), 509–533.
   * Eisenhardt KM, Martin J. (2000). Dynamic capabilities: What are they? Strategic Management Journal, 21, 1105-1121.

2. Tripsas M, Gavetti G. (2010). Capabilities, cognition, and inertia: Evidence from digital imaging. Strategic Management Journal, 21: 1147-1161.
   * Walsh JP. (1995). Managerial and organizational cognition: Notes from a trip down memory lane. Organization Science, 6(3), 280-321.
   * Ocasio W. (1997). Towards an attention-based view of the firm. Strategic Management Journal, 18, 187-206.
   * Kaplan S. (2008). Cognition, capabilities, and incentives: assessing firm response to the fiber-optic revolution. Academy of Management Journal, 51(4), 672-695.
   * Bingham CB, Eisenhardt KM. (2011). Rational heuristics: The `simple rules' that strategists learn from process experience. Strategic Management Journal, 32(13), 1437-1464.
   * Csaszar FA, Levinthal DA. (2016). Mental representation and the discovery of new strategies. Strategic Management Journal, 37(10), 2031-2049.
   * Levine SS, Bernard M, Nagel R. (2017). Strategic intelligence: The cognitive capability to anticipate competitor behavior. Strategic Management Journal, 38, 2390–2423.

3. Billinger S, Stieglitz N, Schumacher TR. (2014). Search on rugged landscapes: An experimental study. Organization Science, 25(1), 93-108.
   * Levinthal DA. (1997). Adaptation on rugged landscapes. Management Science, 43(7), 934-950.
   * Rosenkopf L, Nerkar A. (2001). Beyond local search: Boundary-spanning, exploration, and impact in the optical disk industry. Strategic Management Journal, 22(4), 287-306.
   * Siggelkow N. (2002). Evolution toward fit. Administrative Science Quarterly, 47(1), 125-159.
   * Posen HE, Levinthal DA. (2012). Chasing a moving target: Exploitation and exploration in dynamic environments. Management Science, 58(3), 587-601.
   * Chen M, Kaul A Wu B. (2019). Adaptation across multiple landscapes: Relatedness, complexity, and the long run effects of coordination in diversified firms. Strategic Management Journal, 40(11), 1791-1821.

4. Raffaelli R, Noe R. (2025). Organizational emplacement as a response to digital threat: The novel resurgence of independent bookstores. Administrative Science Quarterly, 70(3).
   * Anderson P, Tushman ML. (1990). Technological discontinuities and dominant designs: A cyclical model of technological-change. Administrative Science Quarterly, 35(4), 604-633.
   * Henderson RM, Clark KB. (1990). Architectural innovation: The reconfiguration of existing product technologies and the failure of established firms. Administrative Science Quarterly, 35(1), 9-30.
   * Suarez FF, Utterback JM. (1995). Dominant designs and the survival of firms. Strategic Management Journal, 16(6), 415-430.
   * Eggers JP, Park KF. (2018). Incumbent adaptation to technological change: The past, present, and future of research on heterogeneous incumbent response. Academy of Management Annals, 12(1), 357-389.

Session 4: Organizational Learning (Thursday, November 12, 2026: 1.15-3.30pm)

Background reading for all: Cohen WM, Levinthal DA. (1990). Absorptive capacity: A new perspective on learning and innovation. Administrative Science Quarterly, 35(1), 128-152.
Background reading for all: March JG. (1991). Exploration and exploitation in organizational learning. Organization Science, 2(1):71–87.

- Kogut B, Zander U. (1992). Knowledge of the firm, combinative capabilities, and the replication of technology. Organization Science, 3(3), 383-397.
- Nonaka I. (1994). A dynamic theory of organizational knowledge creation. Organization Science, 5(1), 14-37.
- Grant RM. (1996). Toward a knowledge-based theory of the firm. Strategic Management Journal, 17, 109-122.
- Schilling MA, Vidal P, Ployhart RE, Marangoni A. (2003). Learning by doing something else: Variation, relatedness, and the learning curve. Management Science, 49, 39-56.
- Raisch S, Birkinshaw J. (2008). Organizational ambidexterity: Antecedents, outcomes, and moderators. Journal of Management, 34(3), 375-409.
- Fang C, Lee J, Schilling MA. (2010). Balancing exploration and exploitation through structural design: The isolation of subgroups and organizational learning. Organization Science, 21(3), 625-642.
- Argote L, Lee S, Park J. (2021). Organizational learning processes and outcomes: Major findings and future research directions. Management Science, forthcoming.

1. Haunschild PR, Polidoro F, Chandler D. (2015) Organizational oscillation between learning and forgetting: The dual role of serious errors. Organization Science

2. Di Stefano G, Micheli M. (2023) To stem the tide: Organizational climate and the locus of knowledge transfer. Organization Science, 34(6), 1997–2525.
   - Darr E, Argote L, Epple D. (1995). The acquisition, transfer and depreciation of knowledge in service organizations: Productivity in franchises. Management Science, 41, 1750-1762
   - Zander U, Kogut B. (1995). Knowledge and the speed of the transfer and imitation of organizational capabilities: An empirical test. Organization Science, 6(1), 76–92.
   - Szulanski G. (1996). Exploring internal stickiness: Impediments to the transfer of best practice within the firm. Strategic Management Journal, 17(S2), 27–43.

3. Roche M, Oettl C, Catalini C (2024) Proximate (co-)working: Knowledge spillovers and social interactions.
   - Boudreau KJ, Brady T, Ganguli I, Gaule P, Guinan E, Hollenberg A, Lakhani KR. (2017). A field experiment on search costs and the formation of scientific collaborations. The Review of Economics and Statistics.
   - Catalini C. (2017). Microgeography and the direction of inventive activity. Management Science.

4. Kim H. (2025). The value of competitor information: Evidence from a field experiment. Management Science, 71(4), 3600-3621.

Session 5: Organizational Design (Tuesday, November 17, 2026: 1.15-3.30pm)

Background reading for everyone: Williamson OE. (1999). Strategy research: governance and competence perspectives. Strategic Management Journal.

- Coase RH. (1937). The nature of the firm. Economica, 4 (16), 386-405.
- Williamson OE. (1981) The economics of organization: the transaction cost approach. American Journal of Sociology, 87(3), 548 - 577.
- Williamson OE. (2002). The theory of the firm as governance structure: From choice to contract. Journal of Economic Perspectives, 16(3), 171-195.
- Winter SG. (1988). On Coase, competence, and the corporation. Journal of Law, Economics, and Organization, 4, 163-80.
- Gibbons R. (1999). Taking Coase seriously. Administrative Science Quarterly.

1. MacCormack A, Rusnak J, Baldwin CY. (2006). Exploring the structure of complex software designs: An empirical study of open source and proprietary code. Management Science, 52(7), 1015-1030.
   - Ethiraj SK, Levinthal DA. (2004). Modularity and innovation in complex systems. Management Science, 50, 159-173.
   - Gulati R., Puranam P., Tushman M. (2012), Meta-organization design: Rethinking design in interorganizational and community contexts. Strategic Management Journal, 33, 571-586.

2. Raveendran M., Puranam P., and Massimo Warglien M. (2016). Object Salience in the Division of Labor: Experimental Evidence. Management Science, 62(7): 2110-2128

3. Silverman BS, Ingram P. (2017). Asset ownership and incentives in early shareholder capitalism: Liverpool shipping in the eighteenth century. Strategic Management Journal, 38(4), 854-875.
   - Oxley J. (1997). Appropriability hazards and governance in alliances: A transaction cost approach. Journal of Law, Economics and Organization, 13, 387-409.
   - Nickerson JA, Silverman BS. (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, 48(3), 433-465.
   - Mayer K, Argyres N. (2004). Learning to contract: Evidence from the personal computer industry. Organization Science, 5, 394-410.
   - Sampson R. (2004). The cost of misaligned governance in R&D alliances. Journal of Law, Economics and Organization, 20, 484-526.
   - Rawley E, Simcoe T. (2010). Diversification, diseconomies of scope, and vertical contracting: Evidence from the taxicab industry. Management Science, 55(9), 1534-1550.

4. Lee S. (2019). Learning-by-moving: Can reconfiguring spatial proximity between organizational members promote individual-level exploration? Organization Science, 30(3), 467-488.

Session 6: Organizational Goals (Thursday, November 19, 2026: 1.15-3.30pm)

Background reading for all: Ethiraj SK, Levinthal D. (2009). Hoping for A to Z while rewarding only A: Complex organizations and multiple goals. Organization Science, 20(1), 4–21.

* Cyert R, March J. (1963). Chapter 3, "Organizational goals". A Behavioral Theory of the Firm. Prentice-Hall, Englewood New Jersey.
* Poppo L., Zenger T. (2002). Do formal contracts and relational governance function as substitutes or complements? Strategic Management Journal, 23, 707-726.
* Sundaram AK, Inkpen AC. (2004). The corporate objective revisited. Organization Science, 15, 350-363.
* Battilana J, Sengul M, Pache A-C, Model J. (2015). Harnessing productive tensions in hybrid organizations: The case of work integration social enterprises. Academy of Management Journal, 58(6), 1658–1685.
* Obloj T, Sengul M. (2020). What do multiple objectives really mean for performance? Empirical evidence from the French manufacturing sector. Strategic Management Journal, 41(13), 2518-2547.

1. Nickerson JA, Zenger TR. (2008). Envy, comparison costs, and the economic theory of the firm. Strategic Management Journal, 29(13), 1429–1449.
   * Carnahan S, Agarwal R, Campbell B. (2012). Heterogeneity in turnover: The effect of relative compensation dispersion of firms on the employee mobility and entrepreneurship of extreme performers. Strategic Management Journal, 12, 1411-1430.
   * Cullen ZB, Perez-Truglia R. (2021). How much does your boss make? The effects of salary comparisons. Journal of Political Economy (forthcoming).

2. Obloj T, Sengul M (2012). Incentive life-cycles: Learning and the division of value in firms. Administrative Science Quarterly, 57(2), 305-347.
   * Gibbons R. (2005). Incentives between firms (and within). Management Science, 51(1), 2–17.

3. Gubler T, Larkin I, Pierce L. (2016). Motivational spillovers from awards: Crowding out in a multitasking environment. Organization Science, 27(2), 286-303.
   * Burbano VC, Mamer J, Snyder J. (2018). Pro bono as a human capital learning and screening mechanism: Evidence from law firms. Strategic Management Journal, 39(11), 2899-2920.
   * Hoffman M, Kahn L, Li D. (2018). Discretion in Hiring. Quarterly Journal of Economics, 133(2), 765-800.

4. Burbano VC. (2016). Social responsibility messages and worker wage requirements: Field experimental evidence from online labor marketplaces. Organization Science, 27(4), 1010-1028.

***** First part of the reviewing exercise due**

Session 7: The Role of Management (Tuesday, November 24, 2026: 1.15-3.30pm)

Background reading for everyone: Frake J, Hagemann A, Uribe J. (2024). Collider bias in strategy and management research: An illustration using women CEO's effect on other women's career outcomes. Strategic Management Journal, 45(7), 1393–1419.

1. Chatterjee A, Hambrick DC. (2007). It's all about me: Narcissistic chief executive officers and their effects on company strategy and performance. Administrative Science Quarterly, 52(3), 351-386.

2. Choudhury P, Wang D, Carlson NA, Khanna T. (2019). Machine learning approaches to facial and text analysis: Discovering CEO oral communication styles. Strategic Management Journal, 40(11), 1705–1732.
   * Hambrick DC. (2007). Upper echelons theory: An update. Academy of Management Review, 32(2), 334–343.

3. Bandiera O, Hansen S, Prat A, Sadun R. (2020). CEO behavior and firm performance. Journal of Political Economy, 128(4).
   * Bertrand M, Schoar A. (2003). Managing With Style: The Effect of Managers on Firm Policies. Quarterly Journal of Economics, CXVIII(November).
   * Malmendier U, Tate G. (2015). Behavioral CEOs: The role of managerial overconfidence. Journal of Economic Perspectives, 29(4).
   * Adams R, Keloharju M, Knupfer S. (2018). Are CEOs born leaders? Lessons from traits of a million individuals. Journal of Financial Economics, 130(2), 392-408.
   * Blader S, Gartenberg C, Prat A. (2020). The contingent effect of management practices. Review of Economic Studies, 87(2), 721–749.
   * Yang M-J, Christensen M, Bloom N, Sadun R, Rivkin J. (2020). How do CEOs make strategy? Harvard Business School Working Paper, No. 21-063.

4. Dezső CL, Li Y, Ross DG (2022). Female CEOs and the Compensation of Other Top Managers. Journal of Applied Psychology, 107(12), 2306-2318.
   * Dezsö CL, Ross DG. (2012). Does female representation in top management improve firm performance? A panel data investigation. Strategic management journal, 33(9), 1072-1089.
   * Corwin ES, Loncarich H, Ridge JW. (2022) What's It Like Inside the Hive? Managerial Discretion Drives TMT Gender Diversity of Women-Led Firms. Journal of management, 48(4), 1003-1034.

***** Second part of the reviewing exercise due**

Session 8: The Role of Institutions (Thursday, November 26, 2026: 1.15-3.30pm)

Background reading for all: Greif A. (1993). Contract enforceability and economic institutions in early trade: The Maghribi traders' coalition. American Economic Review, 83, 525-548.

1. King AA, Lenox MJ. (2000). Industry self-regulation without sanctions: The chemical industry's responsible care program. Academy of Management Journal, 43(4), 698-716.
   * Ingram P, Silverman BS. (2000). Introduction: The new institutionalism in strategic management. Advances in Strategic Management, 19, 1-30.
   * Barnett ML, King AA. (2008). Good fences make good neighbors: A longitudinal analysis of an industry self regulatory institution. Academy of Management Journal, 51(6), 1150-1170.
   * Ody-Brasier A, Sharkey A. (2019). Under pressure: Reputation, ratings, and inaccurate self-reporting in the nursing home industry. Strategic Management Journal, 40(10), 1517-1544.

2. Ody-Brasier A, Vermeulen F. (2014). The price you pay: Price-setting as a response to norm violations in the market for champagne grapes. Administrative Science Quarterly, 59(1), 109–144.

3. Di Stefano G, King AA, Verona G. (2015). Sanctioning in the wild: Rational calculus and retributive instincts in gourmet cuisine. Academy of Management Journal, 58(3), 906–931.
   * Fauchart E, von Hippel E. (2008). Norms-based intellectual property systems: The case of French chefs. Organization Science, 19: 187-201.
   * Guala F. (2012). Reciprocity: Weak or strong? What punishment experiments do (and do not) demonstrate. Behavioral and Brain Sciences, 35, 1–59.

4. Odziemkowska K, Dorobantu S. (2021) Contracting beyond the market. Organization Science, 32(3), 776-803. // No assignment of this reading. Everyone reads it in preparation to the guest talk.
   * Dorobantu S, Odziemkowska K. (2017), Valuing stakeholder governance: Property rights, community mobilization, and firm value. Strategic Management Journal, 38, 2682-2703.
   * Gao C, Zuzul T, Jones G, Khanna T. (2017). Overcoming institutional voids: A reputation-based view of long run survival. Strategic Management Journal, 38(11), 2147–2167.

***** Third part of the reviewing exercise due**