
Introduction

Strategic Management is an important part of the Management field. This literature has been developed in the past 50 years and includes several subfields, dealing with different issues, such as competitive strategy, corporate strategy, and international strategy. In this course, we will review the Strategic Management literature in 10 sessions, which each are dedicated to one specific topic.

Objectives

The purpose of this course is to introduce the students to the field of Strategic Management by discussing seminal papers and more recent papers covering the diverse topics that constitute the field. Moreover, the course aims at developing critical reading skills, leading to the ability to understand, assess, and evaluate papers written in this field. Finally, the course will help the students to think independently about Strategic Management topics and start formulating their own ideas.

Learning Outcomes

At the end of this course, you will have knowledge of the different subfields Strategic Management consists of and you will be familiar with a number of seminal works in each of these subfields. Moreover, you will be able to read Strategic Management papers and understand their contribution relative to the field. You will be able to classify papers according to the methodologies used and assess Strategic Management papers' strengths and weaknesses. The term paper will help you with your academic writing skills, allowing you to formulate and communicate academic ideas related to Strategic Management.

Competences

You will build the following competences:

- Read a Strategic Management paper and evaluate its internal consistency.
- Evaluate a Strategic Management paper's external contribution.
- Synthesize and criticize the current state of the subfields that constitute the field of Strategic Management.
- Develop an original idea related to Strategic Management, survey the related literature, and communicate your idea effectively in the form of a paper.

Content

The course consists of 10 sessions of 3.5 hours each. In those sessions, we will discuss a set of related papers on a specific topic within the field of Strategic Management. The students have to prepare the discussion by reading and evaluating the papers. Moreover, at the end of the course, the students will write a final paper.

Methodology

Session preparation, discussion

Each session will be devoted to a specific topic. For each topic, there is a list of readings. There are three categories of readings, each requiring a different level of preparation. I will provide a list per session of what articles belong to what category and who is responsible for what article(s).

- A. Articles to read, study, and prepare for discussion.
 - B. Articles to read.
 - C. Articles to skim.
- A. In class, we will have an in-depth discussion of the articles in category A. The discussion of the articles belonging to category A will be the most important part of the session. (Each paper will take between 30-45 minutes to discuss.) Reading a limited set of papers in depth will allow you to become familiar with some seminal papers and it will allow you to learn how to read and analyze research papers. While everybody has to prepare these articles in depth, one student will act as discussion leader. You should be prepared to open the discussion on this reading. Given that we have all read the articles, there is no need to summarize them. We should immediately start discussing them. We will first check if we all understood the basic tenets of the paper and then continue talking about what you learned, what you think the strengths and weaknesses of the paper are, how it relates to other articles in the same stream, what new areas for research this paper opens, etc.

Prepare empirical articles by thinking about:

- The theory (“A leads to B”)
- The hypotheses
- The tests
- The results
- The conclusions

For theoretical and conceptual papers, it is important to think what (implicit and explicit) assumptions are used, what new ideas or concepts are introduced, and what the intuition is behind these ideas.

The discussion leader will write a summary of the article discussing the major hypotheses, findings, contributions, limitations, and possible extensions (maximum 800-1200 words). The purpose of these summaries is as a class to create a set of

summaries that you can refer to later as you are working on papers or preparing for your comprehensive exam. This summary is not graded; it should be relatively little extra work once you have prepared for the discussion. Please email the summary at least one hour before the class to the other students and me.

- B. To further improve your understanding of the field in a broader sense, we will also read articles that we will not discuss in depth in class. The preparation of these articles should go faster as you do not have to do an in-depth analysis before the class. One student will be assigned to each paper in this category. This student will briefly present the main ideas of the paper, which will be followed by a brief Q&A if there are questions. This student will also prepare a short summary of the main ideas of the paper (maximum 400-700 words). As above, please email the summary at least one hour before the class to the other students and me. In total, we will spend about 10-15 minutes on each paper in the B category.
- C. Finally, in the reading packet I have included some supplementary readings. As a preparation for the class, you only have to skim these articles so that you know of their existence and roughly know what they are about. In class, I will briefly talk about them, which will allow you to refer to them and read them more carefully if your interests guide you to do so.

Session memos

You have to write a brief memo about five sessions that you chose (maximum about 500-700 words, please put the word count on the front page), in which you synthesize, critique, and/or extend the papers/the topic we discuss in that class. (Don't summarize the papers). Please email the document to me by 8 pm the evening before the class (emailing earlier is appreciated but not required).

Session scout

Finally, each of you has to be a so-called "scout" for one session. I will assign a scouting session to each of you taking into account as much as possible your preferences. The scout will do a search on the topic to find some recent papers that continue the particular research stream. The scout will report in class in about 15 minutes, which paper(s) he or she thinks will eventually be seminal papers about the topics we read. We will discuss in more detail in class how you should prepare for this and how we will conduct this part of the class discussion.

Final Paper Requirements

As a final requirement you need to submit a theoretical or empirical paper. This assignment will help you deepen your understanding of part of the literature. It will also give you the opportunity to practice your writing skills, which are critical to be successful as an academic.

The paper should be about 20 pages double-spaced. You should aim to write a paper similar to what is published in the *Academy of Management Review* as a Research

Note. (Of course, this is a term paper, not a published paper, but hopefully some of the terms papers you write will eventually be published!) The heart of your paper should be to build on one or more of the theories we have discussed in the course, maybe in relation with an empirical phenomenon.

In your paper you should:

1. Explain what the desired contribution of your paper is. How do you think you will contribute with your paper beyond the existing literature? Why is that interesting? If you are starting from an empirical phenomenon, think about why what is known presents a challenge for the existing literature.
 2. Summarize and review the existing literature related to what you will be studying. Note that you should focus your review on building the basis for your further paper.
 3. Summarizing the literature as an exercise in and of itself is not valuable.
 4. Document some basic facts about the phenomenon you are analyzing.
 5. Develop an argument, which is the core of the paper. You need to be able to (1) take a position, going beyond the existing literature and (2) craft logical arguments to convince the reader of your position.
 6. Outline a research design that could test your theoretical arguments in the empirical context you have selected. Describe the data you would need and the operationalization of your key constructs.
-
- The paper should be related to a topic we discussed. However, you do not have to cite all (or even: any) papers from the session.
 - See the paper as an exercise in convincing argumentation, building on and anchoring in the existing literature (it is very important to cite the relevant papers and explain how you build on and go beyond them), motivating why you think your study is interesting, and justifying your approach.
 - It is preferable if your paper has propositions. You may go beyond and briefly explain how your propositions could be tested in an empirical context. (One way to do this is to assume that you have “unlimited” funds to buy data or send out questionnaires.)
 - It is ok if you want to build on another paper you have written, as long as you cite the paper and send me a copy of the other paper too.
 - To ensure that you will start thinking about the paper on time, please send me a 3-page proposal by **May 1** outlining the topic and a preliminary bibliography

Evaluation

Class participation, session statement, and scouting: 50%

Final Paper: 50%

Course Outline & Bibliography

SESSION	DESCRIPTION
1	Development of the Strategic Management Field
2	Industrial Organization Influences in Competitive Strategy
3	Game theory, signaling, commitment vs. flexibility
4	Resource-Based View
5	Competitive Interaction and Dynamics
6	Transaction Cost Economics
7	Value-Based Strategy
8	Corporate Strategy, Corporate Diversification
9	Technological Competition, Knowledge
10	International, Multinational Strategy

Session 1: Development of the Strategic Management Field

- Category A
 - Porter, M.E., 1981, "The contributions of industrial organization to strategic management", *Academy of Management Review*, 6(4): 609-620 (2014: 1203*).
 - Barney, J.B., 1986, "Types of competition and the theory of strategy: Toward an integrative framework", *Academy of Management Review*, 11(4): 791-800 (2015: 766*).
 - March, J. G., & Sutton, R. I., 1997, "Organizational performance as a dependent variable", *Organization Science*, 8(6): 698-706 (2015: 859*).
- Category B
 - Davis, M. S., 1971, "That's interesting!: Towards a phenomenology of sociology and a sociology of phenomenology" in *Philosophy of Social Science*, 1: 309-344 (2015: 803*).
 - Mintzberg, H. 1990, "Strategy formation: Schools of thought", in *Perspectives on Strategic Management*, J. Frederickson, ed., New York: Harper, 105-235 (2015: 867*).
 - Porter, M. E., 1996. "What Is Strategy?", *Harvard Business Review*, Nov/Dec: 61–78 (2015: 8718*).
- Category C
 - Whetten, D. A., 1989, "What constitutes a theoretical contribution?", *Academy of Management Review*, 14(4): 490-495 (2015: 1748).
 - Christensen, C.M. & Raynor, M.E., 2003, "Why hard-nosed executives should care about management theory", *Harvard Business Review*, 81(9): 66-74 (2015: 211*).

Discussion order:

Porter (1981), Barney (1986), Porter (1996), March et al. (1997), Davis (1971), Mintzberg (1990), Whetten (1989), Christensen et al. (2003).

* Number of times cited according to Google Scholar.

Session 2: Industrial Organization Influences in Competitive Strategy

- Category A
 - Demsetz, H., 1973, "Industry structure, market rivalry, and public policy", *Journal of Law and Economics*, 16: 1-9 (2015: 2408*).
 - Identify what the theory is, the hypotheses, tests, results, and the conclusions.
 - Rumelt, R., 1984, "Towards a Strategic Theory of the Firm", Chapter 26 in Lamb, "Competitive Strategic Management": 556-570 (2015: 3910*).
 - Note: Think about the following sentence: "Consequently the net expected profit from an entry attempt is zero, and the survivor's rents exactly balance the failure's losses." (p. 564)
 - Focus on the intuition, not on the formulas. Can you explain the paper in your own words?
 - For those interested, compare with: Lippman, S.A., & Rumelt, R.P., 1982, "Uncertain imitability: An analysis of interfirm differences in efficiency under competition", *Rand Journal of Economics*, 13: 418-438 (2015: 2971*).
 - Rumelt, R., 1991, "How much does industry matter?", *Strategic Management Journal*, 12: 167-186 (2015: 2861*).
 - McGahan, A.M. & M.E. Porter, 1997, "How much does industry matter, really?", *Strategic Management Journal*, 18 (summer special issue): 15-30 (2015: 1524*).
 - Note: The lineup of Tables 3 and 4 is not correct.
- Category B
 - Buzzell et al., 1975, "Market share: A key to profitability", *Harvard Business Review*, Jan-Feb: 97-106 (2015: 1167*).
 - Scherer, F.M., & Ross, D. 1990. "Conditions facilitating oligopolistic coordination", chapter 7 in *Industrial market structure and economic performance*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, pp. 235-276 (2015: 10860*).

Discussion order:

Buzzell et al. (1975), Demsetz (1973), Rumelt (1984), Rumelt (1991) & McGahan et al. (1997), Scherer et al. (1990).

* Number of times cited according to Google Scholar.

Session 3: Game theory, signaling, commitment, flexibility

- Category A
 - Schelling, T.C., 1956 “An Essay on Bargaining”, *American Economic Review*, 46(3): 281-306 (2015: 546*).
 - Akerlof, G.A., 1970. “The markets for ‘lemons’: Quality uncertainty and the market mechanism.” *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 84: 386-409 (2015: 21151).
 - Focus on the intuition, not on the formulas. Can you explain the paper in your own words?
 - Vroom, G., and J. Gimeno, 2007, “Ownership form, managerial incentives, and the intensity of rivalry”, *Academy of Management Journal*, 50(4): 901-922 (2015: 47).
 - Identify what the theory is, the hypotheses, tests, results, and the conclusions.
- Category B
 - Saloner, G., 1991. “Modeling, game theory, and strategic management”, *Strategic Management Journal*, 12 (Special Issue, Winter): 119-136 (2015: 157*).
 - Ghemawat, P. and P. del Sol, 1998, “Commitment versus Flexibility?”, *California Management Review*, 40(4): 26-42 (2015: 216*).
 - Ly, B. and G. Vroom, 2011, “Competitive dynamics”, IESE Technical Note SMN-0680-E.

Discussion order:

Ly et al. (2011), Schelling (1956), Akerlof (1970), Vroom et al. (2007), Saloner (1991), Ghemawat et al. (1998).

* Number of times cited according to Google Scholar.

Session 4: Resource-Based View

- Category A
 - Wernerfelt, B., 1984, “A resource-based view of the firm”, *Strategic Management Journal*, 5: 171-180. (2014: 17120*)
 - Barney, J.B., 1991, “Firm resources and sustained competitive advantage”, *Journal of Management*, 17(1): 99-120. (2014: 33073*)
 - Newbert, S. L., 2008, “Value, rareness, competitive advantage, and performance: A conceptual-level empirical investigation of the resource-based view of the firm”, *Strategic Management Journal*, 29(7): 745–768. (2015: 330*)
 - Teece, D.J., G. Pisano and A. Shuen, 1997, “Dynamic capabilities and strategic management”, *Strategic Management Journal*, 18: 509-533 (2015: 20949*).
- Category B
 - Priem R.L. and J. E. Butler, 2001, “Is the resource-based ‘view’ a useful perspective for strategic management research?”, *Academy of Management Review*, 26(1): 22-40 (2015: 2622*).
 - Ly, B. and G. Vroom, 2011, “Sustaining competitive advantage”, IESE Technical Note SMN-0679-E.
- Category C
 - 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 (2015: 2433*).
 - Priem R.L. and J. 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 (2015: 651*).
 - Dierickx, I. and K. Cool, 1989, “Asset stock accumulation and sustainability of competitive advantage”, *Management Science*, 35(12): 1504- 1511 (2015: 8113*).
 - Barney, J.B, 1989, “Asset stocks and sustained competitive advantage: A comment”, *Management Science*, 35(12): 1511- 1513 (2015: 273*).
 - Dierickx, I. and K. Cool, 1989, “Asset stock accumulation and sustainability of competitive advantage: Reply”, *Management Science*, 35(12): 1514 (2015: 86*).

Discussion order:

Ly et al. (2011) & Wernerfelt (1984) & Barney (1991), Priem et al. (2001), Newbert (2008), Teece et al. (1997).

* Number of times cited according to Google Scholar.

Session 5: Competitive Interaction and Dynamics

- Category A
 - Barnett, W.P., 1997, “The dynamics of competitive intensity”, *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 42: 128-160 (2015: 328*).
 - Ferrier, W.J., K.G. Smith, and C.M. Grimm, 1999, “The role of competitive action in market share erosion and industry dethronement: A study of industry leaders and challengers”, *Academy of Management Journal*, 42(4): 372-388 (2015: 484*). (This article builds among others on ideas from Chen, 1996, see below.)
 - Goolsbee, A., and C. Syverson, 2008, “How do incumbents respond to the threat of entry? Evidence from the major airlines”, *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 123(4): 1611-1633 (2015: 281*).
 - Consider the difference between these three papers (explicit/implicit assumptions, methods, work cited).
- Category B
 - Gimeno, J., 1999, “Reciprocal threats in multimarket rivalry: Staking out ‘spheres of influence’ in the U.S. airline industry”, *Strategic Management Journal*, 20(2): 101-128 (2015: 258*). (This article builds among others on ideas from Karnani & Wernerfelt, 1985, see below.)
- Category C
 - Karnani, A., and B. Wernerfelt, 1985, “Multiple point competition”, *Strategic Management Journal*, 6: 87-96 (2015: 372*). (Use as a background paper for Gimeno, 1999.)
 - Chen, M-J., 1996, “Competitor analysis and interfirm rivalry: Toward a theoretical integration”, *Academy of Management Review*, 21: 100-134 (2015: 1036*). (Use as a background paper for Ferrier et al., 1999, especially Figure 2.)

Discussion order:

Barnett (1997), Ferrier et al. (1999) (& Chen, 1996), Goolsbee et al. (2008), Gimeno (1999) (& Karnani et al., 1985).

* Number of times cited according to Google Scholar.

Session 6: Transaction Cost Economics

- Category A
 - Williamson, O.E., 1979, “Transaction-cost economics: The governance of contractual relations”, *Journal of Law and Economics*, 12: 75-94 (2015: 9393*).
 - Ghoshal, S., and P. Moran, 1996, “Bad for practice: A critique of the transaction cost theory”, *Academy of Management Review*, 21: 13-47 (2015: 2280*). (You may want to look at Williamson’s reply and Moran and Ghoshal’s rejoinder, category C.)
 - Poppo, L., and T. Zenger, 2002, “Do formal contracts and relational governance function as substitutes or complements?”, *Strategic Management Journal*, 23: 707-725 (2015: 2020*).
 - David, R.J., and S. Han, 2004, “A systematic assessment of the empirical support for transaction cost economics”, *Strategic Management Journal*, 25: 39-58 (2015: 750*).
- Category B
 - Coase, R.H., 1937, “The nature of the firm”, *Economica*, 4: 386-405 (2015: 29186*).
- Category C
 - Stuckey, J., and D. White, 1993, “When and when *not* to vertically integrate”, *Sloan Management Review*, 3: 3-27 (2015: 190*).
 - Williamson, O.E., 1996, “Economic organization: The case for candor”, *Academy of Management Review*, 21(1): 48-57 (2015: 338*).
 - Moran, P., and S. Ghoshal, 1996, “Theories of economic organization: The case for realism and balance”, *Academy of Management Review*, 21(1): 58-72 (2015: 199*).
 - The Economist, “The man who showed why firms exist”, September 7, 2013.

Discussion order:

Coase (1937) & Williamson (1979) & David et al. (2004), Poppo and Zenger (2002), Ghoshal et al. (1996).

* Number of times cited according to Google Scholar.

Session 7: Value-Based Strategy

- Category A
 - Brandenburger, A., and H.W. Stuart, 1996, “Value-based business strategy”, *Journal of Economics and Management Strategy*, 5: 5-24 (2015: 655*).
 - It takes a bit getting used to this way of thinking. Make sure that you understand and are able to explain Example 1 (p. 12). Also, make sure you understand the difference between what the authors call “value created”, “added value”, and “value captured”.
 - Adner, R., and P. Zemsky, 2006, “A demand-based perspective on sustainable competitive advantage”, *Strategic Management Journal*, 27: 215-239 (2015: 258*).
 - Make sure you are able to explain Propositions 4 and 5 (see also Figures 4 and 5).
 - Chatain, O., 2010, “Value creation, competition, and performance in buyer-supplier relationships”, *Strategic Management Journal*, 32(1): 76-102 (2015: 102*).
- Category B
 - Priem, R. L., 2007, “A consumer perspective on value creation”, *Academy of Management Review*, 32(1): 219-235 (2015: 342*).
 - Ly, B., and Vroom, G., 2011, “Value creation and capture”, IESE Technical Note SMN-0678-E.
- Category C
 - Brandenburger, A. and H.W. Stuart, 2007, “Biform games”, *Management Science*, 53(4): 537-549 (2015: 191*).
 - Adegbesan, A., 2008, “On the origins of competitive advantage: Strategic factor markets and heterogeneous resource complementarity”, *Academy of Management Review*, 34(3): 463-475 (2015: 120*).

Discussion order:

Ly et al. (2011) & Brandenburger et al. (1996), Adner et al. (2006), Chatain (2011), Priem (2007).

* Number of times cited according to Google Scholar.

Session 8: Corporate Strategy, Corporate Diversification

- Category A
 - Rumelt, R. P., 1982, “Diversification Strategy and Profitability”, *Strategic Management Journal*, 3: 359-369 (2015: 1703*).
 - Palich, L.E., L.B. Cardinal, and C.C. Miller, 2000, “Curvilinearity in the diversification-performance linkage: An examination of over three decades of research”, *Strategic Management Journal*, 21(2): 155-174 (2015: 803*).
 - Campa, J.M. and S. Kedia, 2002, “Explaining the diversification discount”, *Journal of Finance*, 57: 1731-1762 (2015: 1245*).
 - Sohl, T. and G. Vroom, 2015, “Business model diversification and firm performance”, working paper. (To be distributed.)
- Category B
 - Porter, M.E., 1987, “From competitive advantage to corporate strategy”, *Harvard Business Review*, May-June: 43-59 (2015: 3529*).
- Category C
 - Collis, D.J. and C.A. Montgomery, 1998, “Creating corporate advantage”, *Harvard Business Review*, May-June: 71-83 (2015: 334*).

Discussion order:

Porter (1987), Rumelt (1982) & Palich et al. (2000), Campa et al. (2002), Sohl et al. (2015).

* Number of times cited according to Google Scholar.

Session 9: Technological Competition, Knowledge

- Category A
 - Kogut, B., and U. Zander, 1992, “Knowledge of the firm, combinative capabilities, and the replication of technology”, *Organization Science*, 3: 383-397 (2015: 10782*).
 - Subramanian, M., and M. Youndt, 2005, “The influence of intellectual capital on the types of innovative capabilities”, *Academy of Management Journal*, 48(3): 450-463 (2015: 1378*).
 - Anand, N., H.K. Gardner, and T. Morris, 2007, “Knowledge-based innovation: Emergence and embedding of new practice areas in management consulting firms”, *Academy of Management Journal*, 50(2): 406-428 (2015: 286*).
- Category B
 - Hayek, F.A., 1945, “The use of knowledge in society”, *American Economic Review*, 35(4), 519-530 (2015: 11544*).
 - Anderson, P., and M.L. Tushman, 1990, “Technological discontinuities and dominant designs: A cyclical model of technological change”, *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 35: 604-633 (2015: 2788*).
 - Focus on the theoretical contribution and the big picture of the empirical test.
 - Volberda, H. W., N. J. Foss, and M. A. Lyles, 2010, “Absorbing the concept of absorptive capacity: How to realize its potential in the organizational field”, *Organization Science*, 21(4): 931-951 (2015: 332*).
- Category C
 - Cohen, W.M., and D.A. Levinthal, 1990, “Absorptive capacity: A new perspective on learning and innovation”, *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 35: 128-152 (2015: 25059*).
 - Henderson, R., and K. Clark, 1990, “Architectural innovation: The reconfiguration of existing product technologies and the failure of established firms”, *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 35: 9-30 (2015: 7180*).

Discussion order:

Hayek (1945) & Kogut et al. (1992), Subramanian et al. (2005), Anand et al. (2007), Anderson et al. (1990), Volberda et al. (2010), Cohen et al. (1990), Henderson et al. (1990).

* Number of times cited according to Google Scholar.

Session 10: International, Multinational Strategy

- Category A
 - Shaver, J.M., 1998, “Accounting for endogeneity when assessing strategy performance: Does entry mode choice affect FDI survival?”, *Management Science*, 44(4): 571-585 (2015: 635*).
 - Gupta, A., and V. Govindarajan, 2000, “Knowledge flows within multinational corporations”, *Strategic Management Journal*, 21(4): 473-196 (2015: 3103*).
 - Holburn, G.L.F., and B.A. Zelner, 2010, “Political capabilities, policy risk, and international investment strategy: Evidence from the global electric power generation industry”, *Strategic Management Journal*, 31(12): 1290-1315 (2015: 137*).
- Category B
 - Vernon, R., 1966, “International investment and international trade in the product cycle”, *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 80: 190-207 (2015: 9314*).
 - Look up the Leontief paradox on Wikipedia and try to find out why this paper could be seen as a solution to the Leontief paradox.
 - Zaheer, S., 1995, “Overcoming the liability of foreignness”, *Academy of Management Journal*, 38(2): 341-363 (2015: 2076*).
 - Focus on the theory development part, get the big picture of the empirics but there is no need to go into the details.
- Category C
 - Kogut, B., 1985, “Designing global strategies: Profiting from operational flexibility”, *Sloan Management Review*, 27-38 (2015: 970*).

Discussion order:

Vernon (1966), Shaver (1998), Gupta et al. (2000), Holburn et al. (2010), Zaheer (1995), Kogut (1985).

* Number of times cited according to Google Scholar.

Bibliography

The bibliography is included in the above detailed course outline per session.

Professor's Biography



Prof. Govert Vroom

Associate Professor of Strategic Management
Academic Director of the Global Executive MBA Program
Ph.D. in Management, INSEAD
MA/MBA, Boston University
Financial Controller, Free University, Amsterdam

Govert Vroom is an associate professor in the Strategic Management department of IESE. He received his Ph.D. from INSEAD in 2005. His doctoral proposal was awarded second place in the Organization Science dissertation proposal competition and his doctoral dissertation received the Blackwell Outstanding Dissertation Award for the best doctoral dissertation in the Business Policy and Strategy division of the Academy of Management.

Prof. Vroom's research interests include competitive strategy, corporate diversification, strategy in the networked economy, and entrepreneurship. In his research, he explores how firm characteristics, such as organizational design, ownership structure, and firm objectives, affect managerial decision making and interfirm rivalry. He is also working on how strategies are influenced by competition in network environments where critical mass, standards, and externalities play an important role. His work has been published in leading scholarly journals such as *Academy of Management Journal*, *Management Science*, *Strategic Management Journal*, and *Organization Science*. He is editorial board member of the *Strategic Management Journal*, and *Strategy Science*. He has been elected Chair of the Competitive Strategy interest group of the Strategic Management Society, a role he fulfilled in 2012. He is a member of the Executive Committee of the Business Policy and Strategy division of the Academy of Management.

Prior to his academic career, Prof. Vroom worked in the Netherlands at KPN Telecom as a financial controller and cost management consultant. He teaches strategic management, competitive strategy, corporate strategy, and strategy in the networked economy in a wide variety of programs including the MBA, Ph.D., and international executive education.

He enjoys outdoor activities with his wife and three children.