

MHR 920.02
PhD Survey in Competitive Strategy & Organization
Michael J. Leiblein
Fall 2012

E-mail: leiblein_1@cob.osu.edu

Phone: (614) 292-0071

Class: TBA.

URL: http://fisher.osu.edu/~leiblein_1/

Office: Fisher 848

Office Hours: By Appointment

Introduction to the Course:

This course provides an overview of the major research questions and theoretical approaches in the field of strategic management. The course will primarily address issues at the business-level of analysis and focus on two of the four fundamental research questions in the field of strategic management—why do firm's differ (in their resource allocation and organizational decisions) and how do these differences affect performance? The course will emphasize the foundational disciplinary inputs to the field: 1) industrial organization, 2) resource-based and strategic factor market logic; 3) economics of organization; and 4) evolutionary economics and learning theories. Though developed from a strategy perspective, the readings and discussion will likely interest students of organizational economics, finance, sociology, organizational theory, and other related disciplines. Enrollment is restricted to Ph.D. students. Masters students may enroll with the permission of the instructor, but they are unlikely to find the material covered helpful in completing their degree plans.

Course Objectives:

The course is equally concerned with providing students with an overview of the most important topics in contemporary strategic management theory and with promoting their scholarly development. Acknowledging the importance of publishing for career progress, this course will have a significant focus on research practice. The intention is for students to experience the process of conducting high-quality research and crafting an impactful paper. This is knowledge best learnt through practice.

In brief, this course aims to:

1. Develop skills required to evaluate and critically review academic research in the field of strategic management. This implies understanding:
 - how each individual research paper is motivated and framed,
 - what the authors (implicitly or explicitly) regard as incomplete in existing research,
 - the main theoretical argument, its assumptions, causal mechanisms, advantages and disadvantages,
 - the types of evidence the authors bring to bear to support their argument (and what other evidence might them better test their argument),
 - whether and how the paper makes a substantive contribution to the field.
2. Drive students to develop a theoretical argument related to a strategy question—and to consider the appropriate empirical evidence to test it. This implies:
 - developing new ideas and/or approaches that advance some portion of the theory/research in strategic management,
 - finding ways to communicate, in oral and written form, the knowledge, ideas, critical evaluations, and individual contributions to the field of strategic management, and
 - understanding the implications of strategic management and the theory of the firm to their own academic disciplines.

Required Materials:

Readings are listed in the detailed syllabus below. Most readings are available electronically through the library. Go to OSU library at <http://library.osu.edu/>. Click on Research Databases. Search for “Business Source Complete.” Access Business Source Complete, search (e.g., insert article title or author name), and download *.pdf file. If you are accessing from off campus you will need your “name.#” osu account name and password.

Instructional Procedure:

The course will be taught using a seminar style. This means each student must take responsibility for the success of the class. Simply reading the assigned materials is not sufficient class contribution—students are expected to come to class fully prepared to discuss their: (a) evaluation of the assumptions and insights associated with the assigned papers, (b) analysis of how these papers collectively fit with other literatures, and (c) identify opportunities to contribute to the body of knowledge on this topic. All students will be responsible for a common set of readings.

As for any well-established research area, it is impossible to cover all the important contributions to Strategic Management in the space of this doctoral seminar. *Many of the topics that we cover in one day could be the topic of a whole doctoral seminar.* All that we can achieve in this short seminar is to introduce you to the theoretical foundations of the field and to expose you to some well-done research in promising and critical areas. It is your responsibility to expand your knowledge of the area through individual exploration and conversation with other faculty and students. To help out in your individual exploration, I have structured each session around a few basic questions that may guide our discussion and help us think about the next generation of research in an area. In addition, I will provide extra references on the topics covered. These may be helpful for your focusing on a particular topic.

Evaluation:

The grading plan describes the relative importance attached to each of the individual activities used to assign a course grade. The overall course grade will reflect your performance in terms of the: **(1) Paper Summaries (10%), (2) Idea pages / in-class questions (20%), (3) Final exam (20%), and (4) Research Paper (50%).** Each of the grade components are described below.

1. **Paper summaries (10%).** At least one student will be selected to write a summary review for each paper assigned in the course. These summaries will be from two to three pages (single spaced) in length. The first page should include a completed version of the “paper review form” at the end of this syllabus (an electronic version will be posted to Carmen). The remainder of the summary should report the research question and intended contribution of the paper, the conceptual logic presented in the paper, the propositions and evidence presented in the paper, and the ultimate contribution of the paper¹.

Students should bring to class sufficient copies of their summary for distribution to each of the other students and the professor. These summaries will constitute a valuable study and reference aid as students prepare for the preliminary and final exams. While these summaries are important, *just because a student has not been assigned a particular reading to summarize does not mean that the student will not be held responsible for the material in that reading.*

¹ The research and intended contribution section should note gaps or conflicts in the existing literature. It may also note whether the paper represents an application of existing theory to important phenomena, an extension of existing theory, or the integration of existing theory. The conceptual logic and propositions section should describe the assumptions, associations, and causal mechanisms underlying the propositions developed in the paper. The evidence section should describe any analytical or statistical findings. The concluding section should indicate how this reading fits into the broader stream of research and improves the knowledge on the topic. Additional information and “tools” to help with these topics are provided at the end of the syllabus.

2. Idea pages (20%). Research creativity is a fundamental skill of the successful researcher. As you read the literature, you should always look for research opportunities that would create value to the literature. The purpose of the “idea page” is to provide you with an instrument for exploring research gaps in the literature. Each student should turn in 2 idea pages over the semester. Idea pages are **one page outlines** of a potential research question that would contribute to the literature discussed in class. The research idea should relate to the material discussed in class that day, and should discuss the *what*, *why* and *how* of your research idea. Idea pages will be due in my email at 9:00 a.m. of the discussion day. I will select one or two of the most promising idea pages and allocate time for discussion in class. This will provide authors of promising ideas with valuable feedback on their research idea. It is critical that students behave ethically in respecting “idea ownership rights” of others.
3. Final Exam (20%). The final exam will consist of three qualifying exam-type questions, any two of which a student may answer. These questions will offer students the opportunity to integrate and synthesize the material presented in the semester. The primary purpose of the final exam is to help prepare for their qualifying exam.
4. Research Paper (50%). A research paper is due the last day of class. The primary purpose of the research paper is to help students prepare for a research career, including the challenge of presenting difficult arguments in the abbreviated format of an academic conference. The paper should follow the submission guidelines for the *Strategic Management Journal*.

The research paper can take two forms. One alternative is to write a conceptual or empirical manuscript that could be submitted, after further revision, to a top-tier academic journal. Certainly the quality should be adequate to send to a national meeting. This paper must be original work and also be relevant to the topic covered in the seminar. The second alternative is to develop a major research proposal, similar to a dissertation proposal. This proposal would include justification of the research question, theoretical background and literature review of research on the question (including your value added contribution), and research design to test the question.

To help you develop your project I offer the opportunity for students to turn in a 1- to 2-page outline of their proposed project. I will provide (ungraded) feedback on this outline. Finally, prior to the last day of this class, I will give students the opportunity to present a summary of their paper in a 15-minute presentation to the class. An electronic copy of all material should be uploaded to the dropbox on the Carmen course management system and a physical copy should be provided to me at the start of class or in my Fisher 7th floor mailbox.

I will not provide incomplete course grades given for incomplete papers. If you want to further polish the paper, it can be done after the semester. This later work will not be graded, however. To receive a grade of “B” on these assignments, students must show a broad knowledge of the relevant research literature and an ability to integrate that literature. To receive an “A” on these assignments, students must show a broad knowledge of the relevant research literature, an ability to integrate that literature, and some creative insights that are not already present in the literature.

Course Curriculum & Schedule

Class 1: Fundamental Issues in the Field of Strategic Management

Defining the Field: What is academic research in the field of strategic management?

1. Rumelt, R.P., Schendel, D.E., & Teece, D.J. 1994. *Fundamental Issues in Strategy: A Research Agenda*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press:
 - a. See pages 9-47 (Fundamental Issues in Strategy)
 - b. See pages 527-555 (Afterword ... includes references for whole book).
2. Williamson, O. E. (1991). Strategizing, Economizing, and Economic Organization. *Strategic Management Journal*, 12 (Winter Special Issue), 75-94.

Defining Performance: What is meant by the term competitive advantage?

3. Barney, J. B. 1997. Gaining and Sustaining Competitive Advantage. Boston, MA: Addison-Wesley (chapter 2 entitled "What is performance?", pp. 30-64).
4. Brandenburger, A.M., H.W. Stuart. 1996. Value-based business strategy. *Journal of Economics & Management Strategy* 5(1) 5–24.
5. Hoopes, D. G., Madsen, T. L., & Walker, G. 2003. Guest editors' introduction to the special issue: Why is there a resource-based view? - Toward a theory of competitive heterogeneity. *Strategic Management Journal*, 24(10): 889-902.
6. Peteraf, M. and J.B. Barney (2003). Unraveling the resource-based tangle. *Managerial and Decision Economics*, 24(4): 309–323.
7. Postrel, S. 2010. Competitive advantage and the surplus landscape: A Synthesis. UC Irvine working paper.

Defining the Hallmarks of High Quality Research:

8. Oxley, J., J. Rivkin, & M. Ryall. 2010. Recognizing and Encouraging High Quality Research in Strategy. University of Toronto working paper.

Class 2: Industrial organization, strategy and performance

Background: What factors does industrial organization propose leads to superior performance?

1. Porter, M.E. (1981). The contributions of industrial organization to strategic management. *Academy of Management Review*, 6: 609–620.
2. Sharon Oster. 1994. *Modern Competitive Analysis*. Chapter 2.

Evidence: How much variance in profitability is due to firm, industry, and innovation effects?

3. Schmalensee, R. (1985). Do markets differ much? *American Economic Review*, 75: 341-351.
4. Rumelt, R. (1991). How much does industry matter? *Strategic Management Journal*, 12, pp. 167-185.
5. McGahan, A.M. & Porter, M.E. (1997). How much does industry matter, really? *Strategic Management Journal*, 18 (summer special issue): 15-30.
6. Geroski PA, Machin S, Van Reenen J. 1993. The profitability of innovating firms. *RAND J. of Economics*. 24: 198-211.
7. Klepper, S., & Graddy, E. 1990. The evolution of new industries and the determinants of market structure. *RAND Journal of Economics*, 21: 27-44.
8. McGahan, A M & Porter, M E (2003), "The Emergence and Sustainability of Abnormal Profits," *Strategic Organization* 1:1 (February), pp. 79-108.

Class 3: Resource-based sources of heterogeneity and performance

Background: (How) do firm-level factors affect competitive advantage?

1. Lippman, S. and R. Rumelt (1982). Uncertain Imitability: An analysis of Inter-firm Differences in Efficiency under Competition. *Bell Journal of Economics*, 13, 418-438.
2. Strategic Barney, J.B. (1986). Strategic Factor Markets: Expectations, Luck, and Business Strategy. *Management Science*, 32, 1231-1241.
3. Dierickx, I. and K. Cool (1989). Asset Stock Accumulation and Sustainability of Competitive Advantage. *Management Science*, 35, 1504-1511.
4. Barney, J. (1991). Firm Resources and Sustained Competitive Advantage. *Journal of Management*, 17(1): 99-120.
5. Cockburn, I. M., Henderson, R. M., & Stern, S. 2000. Untangling the origins of competitive advantage. *Strategic Management Journal*, 21(10-11): 1123-1145.
6. Kraaijenbrink, J., Spender, J.C., & Groen, A.J. 2010. The resource-based view: A review and assessment of its critiques,” *Journal of Management*, 36: 349-372.
7. Leiblein, MJ. 2011. “What do resource and capability theories propose?” *Journal of Management*. Vol. 37(4): 909-932. [DOI 10.1177/0149206311408321](https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206311408321).
8. Pacheco-de-Almeida, G. and P. Zemsky (2007). The Timing of Resource Development and Sustainable Competitive Advantage. *Management Science*, 53: 651-666.

Class 4: Economic Theories of the Business Firm

Why do firms exist?

1. Coase, R. 1937. The nature of the firm. *Economica N.S.*, 4: 386-405
2. Klein, B., R. Crawford and A. Alchian. 1978. Vertical integration, appropriable rents, and the competitive contracting process. *Journal of Law and Economics*, 21: 297-326.
3. Alchian, A. A., and H. Demsetz. 1972. Production, Information Costs, and Economic Organization. *The American Economic Review*, 62, 777-795.
4. Grossman, S. and O. Hart. 1986. The costs and benefits of ownership: A theory of lateral and vertical integration. *Journal of Political Economy*, 91: 907-928.
5. Williamson, O.E. (1991). Comparative economic organization: The analysis of discrete structural alternatives. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 36: 269-296.
6. Poppo, L. and Zenger, T. 1998. Testing alternative theories of the firm: Transaction cost, knowledge-based, and measurement explanations for make-or-buy decisions in IT Services. *Strategic Management Journal*, 19: 853-877.
7. Leiblein, MJ and DJ Miller. 2003. “An empirical examination of transaction- and firm-level influences on the vertical boundaries of the firm,” *Strategic Management Journal*, Vol. 24(9), pp. 839-859.
8. Foss, K. and N.J. Foss (2005). Resources and transaction costs: how property rights economics further the resource based view. *Strategic Management Journal*, 26(6): 541-553.

Class 5: Knowledge- and Learning-based Theories of the Business Firm

Why do firms exist? How do they best integrate knowledge?

1. Levitt, B. and J. G. March (1988). "Organizational learning." *Annual Review of Sociology* **14**: 319-340.
2. March, J.G. (1991). Exploration and exploitation in organizational learning. *Organization Science*, **2**: 71-87.
3. Cohen, W.M. and D. Levinthal (1990). Absorptive Capacity: A New Perspective on Learning and Innovation. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, **35**: 128-152.
4. Levinthal, D.A. and J.G. March (1993). The Myopia of Learning. *Strategic Management Journal*, **14**: 95-112.
5. Grant, R.M. (1996). Toward a Knowledge-Based Theory of the Firm. *Strategic Management Journal* **17**(Winter Special Issue): 109-122.
6. Foss, N.J. 1996. Knowledge-based approaches to the theory of the firm: Some critical comments. *Organization Science*, **7**: 470-476.
7. Nickerson JA, Zenger TR. 2004. A Knowledge-based Theory of the Firm - The Problem-Solving Perspective. *Organization Science* **15**(6): 617-632
8. Pisano, G. P. (1994). Knowledge, Integration, and the Locus of Learning: An Empirical Analysis of Process Development. *Strategic Management Journal*, **15**, 85-100.

Class 6: The Consequences of Business Organization

How do organizational decisions affect performance? What is “misalignment”? What are the consequences of “misalignment”?

1. Williamson, O. E. 1991. Comparative organization: The analysis of discrete structural alternatives. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, **36**: 269-296.
2. Henderson R. and Clark K. B. 1990. Architectural innovations: the reconfiguration of existing product technologies and failure of established firms. *Administrative Science Quarterly*. **35**: 9-30.
3. Masten, S., J. Meehan, and E. Snyder. 1991. The costs of organization. *Journal of Law, Economics and Organization*, **7**: 1-22.
4. Leiblein, M. J., Reuer, J. J., & Dalsace, F. 2002. Do make or buy decisions matter? The influence of organizational governance on technological performance. *Strategic Management Journal*, **23**(9): 817-833.
5. 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*, **48**: 433-465
6. Sampson, R. 2004. The cost of misaligned governance in R&D alliances. *Journal of Law, Economics and Organization*, **20**: 484-526.
7. Bercovitz, J., S. Jap and J. Nickerson 2006. The antecedents and performance implications of cooperative exchange norms. *Organization Science*, **17**(6) : 724-740.
8. Mooi, Erik A., and Mrinal Ghosh (2010), 'Contract Specificity and its Performance Implications', *Journal of Marketing*, **74** (March), 105-120.

Class 7: Summary & Presentations

How to Read an Academic Article (adapted from work by Peter Klein)

As an academic you will need to become not only avid readers but also efficient readers, able to extract the maximum information from an academic article with the least effort. You will need to learn, in other words, the art of the skim. While many of these tips may be painfully obvious, some students have told me they appreciate having this information. So, I reproduce the handout below. Any comments and suggestions for improvement?

1. Caveat: no single style works for everyone!
2. Klein's basic steps for skimming, scanning, processing...
 - a. Read the abstract (if provided); Read the introduction; Read the conclusion.
 - b. Skim the middle, looking at section titles, tables, figures, etc.—try to get a feel for the style and flow of the article.
 - i. Is it methodological, conceptual, theoretical (verbal or mathematical), empirical, or something else?
 - ii. Is it primarily a survey, a novel theoretical contribution, an empirical application of an existing theory or technique, a critique, or something else?
 - c. Go back and read the whole thing quickly, skipping equations, most figures and tables.
 - d. Go back and read the whole thing carefully, focusing on the sections or areas that seem most important.
3. Once you've grasped the basic argument the author is trying to make, critique it!
 - a. Ask if the argument makes sense. Is it internally consistent? Well supported by argument or evidence? (This skill takes some experience to develop!)
 - b. Compare the article to others you've read on the same or a closely related subject. (If this is the first paper you've read in a particular subject area, find some more and skim them. Introductions and conclusions are key.) Compare and contrast. Are the arguments consistent, contradictory, orthogonal?
 - c. Use Google Scholar, the Social Sciences Citation Index, publisher web pages, and other resources to find articles that cite the article you're reading. See what they say about it. See if it's mentioned on blogs, groups, etc.
 - d. Check out a reference work, e.g. a review or survey article, to see how this article fits in the broader context of its subject area.

How to Prepare a Literature Review (adapted from a post on the Organizations & Markets blog)

A country practitioner was retained one day by a client whose red cow had broken into his neighbor's grain field, and litigation ensued. The practitioner went carefully over the details of the facts in the case with a student in his office, and assigned to the student the duty of "looking up the law" on the subject. Some time after he asked the student what success he had had with the authorities bearing on the case. The student replied: "'Squire, I have searched diligently through every law book in the library, and there isn't a red cow case in them."

The joke of course is that this lawyer thought the issue was red cows rather than trespassing, negligence, and other abstract legal concepts. This was a lot less funny when I realized that when I was in college and my first year or two of grad school, this kind of substantively-focused literalism was exactly how I would approach doing a lit review for a research paper. I would open up Sociofile (now called "Sociological Abstracts") and search for substantive key terms, something like "social movements AND television." That is, I was searching for prior literature on my substantive issue.

A substantive literature search is worth doing to a certain extent, but it's not nearly as important as getting (and understanding) the underlying theory. A single theory often involves wildly disparate empirical issues. So how do you do the theoretical aspect of the review? Well, to a large extent it's just an issue of learning a large body of literature inside out, but that takes a very long time. In the meantime, here's the advice I give to my grad students.

1. Use Business Source Complete, Google Scholar, etc. for queries of key terms but realize that this will only be about a quarter of the work. These databases aren't very good at queries by theory.
2. Figure out what theoretical problems are at issue in your work. These problems may be the result of inconsistencies in the assumptions or causal mechanisms in applications of the theory, inconsistencies across multiple theories addressing a single phenomenon, or inconsistencies or limitations in the empirical evidence. Discuss these issues with your friends and mentors. They may suggest explanations or theoretical solutions you've never heard of. Also ask them for specific citations that they recommend.
3. Search for essays on these theories in high quality journals such as the *Strategic Management Journal*, *Organization Science*, or *Management Science* (or even the annual review issues from the *Journal of Management*). If you're lucky, you may even find a graduate seminar on your target literature. You can also use a few empirical publications that you've read or which are recommended to you as providing particularly good theoretical syntheses.
4. Use these to snowball sample, both backwards and forwards in time. To snowball backwards, read the articles and whenever they mention a citation that sounds interesting, add it to your list. To snowball forward, use Google Scholar to do a cited reference search of your key citations and again, take the stuff that looks promising. As you read, you'll find still more good cites.
5. Actually read and pull out the theoretical problems involved and how they hang together in the different articles. Try to find one to three important theoretical problems and use each of them to derive a proposition that can be operationalized into an empirically-testable hypothesis. Read empirical articles that you admire and note how they structure their lit review / theory section.

Note that this step is as much imposing structure on the literature as about recognizing the structure that pre-exists because, frankly, the literature is often muddled.

6. Get back to your advisors and colleagues once you've finished doing all of this and we can talk about actually doing the empirical part of the project.

Writing “One-Pagers”

A “one pager” is a succinct summary and commentary on either a book or journal article. It is intended to establish that you can grasp the key points of a particular work, and contribute constructively to scholarly dialogue. I have found it to be an effective device to interpret information. As the name suggests, it *must* be kept to one page.

Component Parts

There are four parts to a one pager:

1. Provide an accurate citation of the book/article
2. Include your own name and relevant details.
3. Use three bullet points to provide a holistic summary. Each paragraph should be short, and pick up on a critical part of the thesis. If you’re reading the text with a specific reason in mind (e.g. a literature review on a particular subject), the summary can be focused on that aspect of the piece.
4. Use three bullet points for constructive analysis. These might be aspects of the manuscript that you didn’t understand, sections you feel could/should be expanded, or parts you outright disagree with. The three points should demonstrate that you can critically assess the material, think creatively about how to build upon it, and draw upon a wider knowledge of the subject.

Finally

As with most skills you can develop your ability to write a one-pager with practice. It’s a method to focus your attention whilst reading an article, and therefore – I find – can drastically reduce the time it takes to absorb material, and increase the effectiveness of your reading.

Citation: (Author. Year. "Title." Journal. Volume (Issue): Pages.)

Type:	Exploratory (e.g., taxonomies, descriptive), theoretical, or empirical				
Research Question:					
Argument:					
Framing:					
Theoretical Lens(es):	Industrial Organization, BTOF, Resource / Strategic Factor Market, or Dynamic Capability Logic, Transaction Cost Economics, Real Options, Agency theory, other				
Theoretical Approach:	Verbal explication; analytical / mathematical modeling; empirical examination; other				
Hypotheses:	H1.				
	H2.				
	H3.				
	H4.				
Constructs:	(name)	(nominal definition)			
	(name)	(nominal definition)			
	(name)	(nominal definition)			
	(name)	(nominal definition)			
Context:	(e.g. industry, phenomenon)				
Unit of Analysis:	(e.g. firm, individual, firm-year, event)				
Sampling Strategy:	archival; survey; case study; or experiment				
Sample:	(description)			panel; cross section	
Measures:	class	construct	description	range	type
	DV, IV, or control	(name)			continuous; binary; ordinal
Empirical Model(s):	(e.g., OLS, GLS, Probit / logit, Fixed-Effects, Cox / event-history; GMM)				
Key Findings:					
Contribution:					

Additional thoughts on Reading & Reviewing

The following points offer criteria for reviewing papers suggested by the BPS division of the Academy of Management.

- Introduction
 - Is there a clear research question, with a solid motivation behind it?
 - Is the research question interesting?
 - After reading the introduction, did you find yourself motivated to read further?
- Theory
 - Does the submission contain a well-developed and articulated theoretical framework?
 - Are the core concepts of the submission clearly defined?
 - Is the logic behind the hypotheses persuasive?
 - Is extant literature appropriately reflected in the submission, or are critical references missing?
 - Do the hypotheses or propositions logically flow from the theory?
- Method (for empirical papers)
 - Are the sample and variables appropriate for the hypotheses?
 - Is the data collection method consistent with the analytical technique(s) applied?
 - Does the study have internal and external validity?
 - Are the analytical techniques appropriate for the theory and research questions and were they applied appropriately.
- Results (for empirical papers)
 - Are the results reported in an understandable way?
 - Are there alternative explanations for the results, and if so, are these adequately controlled for in the analyses?
- Contribution
 - Does the submission make a value-added contribution to existing research?
 - Does the submission stimulate thought or debate?
 - Do the authors discuss the implications of the work for the scientific and practice community?

About Your Instructor

Michael J. Leiblein

Michael received his Ph.D. from Purdue University as well as an M.B.A. and a B.S. in Electrical Engineering from Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute. Prior to his doctoral studies, Michael worked as a consultant for Andersen Consulting (Accenture) and as an engineer for Johnson Controls.

Professor Leiblein teaches the Technology Strategy, Advanced Competitive Analysis, and the Innovation Field Study elective courses in the MBA Program and PhD seminars on Competitive and Technology Strategy at the Fisher College. He has previously taught the MBA business core and MBA corporate strategy core courses as well as electives on corporate strategy and strategy consulting. He has also taught MBA, PhD, and Executive Education courses in Europe. In 2000 and 2002 the Ohio State University evening MBA students named him outstanding core course instructor.

Michael has consulted in the United States, Europe, and Asia for a variety of organizations and associations. At Ohio State, he serves as the academic director for the Fisher College Innovation Initiative and as a co-director for the OSU Food Innovation Center, one of President Gee's two inaugural trans-disciplinary centers devoted to improving global health, life quality and economics by way of innovations in the food industries. He is the author and co-sponsor of the Fisher College Innovation Initiative- Manta Innovation Index.

Michael's academic research focuses on the relationship between organizational form and firm performance in technology-intensive industries. His work has been published in leading academic journals such as the *Strategic Management Journal*, the *Academy of Management Journal*, the *Journal of Industrial Economics*, and the *Journal of Management* and has received international media coverage in outlets such as *The Financial Times* (London), *Red Herring*, and *USA Today*. Michael's academic papers have been recognized with several awards including the 1994 Glueck Best Paper Award, an honorable mention for the 1995 Best Paper Award in Technology and Innovation Management, Distinguished Paper Awards from the Business Policy and Strategy division of the Academy of Management in 2005 and 2007, and Distinguished Paper Award from the Operations division of the Academy of Management in 2009. His dissertation research on the adoption of new technologies in the U.S. semiconductor industry was recognized by the Academy of Management as one of the best dissertations in the field of strategic management (1997 Free Press Award). He is currently the primary investigator on a grant from the General Electric National Center for the Middle Market to explore effective innovation practices across different sized firms and a National Science Foundation grant that extends this work by exploring the causes and innovative consequences of organizational decisions in the global semiconductor industry.

Michael currently serves as member of several prestigious editorial boards including the *Strategic Management Journal* (since 2004), the leading academic journal in the field of strategic management, and the *Academy of Management Review* (since 2005). He also has been tapped as an advisory panel member for the *National Science Foundation* (since 2011). In addition, he has served as an editorial board member (2002 through 2007) and as an associate editor (2008 through 2011) at the *Journal of Management*, as a member of the executive committee for the Business Policy & Strategy division of the *Academy of Management* and as a representative and officer of the Competitive Strategy division of the *Strategic Management Society*.

In his free time, Michael enjoys attending collegiate sporting events, opera, and hiking through New England and the American Southwest.