

Towards a Functional Resource-based Theory of the Firm

Jeroen Kraaijenbrink & Aard Groen

Paper presented at the SMS 28th Annual International Conference, Cologne, Germany

The resource-based view (RBV) of the firm has become one of the most influential and highly cited theories in the field of strategic management. Its central proposition is that firms must own or control valuable, rare, inimitable, and non-substitutable (VRIN) resources in order to gain sustained competitive advantage (SCA) (Barney, 1991). This proposition is also at the core of RBV-related theories such as the knowledge-based view (e.g., Grant, 1996) and theories on dynamic capabilities (e.g., Helfat & Peteraf, 2003; Teece, Pisano, & Shuen, 1997). The RBV has been extensively criticized over the last decade. These critiques have uncovered many problems embedded within the RBV, including its inconsistency, its combination of limited generalizability and all-inclusiveness, and its lack of managerial implications. Widely-known examples are Priem & Butler's (2001a; 2001b) critiques and Barney's (2001) response in the January 2001 issue of *Academy of Management Review*. At the same time, alternative theories of the firm are emerging, which we could label as entrepreneurial theories of the firm. In such theories, emphasis moves away from resources to concepts such as novel combinative capabilities (Kogut & Zander, 1992), bricolage (Baker & Nelson, 2005), improvisation, and effectuation (Sarasvathy, 2001). The common denominator here is the process of doing new things with existing resources along the lines of the 'new combinations' which Schumpeter regarded as the defining characteristic of the entrepreneur, the archetypal imaginative business person (Schumpeter, 1957). Despite their critiquing and looking for alternative explanations, both the critiques and the emerging alternative theories still assume resources to be a crucial component for explaining the existence of firms and their differences. Yet, they leave elementary problems with the concept of resources and its explanatory power for a theory of the firm unresolved.

Our paper will develop a possible solution to some of the problems with the RBV. It will address three questions that have unsatisfactorily been answered: What are resources? What types do exist? and, How do they contribute to a firm's competitive advantage? Our answers to these questions will follow in three steps: we summarize the answers given in the existing literature, indicate why these answers are unsatisfactory, and suggest our alternative answer. We will argue that resources are distinct from actions and that theories of dynamic capabilities fail to recognize this difference. We will define resources as the capacities at a firm's disposal comprising the input and output of entrepreneurial actions. Drawing from Parsons' (1951; 1977) we will then suggest a fourfold functional typology of resources and argue that firms derive their competitive advantage from deploying a set of balanced resources in their entrepreneurial actions.

WHAT ARE RESOURCES?

To answer our first question we have scrutinized the resource-based literature for definitions of the concept of resource. Additionally, we have looked for definitions of 'capital', a concept which is sometimes used interchangeably or in combination (e.g., Barney, 1991). A first remarkable observation is that quite some resource-based publications do not provide any definition of what resources are. Examples are Ansoff (1965), Grant (2001), Greene & Brown (1997), Hofer & Schendel (1978), Nahapiet & Ghoshal (1998), and Pride, Hughes, & Kapoor (1991). In these publications, it seems to be assumed that resources are unproblematic a concept and that there is wide agreement on what resources are. This approach is problematic since it attempts to classify concepts of which it is not clear what they refer to and since there is no agreement between authors on what resources are.

Some authors have provided definitions of resources (see Table 1). When looking at these definitions, however, three problems can be observed. First, by giving long lists of examples (e.g., Barney, 1991) or by using terms with a wide coverage such as 'thing' and 'quality' (Dollinger, 1995), the definitions cover a lot of ground. When we look beyond the definitions into what authors consider to be resources, the ground covered even increases. The suggestion is that attributes such as cost leadership, economies of scale, and learning curve economies should all be considered resources (Barney, 2001). As remarked by others (e.g., Priem & Butler, 2001a), such definitions of resources are all-inclusive and therefore not very useful. A second problem is an apparent disagreement on whether dynamic capabilities should be considered as resources or not. According to some authors, dynamic capabilities are "The firm's processes that use resources—specifically the processes to integrate, reconfigure, gain and release resources—to match and even create market change. Dynamic capabilities thus are the organizational and strategic routines by which firms achieve new resource configurations as markets emerge, collide, split, evolve, and die" (Eisenhardt & Martin, 2000; Teece, Pisano, & Shuen, 1997). This definition explicitly distinguishes dynamic capabilities from resources. Similar distinctions appear in statements such as "resources, dynamic capabilities and

knowledge are closely interlinked” (Barney, Wright, & Ketchen Jr., 2001: 630) and “in terms of their resources and internal capabilities” (Peteraf, 1993: 179). While these authors explicitly distinguish capabilities from resources, most of the RBV’s definitions of resources include dynamic capabilities, in their category of intangible assets. This inclusion brings the RBV into an endless loop in which using a resource is defined as a resource as well. Thirdly, from the definitions in Table 1, it is unclear whether we should consider resources as something valuable for the firm by definition or not. When we consider Dollinger’s (1995) definition, we see that only the things or qualities that are useful are assumed to be resources. Similarly, Teece et al., (1997) assume that resources are those assets that are firm specific and difficult to imitate. Thus, only those assets that are valuable to the firm are considered to be resources. Other authors, however, explicitly decouple resource and value, by arguing that firms should gather valuable resources to gain competitive advantage (Barney, 1991). In Wernerfelt’s (1984) definition we even see that weaknesses of a firm should be considered as resources.

TABLE 1 Current Definitions of Resources

Publication	Definition of resources / capitals
(Barney, 1991)	Firm resources include all assets, capabilities, organizational processes, firm attributes, information, knowledge, etc. controlled by a firm that enable the firm to conceive of and implement strategies that improve its efficiency and effectiveness.
(Barney, 2001)	Resources are the tangible and intangible assets a firm uses to choose and implement its strategies
(Bergmann Lichtenstein & Brush, 2001)	All tangible and intangible assets that are tied to the firm in a relatively permanent fashion
(Dollinger, 1995)	A resource is any thing or quality that is useful
(Galunic & Rodan, 1998)	Knowledge-based resources generally refer to the ways in which the more tangible input resources are manipulated and transformed so as to add value
(Makadok, 2001)	A resource is an observable (but not necessarily tangible) asset that can be valued and traded—such as a brand, a patent, a parcel of land, or a license. A capability, on the other hand, is not observable (and hence necessarily intangible), cannot be valued, and changes hands only as part of its entire unit.
(Miller & Shamsie, 1996)	All tangible and intangible assets that are tied to the firm in a relatively permanent fashion
(Penrose, 1959)	The firm is a collection of productive resources the disposal of which between different uses and time is determined by administrative decision. Strictly speaking it is never resources themselves that are ‘inputs’ in the production process, but only the services that the resources can render. The services yielded by the resources are a function of the way in
(Teece, Pisano, & Shuen, 1997)	Resources are firm specific assets that are difficult if not impossible to imitate. Trade secrets and certain specialized production facilities and engineering experience are examples. Such assets are difficult to transfer among firms because of transaction costs, and because the assets may contain tacit knowledge
(Wernerfelt, 1984)	By a resource is meant anything which could be thought of as strength or weakness of a given firm. More formally, a firm’s resources at a given time could be defined as those (tangible and intangible) assets which are tied semipermanently to the firm.
(Yuchtman & Seashore, 1967)	(More or less) generalized means, or facilities, that are potentially controllable by social organizations and that are potentially usable – however indirectly – in relationships between the organization and the environment

The three problems can be traced back to the fact that the RBV makes no sufficient distinction between capacity and action. While capacity is the potential to do something, action is actually doing that something. In work on dynamic capabilities an attempt has been made to clarify this distinction. In line with Penrose (1959), such work has explicitly decoupled resources from the processes of resource deployment. The problem with the dynamic capabilities approach, however, is that the processes of resource deployment are again conceptualized as capacities (or capabilities as they are called there) and not as actions. Conceptualizing these processes as capacities still makes us think in terms of possession rather than in terms of doing. Also, conceptualizing both the resources and the resource deployment processes as capacities causes the endless loops described above. If we want to have a more useful concept of resources we will have to explicitly distinguish capacity from action. Resources, then, are the capacities used in a firm’s actions. They are the means that enable and constrain the actions a firm can perform. This means that resources allow firms to perform their actions, but that resources also constrain them in their actions. Resources gathered in the past will define to a large extent what a firm can do and what it cannot do. Yet, new resources can be gathered that extend the scope of possible actions. In addition to being inputs to a firm’s actions, resources are also affected by these same actions. As such, they are outputs of actions as well.

WHAT TYPES OF RESOURCES EXIST?

Resources have been categorized in many different ways. Table 2 presents an arguably representative sample. Some authors suggest a typology of resources based on empirical work or practice. One of the first authors who categorized resources was Ansoff (1965), who divided a firm’s resources into physical, monetary and human resources. In a similar way, Barney (1991) distinguished physical, human, and organizational capital resources.

Publications in which this sort of typologies are made, typically define the types by illustrating them with examples. A weakness of this approach is that it is often ad hoc in nature. There is no rationale provided why the types of resources are distinguished and on which dimensions they differ. On the other hand, there are authors who use dichotomies to divide resources into two types. An example is Miller and Shamsie (1996) who make a distinction between knowledge-based resources and proprietary resources based on imitability as dimension. Another dichotomy often used is the distinction between tangible and intangible resources (Barney, 2001).

When we compare the various typologies of resources and capitals in Table 2, we see that they are all different but often include one or more similar types. This causes confusion. For example, physical resources are included as a type of resource within many of the typologies. However, all of the typologies in which this type is included are different. While Grant (2001) sees it as being different from four other types of resources – financial, technological, reputation, and human resources – Penrose (1959) sees it has one out of two types of resources, human resources being the second type. The same confusion consists for other types of resources such as human resources, financial resources, and organizational resources.

Also, similar terms are used to refer to different types of resources (homonymy) and different terms are used to refer to the same types of resources (synonymy). An example of the latter is the use of the terms ‘monetary resources’ (Ansoff, 1965) and ‘financial resources’ (e.g., Dollinger, 1995). An example of homonymy is the notion of social capital. Nahapiet and Ghoshal defined it as “the sum of the actual and potential resources embedded within, available through, and derived from the network of relationships possessed by an individual or social unit. Social capital thus comprises both the network and the assets that may be mobilized through that network” (1998: 243). This means that every resource one can access through a network is social capital as well, regardless of the nature of the resource. Barney, on the other hand makes a distinction between the social relations of individuals (labeled as human capital resources) and the social relations of the firm (labeled as organizational capital resources). Thus, while Nahapiet and Ghoshal defined social capital as a separate, broad class of resources, Barney defined it as being part of the human resource class and organizational resource class. Such variety in interpretations, again, is confusing.

TABLE 2 Current Typologies of Resources

Publication	Types distinguished
(Ansoff, 1965)	Physical resources, Monetary resources, Human resources
(Barney, 1991)	Physical capital resources, Human capital resources, Organizational capital resources
(Barney, 2001)	Tangible resources, Intangible resources
(Bergmann Lichtenstein & Brush, 2001)	Financial resources, Physical resources, Human resources, Social resources, Organizational resources
(Dollinger, 1995)	Physical resources, Reputation resources, Organizational resources, Financial resources, Intellectual (human) resources, Technological resources
(Galunic & Rodan, 1998)	Knowledge-based resources, Tangible resources
(Grant, 2001)	Financial resources, Physical resources, Technological resources, Reputation, Human resources
(Greene & Brown, 1997)	Human capital resources, Social capital resources, Physical capital resources, Organizational capital resources, Financial capital resources
(Hofer & Schendel, 1978)	Financial resources, Physical resources, Human resources, Organizational resources, Technological resources
(Makadok, 2001)	Resources, Capabilities
(Miller & Shamsie, 1996)	Knowledge-based resources, Proprietary based resources
(Penrose, 1959)	Physical resources, Human resources
(Pride, Hughes, & Kapoor, 1991)	Material resources, Human resources, Financial resources, Information resources
(Teece, Pisano, & Shuen, 1997)	Technological assets, Complementary assets, Financial Assets, Reputational assets, Structural assets, Institutional assets, Market assets, Boundary assets
(Wernerfelt, 1984)	Examples: brand-names, in-house knowledge of technology, employment of skilled personnel, trade contacts, machinery, efficient procedures, capital, etc.
(Yuchtman & Seashore, 1967)	Personnel resources, Physical resources, Technological resources, Liquid resources

The typologies summarized in Table 2 all reflect attempts to categorize the world into the components it consists of. That is, they look at the world of organizations and categorize what is seen there. Organizations are considered to be socio-technical systems comprised of people, tangibles, and intangibles. We find this back in the typologies using terms such as human resources and personnel resources (people), tangible assets, physical resources, and technological resources (tangibles), and knowledge-based resources, intangible assets, liquid resources, and

reputational assets (intangibles). While all of the typologies might be perfectly categorizing resources, the question is how useful they are. We could also divide the world into small and large resources, into light and dark resources, or into their chemical components. But is this useful?

Rather than basing a typology of resources on the elements organizations are comprised of, we deem it more useful to categorize resources in terms of the functions they have for organizations. Such focus on function enables us to consider what contribution resources make to the organization. It recognizes that not all resources are equally important to organizations and that organizations need various types of resources. This is more informative and arguably also more suitable for explaining competitive advantage than mere typologies of resources that do not express a relation with their role in the organization.

For making a functional typology of resources, we go back to the most systematic and comprehensive set of ideas on functional differentiation developed to date: Parsons' (1956a; 1956b; 1959) social systems theory. Parsons' structural-functionalist theory has been extensively criticized to the extent that it has been dismissed by many scholars. However, going back to Parsons' earlier work, it appears that his original theory of social systems is very useful for categorizing resources. Parsons distinguished four functions that, according to him, are elemental to the survival of all social systems, including firms: goal attainment, adaptation, integration, and pattern maintenance. An important axiom of Parsons' theory is that each of the four functions is associated with one particular type of capital (Parsons, 1951). Based on the functional decomposition of systems we can thus distinguish four types of capital.

Strategic capital: The goal attainment function concerns an actor's capacity to mobilize resources and actors in the interest of attaining its particular goals. The associated type of capital is 'strategic capital', which is defined as *the set of capacities that enables actors to decide on goals and to control resources and other actors to attain them.* When an actor possesses much strategic capital it is able to set the agenda, to influence other actors and to deploy resources in such a way that it achieves its goals. A typical example of strategic capital is power, which, when exercised, enables an actor exactly to achieve this. Related examples are authority and status. Strategic capital does not only reside in people. Also artifacts can contribute towards the achievement of an actor's goals. While they cannot set goals by themselves, artifacts can play an important role in attaining goals. An example of a strategic capital artifact is a technical standard, when used to force other actors in a certain direction. Also a patent can be seen as a form of strategic capital, when it is used to block competitors from using some specific technology.

Economic capital: The adaptive function represents an actor's ability to optimize the outcomes of action patterns. This relates to economic processes of acquisition and disposal of rights of possession of facilities and rewards. We label the type of capital associated with the adaptive function 'economic capital' and define it as *the set of mobile resources that are potentially usable in exchange relationships between the actor and its environment in processes of acquisition, disposal or selling.* This definition is based on Yuchtman & Seashore's definition of resources, which are "generalized means, or facilities, that are potentially controllable by social organizations and that are potentially usable – however indirectly – in relationships between the organization and the environment" (1967: 900). Essential in this definition is that resources are not in themselves tied directly to a particular goal. Actors can deploy resources to achieve such goal, but can use them for the achievement for other goals as well. The most representative example of economic capital is money, which can be used for a wide range of purposes and can be traded easily. Additionally, also the traditional production factors as distinguished by Adam Smith (1776) can be considered as economic capital: land (natural resources), labor (including skills), and capital (human made goods). Scholars have suggested knowledge as an additional production factor (Grant, 1996; Spender, 1998). As a production factor, we consider knowledge also as economic capital.

Social capital: Parsons' third function is the integrative function. This function concerns the mutual adjustment and coordination of actors and artifacts within an organization as well as between an organization and its environment. It involves connecting a variety of people and artifacts. The type of capital associated with this function is social capital. Social capital is defined here as *the set of network relations through which actors can utilize, employ, or enjoy the benefits of capital that is controlled or owned by other actors.* This definition implies that when a partner firm of the focal organization increases its amount of economic capital, this does not affect the amount of social capital of the focal organization. Rather, it potentially increases the economic capital the focal organization has access to. As such, our definition differs from, for example Nahapiet & Ghoshal, who consider social capital to be "the sum of the actual and potential resources embedded within, available through, and derived from the network of relationships possessed by an individual or social unit" (1998: 243). We agree that access to resources of other

actors can be an important benefit for organizations. However, it is a mistake to label such resources of other actors social capital.

Cultural capital: The final function Parsons distinguishes is the pattern maintenance function. This function refers to the integrated structure of a social system. It creates a state of order in a symbolic system of values, norms, beliefs, assumptions, symbols, rule sets and artifacts. The associated type of capital is cultural capital, which we define as *the set of values, norms, beliefs, assumptions, symbols, rule sets, behaviors and artifacts that define the actor in relation to other actors and environment*. This definition is based on Barney's (1986) definition of culture, with the addition of norms, rule sets and behaviors and artifacts. These additions were made because norms, rule sets and behaviors such as routines and habits, and artifacts such as building and work space design make up for an important part of the identity and culture of an organization. Different from other definitions, our definition explicitly addresses an actor's relation to other actors and environment. This isolates the cultural capital that belongs specifically to the actor from the wider culture in which the actor operates. Both the organizational culture and the wider culture affect what the organization is and does. However, it is the organizational culture that distinguishes an organization from its environment and that can be a basis for competitive advantage.

By explicitly distinguishing cultural capital from economic capital, we refine Barney's (1986) and Fiol's (1991; and her revisit in 2001) view on the role of culture as a resource. The current paper argues that cultural capital and economic capital are distinct in that economic capital are mobile and relatively generic, while cultural capital is often something virtually immobile, often highly organization and its relations specific. For example 'knowledge' as a part of cultural capital represents a variety of types of knowledge of which some are firm specific and others are not. It is important here to distinguish between knowledge held at the individual, which is mostly mobile and related to the production factor labor, and knowledge held at the organizational level, which is not mobile and related to the culture of an organization. Examples of the first are skills and technical expertise. Examples of the second are organizational routines and values.

As the discussion of cultural capital hints at, capital is an analytical concept that not necessarily has one specific empirical referent. This means that actions in practice can contribute to several types of capitals at the same time. For example, acquiring a certain amount of money increases the economic capital of a firm. Additionally, however, the same amount of money can also increase the firm's power in relation to its partners, when the money is used to buy influence or power from other actors. This means that it is context dependent and socially constructed what type of capital the people, tangibles, and intangibles are and how valuable they are for the firm.

HOW DO RESOURCES CONTRIBUTE TO COMPETITIVE ADVANTAGE?

The RBV argues that firms have a competitive advantage when their resources and capabilities are valuable, rare, inimitable or nonsubstitutable (VRIN), and when an appropriate organization is in place (O) (Barney, 1991, 1997). By reviewing numerous empirical RBV studies, Newbert (2007) has demonstrated that this argument has only received modest empirical support. To explain this lack of empirical support we can look at both the dependent variable (competitive advantage) and the independent variable (resources).

Concerning the dependent variable, Newbert concluded that 76 % of the studies used performance as a measure of competitive advantage. Although performance and competitive advantage are related, Powell (2001) has effectively pointed out that having a competitive advantage does not automatically lead to an increased performance and thus that performance should be clearly distinguished from competitive advantage. We can make an explicit distinction between the two based on the distinction between resources (including capabilities and competences) and actions mentioned earlier. Resources, capabilities, and competences all concern an organizations *potential* to perform. It is this potential that comprises a firm's competitive advantage – or disadvantage. A firm, then, has a competitive advantage when it has capabilities superior to those of competitors. Whether this competitive advantage leads to an increased performance will depend upon whether and how organizations perform actions in which resources are deployed. Such actions include recognizing possibilities where others do not see them (Sarasvathy, 2004). This means seeing functional resources where others only see people, tangibles, or intangibles; or seeing one type of capital where others only see another type of capital. Such actions also include getting access to and developing resources in such a way that they can be deployed by the firm. This means operating in a network with other actors and exchanging resources with them. Additionally, firms also have to be able to keep particular resources and get rid of other resources. Therefore, appropriate retention and removal actions are needed as well. Finally, such actions include the actual deployment of resources into products or services valued by other actors.

Concerning the independent variable, Newbert concluded that there is a great deal of variety in the resources, capabilities, and core competencies scholars have examined under the RBV. Above, we have observed additionally

that a great deal of ambiguity is present in the definitions and types of resources scholars have used in their theories. As a remedy against this ambiguity we have suggested an alternative, fourfold functional typology of resources. An important cause for the lack of empirical support for the RBV is its focus on characteristics of individual resources. Following a functional logic, it is not the characteristics of individual resources that make for a firm's competitive advantage, but the characteristics of the set of resources that firm's have at their disposal. Individual resources can be valuable, rare, inimitable, and non-substitutable, but they do not bring a firm a competitive advantage when they do not fit with other resources and actions of the firm. Barney has recognized that an appropriate organization has to be in place. But this is reversing the logic. It says in which situations resources can be useful for a firm, not when a firm can achieve competitive advantage with resources. It is argued here that, rather than that the firm should be ready to deploy a resource, this resource should fit the other resources and the actions of the firm. Following Parsons' theory, this means that the resources of a firm should be balanced. Throughout his oeuvre, Parsons has convincingly argued and demonstrated that, in order to sustain, organizations need to realize all four functions. In our case, this means that firms should have all four types of capitals at their disposal. Thus, to have a sustained competitive advantage, organizations should have sufficient economic, strategic, social, and cultural capital. This implies to say that organizations cannot do without one of the four types of capitals and that one type of capital cannot completely substitute for another. It also implies that it is not simply the sum of the capitals that explains a firm's competitive advantage. Unlike in the RBV, more capital of one type does not necessarily mean a firm's competitive advantage increases, even if that capital is VRIN. Whether this is the case depends on the other capitals available.

REFERENCES

- Ansoff, H. I. (1965). *Corporate Strategy: An Analytic Approach to Business Policy for Growth and Expansion*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Baker, T., & Nelson, R. E. (2005). Creating Something from Nothing: Resource Construction through Entrepreneurial Bricolage. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 50, 329-366.
- Barney, J. B. (1986). Organizational Culture: Can It Be a Source of Sustained Competitive Advantage? *Academy of Management Review*, 11(3), 656-665.
- Barney, J. B. (1991). Firm Resources and Sustained Competitive Advantage. *Journal of Management*, 17(1), 99-120.
- Barney, J. B. (1997). *Gaining and Sustaining Competitive Advantage*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- 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.
- Barney, J. B., Wright, M., & Ketchen Jr., D. J. (2001). The Resource-Based View of the Firm: Ten Years After 1991. *Journal of Management*, 27, 625-641.
- Bergmann Lichtenstein, B., & Brush, C. (2001). How Do "Resource Bundles" Develop and Change in New Ventures? A Dynamic Model and Longitudinal Exploration. *Entrepreneurship Theory & Practice*, 25(3), 17-36.
- Dollinger, M. (1995). *Entrepreneurship: Strategies and Resources*. Boston: Irwin.
- Eisenhardt, K. M., & Martin, J. A. (2000). Dynamic Capabilities: What are They? *Strategic Management Journal*, 21, 1105-1121.
- Fiol, C. M. (1991). Managing Culture as a Competitive Resource: An Identity-Based View of Sustainable Competitive Advantage. *Journal of Management*, 17(1), 191-211.
- Fiol, C. M. (2001). Revisiting an Identity-Based View of Sustainable Competitive Advantage. *Journal of Management*, 27, 691-699.
- Foss, N. J. (1996a). Knowledge-Based Approaches to the Theory of the Firm: Some Critical Comments. *Organization Science*, 7(5), 470-476.
- Foss, N. J. (1996b). More Critical Comments on Knowledge-Based Theories of the Firm. *Organization Science*, 7(5), 519-523.
- Galunic, D. C., & Rodan, S. (1998). Resource Combinations in the Firm: Knowledge Structures and the Potential for Schumpeterian Innovation. *Strategic Management Journal*, 19, 1193-1201.
- Grant, R. M. (1996). Toward a Knowledge-Based Theory of the Firm. *Strategic Management Journal*, 17(Winter), 109-122.
- Grant, R. M. (2001). *Contemporary Strategy Analysis*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers Inc.
- Greene, P., & Brown, T. (1997). Resource Needs and the Dynamic Capitalism Typology. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 12(3), 161-173.
- Helfat, C. E., & Peteraf, M. A. (2003). The Dynamic Resource-Based View: Capability Lifecycles. *Strategic Management Journal*, 24, 997-1010.

- Hofer, C., & Schendel, D. (1978). *Strategy Formulation: Analytical Concepts*. St. Paul: West Publ.
- Kogut, B., & Zander, U. (1992). Knowledge of the Firm, Combinative Capabilities, and the Replication of Technology. *Organization Science*, 3(3), 383-397.
- Mahoney, J. T. (2001). A Resource-Based Theory of Sustainable Rents. *Journal of Management*, 27, 651-660.
- Makadok, R. (2001). Towards a Synthesis of Resource-Based and Dynamic Capability Views of Rent Creation. *Strategic Management Journal*, 22(5), 387-402.
- Miller, D., & Shamsie, J. (1996). The Resource-Based View of the Firm in Two Environments: The Hollywood Film Studios from 1936 to 1965. *Academy of Management Journal*, 39(3), 519-543.
- Nahapiet, J., & Ghoshal, S. (1998). Social Capital, Intellectual Capital, and the Organizational Advantage. *Academy of Management Review*, 23(2), 242-266.
- Newbert, S. L. (2007). Empirical Research on the Resource-Based View of the Firm: An Assessment and Suggestions for Future Research. *Strategic Management Journal*, 28, 121-146.
- Parsons, T. (1951). *The Social System* (1964 ed.). New York: The Free Press.
- Parsons, T. (1956a). Suggestions for a Sociological Approach to the Theory of Organizations. I. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 1(1), 63-85.
- Parsons, T. (1956b). Suggestions for a Sociological Approach to the Theory of Organizations. II. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 1(2), 225-239.
- Parsons, T. (1959). General Theory in Sociology. In R. Merton, L. Broom & L. S. Cotrell Jr. (Eds.), *Sociology Today: Problems and Prospects* (pp. 3-37). New York: Basic Books.
- Parsons, T. (1977). *Social Systems and the Evolution of Action Theory*. New York: The Free Press.
- Penrose, E. T. (1959). *The Theory of the Growth of the Firm*. New York: John Wiley and Sons.
- Peteraf, M. A. (1993). The Cornerstones of Competitive Advantage: A Resource-Based View. *Strategic Management Journal*, 14(3), 179-191.
- Powell, T. C. (2001). Competitive Advantage: Logical and Philosophical Considerations. *Strategic Management Journal*, 22, 875-888.
- Pratt, J. W., & Zeckhauser, R. J. (Eds.). (1991). *Principals and Agents: The Structure of Business*. Cambridge MA: Harvard Business School Press.
- Pride, W., Hughes, R., & Kapoor, J. (1991). *Business*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Priem, R. L., & Butler, J. E. (2001a). Is the Resource-Based "View" a Useful Perspective for Strategic Management Research? *Academy of Management Review*, 26(1), 22-40.
- Priem, R. L., & Butler, J. E. (2001b). Tautology in the Resource-Based View and the Implications of Externally Determined Resource Value: Further Comments. *Academy of Management Review*, 26(1), 57-66.
- Sarasvathy, S. D. (2001). Causation and Effectuation: Toward a Theoretical Shift from Economic Inevitability to Entrepreneurial Contingency. *Academy of Management Review*, 26(2), 243-263.
- Sarasvathy, S. D. (2004). Making It Happen: Beyond Theories of the Firm to Theories of Firm Design. *Entrepreneurship Theory & Practice*, 28(6), 519-531.
- Schumpeter, J. A. (1957). *Capitalism, Socialism, and Democracy* (4th ed.). London: Allen and Unwin.
- Smith, A. (1776). *The Wealth of Nations* (1910 ed.). London etc.: Dent.
- Spender, J.-C. (1998). Pluralist Epistemology and the Knowledge-Based Theory of the Firm. *Organization*, 5(2), 233-256.
- Teece, D. J., Pisano, G. P., & Shuen, A. (1997). Dynamic Capabilities and Strategic Management. *Strategic Management Journal*, 18(7), 509-533.
- Wernerfelt, B. (1984). A Resource-Based View of the Firm. *Strategic Management Journal*, 5(2), 171-180.
- Yuchtman, E., & Seashore, S. E. (1967). A System Resource Approach to Organizational Effectiveness. *American Sociological Review*, 32(6), 891-903.