Marina SOLESVIK

PhD in Business Management, Professor and Chair
of Maritime Innovation and Management

Nord University Business School

Norway, 8049 Bodø, P.O. Box 1490

Contact phone: +47 48 133 882

e-mail: mzs@hvl.no

The Rise and Fall of the Resource-Based View: Paradigm Shift in Strategic Management

The paper is a literature review and explores whether resource-based view with newly emerged extensions including the dynamic capabilities perspective and the knowledge-based view is a new theory of the firm or a compliment to existing theories. Methodologically the author relies on Thomas Kuhn's (1962) theory of scientific revolutions, which significantly contributed to the philosophy of science and includes such elements as the concept of paradigm, normal science, scientific revolutions, and incommensurability of paradigms. On the basis Kuhn's system of views, this paper analyses new paradigms in the strategic management literature. The results suggest that strategic management is a multi-paradigmatic discipline. The critical analysis indicates that the resource-based view is a new paradigm of strategic management, although not a dominating one. The article will be interesting for undergraduate and PhD students, as well as management scholars particularly focusing their research on the strategic management and the theory of the firm.

JEL classification: M10, N00

Keywords: resource-based view; knowledge-based view; dynamic capabilities perspective; paradigm; economic history.

Introduction

Strategic management has been looking for a new paradigm for a certain period of time [57]. Strategic management is not a mono-paradigmatic discipline. Mintzberg et al. [43] have recognized ten schools within strategic management research: the design, planning, position, entrepreneurial, learning, configuration, cultural, power, environmental, and cognition schools. According to Mintzberg et al. [43], the resource-based view is a composite theory of the cultural and the learning schools. There are doubts among scholars that a unifying paradigm is necessary in strategic management, since this field is interdisciplinary with a number of incommensurable approaches [3]. If such a unifying paradigm should come it will appear in an evolutionary rather than revolutionary way [57].

Kuhn [36] suggested that a period of normal science lasts several decades. During this period scholars use a current paradigm to analyze data, explain phenomena using the theories of this paradigm, scientists improve the paradigm, and make it more sophisticated if necessary. Eventually, a new paradigm emerges if the old one often fails to explain facts and events [1]. In strategic management, the environmental paradigm dominated in the 1970s and the beginning of the 1980s. The environmentalists advocated that external factors such as industrial and market conditions [51] determine the competitive position of the firm. The emphasis of debates during the last thirty years has changed from the environmental perspective to the resource-based view of the firm proposed by Rumelt [55], Wernerfelt [66], and Barney [7]. The resource-based view postulates that the source of competitive advantage is in the firm's resources. Those firms that own or have access to valuable, rare, and poorly substitutable and imitable resources

and capabilities achieve and sustain competitive advantage. Furthermore, the resource-based perspective has been extended by the knowledge-based view, the dynamic capabilities perspective, and the relational view. These new theories emerged as a response to critics of the resource-based view when it failed to fully clarify the competitive advantage of firms in certain situations.

As Popper noted [47. P. 59], “theories are nets cast to catch what we call “the world”: to rationalise, to explain, and to master it. We endeavour to make the mesh ever finer and finer”. In order to improve our knowledge of strategic management, it is important to merge the debates among the resource-based scholars [7; 55; 66], the knowledge-based view proponents [18; 28], and the dynamic capabilities researchers [21; 64]. These three theoretical approaches are part of the resource-based theory [4]. Peteraf [48] pointed out that the resource-based view has a potential as a paradigm in strategic management. Mir and Watson [40] claimed that the resource-based view has chances to be a new theory of the firm. The research question, which the article is intended to answer, is: Is the resource-based view the new paradigm in strategic management or a compliment to existing theories? Answering this research question, this paper will contribute to our understanding of the philosophical underpinnings of strategic management. The theoretical underpinning of this article is the seminal work of Thomas Kuhn, *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions* [37]. The discussions of paradigms and commensurability of paradigms are among the key positions of Kuhn’s theory.

The paper is organised as follows: the next section highlights the main positions of the Kuhnian framework. In particular, Kuhn’s important contributions are the concept of the paradigm, analysis of incommensurability of paradigms, and the distinction between normal science and scientific revolutions. The subsequent section uses Kuhn’s theory to analyse whether there was a paradigm shift in the strategic management literature with the emergence of the resource-based theory. The rest of the paper is devoted to the explanation of the philosophical foundation of the research. The paper terminates with conclusions.

Theoretical Framework: Kuhn’s Theory of Scientific Revolutions

The theoretical framework for the analysis of recent paradigm shifts in strategic management is Thomas Kuhn’s work *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*, which first appeared in 1962. Kuhn’s philosophy replaced the idea of a science-producing algorithm [5]. Kuhn’s views on the philosophy of science were rather different from the vision of his contemporaries – Polanyi’s “mutual trust” and “operationalism” of Bridgman [26]. Kuhn also criticized Popper’s [50] belief on perpetual revolution in science. Kuhn [37] suggested that most of the time a scientific thought has an evolutionary development. He calls this process ‘normal science’. Kuhn [37. P. 10] defines normal science as “research firmly based upon one or more past scientific achievements, achievements that some particular scientific community acknowledges for a time as supplying the foundation for its further practice”. From time to time, scientists come up with revolutionary ideas that change the consciousness of other scientists in the discipline and change the course of normal science. In the natural sciences, for example, such revolutions are related to the discoveries of Copernicus, Einstein, and Darwin.

The Concept of Paradigm

The paradigm plays the central role in Kuhn’s framework. Kuhn [37. P. 175] defines paradigm as “the entire constellation of beliefs, values and techniques, and so on shared by the members of a given community”. Kuhn [37] argued that a paradigm consists of two elements. First, there is a building block consisting of a series of beliefs, which are generally recognized by contemporary scholars. Second, there is a range of research questions answered with the help of a paradigm. Scientific work is ‘puzzle solving’. A paradigm often tells scientists which problems to ignore. Kuhn [37] claimed that paradigms supply researchers with essential knowledge on how to conduct research, provide theories, and methods, and show the direction for scientific exploration. In his work Kuhn [37] reflected on whether a new paradigm is objectively better

than the old one. The answer is no. Paradigms cannot be compared in this way. The theory presupposes that scientists within different paradigms are living in different worlds.

The general support of the paradigm by the scientific community in a given discipline is one of the features of the paradigm. However, in some disciplines, especially in the social sciences where different schools may interpret phenomena in their own way, it is almost impossible to consolidate the whole research community under the banner of a single paradigm. Such disciplines are multi-paradigmatic [25]. Kuhn, however, regarded the majority of social scientific fields (except economics) to be in a pre-paradigmatic state since they do not share a single paradigm. Kuhn [37] argued that economists have a common viewpoint on what economics is. Another feature of the paradigm is that it is based on previous research underpinnings.

Kuhn worked with the concept of paradigm during his whole life. In the afterword of his book, *Second Thoughts on Paradigms* [38], Kuhn explains his position regarding paradigms. Kuhn agreed that he used the term paradigm too widely. He suggested dividing the term 'paradigm' into two subsets: "One sense of 'paradigm' is global, embracing all the shared commitments of a scientific group; the other isolates a particularly important sort of commitment and is thus a subset of the first" [38. P. 294]. Kuhn called these subsets as a disciplinary matrix and exemplars. A disciplinary matrix includes following building blocks: equations or symbolic generalisations, instruments, metaphysical assumptions, the area of inquiry, and exemplars [27]. 'Exemplars' is a second meaning of paradigm, and they are examples of actual problems solving. Modern scholars define a paradigm as key viewpoints that direct research [19. P. 245]. Denzin and Lincoln [19] stress that there are also important distinctions between paradigms and perspectives. Although they have much in common, perspectives are not so solidified and integrated as paradigms.

Incommensurability of Paradigms

Thomas Kuhn and Paul Feyerabend introduced the term 'incommensurability' independently in their publications in 1962 [23; 36]. Incommensurability is defined as "a relation of incomparability, or limited comparability, purported to obtain between some pairs of successive or competing scientific theories" [56. P. 370]. Can paradigms be compared? According to Feyrabend [24], theories cannot be compared due to semantic differences. Kuhn [37] assumed that two rival paradigms are usually not commensurable; they cannot be compared objectively on a common scale. This is considered as very controversial in his theory. In Kuhn's view, incommensurability between paradigms occurs both for semantic and non-semantic reasons. The first divergence is due to methodological difference. The second dissimilarity arises on the semantic level when different definitions emerge due to new concepts. Kuhn argued that incommensurability emerges because scientific concepts cannot be understood without the complete knowledge of the theory to which they belong. The third difference is explained by the theory-dependence of research. Kuhn believed that all data are dependent on theories. It is an ideal situation when data are independent on a previous body of knowledge, which is hardly attainable in a real world. There are two reasons for theory-dependence of data. First, all researchers look at scientific problems through the paradigm's lens and professional background. Second, experiments and observation reports contain information and statements that are influenced by theory [46]. In later publications, Kuhn [38] suggested that paradigms are incommensurable due to differences in taxonomic schemes. When the paradigms shift, taxonomic categorisations change. It is difficult to compare two theories because of new terminology and criteria for classification. Guba and Lincoln [30] cautiously concluded that some paradigms are commensurable with each other.

Scientific Revolutions and Normal Science

There are two ways for scientific development: normal and revolutionary. Usually science develops in a linear mode. Kuhn [37] associates normal science with a building to which scholars add bricks to the top. Stones that are different from other bricks and are not suited to the

wall are called ‘anomalies’. The life cycle of one paradigm lasts several decades. In the initial stage, a novel paradigm has a few adaptations. Gradually the paradigm is being tested with regard to various scientific problems; it is fine-tuned and becomes more sophisticated. Even successful paradigms are not always able to answer all questions or to fit all research situations. Thus minor changes to a paradigm are necessary when researchers meet anomalies that are unexplainable within the basic paradigm. Kuhn [37] emphasizes that such adjustments and improvements shall not deviate significantly from the main course of the paradigm. Finally, a paradigm is accepted by the scientific community. Later Cohen [14] has identified four phases of revolution: the first one is “the intellectual revolution”, when a radical idea for solving problems leads to formulating a new research programme. The next stage is loyalty to the research programme. Furthermore, ideas are widely spread through publications. And, finally, resistant fields switch to the new research programme.

The scientific revolution is associated with the totally novel technique of construction. There are five characteristics in Kuhn’s framework of scientific revolutions [35]. First, a new theory that is a product of a new scientific idea explains the main problems in the field better than existing paradigm. Second, a paradigm shift takes place as a result of an emerging new paradigm. Third, an old and a new paradigms are different by at least one key position and they are logically not compatible. Fourth, with a paradigm shift a scientific revolution brings out new research questions and new ways of solving the puzzles. Fifth, after a scientific revolution normal science loses its usual way and moves into a new path. Scientific revolutions bring both losses and gains. It is often the case that a new paradigm fails to solve puzzles that an old paradigm could explain.

Kuhn’s conception changed the field of philosophy of science and greatly influenced further research in this area. However, Kuhn’s views have been criticised from at least two different positions. First, Kuhn’s opponent Karl Popper denied the relevance and existence of normal science. Popper suggested that if Kuhn’s idea of normal science was correct, scientists cannot test cognitive elements of the discipline matrix, they could only presuppose them [27]. Popper believed that only perpetual revolutions in science bring creative ideas that help to solve problems. Second, Kuhn’s concept of normal science makes scientific work ordinary and routine. It is also difficult to agree with Kuhn’s comparison of normal science with puzzle solving. The results of scientific discoveries are not known in advance, however, the results of a puzzle are already known at least to its author.

Analysis of the Theoretical Perspectives Using Kuhn’s Model

Overview of the Theories

Definitions

Resources are broadly defined as the set of assets, capabilities, organisational processes, firm characteristics, information, and knowledge under the firm’s control, allowing the firm to conceive of and realise strategies intended to increase its effectiveness [9]. Since the mid-1980s, the RBV of the firm has been widely viewed as an important strategic management theory. This perspective has been used to explore various phenomena. Key issues relating to the RBV are discussed, in turn, below.

The Resource-Based View of the Firm

Strategic management has been looking for a new paradigm for a certain period of time [57]. The resource-based view of the firm became an important strategic management theory in the mid-1980s. The fundamental background of the resource-based view can be traced back to David Ricardo’s [47] analysis of land rent. He considered the influence of mainly inelastic resources (such as land) on the firm’s rent. The next major development came when Edith

Penrose [54] broadened the concept of resources and proposed viewing a firm as a bundle of resources. A firm “is more than an administrative unit; it is also a collection of productive resources the disposal of which between different uses and over time is determined by administrative decision” [54. P. 24]. Thus, firms are heterogeneous from the resource-based perspective. A distinctive competencies perspective [6; 39] provided the next input into the resource-based view. The distinctive competency is an action that a firm can perform better than competitors and that allows achieving higher efficiency and effectiveness compared to rivals [10; 11; 33]. Thus, it has been admitted by distinctive competency scholars that the sources of competitive advantage are internal in the firm. Distinctive and superior competencies in functional areas (management, marketing, production design, and others) are positively associated with performance [33]. Hitt and Ireland [32] have identified fifty-five distinctive competence attributes in the firm's functional areas. The fourth theory on which the resource-based view is based is the study of antitrust assumptions in economics [10]. The idea of the resource-based view of the firm was further developed by [7; 55; 66]. The resource-based view claims that the sources of sustained competitive advantage of the firm are inside the firm, namely that are the businesses have unique and valuable resources and capabilities that are rare, hard to imitate, imperfectly substitutable, and mobile, and may attain and keep competitive advantage [8; 15; 20; 60; 64]. The resource-based motives are often crucial for a firm's decisions to join collaborative relationships.

Types of resources

Different classifications of resources have been suggested in prior research. A distinction is made between tangible and intangible resources [66]. It has been differentiated between resources and capabilities. It has been argued that strategic capabilities rather than resources enable firms to develop better business structures that promote competitive advantage. However, Barney and Clark [10] noted that such differentiation has not added much to the RBV's essence. Barney [9] argues that there are four categories of resources relating to financial capital, physical resources, human capital, and organisational assets. A distinction is made between financial, physical, managerial, human, organisational, and technological resources. A similar classification to the latter is proposed by Dollinger [20]. He also named six groups of resources, but substituted managerial capital with reputational capital. Management capabilities include production management capability, production-oriented design, marketing management proficiency, human resources management capability, information management capability, and general management capability.

Several researchers categorise resources relating to the barriers to imitability [42]. They argue that resources are grouped into property-based and knowledge-based resource categories. Property-based resources are safeguarded from imitation by property rights, such as patents and contracts. These resources include financial, human, and physical capital. Knowledge-based resources include intangible skills and knowledge. The tacitness of these resources is an obstacle for a firm's rivals to duplicate these assets. It has been argued that property-based resources are more valuable in an established and predictable milieu, while knowledge-based resources favour a firm's competitive advantage in unpredictable and altering environments [42].

Basic assumptions of the RBV

The RBV theory postulates that a firm is a bundle of resources and capabilities. The combination of a set of heterogeneous resources and capabilities in an effective manner can lead to value creation [66], and these resources can be leveraged to ensure competitive advantage [8]. Following Peteraf [48], four resource conditions are necessary to gain competitive advantage. They relate to heterogeneity, imperfect mobility, ex post and ex ante limits to competition. Barney [8] argued that firms achieve and sustain competitive advantage if they have special

resources which have the following fundamental attributes: valuable, that is to be useful in producing goods and services which have demand on the market; rare, meaning that there is a limited availability of such or similar resources and capabilities at competitors; imperfectly imitable, implying that it is difficult or costly to reproduce resources; imperfectly substitutable, that is other resources cannot be suitable or costly to make a product in demand; and imperfectly mobile, meaning that resources cannot be moved physically or relocation will entail high transaction and transfer costs. The concept of value is essential to the resource-based view of the firm [52]. There are three aspects of value relating to 1) perceived use value; 2) total monetary value; and 3) exchange value.

A resource-based view and competitive advantage

Winter [67] argued that formulas for defining the sustained competitive advantage are too generic. Competitive advantage has been defined as special position in an industry or market which a firm achieves due to its actions and only a few competitors are able to do similar actions [9]. Barney [8] asserted that the combination of valuable and rare resources and skills may be a source of competitive advantage, which can promote superior firm performance. This view is illustrated in the Figure. A combination of valuable, rare, inimitable and non-sustainable assets can, therefore, promote sustained competitive advantage and ensure sustained superior firm performance.

A link between resource characteristics, competitive advantage and firm's performance (adapted from Newbert [44])

Causal ambiguity helps to safeguard the firm's competitive advantage by hindering resource imitation by competitors. Tacitness, complexity, and specificity features of resources and skills can increase causal ambiguity. Tacitness [49] indicates that a range of skills is not exactly codifiable and often implicit. Complexity refers to a variety of resources, skills and relations that a firm orchestrates, which make them difficult to imitate as wholeness and move them.

The Knowledge-Based View of the Firm

Knowledge is a philosophical phenomenon that has been studied in various disciplines starting from ancient times (e.g. Plato). Knowledge can be defined as "justified true belief" [45. P. 15]. From a psychological view, various sorts of mental materials are used by humans when making decisions. Mental materials have been generally defined as "experience organised in fairly well-defined patterns" [1. P. 54]. These mental materials are divided into tacit feelings, skills, unconscious tendencies, semantic understanding, and episodic memories [63]. Tacit knowledge [49] is a characteristic of knowledge that lay in the base of one of the most popular classifications of knowledge – the tacit-explicit dichotomy [16].

The knowledge-based view (KBV) is rooted in the resource-based view of the firm [18; 29]. At present it has also disseminated to other fields as well, especially to information systems research [4]. Currently the KBV is considered as a separate perspective and forms the resource-

based theory together with the dynamic capabilities perspective, and the relational view [4]. The importance of considering the knowledge-based view as a separate view is explained by the special status of knowledge assets. It is believed that the major productive resource of the firm is its knowledge [28; 59]. Grant and Baden-Fuller [29] argued that the emerging knowledge-based view of the firm provides new horizons for management research. Knowledge acquisition is one of the important goals and outcomes of a firm's activity. It has been argued that knowledge is the major productive resource of the firm [28]. Knowledge-based view is especially popular in studies of interfirm collaboration [12; 62]. Hamel [31] has defined collaboration as "a race to learn" (p. 85). In the same vein, Child et al. [13] argue that organisational learning in all its aspects is a driver in collaboration relationships. Nevertheless, as Eisenhardt and Schoonhoven [22] noted, the process of learning from the inter-firm collaboration is not always smooth, and although alliances give an opportunity for firms to learn, considerable research advises that acquiring resources from collaboration may be lengthy and costly.

The Dynamic Capabilities Perspective

Another important extension of the resource-based view is the dynamic capabilities perspective [64]. The dynamic capabilities view appeared as a response to criticism of the RBV for rigidity and inability to explain the difference in performance of firms with similar resource foundations. The resource-based view has also been criticised for failing to explain why possessing certain idiosyncratic resources leads to a competitive advantage [52]. Critics of the resource-based approach have pointed out its static nature. Observations also show that in dynamic environments some firms are better able to get economic rents than others [64]. Dynamic capabilities are defined as "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 are thus the organisational and strategic routines by which firms achieve new resource configurations as markets emerge, collide, split, evolve, and die" [21. P. 1107]. There are three main groups of dynamic capabilities: adaptive capability, innovative capability, and absorptive capability [65]. As for the research within collaboration, alliancing, i.e., ability to get new resources from other firms, is named as one of the key dynamic capabilities [61]. Other dynamic capabilities of the firms include knowledge creation procedures and strategic decision-making [21].

Discussion

Kuhn [38] identified some characteristics for the evaluation of scientific theories. They are accuracy, broad scope, simplicity, fruitfulness, and consistency. McMullin [41] categorised virtues of a good theory into internal virtues (simplicity, internal consistency, and internal coherence), contextuality (external consistency, consonance), and diachronicity (fertility, consilience, and durability). Furthermore, he suggested that a theory must have an explanatory power and empirical fit. Holmstrom and Tirole [34. P. 65] claimed that a good theory of the firm must answer two important questions: (1) why firms exist, and, (2) what affects firms' scale and scope.

Kuhn [38] postulates that the new paradigm is always based on previous research, but at least one postulate in a novel paradigm is different from previous ones. Conner [18] compared the resource-based view with five schools of industrial economics: the neoclassical perfect competition theory, the Bain-type industrial organisation, the Schumpeterian and Chicago schools, and the transaction costs economics. She concluded that the RBV has common aspects with each of these theories and at the same time is fundamentally distinct from its predecessors. Hence, one of the prerequisites for the resource-based view to be considered as a paradigm in the Kuhnian framework is satisfied. However, not all members of the scientific community agree that the RBV is a new theory of the firm. Teece with colleagues [64] pointed out that the resource-based perspective is a compliment to industrial organisation theory.

Kuhn regarded changes and improvements in the development of paradigms as inevitable, but he stressed that alterations should not be significant and deviate far from the core paradigm. The RBV of the firm has also become more sophisticated and capable to better explain competitive advantage and gaining economic rents after the emergence of the dynamic capabilities theory and the knowledge-based view. As has been said, strategic management is in need of a new paradigm [57]. The discipline has no dominating paradigm yet. The resource-based paradigm definitely pushed an industrial organisation paradigm from its leading position within strategic management research. The RBV with its extensions has every chance of becoming an established paradigm.

Kuhn wrote that one of the signs of a paradigm is the presence of theories belonging to the paradigm in textbooks. In fact, the resource-driven approach is widely represented in strategy textbooks (e.g. [9; 20; 28]). There are numerous papers and dissertations based on the resource-based view. However, the RBV research is not mature yet, and it is still lacking with regard to empirical research [65]. In the same time, for a theory that is in its early stages of development, the lack of empirical fit is quite acceptable. Nonetheless, in later stages of the theory's evolution such inconsistency might be a basis for anomalies [41]. During the paradigm shift period, there are hot debates between the proponents of the old paradigm and the new paradigm. The resource-based view is criticised for being underdeveloped as a theory of strategic management [52; 53]. However, other scientists defend the RBV as a new theory of the firm [8; 17].

The resource-based view is heavily grounded on previous research, especially on E. Penrose's [47] work. Analysing the resource-based view through the lens of characteristics of scientific revolutions in Kuhn's framework, it is possible to conclude as follows. First, the resource-based theory with the knowledge-based view and the dynamic capabilities perspective proposes some better explanations of competitive advantage and economic rents than industrial organisation theories. Second, the use of the resource-based theory with extensions is extremely popular in strategic management literature. However, older industrial organisation theories are also exploited in recent research. In other words, there are no signs that the resource and the knowledge-based view and the dynamic capabilities perspective have completely replaced the old paradigms. As for compatibility of the resource-based theory and older paradigms, this requirement is satisfied: the resource-based view is at least on one point different from the industrial organisation theories [17]. Therefore, the resource-based perspective with the new extensions – the dynamic capabilities view and the knowledge-based view – is a novel theory of the firm. However, it cannot pretend to be a single theory of strategic management that is a multi-paradigmatic field. It seems that the scientific change in strategic management occurred in an evolutionary way. Three theories (the RBV, the knowledge-based view, and the dynamic capabilities view) are compatible since the two latter perspectives have their source in the RBV.

Conclusions

The paper has taken a close look at the resource-based view, the dynamic capabilities perspective, and the knowledge-based view. The paper sets out the first task: to explore whether the resource-based theory of the firm is a new paradigm in strategic management. In order to understand whether the resource-based theory is a new theory or an extension of existing paradigms, the Kuhnian framework of scientific revolutions has been applied. Thomas Kuhn developed important concepts in the philosophy of science: the concept of paradigm, normal science and scientific revolutions, and incommensurability of paradigms. The discipline of the philosophy of science has changed after Kuhn's book was published.

There are still debates between proponents of the resource-based theory and their rivals on whether this theory is something novel. In conclusion, it is possible to say that the resource-based view with its complementarities – the knowledge-based view and the dynamic capabilities approach – is one of the dominating paradigms in the discipline at the present; however, it is not mature yet. The resource-based theory emerged in an evolutionary mode. It can be

named a new paradigm of strategic management, but not the only one within the field. The emergence of the resource-based theory has changed a normal way of science. A great number of publications in strategic management literature based on this theoretical foundation have appeared.

References

1. Maltsev A. I. A. Est' li budushchee u eksternalistskoy traktovki izucheniya istorii ekonomicheskoy mysli? [Is there a future for the externalist approach to studying the history of economic thought?]. *Izvestiya Uralskogo gosudarstvennogo ekonomicheskogo universiteta – Journal of the Ural State University of Economics*, 2017, no. 6 (74), pp. 64–76.
2. Abercrombie M. L. J. *The Anatomy of Judgment: An Investigation into the Processes of Perception and Reasoning*. L.: Hutchinson, 1960.
3. Abreu Pederzini G. D. Strategic Management Cultures: Historical Connections with Science. *Journal of Management History*, 2016, vol. 22, no. 2, pp. 214–235.
4. Acedo F. J., Barroso C., Galan J. L. The Resource-Based Theory: Dissemination and Main Trends. *Strategic Management Journal*, 2006, vol. 27, no. 7, pp. 621–636.
5. Agassi J. The Philosophy of Science Today. In: Shanker S. G. (ed.) *Philosophy of Science, Logic and Mathematics in the Twentieth Century*. L., N. Y.: Routledge, 1996, pp. 235–265.
6. Ansoff H. I. *Corporate Strategy: An Analytic Approach to Business Policy for Growth and Expansion*. N. Y.: McGraw-Hill, 1965.
7. Barney J. B. Strategic Factor Markets: Expectations, Luck and Business Strategy. *Management Science*, 1986, vol. 32, no. 10, pp. 1231–1241.
8. Barney J. B. Special Theory Forum. The Resource-Based View of the Firm: Origins, Implications and Prospects. *Journal of Management*, 1991, vol. 17, no. 1, pp. 97–98.
9. Barney J. B. *Gaining and Sustaining Competitive Advantage*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall, 2002.
10. Barney J. B., Clark D. N. *Resource-Based Theory: Creating and Sustaining Competitive Advantage*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007.
11. Borch O. J., Solesvik M. Innovation on the Open Sea: Examining Competence Transfer and Open Innovation in the Design of Offshore Vessels. *Technology Innovation Management Review*, 2015, vol. 5, no. 9, pp. 17–22.
12. Borch O. J., Solesvik M. Partner Selection versus Partner Attraction in R&D Strategic Alliances: The Case of the Norwegian Shipping Industry. *International Journal of Technology Marketing*, 2016, vol. 11, no. 4, pp. 421–439.
13. Child J., Faulkner D., Tallman S. B. *Cooperative Strategy: Managing Alliances, Networks, and Joint Ventures*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005.
14. Cohen I. B. *Revolution in Science*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1985.
15. Combs J. G., Ketchen D. J. Explaining Interfirm Cooperation and Performance: Toward a Reconciliation of Predictions from the Resource-Based View and Organizational Economics. *Strategic Management Journal*, 1999, vol. 20, no. 9, pp. 867–888.
16. Connel N. A. D., Klein J. D., Powell P. L. It's Tacit Knowledge but as We Know It: Redirecting the Search for Knowledge. *Journal of the Operational Research Society*, 2003, vol. 54, no. 2, pp. 140–152.
17. Conner K. R. A Historical Comparison of Resource-Based Theory and Five Schools of Thought within Industrial Organization Economics: Do We Have a New Theory of the Firm? *Journal of Management*, 1991, vol. 17, no. 1, pp. 121–154.
18. Conner K. R., Prahalad C. K. A Resource-Based Theory of the Firm: Knowledge versus Opportunism. *Organization Science*, 1996, vol. 7, no. 5, pp. 477–501.
19. Denzin N. K., Lincoln Y. S. *The Landscape of Qualitative Research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, 2008.

20. Dollinger M. J. *Entrepreneurship: Strategies and Resources*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall, 2003.
21. Eisenhardt K. M., Martin J. A. Dynamic Capabilities: What are They? *Strategic Management Journal*, 2000, vol. 21, no. 10-11, pp. 1105–1121.
22. Eisenhardt K. M., Schoonhoven C. B. Resource-Based View of Strategic Alliance Formation: Strategic and Social Effects in Entrepreneurial Firms. *Organization Science*, 1996, vol. 7, no. 2, pp. 136–150.
23. Feyerabend P. K. Explanation, Reduction and Empiricism. In: Feigl H., Maxwell G. (eds.) *Scientific Explanation, Space, and Time* (Minnesota Studies in the Philosophy of Science, Volume III). Minneapolis: University of Minneapolis Press, 1962, pp. 28–97.
24. Feyerabend P. K. An Attempt at a Realistic Interpretation of Experience. In: *Realism, Rationalism and Scientific Method. Vol. 1. Philosophical Papers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981, pp. 44–96.
25. Friedrichs R. W. *A Sociology of Sociology*. N. Y.: Free Press, 1970.
26. Fuller S. Science & Technology Studies and the Philosophy of Social Sciences. In: Turner S. P., Roth P. A. (eds.) *The Blackwell Guide to the Philosophy of the Social Sciences*. Malden, MA: Blackwell, 2003, pp. 207–233.
27. Grandy R. 'Thomas Kuhn'. In: Sarkar S., Pfeifer J. (eds.) *The Philosophy of Science: An Encyclopaedia*. N. Y.: Routledge, 2006, pp. 419–431.
28. Grant R. M. *Contemporary Strategy Analysis*. Oxford: Blackwell, 2005.
29. Grant R., Baden-Fuller C. A Knowledge Accessing Theory of Strategic Alliances. *Journal of Management Studies*, 2004, vol. 41, no. 1, pp. 61–84.
30. Guba E. G., Lincoln Y. S. Paradigmatic Controversies, Contradictions, and Emerging confluences. In: Denzin N. K., Lincoln Y. S. (eds.) *The Landscape of Qualitative Research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, 2008, pp. 255–286.
31. Hamel G. Competition for Competence and Inter-Partner Learning within International Strategic Alliances. *Strategic Management Journal*, 1991, vol. 12, no. 4, pp. 83–103.
32. Hitt M. A., Ireland R. D. Corporate Distinctive Competence, Strategy, Industry and Performance. *Strategic Management Journal*, 1985, vol. 6, no. 3, pp. 273–293.
33. Hitt M. A., Ireland R. D. Relationships among Corporate Level Distinctive Competencies, Diversification Strategy, Corporate Structure and Performance. *Journal of Management Studies*, 1986, vol. 23, no. 4, pp. 401–416.
34. Holmstrom B., Tirole J. The Theory of the Firm. In: Schmalensee R., Willig R. (eds.) *Handbook of Industrial Organization*. Amsterdam: Elsevier Science Publ., 1989, pp. 61–133.
35. Johannessen K. S. *Traditions and Schools in Modern Philosophy of Science*. Bergen: Sigma, 1985.
36. Kuhn T. S. *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1962.
37. Kuhn T. S. *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1970.
38. Kuhn T. S. *The Essential Tension: Selected Studies in Scientific Tradition and Change*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1977.
39. Learned E. P., Christensen C. R., Andrews K. R., Guth W. D. *Business Policy: Text and Cases*. Homewood, IL: Richard D. Irwin, 1969.
40. Mir R., Watson A. Strategic Management and the Philosophy of Science: The Case for a Constructivist Methodology. *Strategic Management Journal*, 2000, vol. 21, no. 9, pp. 941–953.
41. McMullin E. The Virtues of a Good Theory. In: Psillos S., Curd M. (eds.) *The Routledge Companion to Philosophy of Science*. L.; N. Y.: Routledge, 2008, pp. 498–508.
42. Miller D., Shamsie J. The Resource-Based View of the Firm in Two Environments: The Hollywood Film Studios from 1936 to 1965. *Academy of Management Journal*, 1996, vol. 39, no. 3, pp. 519–543.

43. Mintzberg H., Ahlstrand B., Lampel J. *Strategy Safari: A Guided Tour through the Wilds of Strategic Management*. N. Y.: Free Press, 1998.
44. Newbert S. L. Empirical Research on the Resource-Based View of the Firm: An Assessment and Suggestions for Future Research. *Strategic Management Journal*, 2007, vol. 28, no. 2, pp. 121–146.
45. Nonaka I., Toyama R. Why Do Firms Differ? The Theory of the Knowledge-Creating Firm. In: Ichijo K., Nonaka I. (eds.) *Knowledge Creation and Management: New Challenges for Managers*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007, pp. 13–31.
46. Okasha S. *Philosophy of Science: A Very Short Introduction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002.
47. Penrose E. *The Theory of the Growth of the Firm*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1959.
48. Peteraf M. A. The Cornerstones of Competitive Advantage: A Resource-Based View. *Strategic Management Journal*, 1993, vol. 14, no. 3, pp. 179–191.
49. Polanyi M. *The Tacit Dimension*. Garden City, NY: Anchor, 1967.
50. Popper K. R. *The Logic of Scientific Discovery*. L.: Hutchinson, 1959.
51. Porter M. *Competitive Advantage*. N. Y.: Free Press, 1980.
52. Priem R. L., Butler J. E. Is the Resource-Based “View” a Useful Perspective for Strategic Management Research? *Academy of Management Review*, 2001, vol. 26, no. 1, pp. 22–40.
53. Priem R. L., Butler J. E. Tautology in the Resource-Based View and the Implications of Externally Determined Resource Value: Further Comments. *Academy of Management Review*, 2001, vol. 26, no. 1, pp. 57–66.
54. Ricardo D. *Principles of Political Economy and Taxation*. L.: J. Murray, 1817.
55. Rumelt R. Towards a Strategic Theory of the Firm. In: Lamb R. (ed.) *Competitive Strategic Management*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall, 1984, pp. 556–570.
56. Sankey H. Incommensurability. In: Sarkar S., Pfeifer J. (eds.) *The Philosophy of Science: An Encyclopaedia*. N. Y.: Routledge, 2006, pp. 370–373.
57. Schendel D. Introduction to the Summer 1994 Special Issue – Strategy: Search for New Paradigms. *Strategic Management Journal*, vol. 15, Special Issue: Strategy: Search for New Paradigms, 1994, pp. 1–4.
58. Solesvik M. Hybrid Entrepreneurship: Definitions, Types and Directions for Future Research. *The Manager*, 2017, no. 4 (68), pp. 2–13.
59. Solesvik M. Functioning of SMEs, Cooperative Models and Management of Human Resources: Editorial. *Forum Scientiae Oeconomia*, 2017a, vol. 5, no. 3, pp. 5–7.
60. Solesvik M. The Triple Helix Model for Regional Development and Innovation: Context of Nordic Countries. *Forum Scientiae Oeconomia*, 2017b, vol. 5, no. 4, pp. 5–21.
61. Solesvik M. Effectuation, Causation and Firm-Level Radical Innovation in Entrepreneurial Firms. Paper presented at the 4th International Conference “GSOM Emerging Markets Conference 2017”, 5–7 October 2017, St. Petersburg, Russia.
62. Solesvik M., Westhead P. Partner Selection for Strategic Alliances: Case Study Insights from the Maritime Industry. *Industrial Management & Data Systems*, 2010, vol. 110, no. 6, pp. 841–860.
63. Sparrow J. *Knowledge in Organizations: Access to Thinking at Work*. L.: Sage, 1998.
64. Teece D. J., Pisano G., Shuen A. Dynamic Capabilities and Strategic Management. *Strategic Management Journal*, 1997, vol. 18, no. 7, pp. 509–533.
65. Wang C. L., Ahmed P. Dynamic Capabilities: A Review and Research Agenda. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, 2007, vol. 9, no. 1, pp. 31–51.
66. Wernerfelt B. A Resource-Based View of the Firm. *Strategic Management Journal*, 1984, vol. 5, no. 2, pp. 171–180.
67. Winter S. G. Understanding Dynamic Capabilities. *Strategic Management Journal*, 2003, vol. 24, no. 10, pp. 991–995.

Взлет и падение ресурсной теории фирмы: смена парадигмы в стратегическом управлении

Марина Солевик

Статья представляет собой научный обзор и посвящена исследованию вопроса о том, является ли ресурсная теория фирмы и ее ответвления – теория динамических способностей и знаниевая теория фирмы – новыми теориями фирмы или лишь дополнением к существующим теориям. Методологической основой работы послужила теория научных революций Томаса Куна, которая значительно поспособствовала развитию философии науки и включает такие элементы как концепцию парадигмы, нормальную науку и научные революции, и несоизмеримость парадигм. На основании взглядов теория научных революций Куна в данной статье анализируются новые парадигмы стратегического менеджмента. Проведен научный обзор основных концептуальных положений ресурсной теории фирмы, теории динамических способностей и знаниевая теория фирмы. Результаты исследования показывают, что стратегическое управление является мультипарадигматической дисциплиной. Критический анализ также демонстрирует, что ресурсная теория фирмы представляет собой новую, хотя и не доминирующую, парадигму стратегического управления. Исследование будет полезно ученым, занимающимся теорией фирмы, вопросами стратегического управления.

Ключевые слова: ресурсная теория фирмы; знаниевая теория фирмы; теория динамических способностей; парадигма; история экономических учений.

Источники:

1. Мальцев Ал. А. Есть ли будущее у экстерналистской трактовки изучения истории экономической мысли? // Известия Уральского государственного экономического университета. 2017. № 6 (74). С. 64–76.
2. Abercombie M. L. J. The Anatomy of Judgment: An Investigation into the Processes of Perception and Reasoning. L.: Hutchinson, 1960.
3. Abreu Pederzini G. D. Strategic Management Cultures: Historical Connections with Science // Journal of Management History. 2016. Vol. 22, no. 2. Pp. 214–235.
4. Acedo F. J., Barroso C., Galan J. L. The Resource-Based Theory: Dissemination and Main Trends // Strategic Management Journal. 2006. Vol. 27, no. 7. Pp. 621–636.
5. Agassi J. The Philosophy of Science Today // Philosophy of Science, Logic and Mathematics in the Twentieth Century / ed. by S. G. Shanker. L., N. Y.: Routledge, 1996. Pp. 235–265.
6. Ansoff H. I. Corporate Strategy: An Analytic Approach to Business Policy for Growth and Expansion. N. Y.: McGraw-Hill, 1965.
7. Barney J. B. Strategic Factor Markets: Expectations, Luck and Business Strategy // Management Science. 1986. Vol. 32, no. 10. Pp. 1231–1241.
8. Barney J. B. Special Theory Forum. The Resource-Based View of the Firm: Origins, Implications and Prospects // Journal of Management. 1991. Vol. 17, no. 1. Pp. 97–98.
9. Barney J. B. Gaining and Sustaining Competitive Advantage. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall, 2002.
10. Barney J. B., Clark D. N. Resource-Based Theory: Creating and Sustaining Competitive Advantage. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007.
11. Borch O. J., Solesvik M. Innovation on the Open Sea: Examining Competence Transfer and Open Innovation in the Design of Offshore Vessels // Technology Innovation Management Review. 2015. Vol. 5, no. 9. Pp. 17–22.
12. Borch O. J., Solesvik M. Partner Selection versus Partner Attraction in R&D Strategic Alliances: The Case of the Norwegian Shipping Industry // International Journal of Technology Marketing. 2016. Vol. 11, no. 4. Pp. 421–439.
13. Child J., Faulkner D., Tallman S. B. Cooperative Strategy: Managing Alliances, Networks, and Joint Ventures. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005.
14. Cohen I. B. Revolution in Science. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1985.
15. Combs J. G., Ketchen D. J. Explaining Interfirm Cooperation and Performance: Toward a Reconciliation of Predictions from the Resource-Based View and Organizational Economics // Strategic Management Journal. 1999. Vol. 20, no. 9. Pp. 867–888.
16. Connel N. A. D., Klein J. D., Powell P. L. It's Tacit Knowledge but as We Know It: Redirecting the Search for Knowledge // Journal of the Operational Research Society. 2003. Vol. 54, no. 2. Pp. 140–152.

17. Conner K. R. A Historical Comparison of Resource-Based Theory and Five Schools of Thought within Industrial Organization Economics: Do We Have a New Theory of the Firm? // *Journal of Management*. 1991. Vol. 17, no. 1. Pp. 121–154.
18. Conner K. R., Prahalad C. K. A Resource-Based Theory of the Firm: Knowledge versus Opportunism // *Organization Science*. 1996. Vol. 7, no. 5. Pp. 477–501.
19. Denzin N. K., Lincoln Y. S. *The Landscape of Qualitative Research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, 2008.
20. Dollinger M. J. *Entrepreneurship: Strategies and Resources*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall, 2003.
21. Eisenhardt K. M., Martin J. A. Dynamic Capabilities: What are They? // *Strategic Management Journal*. 2000. Vol. 21, no. 10–11. Pp. 1105–1121.
22. Eisenhardt K. M., Schoonhoven C. B. Resource-Based View of Strategic Alliance Formation: Strategic and Social Effects in Entrepreneurial Firms // *Organization Science*. 1996. Vol. 7, no. 2. Pp. 136–150.
23. Feyerabend P. K. *Explanation, Reduction and Empiricism* // *Scientific Explanation, Space, and Time* (Minnesota Studies in the Philosophy of Science, Volume III) / ed. by H. Feigl, G. Maxwell. Minneapolis: University of Minneapolis Press, 1962. Pp. 28–97.
24. Feyerabend P. K. *An Attempt at a Realistic Interpretation of Experience* // *Realism, Rationalism and Scientific Method*. Vol. 1. Philosophical Papers. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981. Pp. 44–96.
25. Friedrichs R. W. *A Sociology of Sociology*. N. Y.: Free Press, 1970.
26. Fuller S. *Science & Technology Studies and the Philosophy of Social Sciences* // *The Blackwell Guide to the Philosophy of the Social Sciences* / ed. by S. P. Turner, P. A. Roth., Malden, MA: Blackwell, 2003. Pp. 207–233.
27. Grandy R. 'Thomas Kuhn' // *The Philosophy of Science: An Encyclopaedia* / ed. by S. Sarkar, J. Pfeifer. N. Y.: Routledge, 2006. Pp. 419–431.
28. Grant R. M. *Contemporary Strategy Analysis*. Oxford: Blackwell, 2005.
29. Grant R., Baden-Fuller C. A Knowledge Accessing Theory of Strategic Alliances // *Journal of Management Studies*. 2004. Vol. 41, no. 1. Pp. 61–84.
30. Guba E. G., Lincoln Y. S. Paradigmatic Controversies, Contradictions, and Emerging confluences // *The Landscape of Qualitative Research* / ed. by N. K. Denzin, Y. S. Lincoln. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, 2008. Pp. 255–286.
31. Hamel G. Competition for Competence and Inter-Partner Learning within International Strategic Alliances // *Strategic Management Journal*. 1991. Vol. 12, no. 4. Pp. 83–103.
32. Hitt M. A., Ireland R. D. Corporate Distinctive Competence, Strategy, Industry and Performance // *Strategic Management Journal*. 1985. Vol. 6, no. 3. Pp. 273–293.
33. Hitt M. A., Ireland R. D. Relationships among Corporate Level Distinctive Competencies, Diversification Strategy, Corporate Structure and Performance // *Journal of Management Studies*. 1986. Vol. 23, no. 4. Pp. 401–416.
34. Holmstrom B., Tirole J. *The Theory of the Firm* // *Handbook of Industrial Organization* / ed. by R. Schmalensee, R. Willig. Amsterdam: Elsevier Science Publ., 1989. Pp. 61–133.
35. Johannessen K. S. *Traditions and Schools in Modern Philosophy of Science*. Bergen: Sigma, 1985.
36. Kuhn T. S. *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1962.
37. Kuhn T. S. *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1970.
38. Kuhn T. S. *The Essential Tension: Selected Studies in Scientific Tradition and Change*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1977.
39. *Business Policy: Text and Cases* / E. P. Learned, C. R. Christensen, K. R. Andrews, W. D. Guth. Homewood, IL: Richard D. Irwin, 1969.
40. Mir R., Watson A. Strategic Management and the Philosophy of Science: The Case for a Constructivist Methodology // *Strategic Management Journal*. 2000. Vol. 21, no. 9. Pp. 941–953.
41. McMullin E. The Virtues of a Good Theory // *The Routledge Companion to Philosophy of Science* / ed. by S. Psillos, M. Curd. L.; N. Y.: Routledge, 2008. Pp. 498–508.
42. Miller D., Shamsie J. The Resource-Based View of the Firm in Two Environments: The Hollywood Film Studios from 1936 to 1965 // *Academy of Management Journal*. 1996. Vol. 39, no. 3. Pp. 519–543.
43. Mintzberg H., Ahlstrand B., Lampel J. *Strategy Safari: A Guided Tour through the Wilds of Strategic Management*. N. Y.: Free Press, 1998.
44. Newbert S. L. Empirical Research on the Resource-Based View of the Firm: An Assessment and Suggestions for Future Research // *Strategic Management Journal*. 2007. Vol. 28, no. 2. Pp. 121–146.

45. Nonaka I., Toyama R. Why Do Firms Differ? The Theory of the Knowledge-Creating Firm // Knowledge Creation and Management: New Challenges for Managers / ed. by K. Ichijo, I. Nonaka. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007. Pp. 13–31.
46. Okasha S. Philosophy of Science: A Very Short Introduction. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002.
47. Penrose E. The Theory of the Growth of the Firm. Oxford: Blackwell, 1959.
48. Peteraf M. A. The Cornerstones of Competitive Advantage: A Resource-Based View // Strategic Management Journal. 1993. Vol. 14, no. 3. Pp. 179–191.
49. Polanyi M. The Tacit Dimension. Garden City, NY: Anchor, 1967.
50. Popper K. R. The Logic of Scientific Discovery. L.: Hutchinson, 1959.
51. Porter M. Competitive Advantage. N. Y.: Free Press, 1980.
52. Priem R. L., Butler J. E. Is the Resource-Based “View” a Useful Perspective for Strategic Management Research? // Academy of Management Review. 2001. Vol. 26, no. 1. Pp. 22–40.
53. Priem R. L., Butler J. E. Tautology in the Resource-Based View and the Implications of Externally Determined Resource Value: Further Comments // Academy of Management Review. 2001. Vol. 26, no. 1. Pp. 57–66.
54. Ricardo D. Principles of Political Economy and Taxation. L.: J. Murray, 1817.
55. Rumelt R. Towards a Strategic Theory of the Firm // Competitive Strategic Management / ed. by R. Lamb. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall, 1984. Pp. 556–570.
56. Sankey H. Incommensurability // The Philosophy of Science: An Encyclopaedia / ed. by S. Sarkar, J. Pfeifer. N. Y.: Routledge, 2006. Pp. 370–373.
57. Schendel D. Introduction to the Summer 1994 Special Issue – Strategy: Search for New Paradigms // Strategic Management Journal. 1994. Vol. 15, Special Issue: Strategy: Search for New Paradigms. Pp. 1–4.
58. Solesvik M. Hybrid Entrepreneurship: Definitions, Types and Directions for Future Research // Управление. 2017. №4(68). С. 2–13.
59. Solesvik M. Functioning of SMEs, Cooperative Models and Management of Human Resources: Editorial // Forum Scientiae Oeconomia. 2017a. Vol. 5, no. 3. Pp. 5–7.
60. Solesvik M. The Triple Helix Model for Regional Development and Innovation: Context of Nordic Countries // Forum Scientiae Oeconomia. 2017b. Vol. 5, no. 4. Pp. 5–21.
61. Solesvik M. Effectuation, Causation and Firm-Level Radical Innovation in Entrepreneurial Firms. Paper presented at the 4th International Conference “GSOM Emerging Markets Conference 2017” (5–7 October 2017, St. Petersburg, Russia).
62. Solesvik M., Westhead P. Partner Selection for Strategic Alliances: Case Study Insights from the Maritime Industry // Industrial Management & Data Systems. 2010. Vol. 110, no. 6. Pp. 841–860.
63. Sparrow J. Knowledge in Organizations: Access to Thinking at Work. L.: Sage, 1998.
64. Teece D. J., Pisano G., Shuen A. Dynamic Capabilities and Strategic Management // Strategic Management Journal. 1997. Vol. 18, no. 7. Pp. 509–533.
65. Wang C. L., Ahmed P. Dynamic Capabilities: A Review and Research Agenda // International Journal of Management Reviews. 2007. Vol. 9, no. 1. Pp. 31–51.
66. Wernerfelt B. A Resource-Based View of the Firm // Strategic Management Journal. 1984. Vol. 5, no. 2. Pp. 171–180.
67. Winter S. G. Understanding Dynamic Capabilities // Strategic Management Journal. 2003. Vol. 24 no. 10. Pp. 991–995.

Сведения об авторе:

М. Солевик, д-р философии, проф.
морских инноваций и менеджмента
Контактный телефон: +47 48 133 882
e-mail: mzs@hvl.no

Бизнес-школа Университета Норд
Норвегия, 8049 Будо, п/я 1490

Ссылка для цитирования: Solesvik M. The Rise and Fall of the Resource-Based View: Paradigm Shift in Strategic Management // Известия Уральского государственного экономического университета. 2018. Т. 19, № 4. С. 5–18. DOI: 10.29141/2073-1019-2018-19-4-1

For citation: Solesvik M. The Rise and Fall of the Resource-Based View: Paradigm Shift in Strategic Management Izvestiya Uralskogo gosudarstvennogo ekonomicheskogo universiteta – Journal of the Ural State University of Economics, 2018, vol. 19, no. 4, pp. 5–18. DOI: 10.29141/2073-1019-2018-19-4-1