

COURSE SYLLABUS

MARK-L20001 Historical Approaches to Business Research (6 ECTS cr.)

Course title:	<i>Historical Approaches to Business Research</i>
Credits:	6 ECTS
Target Group:	Doctoral students in any major interested in historical research
Grading:	Fail/Pass
Format:	Block seminar course, 3 seminar days (7.-9. March, 2023)
Timing:	Period 5, Spring term 2023
Language:	English
Faculty:	<i>Prof. Henrikki Tikkanen, A. I. Virtanen Professor of Consumer Research, Professor of Business Administration in Marketing, Aalto University School of Business, Helsinki, Finland</i> <i>Dr. Antti Sihvonen, lecturer, Jyväskylä University School of Business and Economics, Finland</i> To register for the course, register at Sisu (Aalto students) or email henrikki.tikkanen@aalto.fi (also for questions regarding the course)

Introduction and Positioning of the Course

The research field of management and organizational history started to emerge in the late 1980s and the early 1990s at the intersection of economic and business history on the one hand, and management and organizational studies (MOS) on the other. The immediate aim was to bring 'historical consciousness' back to the ever larger and dominant field of MOS, essentially beleaguered by ahistorical, positivist and essentialist approaches to the study of organizations and their management (Booth and Rowlinson 2006). A pivotal starting point was that when treated ahistorically, organization and management theory and its related constructs become:

“...timeless and eternal, changeless despite the passage of time and context. Or, when theory is assumed to be universally applicable it gets used irrespective of factors such as differences in specific organizational context, culture or other sociopolitical contingencies.” (Weatherbee et al. 2012, 205)

The real-life historical complexities of persons, actions and events tend to be methodologically reduced to simplified 'dummy' variables. There have been similar developments in many areas of history in general, as traditional narrative approaches have been gradually losing out since the 1970s to cliometrics-dominated economic history on the one hand and the increasing use of multivariate

analysis in social and political history on the other (Weatherbee et al. 2012, 209). As Mills et al. (2016, 74) bluntly state in their recent reappraisal of the 'historic turn', whereas there is evidence of an increasing interest in the integration of history into organizational research, this "has not produced a true "paradigm shift". In general, however, there is a growing tendency to adopt historical approaches in research on strategy, management, leadership and organizations, as evidenced in recent history-related special issues in prominent journals such as the *Strategic Management Journal* (Argyres et al. 2020) and the *Academy of Management Review* (Godfrey et al. 2016). Moreover, similar developments have occurred in marketing, entrepreneurship, international business, finance and accounting, too.

All in all, researchers in business administration seem to have more and more interest towards historical approaches in general. Thus, it is opportune to offer a doctoral course focused on what various historical approaches can offer to students of business who aim at conducting historical research of their own.

From a wider perspective, the nascent field of management and organizational history incorporates (business) historical studies on the emergence and dissemination of (American) management concepts such as Taylorian Scientific Management, Chandler's widely-referenced historical studies on the birth of the professionally-led, multidivisional (M-form) US corporation, and various influential longitudinal studies on prominent global corporations such as Intel and Cadbury, published in the 1980s. Business historian Alfred Kieser's (1994) seminal paper about the urgent need for more historical analyses in management and organizational research, and Mayer N. Zald's (e.g. 1996) calls for the further integration of the social sciences with the humanities have been identified as key points of departure for expanding the field.

Major venues and outlets in which research in this evolving field could be discussed and published include the long-established Management History (MH) Division of the Academy of Management, emerging sub-groups in other communities such as EGOS (European Group for Organizational Studies), and traditional journals of business history including *Business History Review* (BHR) and *Business History* (BH). The *Journal of Management History* was founded in 1995, and 2006 saw the inauguration of another specialist journal in the field, *Management & Organizational History*. The book *Organizations in Time* (Bucheli and Wadhvani, eds., 2014) also made a substantial contribution to the development of management and organizational history as a separate research field. In other management specialisms, we also have journals such as the *International Journal of Historical Research in Marketing* or *Accounting History*. However, historical approaches in these fields seem to somewhat lag behind management and organizational studies in terms of discourse sophistication.

However, it seems that current scholars in the field have an informed overall picture of the different paradigms or 'theories of History' that have gained ground in historiographical debates in general and in management and organizational history in particular. In an early paper, Rowlinson (2004) identifies three distinct historical perspectives in organizational studies: the factual, the narrative and the archeo-genealogical. Similarly, Üsdiken and Kieser (2004) describe the supplementarist (theory-driven), the integrationist and the reorientationist (phenomenon-driven) approaches to the use of history in this field. Rowlinson, Hassard and Decker (2014), in turn, identify four alternative research approaches to organizational history: corporate history, meaning the construction of a holistic, objectivist narrative of a corporate entity; analytically structured history, involving the narration of theoretically conceptualized structures and events; serial history, using replicable techniques to analyse repeatable facts; and ethnographic history, or the reading of documentary sources "against

the grain". Vaara and Lamberg (2016) specify the realist, the interpretative and the post-structural approaches to the study of history in the field of strategy as practice and process (SAPP) and, finally, Suddaby and Foster (2017) identify four models of history in the literature on organizational change: History-as-Fact, History-as-Power, History-as-Sensemaking and History-as-Rhetoric.

As the above-cited papers imply, many scholars specializing in management and organizational history make a paradigmatic distinction between the traditional realist approach to history on the one hand and a more interpretive, constructivist approach on the other. The most prominent line of division between these approaches is the focus of the former on key historical events as they unfold over time and the causal relationships between them, and the emphasis of the latter on the actions, meaning-making and meaning-giving of historical actors in their situations and contexts. Last but not least, a diverse and fragmented post-structural approach aimed at providing critical/alternative readings of 'historical truths' in given settings has emerged, in line with increased engagement with the linguistic turn and the arrival of the 'post' in both the humanities and the social sciences. (cf. Vaara and Lamberg 2016, 638-639)

Summarizing the state of the research field, Mills et al. (2016, 70-72) put forward the notion of what they call 'polyphonic constitutive historicism'. The main point is to focus on multiple and diverse organizational voices to understand how divergent, often competing interpretations of the past emerge and are used by different actors within and beyond organizations.

Consequently, in an account of how management scholars in general have 'theorized the past', Weatherbee (2012, 204-214) puts forward a broad, interpretive approach that he claims is discernible in a lot of work in the field of management and organizational history. He builds on Rowlinson(2004), for example, in suggesting that from this perspective the past is about stories constructed around 'traces' of the past rather than the interpretation of facts. He also refers to Munslow's argument that the past and history are ontologically dissonant: the past, having gone, is no longer real and can never be reproduced as such through history. According to Munslow, the past and history are interconnected in a discursive process in which the latter is constantly produced and reproduced as

"...a culturally defined discourse of knowledge implicated in the structures of society and conventions of culture, as much as the given product of the past labour of historians" (Munslow 1997, 3).¹

Weatherbee (2012, 206) further summarizes his preferred approach as follows:

"...As we are actors in the world we study, we ourselves are also products of particular historical and sociopolitical contexts. So when we work with traces of the past, we need to understand that our interpretation will be influenced by the conditions of our present context, even as the traces of the past were themselves formed under different ones. We must acknowledge the relational nature of the past, its traces, our interpretations, and the history we engage with, engage in or author. Metaphysical coherency and reflexivity, the separation of past and history, of 'facts' and 'traces', will allow us to avoid epistemic fallacy and the pratfalls of either historical or methodological realism."

¹ Reference: Munslow, A. 1997. Editorial. *Rethinking History*, 1: 1-20. This article does not belong to the readings list of the course.

Thus, proponents of this approach do not contend that the past did not happen, nor do they make a case for 'anything goes' or for historical objective truth. Given that the past remains unrecoverable, we are assigned to work with its 'traces' - whether natural, material or social in nature. Thus,

"...the ordering of these traces and the derivation of meaning from them in the production of a history is first and foremost an interpretive act." ... "...Declarations of 'this is the way it was' or argumentation based on impartial or objective knowledge must fall to the wayside. Accordingly, as this historiography is the result of engagement with traces of the past or representations as found in the MOS canon, it is neither wholly realist nor wholly relativist in account." (Weatherbee 2012, 213)

As to the practical conduct of historical organization studies, in a recent paper, Maclean, Harvey and Clegg (2016) identify five core principles (dual integrity, pluralistic understanding, representational truth, context sensitivity and theoretical fluency). In the perspective of the authors, *dual integrity* specifically underscores the importance of historical veracity and conceptual rigour, extending mutual respect to history and organization studies in uniting the two, such that each discipline informs and enhances the other without either becoming the predominant driver.

Overall, this course thus introduces the participants to the multi-faceted world of how various historical approaches and related historical methodology can be applied to contemporary business research. Thus, the course is both meta-theoretical and pragmatic. Two examples of historical studies conducted by the teachers (one on the evolution of the Nokia corporation, Aspara et al. 2023, and another one on the history of the Helsinki School of Economics/Aalto University School of Business, Tikkanen 2023), are examined more deeply to shed light on conducting historical studies from different paradigmatic and methodological perspectives.

Course Organisation

Prof. Henrikki Tikkanen (henrikki.tikkanen@aalto.fi) is the A.I. Virtanen Professor of Marketing and Consumer Research at Aalto University School of Business in Helsinki, Finland. Henrikki's research has focused on the interface of strategic marketing and management, business model and industry evolution, and management & organizational history. He has published recently in such leading journals such as *Business History*, *Management & Organizational History*, *Scandinavian Economic History Review*, *Strategic Management Journal*, *Journal of Management Studies*, *Journal of Marketing* and *Journal of Service Research*. Henrikki has also been a Professor at Stockholm University, and a visiting professor at ESCP Europe in Paris and at the AIT Asian Institute of Technology in Bangkok. He holds a D.Sc. (Econ. & Bus. Adm.) in international marketing and a Ph.D. in history. You can check out his history doctoral thesis [here](#).

Dr. Antti Sihvonon is a lecturer in strategy and entrepreneurship at Jyväskylä University School of Business and Economics, Finland. He has also been an asst. professor at Karlstad University in Sweden. His research interests concentrate on the organizational and cultural processes of product and market development. His research has been published in journals such as *Journal of Product Innovation Management*, *Journal of Retailing*, *Journal of Business Ethics*, *Marketing Theory*, *Industrial Marketing Management*, and *Innovation: Organization & Management*.

Learning outcomes

Upon completion of the course, students will:

- Understand how the historical method can be applied to the study of diverse topics in business research,
- Understand the development of management & organizational history as a special field of economic and business history,
- Understand how central concepts in strategy, management & organizational studies, marketing, accounting and finance and other business disciplines (e.g. dynamic capabilities, market orientation, the notion of international business etc.) have evolved and how they have been applied in longitudinal/historical research,
- Have the capacity to benchmark their own research ideas to different historical methodologies applied in extant studies (studies discussed in class, and studies reported in some of the articles, e.g. the traditional realist approaches of Lamberg et al. 2021; 2009; Lamberg and Peltoniemi, 2020; Jacobides 2007, interpretive history of Lamberg and Pajunen 2010 or the post-structural approach by Karababa and Ger, 2011).

Learning methods

Sessions

You need to attend the three-day block seminar in March 2023, where some of the course literature is discussed in-depth in five sessions as highlighted below. The course teachers naturally also aim at communicating their key ideas and interpretations of historical research in management studies during the sessions, over and above the readings. If you read the literature indicated below in terms of individual sessions beforehand, you are better equipped to understand and discuss the topics during the sessions. In an ideal case, you have read the entire readings package in advance.

Readings Package

The readings package for this course consists of articles/book chapters listed below under Course Literature.

QAQC Analysis

Students are expected to write QAQC-analyses of **25 of their preferred articles** chosen amongst the listed articles/chapters (deliverable 1). Please write succinctly, preferably no more than half a page per article. The maximum length of this assignment is thus ca. 15-20 pages (Times New Roman, size 12, 1,5-spaced).

QAQC analysis consists of the following steps:

- **Quote:** Select a quote from the paper that summarizes the study, using the words of the author(s).
- **Argument:** Summarize the main argument of the paper in your own words. No more than a few sentences.
- **Question:** Pose a question that you would like to discuss based on the paper.
- **Connection:** Describe how the focal article relates to other articles in the same session. No more than a few sentences.

Learning Diary

Students are expected to complete an independent learning diary (deliverable 2, can be collated to a single document with the above-mentioned QAQC analysis). The learning diary should reflect the overall learning experience from the literature. The maximum length of the learning diary is 10 pages (Times New Roman, size 12, 1,5-spaced).

Guidance on writing a learning diary – some questions to consider

- (1) What did you learn? What was new? Was there something that changed your views? Why? Which themes resonated with you?
- (2) What did you not understand? Which ideas did you resist? Why? What are you still puzzled about?
- (3) What is likely to be relevant in your own future research? How can you apply the knowledge and skills developed on the course in the short, medium and long term?

Student Work Hours

Lectures and exercises 21 hours, personal reading and writing 141 hours (literature summaries and learning diary as deliverables), total 162 hours (i.e. 6 credits)

Assessment Criteria

As the aim of the course is to help doctoral students in developing their understanding of and skills in applying various historical research approaches in business studies, the course is graded fail/pass. Thus, the achieving of this understanding is not seen as a competition. **However, you need to submit the above-mentioned two deliverables to Prof. Tikkanen per e-mail (henrikki.tikkanen@aalto.fi) before the first of June, 2023.** If you submit the deliverables earlier, the professor will read your papers and have the course completion registered for you earlier, too.

Course Sessions and Contents

Tuesday, the 7th of March, 2023

**Session 1: Introduction, History Paradigms (H. Tikkanen) 10:00 – 13:00 (lunch break 13:00-14:00)
Rooms XXXX 10:00-12:00; YYYY 12:00-16:00 (Kandidaattikeskus)**

Introduction and Organization of the Course

Key Concepts and Approaches

Historical Paradigms and Organizational Analysis

General course book:

Bucheli M, Wadhvani RD, eds. 2014. *Organizations in Time: History, Theory, Methods*. Oxford University Press: Oxford. Read at least **CHAPTERS 11-13** (Sources and Methods).

Readings:

Burgelman RA. 2011. Bridging history and reductionism: A key role for longitudinal qualitative research. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 42: 591–601.

Godfrey PC, Hassard J, O'Connor ES, Rowlinson M, Ruef M. 2016. What is organizational history? Toward a synthesis of history and organization studies. *Academy of Management Review*, 41: 590-60

Hansen PE. 2012. Business history: A cultural and narrative approach. *Business History Review*, 86: 693-717.

Hargadon A., Wadhvani, D. (2022) Theorizing with microhistory. *Academy of Management Review*, in press.

Maclean M, Harvey C, Clegg SR. 2016. Conceptualizing historical organization studies. *Academy of Management Review*, 41: 609-632.

Rowlinson M. 2013. Management & organizational history: The continuing historic turn. *Management & Organizational History*, 8: 327-328.

Suddaby R, Foster WH. 2017. History and organizational change. *Journal of Management*, 43: 19-38

Vaara E, Lamberg JA. 2016. Taking historical embeddedness seriously: Three historical approaches to advance strategy process and practice research. *Academy of Management Review*, 41: 633–57.

Session 2: Historical Research in Different Areas of Business Studies (H. Tikkanen), 14:00-16:00

Why and How to Conduct Historical Research in Different Areas of Business Studies?

Historical Studies on Thought (Concepts) and Practices in Different Areas of Business Studies.

Readings:

Argyres NS, De Massis A, Foss NJ, Frattini F, Jones G, Silverman BS. 2020. History-informed strategy research: The promise of history and historical research methods in advancing strategy scholarship. *Strategic Management Journal*, 41. (If you have more interest, see also the full list of papers in this special issue!)

Botez A, Hietanen J, Tikkanen H (2020) Mapping the absence: a theological critique of posthumanist influences in marketing and consumer research. *Journal of Marketing Management*, 36:15-16, 1391-1416, DOI: 10.1080/0267257X.2020.1805491

Buckley PJ. 2020. The role of history in international business: Evidence, research practices, methods and theory. *British Journal of Management*, 32(3): 797-811.

Ghemawat P. 2002. Competition and business strategy in historical perspective. *The Business History Review*, 76(1): 37-74.

Karababa E, Ger G. 2011. Early modern Ottoman coffeehouse culture and the formation of the consumer subject. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 37(5): 737-760.

Lamoreaux NR, Raff DMG, Temin P. 2008. Economic theory and business history, in *The Oxford Handbook of Business History* ed. by Geoffrey G. Jones and Jonathan Zeitlin. Oxford University Press, Oxford.

Miller MH. 2000. The history of finance. An eyewitness account. *The Journal of Applied Corporate Finance*, 13: 8-14.

Perchard A, MacKenzie NG, Decker S, Favero G. 2017. Clio in the business school: Historical approaches in strategy, international business and entrepreneurship. *Business History*, 59: 904–27.

Ryan A, Trumbull G, Tufano P. 2011. A brief postwar history of U.S. consumer finance. *Business History Review*, 85(3): 461-498. doi:10.1017/S0007680511000778

Suddaby R, Coraiola D, Harvey C, Foster W. 2020. History and the micro-foundations of dynamic capabilities. *Strategic Management Journal*, 41(3): 530-556.

Tadajewski M, Jones DGB. 2014. Historical research in marketing theory and practice: a review essay. *Journal of Marketing Management*, 30: 1239-1291.

Walker SP. 2005. Accounting in history, *Accounting Historians Journal*, 32: Article 10. Available at: https://egrove.olemiss.edu/aah_journal/vol32/iss2/10

Wednesday, the 8th of March, 2023

Session 3: Historical Methodologies (H. Tikkanen) 10:00 – 13:00 (lunch break 13:00-14:00) XXXX (Kandidaattikeskus)

An Example of Realist vs. Interpretive Approaches to Organizational History

Read in advance:

https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/00253359.2017.1304709?casa_token=MoNMThKJqOQAAAAA:17-IcnAobvns5bnasYWjefW4nVfA1nTvPuPIHwZSyVrkZbRpD_Lknn3_k367nd33xBOhTEElisz4w

https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/00253359.2018.1454127?casa_token=JINUr5noZwAAAAA:5V6GpPYW-yfXNDdbfhBWAKsXHmTz1IP-YCbZsfFLnkJKdjSCPN0fJ9GIPJIB_ZU_ji0AA2eBWY8xXQ

Methodological Alternatives and Related Source Work

Counterfactuals in Historical Analysis

Readings:

Bucheli M, Wadhvani RD, eds. 2014. *Organizations in Time: History, Theory, Methods*. Oxford University Press: Oxford. Read at least **CHAPTERS 11-13** (Sources and Methods).

Decker S, Kipping M, Wadhvani RD. 2015. New business histories! Plurality in business history research methods. *Business History*, 57: 30-40.

Durand R, Vaara E. 2009. Causation, counterfactuals, and competitive advantage. *Strategic Management Journal*, 33: 1245-1264.

Gill MJ, Gill DJ, Roulet TJ. 2018. Constructing trustworthy historical narratives: Criteria, principles and techniques. *British Journal of Management*, 29: 191–205.

Maclean M, Harvey C, Clegg SR. 2016. Conceptualizing historical organization studies. *Academy of Management Review*, 41: 609-632.

Rowlinson M, Hassard J, Decker S. 2014. Research strategies for organizational history: A dialogue between historical theory and organization theory. *Academy of Management Review*, 39: 250-274.

Vaara E, Lamberg JA, Tikkanen H. 2023. Counterfactual analysis as methodology for historically-oriented strategy research. In the review process of the *Organization Science*, first round. **IF YOU READ IN ADVANCE, E-MAIL AND ASK THE PAPER FROM THE PROFESSOR!**

Session 4: Reviewing an Historical Paper, 14:00-16:00; XXXX

Acting as a Referee to an Historical paper: Group Work

Readings:

Alajoutsijärvi K, Kettunen K, Tikkanen H. 2012. Institutional evolution of business schools in Finland 1909-2009. *Management & Organizational History*, 4: 337–367.

Manuscript to be reviewed:

Tikkanen H. 2023. Towards Americanization and the corporate university in an elite business school: A leadership history of the Helsinki School of Economics/Aalto University School of Business, 1974-2021. In the review process of *Business History*, third round. **IF YOU READ IN ADVANCE, E-MAIL AND ASK THE PAPER FROM THE PROFESSOR!**

Thursday, the 9th of March, 2023

Session 5: Practical Conduct of Historical Studies (A. Sihvonen & H. Tikkanen), Wrap-Up (H. Tikkanen) 10:00 – 13:00 (lunch break 13:00-14:00)

How to Conduct Historical Research in Practice and Cope with the Referee Process: Case Nokia

Readings:

Aspara J, Lamberg JA, Sihvonen A, Tikkanen H. 2023. Chance, strategy and change: The structure of contingency in the evolution of the Nokia Corporation, 1986–2015. Forthcoming in *Academy of Management Discoveries*.

<https://journals.aom.org/doi/10.5465/amd.2019.0067>

IF YOU READ IN ADVANCE, E-MAIL AND ASK THE PAPER FROM THE PROFESSOR!

Lamberg JA, Lubinaitė S, Ojala J, Tikkanen H. 2021. The curse of agility: The Nokia Corporation and the loss of market dominance in mobile phones, 2003–2013. *Business History*, 63:4: 574-605.

To the surprise of our research team, this paper (online since autumn 2019) is the most-downloaded paper in the history of the *Business History* journal with more than 85 000 downloads!

Course Wrap-Up and Conclusions

COMPLETE COURSE LITERATURE FOR THE READINGS ASSIGNMENT

(in alphabetical order; session-specific literature is indicated above in the session descriptions)

Alajoutsijärvi K, Kettunen K, Tikkanen H. 2012. Institutional evolution of business schools in Finland 1909-2009. *Management & Organizational History*, 4: 337–367.

Aspara J, Lamberg JA, Sihvonen A, Tikkanen H. 2021. Chance, strategy and change: The structure of contingency in the evolution of the Nokia Corporation, 1986–2015. Third round revision in *Academy of Management Discoveries*.

Argyres NS, De Massis A, Foss N J, Frattini F, Jones G, Silverman BS. 2020. History-informed strategy research: The promise of history and historical research methods in advancing strategy scholarship. *Strategic Management Journal*, 41.

Booth C, Rowlinson M. 2006. Management and organizational history: Prospects. *Management & Organizational History*, 1: 5–30.

Botez A, Hietanen J, Tikkanen H (2020) Mapping the absence: a theological critique of posthumanist influences in marketing and consumer research. *Journal of Marketing Management*, 36:15-16, 1391-1416, DOI: 10.1080/0267257X.2020.1805491

Bucheli M, Wadhvani RD, eds. 2014. *Organizations in Time: History, Theory, Methods*. Oxford University Press: Oxford. **CHAPTERS 11-13** (Sources and Methods).

Burgelman RA. 2011. Bridging history and reductionism: A key role for longitudinal qualitative research. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 42: 591–601.

Buckley PJ. 2020. The role of history in international business: Evidence, research practices, methods and theory. *British Journal of Management*, 32(3): 797-811.

Decker S, Kipping M, Wadhvani RD. 2015. New business histories! Plurality in business history research methods. *Business History*, 57: 30-40.

Durand R, Vaara E. 2009. Causation, counterfactuals, and competitive advantage. *Strategic Management Journal*, 33: 1245-1264.

- de Jong A, Higgins DH, van Driel H. 2015. Towards a new business history? *Business History*, 57: 5-29.
- Ghemawat P. 2002. Competition and business strategy in historical perspective. *The Business History Review*, 76(1): 37-74.
- Gill MJ, Gill DJ, Roulet TJ. 2018. Constructing trustworthy historical narratives: Criteria, principles and techniques. *British Journal of Management*, 29: 191–205.
- Godfrey PC, Hassard J, O'Connor ES, Rowlinson M, Ruef M. 2016. What is organizational history? Toward a synthesis of history and organization studies. *Academy of Management Review*, 41: 590-60
- Hansen PE. 2012. Business history: A cultural and narrative approach. *Business History Review*, 86: 693-717.
- Hargadon A., Wadhvani, D. (2022) Theorizing with microhistory. *Academy of Management Review*, in press.
- Jacobides MG. 2007. The inherent limits of organizational structure and the unfulfilled role of hierarchy: Lessons from a near-war. *Organization Science*, 18: 455-477.
- Karababa E., Ger G. 2011. Early modern Ottoman coffeehouse culture and the formation of the consumer subject. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 37(5): 737-760.
- Kieser A. 1994. Why organizational theory needs historical analyses – and how this should be performed. *Organization Science*, 5: 608–20.
- Kieser A. 2015. "Twenty years after. Why organization theory needs historical analysis." In *The Routledge Companion to Management and Organizational History*, 47–48, ed. by PG McLaren, AJ Mills, TG Weatherbee. Routledge: London.
- Kipping H, Üsdiken B. 2014. History in organization and management theory: More than meets the eye. *The Academy of Management Annals*, 8: 535-588.
- Lamberg JA, Lubinaitė S, Ojala J, Tikkanen H. 2021. The curse of agility: The Nokia Corporation and the loss of market dominance in mobile phones, 2003–2013. *Business History*, 63:4: 574-605.
- Lamberg JA, Pajunen K. 2010. Agency, institutional change, and continuity: The case of the Finnish Civil War. *Journal of Management Studies*, 47(5): 814-836.
- Lamberg JA, Peltoniemi, M. 2020. The nanoeconomics of firm-level decision-making and industry evolution: Evidence from 200 Years of paper and pulp making. *Strategic Management Journal*, 41: 499-529.
- Lamberg JA, Tikkanen H, Nokelainen T, Suur-Inkeroinen H. 2009. Competitive dynamics, strategic consistency, and organizational survival. *Strategic Management Journal*, 30: 45-60.
- Lamoreaux NR, Raff DMG, Temin P. 2008. Economic theory and business history, in *The Oxford Handbook of Business History* ed. by Geoffrey G. Jones and Jonathan Zeitlin. Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- Maclean M, Harvey C, Clegg SR. 2016. Conceptualizing historical organization studies. *Academy of Management Review*, 41: 609-632.

- Maclean M, Harvey C, Clegg SR. 2017. Organization theory in Business and Management History: Current status and future prospects. *Business History Review*, 91: 457-481.
- Miller MH. 2000. The history of finance. An eyewitness account. *The Journal of Applied Corporate Finance*, 13: 8-14.
- Mills AJ, Suddaby R, Foster WM, Durepos G. 2016. Re-visiting the historic Turn 10 years later: Current debates in management and organizational history – An Introduction. *Management & Organizational History*, 11: 67-76.
- Ojala J, Eloranta J, Ojala A, Valtonen H. 2017. Let the best story win. Evaluation of the most cited business history articles. *Management & Organizational History*, 12: 305-333.
- Perchard A, MacKenzie NG, Decker S, Favero G. 2017. Clio in the business school: Historical approaches in strategy, international business and entrepreneurship. *Business History*, 59: 904–27.
- Rowlinson M. 2004. Historical perspectives in organization studies: Factual, narrative, and archeo-genealogical. In *Management Knowledge and the New Employee*, ed. by DE Hodgson and C Carter, 8–20. Ashgate Publishing: Burlington, VT.
- Rowlinson M. 2013. Management & organizational history: The continuing historic turn. *Management & Organizational History*, 8: 327-328.
- Rowlinson M, Hassard J, Decker S. 2014. Research strategies for organizational history: A dialogue between historical theory and organization theory. *Academy of Management Review*, 39: 250-274.
- Ryan A, Trumbull G, Tufano P. 2011. A brief postwar history of U.S. consumer finance. *Business History Review*, 85(3): 461-498. doi:10.1017/S0007680511000778
- Suddaby R, Foster WH. 2017. History and organizational change. *Journal of Management*, 43: 19-38.
- Suddaby R, Coraiola D, Harvey C, Foster W. 2020. History and the micro-foundations of dynamic capabilities. *Strategic Management Journal*, 41(3): 530-556.
- Tadajewski M, Jones DGB. 2014. Historical research in marketing theory and practice: a review essay. *Journal of Marketing Management*, 30: 1239-1291.
- Tikkanen H. 2022. Towards Americanization and the corporate university in an elite business school: A leadership history of the Helsinki School of Economics/Aalto University School of Business, 1974-2021. Unpublished manuscript.
- Üsdiken B, Kieser A. 2004. Introduction: History in organization studies. *Business History*, 46: 321–30.
- Vaara E, Lamberg JA. 2016. Taking historical embeddedness seriously: Three historical approaches to advance strategy process and practice research. *Academy of Management Review*, 41: 633–57.
- Walker, SP. 2005. Accounting in history, *Accounting Historians Journal*, 32: Article 10. Available at: https://egrove.olemiss.edu/aah_journal/vol32/iss2/10
- Weatherbee TG. 2012. Caution! This historiography makes wide turns: Historic turns and breaks in management and organization studies. *Management & Organizational History*, 7: 203–218.

Weatherbee TG, Durepos G, Mills AJ, Mills JH. 2012. Theorizing the past: Critical engagements. *Management & Organizational History*, 7: 193–202.

Zald M. 1996. More fragmentation? Unfinished business in linking the social sciences and the humanities. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 41: 251–61