

This is the author-created version of the following work:

Maghazi, Atefeh, Lin, Nidhida, Pfarrer, Michael, Gudergan, Sigg, and Wilden, Ralf (2023) *Creating opportunities: Heuristic reasoning in proactive dynamic capability deployment*. *Academy of Management Review*, . (In Press)

Access to this file is available from:

<https://researchonline.jcu.edu.au/77287/>

© 2023 Academy of Management. At AOM, we provide Open Access publishing through a CC-BY-NC-ND license. The AOM provides authors the option to distribute their work, while still employing a commonly used OA licensing mechanism.

Please refer to the original source for the final version of this work:

<https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.2018.0265>



Review

Creating opportunities: Heuristic reasoning in proactive dynamic capability deployment

Journal:	<i>Academy of Management Review</i>
Manuscript ID	AMR-2018-0265-Original.R4
Manuscript Type:	Original Manuscript
Theoretical Perspectives:	Dynamic capabilities approach, Microfoundations of strategy, Behavioral theory and Decision Making
Other Theoretical Perspectives:	
Topic Areas:	Strategic decision making < Strategic Management Process < Business Policy and Strategy, Managerial and organization cognition (General) < Managerial and Organizational Cognition, Strategic change processes < Strategic Management Process < Business Policy and Strategy
Other Topic Areas:	
Abstract:	<p>Research on dynamic capabilities (DCs) has focused primarily on reactive DC deployment (i.e., opportunity discovery) with less attention being paid to proactive DC deployment (i.e., opportunity creation). Drawing on the opportunity creation perspective in entrepreneurship, we argue that proactive DC deployment is characterized by uncertainty, which makes deductive reasoning less effective and thus requires the use of heuristic reasoning. We also incorporate the evolutionary logic of variation, selection, and retention to theorize about the role of heuristic reasoning in the process of proactive DC deployment. Specifically, we integrate the concept of ecologically rational heuristic reasoning to answer two key questions: First, how does ecologically rational heuristic reasoning facilitate proactive DC deployment when the decision context is uncertain? Second, why is ecologically rational heuristic reasoning effective for proactive DC deployment? In summary, our paper advances the ongoing debate concerning DCs and the way in which heuristic reasoning assists a firm in deploying such capabilities.</p>

1
2
3
4 **CREATING OPPORTUNITIES: HEURISTIC REASONING IN PROACTIVE**
5
6 **DYNAMIC CAPABILITY DEPLOYMENT**
7
8
9
10

11 **Atefeh Maghzi**

12 University of Southampton

13 United Kingdom

14 a.maghzi@soton.ac.uk
15
16
17

18 **Nidthida Lin**

19 Macquarie University

20 Australia

21 nidthida.lin@mq.edu.au
22
23
24

25 **Michael D. Pfarrer**

26 University of Georgia

27 USA

28 mpfarrer@uga.edu
29
30
31

32 **Siegfried Gudergan**

33 James Cook University

34 Australia

35 siggi.gudergan@jcu.edu.au
36
37
38

39 **Ralf Wilden**

40 Macquarie University

41 Australia

42 ralf.wilden@mq.edu.au
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 **CREATING OPPORTUNITIES: HEURISTIC REASONING IN PROACTIVE**
4
5 **DYNAMIC CAPABILITY DEPLOYMENT**
6
7

8 **ABSTRACT**
9

10
11 Research on dynamic capabilities (DCs) has focused primarily on reactive DC
12 deployment (i.e., opportunity discovery) with less attention being paid to proactive DC
13 deployment (i.e., opportunity creation). Drawing on the opportunity creation perspective in
14 entrepreneurship, we argue that proactive DC deployment is characterized by uncertainty, which
15 makes deductive reasoning less effective and thus requires the use of heuristic reasoning. We
16 also incorporate the evolutionary logic of variation, selection, and retention to theorize about the
17 role of heuristic reasoning in the process of proactive DC deployment. Specifically, we integrate
18 the concept of ecologically rational heuristic reasoning to answer two key questions: First, how
19 does ecologically rational heuristic reasoning facilitate proactive DC deployment when the
20 decision context is uncertain? Second, why is ecologically rational heuristic reasoning effective
21 for proactive DC deployment? In summary, our paper advances the ongoing debate concerning
22 DCs and the way in which heuristic reasoning assists a firm in deploying such capabilities.
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 “A creator who isn’t grabbed around the throat by a set of impossibilities is no
4 creator. A creator is someone who creates their own impossibilities, and thereby
5 creates possibilities . . . it’s by banging your head on the wall that you find a way
6 through. You have to work on the wall, because without a set of impossibilities,
7 you won’t have the line of flight, the exit that is creation...” (Deleuze, 1995: 133).
8
9

10
11 Dynamic capabilities (DCs) underlie a firm’s capacity to both react to a changing
12 business environment by discovering new opportunities, and to proactively change the
13 environment by creating new opportunities (Helfat et al., 2007; Teece, Pisano, & Shuen, 1997;
14 Zahra, Sapienza, & Davidsson, 2006; Zott, 2003). Given the importance of DCs to a firm’s
15 competitive advantage (Girod & Whittington, 2017; Schilke, 2014; Teece, 2007), scholars have
16 devoted much attention to improving our understanding of DCs and their related antecedents and
17 outcomes. For instance, we have learned that DCs affect firm performance by modifying the
18 firm’s resources and capabilities to take advantage of opportunities (see Barreto, 2010; Helfat et
19 al., 2007; Peteraf, Di Stefano, & Verona, 2013; Vogel & Güttel, 2013) and enable resource
20 reallocation within organizations (Lovallo, Brown, Teece, & Bardolet, 2020). Despite extensive
21 research on DCs, however, several aspects of DC deployment and its underlying process remain
22 unclear (see Peteraf et al., 2013; Schilke, Hu, & Helfat, 2018). For example, in terms of decision
23 making underlying DC deployment, some scholars have suggested the importance of emotions
24 (Hodgkinson & Healey, 2011) and heuristic reasoning (i.e., simple decision rules [Eisenhardt &
25 Martin, 2000]), whereas others have emphasized the primacy of deductive reasoning (Teece,
26 2007).
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47

48 In this paper, we address the limitations of current theorizing by first arguing that the
49 existing literature has predominantly applied a reactive rather than a proactive view of DC
50 deployment (e.g., Benner & Tushman, 2002; Eisenhardt & Martin, 2000; Harreld, O’Reilly III, &
51 Tushman, 2007; Teece, 2007; Teece et al., 1997). The former is about responding to exogenous
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 changes in the environment (i.e., the discovery perspective) (Day, 2011; Pitelis & Teece, 2010),
4 while the latter is about creating changes endogenous to the firm (i.e., the creation perspective)
5
6 (Alvarez & Barney, 2007). Although firms engage in both reactive and proactive DC
7
8 deployment, they involve different decision-making contexts—risk vs. uncertainty—that in turn
9
10 requires different decision-making approaches—deductive vs. heuristic reasoning (Alvarez &
11
12 Barney, 2007).
13
14
15

16
17 Given the wealth of existing knowledge on reactive DC deployment, we focus
18
19 specifically on the less understood, but very relevant, proactive DC deployment to develop a
20
21 theory explaining its underlying process. To do so, we incorporate the concept of opportunity
22
23 creation from the entrepreneurship literature (Alvarez & Barney, 2007; Alvarez, Barney, &
24
25 Anderson, 2013; Arikan, Arikan, & Koparan, 2020). Alvarez and Barney (2007) clarified the
26
27 distinction between opportunity creation and discovery as well as their associated decision-
28
29 making contexts. They argued that opportunity discovery is associated with “risk” because the
30
31 availability of information enables the estimation of possible outcomes. Thus, deductive
32
33 reasoning is an appropriate decision-making approach in this context. In contrast, opportunity
34
35 creation is associated with “uncertainty,” which is characterized by a lack of sufficient
36
37 information, thereby preventing the estimation of possible outcomes (Alvarez & Barney, 2005,
38
39 2007). Accordingly, the use of heuristic reasoning is appropriate in this context. Building on this
40
41 latter argument, we draw on the ecologically rational heuristic perspective to explain the role of
42
43 heuristic reasoning in proactive DC deployment. The ecologically rational heuristic perspective
44
45 emphasizes the need for functional matches between cognition and the environment (i.e.,
46
47 ecologically rational), especially when a high degree of uncertainty is present (Gigerenzer &
48
49 Gaissmaier, 2011; Mousavi & Gigerenzer, 2014).
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Our paper clarifies two aspects of heuristic reasoning in proactive DC deployment. First,
4 we incorporate the evolutionary logic of variation, selection, and retention (Aldrich & Ruef,
5 2006) from the opportunity creation perspective (Alvarez & Barney, 2007) to explain the
6 underlying process of proactive DC deployment. Specifically, we explain *how* heuristic
7 reasoning facilitates the sensemaking and development of new ideas during the variation stage,
8 the identification of potentially promising ideas for new opportunities during the selection stage,
9 and the retention of effective heuristics that underpin proactive DC deployment during the
10 retention stage. Second, we draw on the “bias-variance tradeoff”¹—a central element of
11 ecologically rational heuristic reasoning (Artinger, Petersen, Gigerenzer, & Weibler, 2015)—
12 and the iterative learning process to clarify *why* heuristic reasoning in proactive DC deployment
13 leads to a better perceived alignment between a new opportunity to its potential market. In doing
14 so, we explain how iterative learning during proactive DC deployment promotes the balance
15 between bias and variance (i.e., the main error components) in decision making and hence
16 increases the confidence (i.e., belief in the expected outcome) in heuristic reasoning over time.
17 This process of proactive DC deployment in turn leads to creating a new opportunity (e.g., a new
18 product or service).

19
20
21 Our theorizing makes four primary contributions. First, we respond to Schilke, Hu, and
22 Helfat’s (2018) call to infuse the DC view with psychological theory on heuristic reasoning and
23 to incorporate insights from entrepreneurship literature. More specifically, we extend the DC
24

25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
¹ We agree with Alvarez and colleagues’ perspective that opportunity creation “should sidestep positivism” as the
positivist language “comes from framing opportunities as objective, discoverable objection” (Alvarez, Barney,
McBride, & Wuebker, 2014: 230, 227). However, for our key arguments to be clearly understood by a wider
audience in the cognition and decision-making literature, we sometimes adopt positivist terms, such as “error,”
“bias,” and “variance.”

1
2
3 literature by explaining how the distinction between opportunity discovery and opportunity
4 creation clarifies our understanding of the uncertain nature of proactive DCs and how heuristic
5 reasoning facilitates its deployment. Second, we improve our understanding of the process
6 underlying proactive DC deployment, in particular the role of heuristic reasoning, which remains
7 limited in the literature. The current literature has focused primarily on heuristic reasoning in the
8 reactive discovery of opportunities (e.g., Eisenhardt & Martin, 2000; Peteraf et al., 2013),
9 thereby raising questions about the applicability of these arguments to proactive DC deployment.
10 Our theorizing therefore clarifies the underlying mechanisms of heuristic reasoning and its
11 enabling characteristics for proactive DC deployment. Third, by shedding light on how and why
12 heuristic reasoning facilitates the proactive creation of opportunities, we also contribute to the
13 strategy and the entrepreneurship literatures where the use of heuristic reasoning in opportunity
14 creation is suggested, but its enabling mechanism is not fully explained (e.g., Alvarez et al.,
15 2013; Foss & Klein, 2017; Maine, Soh, & Dos Santos, 2015). Fourth, our theorizing on the
16 underlying mechanism of proactive DC deployment contributes to the resource-based view of the
17 firm, particularly a more nuanced understanding of sustainable competitive advantage.
18 Specifically, we clarify where heterogeneous resources and capabilities come from and how they
19 shape the foundation of firms' sustainable competitive advantage (Alvarez & Barney, 2007;
20 Barney, Wright, & Ketchen, 2001).

21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30 31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39 40 41 42 43 44 45 46 47 48 49 50 51 52 53 54 55 56 57 58 59 60

THEORETICAL BACKGROUND

Dynamic Capabilities

DCs are “the capacity of an organization to purposefully create, extend or modify its resource base” (Helfat et al., 2007: 1). This ability rests on the firm’s reaction to opportunities ahead of competitors (i.e., reactive DC deployment) (Adner & Helfat, 2003; Teece et al., 1997),

1
2
3 proactive creation of new opportunities (i.e., proactive DC deployment), or both (Teece, 2007).
4
5 Given the value of DCs, a large body of research has investigated their underlying processes and
6
7 associated outcomes (see Barreto, 2010; Lampert, Kim, & Polidoro Jr, 2020; Peteraf et al., 2013;
8
9 Vogel & Güttel, 2013). For example, these studies have discussed the positive effects of DC
10
11 deployment through mergers and acquisitions (Meyer-Doyle, Lee, & Helfat, 2019),
12
13 organizational reorganization (Girod & Whittington, 2017), and resource reallocation (Lovallo et
14
15 al., 2020). Others have investigated DC deployment by explaining its antecedents and
16
17 development process, with a specific focus on its cognitive and psychological foundations (e.g.,
18
19 Eisenhardt & Martin, 2000; Felin, Foss, Heimeriks, & Madsen, 2012; Helfat & Peteraf, 2015;
20
21 Hodgkinson & Healey, 2011; Kaplan, 2008; Tasheva & Nielsen, 2020; Teece, Peteraf, & Leih,
22
23 2016; Teece, 2007; Zollo & Winter, 2002; Zott, 2003). For example, Helfat and Peteraf (2015)
24
25 drew on the attention-based view (Ocasio, 1997) to explain the role of perception and attention in
26
27 sensing opportunities in DC deployment.
28
29
30
31
32

33 Eisenhardt and Martin (2000) suggested that when information is limited and the
34
35 estimation of decision outcomes is not possible, DC deployment demands the use of heuristic
36
37 reasoning. In the same vein, Helfat and Peteraf (2015) suggested that heuristic reasoning can be
38
39 effective in DC deployment, particularly when managers face time pressure to make decisions or
40
41 when problems are ill-defined. Teece (2007), in contrast, argued that deductive reasoning (e.g.,
42
43 scenario planning) is the preferred route since heuristic reasoning is prone to bias and may lead
44
45 to inferior DC deployment. Zollo and Winter (2002) also emphasized the role of deductive
46
47 reasoning (e.g., through the use of knowledge articulation and codification) and suggested that
48
49 such reasoning is effective in DC deployment (Barreto, 2010).
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 While this body of research has added significantly to our understanding of DCs, we
4 argue that the conflicting views on the value of heuristic reasoning are rooted in a lack of
5 distinction between reactive and proactive DC deployment. That is, while DC deployment can be
6 reactive, proactive, or both, most DC research discusses DC deployment in the context of
7 exogenous change, which focuses particularly on a *reactive* view. However, DC deployment can
8 also be *proactive*, which has received less attention in the literature (Pitelis & Teece, 2010). This
9 narrow focus has resulted in a lack of understanding of proactive DC deployment's underlying
10 mechanisms and implications. Below, we develop our framework for the proactive DC
11 deployment process. First, we draw from entrepreneurship research to contrast opportunity
12 discovery, which is associated with risk, with opportunity creation, which is characterized by
13 uncertainty. We then focus on discussing the role of heuristic reasoning in proactive DC
14 deployment associated with uncertainty.

31 **Opportunity Discovery vs. Opportunity Creation**

32
33 The entrepreneurship literature has suggested that both the discovery and creation
34 perspectives can explain how entrepreneurs' actions lead to new opportunities (Alvarez &
35 Barney, 2007; Berglund, Bousfiha, & Mansoori, 2020; Foss & Klein, 2017; Shane &
36 Venkataraman, 2000). Opportunity discovery and creation, however, differ in several aspects,
37 including the nature of the opportunity and the decision-making context, which together call for
38 different types of reasoning (Alvarez & Barney, 2007; Alvarez & Parker, 2009; McBride &
39 Wuebker, 2020).

40
41 The opportunity discovery perspective (Shane, 2003; Shane & Venkataraman, 2000)
42 suggests that competitive imperfections arise exogenously through, for example, technological,
43 demand, or regulatory changes. In such circumstances, a systematic search of the environment
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 can lead to a (reactive) discovery of opportunities that exist but are waiting to be discovered
4
5 (Alvarez & Barney, 2005). Aligning with Knight (1921), the decision-making context of
6
7 opportunity discovery is associated with risk: While the specific outcome of a given situation is
8
9 unknown, there is sufficient information about the probability distribution to estimate possible
10
11 outcomes. Thus, the opportunity discovery perspective suggests that firms employ deductive
12
13 reasoning to estimate their odds of success. In such contexts, management can use risk
14
15 assessment tools to collect and analyze relevant information to develop a better understanding of
16
17 the nature of the opportunity, compared to other opportunities, and possible outcomes (Alvarez
18
19 & Barney, 2007).

20
21
22
23
24 In contrast, the opportunity creation perspective (Alvarez & Barney, 2004) posits that
25
26 opportunities do not readily exist in the market. That is, firms need to proactively create new
27
28 opportunities endogenously through an evolutionary enactment process (Alvarez & Barney,
29
30 2007). In such circumstances, *ex ante* knowledge about the links between a potential opportunity
31
32 and previously existing markets is unknown or does not necessarily exist. Therefore, the
33
34 decision-making context within which opportunities are created is not risky, but uncertain
35
36 (Alvarez & Barney, 2007). According to Knight (1921), uncertainty involves a situation in which
37
38 sufficient prior information is not available, and hence both the odds of a specific outcome and
39
40 the probability distribution of possible outcomes are unknown.² In such contexts, traditional
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48

49
50 ² We acknowledge that various definitions and perspectives of uncertainty exist. In this paper, we adopt Knight's
51 (1921) concept of uncertainty and theorize based on this definition. In addition, we acknowledge that, in principle,
52 complexity—when firms perceive a great multiplicity and diversity of factors as relevant (Miller & Friesen, 1983)—
53 and uncertainty, despite being related, have different characteristics and thus require different decision-making
54 approaches. However, we argue that individuals do not clearly differentiate between complexity and uncertainty and
55 thus tend to perceive complex and uncertain situations similarly.
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 approaches of deductive reasoning may not be feasible due to a lack of information, while
4
5 alternative approaches, such as ecologically rational heuristic reasoning, may be more effective
6
7
8 (Mousavi & Gigerenzer, 2014).
9

10 **Heuristic Reasoning under Uncertainty**

11
12 Managers' use of heuristic reasoning³ has been studied widely in the management
13
14 literature, yet its benefits, particularly in uncertain decision-making contexts, remain
15
16 underexplored (e.g., Amit & Schoemaker, 1993; Dew, 2007). This lack of attention has its roots
17
18 in associating heuristic reasoning with cognitive biases, which implies inferiority to deductive
19
20 reasoning (e.g., Busenitz & Barney, 1997; Hodgkinson, Bown, Maule, Glaister, & Pearman,
21
22 1999; Schwenk, 1984; Schwenk, 1985). This understanding of heuristic reasoning draws on the
23
24 "heuristic and bias" paradigm (Tversky & Kahneman, 1974), which adopts an economic
25
26 optimization view, arguing that lack of information and time as well as cognitive constraints lead
27
28 managers to engage in heuristic reasoning (Kahneman, 2003). These studies, however, do not
29
30 account for how uncertainty in the decision-making context may constrain "optimized" decision
31
32 making because managers either disregard the underlying conditions (Bateman & Zeithaml,
33
34 1989a, b) or misconstrue them as risks (Barnes, 1984).
35
36
37
38
39

40 Building on Simon's (1955; 1976) concept of bounded rationality, the ecological
41
42 rationality of heuristic reasoning challenges the traditional perspective of heuristic reasoning,
43
44 which often associates its use with inferior outcomes (as a result of cognitive biases). In contrast,
45
46
47
48
49

50
51 ³ The entrepreneurship literature references the use of both heuristic and abductive reasoning, particularly when
52 limited information is available to explain observations (Peirce, 1932). While we acknowledge the usefulness of
53 abduction for generating a new idea in innovation and design contexts (Dunne & Dougherty, 2016; Dew, 2007;
54 Powell, 2001), our theorizing focuses on heuristic reasoning.
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 the ecologically rational perspective suggests that in uncertain environments with poor
4 probability estimations or limited information about alternatives, individuals and firms rely on
5 simple heuristic reasoning in an adaptive way (Gigerenzer & Selten, 2002; Mousavi &
6 Gigerenzer, 2014). Accordingly, two key characteristics of ecologically rational heuristic
7 reasoning that assist firms when making decisions in uncertain environments are simplicity and
8 adaptability.
9

10
11 The *simplicity* of ecologically rational heuristic reasoning lies in its focus on fewer pieces
12 of information, allowing decision makers to solve problems and make judgments with less
13 analytical effort (so-called “less is more”). In doing so, it “limit[s] a search of objects or
14 information using easily computable stopping rules and [allows management to] make their
15 choices with easily computable decision rules” (Todd & Gigerenzer, 2000: 731).
16

17
18 The *adaptability* of ecologically rational heuristic reasoning directs decision makers to be
19 selective in their search for and attention to information and to only focus on information that is
20 seemingly most relevant for a particular context (Gigerenzer & Brighton, 2009). The degree of
21 adaptability of heuristic reasoning to align with a particular context plays a critical role in
22 determining the confidence in its outcome (Artinger et al., 2015; Gigerenzer, 2002).⁴ We define
23 confidence as the expectation that decision makers place in the outcome of a decision (Munn,
24 Porritt, Lockwood, Aromataris, & Pearson, 2014).
25

26
27 In this way, the concepts of simplicity and adaptability emphasize the importance of
28 selective attention distribution (Ocasio, 1997). The significant role of organizational context in
29
30

31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
⁴ The ecologically rational literature commonly uses the term “accuracy” when discussing the outcome of heuristic reasoning. We, however, choose to use “confidence” to avoid positivistic language (please also see footnote 1).

1
2
3 selective attention (Gavetti, 2005) is a key foundation of the attention-based view, which is
4
5 consistent with the ecologically rational heuristic perspective's emphasis on understanding the
6
7 context in which a decision is made.
8
9

10 In summary, while research on DC deployment has made great strides, arguments about
11
12 its underlying processes remain limited, which in part is driven by an unclear distinction between
13
14 reactive and proactive DC deployment as well as a limited exploration of heuristic reasoning.
15
16 While the former represents a risky environment where the use of deductive reasoning is likely
17
18 to be more appropriate, the latter represents an uncertain environment where the use of heuristic
19
20 reasoning is likely to be more effective (Alvarez & Barney, 2007; Alvarez & Parker, 2009). In
21
22 the next section, we address these limitations by theorizing how the simplicity and adaptability
23
24 of ecologically rational heuristic reasoning facilitate proactive DC deployment in uncertain
25
26 contexts.
27
28
29
30

31 **HEURISTIC REASONING IN PROACTIVE DYNAMIC CAPABILITY DEPLOYMENT**

32
33
34 We propose a conceptual framework that (1) explicates *how* ecologically rational
35
36 heuristic reasoning facilitates proactive DC deployment when the decision context is uncertain
37
38 and (2) clarifies *why* ecologically rational heuristic reasoning is effective for proactive DC
39
40 deployment. In doing so, we draw on evolutionary theory (Aldrich & Ruef, 2006) to delineate
41
42 the core processes embedded in opportunity creation, including variation, selection, and retention
43
44 (Alvarez & Barney, 2007). We refer to the initial belief about an opportunity as an "idea" before
45
46 it is made sense of and developed into a business opportunity. According to the creation
47
48 perspective, opportunities can only be understood retrospectively through an iterative process of
49
50 action and reaction (Alvarez & Barney, 2007; McBride & Wuebker, 2020).
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32

Figure 1 illustrates our framework and describes the two key questions we seek to answer. Specifically, we explain *how* the simplicity and adaptability of ecologically rational heuristic reasoning facilitate (1) the sensemaking and development of a new idea during the variation stage and (2) the selection of one of the variants of the new idea as well as the criteria for such decision making during the selection stage. We argue that the iterative process of variation and selection of a new idea continues until a new opportunity is created or failure occurs. We then discuss (3) the retention of heuristic reasoning, which occurs after an opportunity has been created. Finally, we draw on the concept of the bias-variance tradeoff to explain *why* the simplicity and adaptability of ecologically rational heuristic reasoning are effective for proactive DC deployment. More specifically, we argue that these two characteristics enable firms to learn from feedback during the iterative process of variation and selection and further refine their confidence in heuristic reasoning (Alvarez et al., 2013) (represented by the feedback loop in Figure 1).

33
34
35

Insert Figure 1 about here

36 37 38 39 40 41 42 43 44 45 46 47 48 49 50 51 52 53 54 55 56 57

How Ecologically Rational Heuristic Reasoning Facilitates Proactive DC Deployment

38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Variation in proactive DC deployment. Proactive DC deployment starts with *variation* (Aldrich & Ruef, 2006), which involves the making sense of and development of a new idea. While making sense of an idea involves how firms give meaning to and explain a new idea, idea development relates to how firms bring the new idea into existence. Both steps in the variation process are iterative and evolve over time as firms become clearer in their understanding of an idea and its potential value for a potential market. In the following sections, we discuss the role of heuristic reasoning in the variation process by breaking it down into two steps: making sense of an idea and idea development.

1
2
3 *Heuristic reasoning in variation: making sense of an idea.* Before a new idea can be
4 made sense of using heuristic reasoning, it needs to be created either intentionally or blindly.
5 Intentional idea creation occurs when individuals engage in activities to find a solution for a
6 known problem (Amabile, 1983; Vogel, 2017). Blind idea creation occurs when individuals
7 come up with a new idea without conscious planning or a pre-defined problem to be solved, such
8 as in casual conversations (Aldrich & Ruef, 2006; Campbell, 1994). Regardless of how a new
9 idea is created, it is often a vague and incomplete mental representation of a potential
10 opportunity for a firm (Vogel, 2017). Therefore, firms need to make sense of a new idea in such
11 a way that its unique characteristics and potential value can be understood. However, making
12 sense of a new idea is challenging because the lack of information creates uncertainty about its
13 potential value, its similarity to or deviation from current products or services, and how the firm
14 should address it. Therefore, the important question here is, “How is a new idea made sense of?”

15
16
17 The *simplicity* of heuristic reasoning directs firms to focus on a few pieces of past
18 information to make sense of the newly created idea. Doing so enables firms to engage in non-
19 excessive analytical effort. The *adaptability* of heuristic reasoning directs firms in selecting those
20 pieces of past information that are seemingly most relevant for making sense of a new idea. In
21 other words, firms selectively attend to past information that, from their perspective, shares
22 commonalities with the new idea and its potential value, given that under uncertainty they do not
23 know exactly which information is relevant. That is, firms can only guess based on the available
24 information.

25
26
27 Together, the simplicity and adaptability of heuristic reasoning guides firms to focus on
28 limited, but seemingly the most relevant, past information in order to reasonably make sense
29 (i.e., good enough) of a new idea and to assess its novelty (Todd & Gigerenzer, 2000). They

1
2
3 allow firms to “depart from the web of significance,” “break casual structures of associates,” and
4
5 break away from the past and “the iron cage of the history” that try to align the understanding of
6
7 a new idea to existing ones (see Garud & Karnøe, 2001: 14). However, such heuristic reasoning
8
9 does not necessarily result in a complete understanding of a new idea in proactive DC
10
11 deployment. Rather, it assists firms in developing a reasonable understanding of the new idea, its
12
13 distinctiveness, and its potential value using less information and less analytical effort (see
14
15 Figure 1). By doing so, heuristic reasoning helps generate momentum around the new idea
16
17 (Garud & Karnøe, 2001) as well as the initial legitimacy and acceptance needed for putting it
18
19 into further action (Hargadon & Douglas, 2001).
20
21
22
23

24 An example of such heuristic reasoning is the one-reason heuristic (Todd & Gigerenzer,
25
26 2000), which guides a decision maker to rely on one specific criterion to make sense of a new
27
28 idea and its relationship to existing products or services (Todd & Gigerenzer, 2000). By relying
29
30 on one specific criterion, the one-reason heuristic is simple and requires less analytical effort. It
31
32 is also adaptable because this one specific criterion is selected from past information that is
33
34 perceived as most relevant in relation to the new context.
35
36
37

38 For instance, in developing Post-it Notes, the 3M scientist, Spencer Silver, asked, “Aren’t
39
40 there times when you want a glue to hold something for a while but not forever?” (Nayak &
41
42 Ketteringham, 1986: 43-44). In his effort to make sense of the potential of low-tack adhesive,
43
44 Silver relied on a single criterion: the adhesive characteristic of his weak glue—a commonality
45
46 shared with normal glue. This illustrates the adaptability of Silver’s heuristic reasoning, as this
47
48 criterion was perceived as most relevant for his making sense of a new product, Post-It Notes. By
49
50 engaging in a simple reasoning process and ignoring other characteristics of normal glue (e.g.,
51
52 the ability to hold two objects tightly and permanently together), he identified possible
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 differences and novelties of the weak glue. Thus, such reliance on a single criterion from the set
4 of past information assisted him in reasonably making sense of a new idea—weak glue—and its
5 potential value for 3M.
6
7

8
9
10 *Heuristic reasoning in variation: idea development.* Once an idea has been reasonably
11 made sense of, the next step is to develop it. At this stage, the critical question is, “What are the
12 possible paths for developing the new idea?” Given the inherent uncertainty in proactive DC
13 deployment, it is difficult for firms to rely solely on existing knowledge, capabilities, and
14 resources to identify a clear path for idea development. Hence, in such contexts, new knowledge
15 and resource configurations are necessary. Yet, in the case of proactive DC deployment, no clear
16 understanding exists about the specific new knowledge and resources required, as well as where
17 or how they can be obtained. This, however, does not suggest that firms are fully unaware or
18 unable to collect any information about how to further develop a new idea (Alvarez & Barney,
19 2007).
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31

32
33 The *simplicity* of ecologically rational heuristic reasoning suggests that firms rely on a
34 few pieces of know-how from existing actions and implementation processes to start taking
35 actions toward developing a new idea. We define know-how as practical knowledge on how to
36 accomplish a task (e.g., knowledge about the design and development of a product or service).
37 The focus on only a few pieces of know-how, therefore, enables firms to sufficiently understand
38 how to start acting on a new idea while engaging in less analytical effort. The *adaptability* of
39 heuristic reasoning guides firms to identify those pieces of the existing know-how that are
40 assumed to be most relevant for starting the development of a new idea.
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50

51 In addition, the adaptability of heuristic reasoning allows for deviation from existing
52 know-how and learning through experimentation (Berglund et al., 2020; Garud & Karnøe, 2001),
53
54
55
56
57

1
2
3 which leads to new know-how. It also facilitates new idea development by integrating both new
4 and existing know-how (Eisenhardt & Martin, 2000; Lavie, 2006; Teece, 2007). Together, the
5 simple and adaptive nature of heuristic reasoning enables firms to compensate for the uncertainty
6 inherent in proactive DC deployment by focusing on a few pieces of existing know-how that are
7 seemingly most relevant to the new context. Reliance on such know-how enables firms to
8 develop a sufficient understanding of how to take an initial action to develop a new idea.
9

10
11 We can see the process of reliance on a few pieces of relevant existing know-how for
12 developing a new idea by returning to our Post-It Notes example. Dr. Silver and his colleague at
13 3M, Arthur Fry, began the new idea development process by thinking of existing parts they
14 could use to assemble the new manufacturing equipment, as well as the people who could help.
15 Fry explained, “At 3M, we've got so many experts and so much equipment scattered around that
16 we can [...] make the adhesive and some of the raw materials here, and do one part over here,
17 and another part over there, and convert a space there and make a few things that aren't
18 available” (Nayak & Ketteringham, 1986: 50).
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34

35 This example illustrates how Fry and his team searched for existing know-how within 3M
36 and took the initial actions after finding a few pieces of relevant know-how. This process reflects
37 the simplicity of heuristic reasoning, as it requires less analytical effort. In addition, it
38 demonstrates the adaptability of heuristic reasoning, as the process initially relied on the
39 seemingly most relevant know-how from within 3M and then was continuously refined as they
40 progressed through an iterative process of action and reaction. It took the company two years to
41 explore existing know-how, engage in iterative learning through a series of trial and error, and
42 invent variants of new machines and production. 3M eventually discarded most of them before
43 successfully developing the manufacturing machine and process for Post-it Notes.
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 In sum, the variation stage in Figure 1 describes *how* heuristic reasoning facilitates (1)
4 making sense of a new idea by directing a firm's attention to identify a few pieces of past
5 information that are perceived as most relevant for providing reasonable meaning to the newly
6 created idea, and (2) the development of a new idea by assisting a firm in identifying a few
7 pieces of existing know-how that are perceived as most relevant to sufficiently understand how
8 to act.
9

10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17 ***Selection in proactive DC deployment.*** Following the variation stage is the *selection*
18 stage, which involves the decision to abandon or pursue a new idea (Aldrich & Ruef, 2006).
19 Given the uncertainty surrounding a new idea, firms often come up with multiple variants during
20 proactive DC deployment. However, given the scarcity of firms' resources, firms need to decide
21 which variant should be selected for further development and which should be abandoned
22 (Aldrich & Ruef, 2006).
23
24
25
26
27
28
29

30
31 ***Heuristic reasoning in selection.*** Since proactive DC deployment concerns a new idea
32 that may not be comparable with existing perceptions or practices (Nayak & Ketteringham,
33 1986), firms usually lack the relevant information to ask, "Which variant of a new idea should be
34 selected for further development?" The answer is unclear because the process of proactive DC
35 deployment involves uncertainty around the key criteria that affect the acceptance of a new idea.
36 This suggests that firms must deviate from the criteria associated with existing markets to
37 develop an understanding of criteria that are more relevant to the new market. Such a decision,
38 however, is challenging because deviation from the existing market can be threatening to the
39 firms' current products or services. Thus, the key challenge in such uncertain contexts is to
40 understand the extent to which the deviation and its effects are acceptable to the current business,
41 while being sufficiently worthwhile to pursue new opportunity creation (Garud & Karnøe, 2001).
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 The simplicity and adaptability of heuristic reasoning enable firms to generate a limited
4 set of selection criteria that are perceived to be aligned with the new context and use them to
5 evaluate and choose a variant of a new idea that is perceived as being worth developing.
6
7 Specifically, the *simplicity* of heuristic reasoning suggests that firms focus on a few key selection
8 criteria, allowing them to exert less analytical effort by processing just-enough information to
9 assess and pursue a selected variant of a new idea while reducing the chances of failure. The
10 *adaptability* of heuristic reasoning directs firms toward identifying those criteria drawn from
11 their experience with existing products or services that are perceived to best suit the new market
12 for pursuing a variant of a new idea. Hence, simple and adaptive heuristic reasoning enables
13 managers to select one variant of a new idea that is perceived to align with their understanding of
14 the potential new market, while simultaneously leaving room for divergence from the existing
15 market as they move forward and engage in the iterative process of action and reaction.
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29

30 An example of heuristic reasoning at the selection stage is the tallying heuristic, which
31 counts the number of criteria favoring one variant over another (Gigerenzer & Goldstein, 1996).
32 The use of the tallying heuristic can be seen in JVC's development of the videocassette recorder
33 (VCR). Yuma Shiraishi and his team generated a set of criteria (e.g., price, easy to use), adapted
34 from two existing criteria: Could it be used at home? Is it affordable to the average consumer?
35 The team used this limited number of criteria to decide whether a variant of the VCR should be
36 selected for further development. A variant would be selected only if its number of positive
37 attributes exceeded its negative attributes (Artinger et al., 2015; Nayak & Ketteringham, 1986).
38 The tallying heuristic illustrates both the simplicity and adaptability of heuristic reasoning. It is
39 simple because the team focused on a limited number of criteria. It is adaptable because these
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 criteria were reconstructed from the initial criteria based on the team's experience to align with
4 the VCR market.
5
6

7
8 In sum, the simplicity and adaptability of heuristic reasoning facilitate selecting what
9 firms perceive as the most promising variant of a new idea (see the selection stage in Figure 1).
10 In doing so, such reasoning directs firms to focus on only a few and seemingly most relevant
11 criteria to pursue a variant of a new idea that is perceived to best suit the potential new market.
12
13
14
15

16
17 As also illustrated in Figure 1 (see the iterative learning process between and within the
18 variation and selection stages), firms repeatedly go through the variation and selection stages of
19 proactive DC deployment to refine their sensemaking of existing ideas and create new ones,
20 explore different paths for idea development, and refine selection criteria based on feedback and
21 experience. This iterative process continues until a variant of an idea emerges to successfully
22 become a new opportunity or the process is terminated (Alvarez et al., 2013).
23
24
25
26
27
28
29

30
31 ***Retention in proactive DC deployment.*** As firms complete the variation and selection of
32 proactive DC deployment and create a new opportunity that is well received by the market, it is
33 important that they retain the heuristics underlying the opportunity creation process. The
34 retention process is particularly crucial in uncertain environments, as it enables firms to
35 economize on information processing and reduce their analytical effort. More specifically, it
36 enables a firm to routinize certain activities, while paying more attention to the ongoing changes
37 in the uncertain environment (Aldrich & Ruef, 2006).
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45

46
47 ***Retention of heuristic reasoning.*** Through the iterative process of variation and selection,
48 firms accumulate a set of heuristics that facilitates the replication of a newly created opportunity.
49 Thus, the important question here is, "How can the firm retain useful heuristics?" that facilitate
50 future replication and a better sense of variants of the newly created opportunity.
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 The retention of useful heuristics, however, is challenging. The inherent uncertainty of
4 proactive DC deployment necessitates continuous updates and additions to heuristics throughout
5 the variation and selection stages (see the feedback loops within variation and selection, and the
6 feedback loop between the variation and selection stages in Figure 1). A result of this iterative
7 process is therefore a refined set of heuristics that have become more specific to a particular set
8 of inferences based on experiences firms gain through this iterative process. This process
9 inherently allows the heuristics to become more sophisticated (less simple) and to align more
10 closely with the specific contexts in which they have been developed. While such highly specific
11 heuristics enable firms to increasingly rely upon them, their lack of simplicity can make their
12 memorability challenging (Ellis & Shpielberg, 2003). In addition, such highly specific heuristics
13 are less adaptable to the changing business environment, making them less useful for making
14 sense of variants of the newly created opportunity (see the feedback loop between retention and
15 variation stage in Figure 1).
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31

32
33 To ensure that the simplicity and adaptability of heuristics are maintained, firms undergo
34 a process of *simplification cycling* (Bingham & Eisenhardt, 2011), which involves the pruning of
35 heuristics (see the retention stage of Figure 1). Such simplification, however, must be conducted
36 with caution, as simply pruning to reduce the number of heuristics or criteria without careful
37 thought may result in underexploiting past experiences. Instead, as firms gain more experience
38 through the iterative process of proactive DC deployment, they engage in simplification cycling
39 by adding, removing, and/or refining their heuristics with an aim to increase their simplicity and
40 adaptability (Bingham & Eisenhardt, 2011).
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50

51 The *simplicity* of heuristics ensures their efficient encoding in firms' memories for better
52 recollection and updating (Bingham & Eisenhardt, 2011). In addition, simplified heuristics
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 provide firms space to modify their heuristics according to changes in the business environment
4 and therefore increase their adaptability. An *adaptable* set of heuristics enables firms to be less
5 fixated and move beyond applying previous solutions to future problems (less specific to a
6 particular context). Such modifications may guide management to explore possible approaches
7 of implementing changes in the firm's resource base (e.g., varying IT systems to create new
8 marketing capabilities) (Simon, 1955; Todd & Miller, 1999).
9

10
11
12 Simplification cycling can be explained by extending the VCR example from above. As
13 Shiraishi's team went through an iterative trial-and-error process, they developed a list of 12
14 criteria specific to a particular context that needed to be fulfilled. Shiraishi then purposefully
15 simplified the heuristic reasoning to what he described as "a device [that] must be intelligible to
16 the people who make it, the people who buy it, and the people who have to fix it" (Nayak &
17 Ketteringham, 1986: 15). Such simplification cycling resulted in simpler, more memorable
18 heuristics and is thus likely adaptable to the changing business environment
19

20
21
22 In summary, retention of heuristic reasoning occurs after the process of variation and
23 selection has been completed and a new opportunity is successfully created (see the retention
24 stage in Figure 1). It is important to re-emphasize that the retention stage does not involve the
25 development or utilization of new heuristics; instead, firms refine their existing heuristics
26 developed throughout the variation and selection stages of proactive DC deployment to ensure
27 their simplicity and adaptability.
28

29
30
31 To review, we have thus far addressed our first question of *how* heuristic reasoning
32 facilitates proactive DC deployment. We have delineated the role of heuristic reasoning in
33 enabling the creation of an opportunity through variation, selection, and retention stages of
34 proactive DC deployment. Comprehensive theorizing on proactive DC deployment, however,
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 requires an explanation of *why* the use of heuristic reasoning is effective in such a process. In the
4
5 next section, we therefore delve deeper into our second question and elucidate the underlying
6
7 mechanism of the why question we depict in Figure 1.
8
9

10 **Why Ecologically Rational Heuristic Reasoning Is Effective for Proactive DC Deployment**

11
12
13 The effectiveness of heuristic reasoning is determined by the degree of confidence in its
14
15 expected outcome. As we alluded to above, a key concern about heuristic reasoning is whether it
16
17 leads to an inferior decision outcome compared to deductive reasoning. Therefore, in this
18
19 section, we complete our theorizing by explaining why heuristic reasoning is effective in
20
21 uncertain environments: (a) by overcoming perceived underalignment and overalignment and (b)
22
23 by refining confidence (i.e., belief in the expected outcome) during the process of proactive DC
24
25 deployment.
26
27

28
29 We begin by drawing on the concept of the bias-variance tradeoff to explicate why the
30
31 simplicity and adaptability of heuristic reasoning lead to a balance between bias and variance,
32
33 two key factors that affect confidence in a decision. Finding a balance allows firms to overcome
34
35 underalignment (i.e., high bias and low variance) and overalignment (i.e., low bias and high
36
37 variance) during the variation, selection, and retention stages of proactive DC deployment (see
38
39 the summary of our arguments in the first row of “WHY” in Figure 1 and its schematic
40
41 illustration in Figure 2). We then discuss why the simplicity and adaptability of heuristic
42
43 reasoning enable learning through the iterative process of proactive DC deployment, which in
44
45 turn allows firms to continuously obtain and process new information, reprocess the past
46
47 information, and update their heuristics to refine the confidence in their heuristic reasoning (see
48
49 the summary of our arguments in the second row of “WHY” in Figure 1 and its schematic
50
51 illustration in Figure 3).
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 ***Overcoming underalignment and overalignment.*** As we suggested earlier, using
4 heuristic reasoning in proactive DC deployment enables the firm to focus on a few pieces of
5 information in an adaptive way. In essence, the simple and adaptive characteristics of heuristic
6 reasoning can mitigate the bias and variance in uncertain environments, by overcoming both
7 under and overalignment. In an uncertain environment, decision making is prone to under and
8 overalignment, which are detrimental to confidence in decision, and therefore need to be
9 carefully managed (Bishop, 2006). We note that in uncertain environments, decision makers are
10 often unaware of the extent to which they rely on past information as well as the relevance of
11 that information. Thus, under and overalignment represent their perception of the information
12 and context. Figure 2 serves as a foundation for us to (1) demonstrate, through the concept of the
13 bias-variance tradeoff, the occurrence of underalignment and overalignment and (2) demonstrate
14 how the logic of Figure 2 complements Figure 1 (i.e., the first row of “WHY” in Figure 1).
15 Below we explain the key terms introduced in this section (e.g., decision rule, confidence, bias,
16 and variance) and unpack their relationships as illustrated in Figure 2.
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34

35 -----
36 Insert Figure 2 about here
37 -----

38 To examine the relationship between simplicity, which varies across reasoning
39 approaches, and confidence, we need to step back and define a decision rule as a higher-level
40 construct that encompasses all reasoning approaches. It ranges from a highly complex decision
41 rule—toward the left-hand side of the x-axis in Figure 2—to a highly simple decision rule—
42 toward the right-hand side of x-axis in Figure 2. The concept of a decision rule allows us to
43 explain why heuristic reasoning is effective in uncertain environments compared to deductive
44 reasoning. The simplicity of a decision rule is a function of the extent of information and
45 analytical effort required to assess an idea (Holmström & Myerson, 1983), ranging from low to
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 high (see the x-axis of Figure 2). A simple decision rule requires less information and analytical
4 effort, and thus is more adaptable (i.e., heuristic reasoning). In contrast, a more complex (lower
5 degree of simplicity) decision rule requires more information and analytical effort, and thus is
6 more specific to a particular context and less adaptable (i.e., deductive reasoning).
7
8
9

10
11
12 We define confidence as the expectation that decision makers place in the outcome of a
13 decision (King, Keohane, & Verba, 1994; Munn et al., 2014). Confidence is determined by two
14 error components: bias and variance.⁵ We note that confidence, bias, and variance are indicative
15 of decision makers' perceptions because in uncertain environments decision makers do not know
16 the outcome of a decision *ex ante*. The "truth" in the context of proactive DC deployment is
17 socially constructed by decision makers intersubjective experiences and their iterative enactment
18 process (Alvarez et al., 2013; Angen, 2000; Kvale, 1994). Therefore, decision makers can merely
19 estimate the truth and error based on their perception of available information, which in turn
20 helps them to forge a path forward in such an environment (Alvarez & Porac, 2020).
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31

32
33 Accordingly, confidence in a decision rule can be increased by minimizing bias and variance. In
34 Figure 2, the vertical axis represents error in a decision rule, which reflects the extent to which
35 confidence in a decision rule is impaired by bias or variance, while the total error curve
36 represents the sum of bias and variance. To avoid the issue of underalignment and
37 overalignment, the focus should be on reducing *total error* (i.e., increasing confidence), which
38 can only be achieved when firms balance between bias and variance and not simply focus on one
39 while ignoring the other (Artinger et al., 2015).
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51

52
53 ⁵ Random noise is discussed in the literature as a third error component. However, because random noise is
54 uncontrollable, we exclude it from our discussion here.
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 The first component, *bias*, refers to “the difference between the mean across samples and
4 the true underlying mean” (Artinger et al., 2015: 36). In other words, it is the difference between
5 the estimation derived through a decision rule and the real value of what we attempt to estimate
6 (Fortmann-Roe, 2012). Thus, a high level of bias occurs when a decision rule is oversimplified
7 and unable to capture the real value (Briscoe & Feldman, 2011). Because the information
8 required to estimate the real value is often unknown *ex ante*, especially in an uncertain
9 environment associated with proactive DC deployment, it is challenging for firms to develop an
10 understanding about the confidence in their assessment of a new idea *ex ante*. Instead, this
11 understanding gradually develops and becomes more complete *ex post* after the opportunity has
12 reached its commercial viability.
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

26 The second component, *variance*, stems from the variability in the estimation that a
27 decision rule produces when applying it to new contexts (Gigerenzer & Gaissmaier, 2011). High
28 levels of variance occur when a decision rule aligns with a specific context (i.e., its original
29 context) but does not align with other contexts. Therefore, a decision rule with high variance
30 performs poorly in an uncertain environment because the new context often differs greatly from
31 the original context. As a result, an attempt to align such a decision rule to a different context can
32 impair the confidence in an assessment of a new idea.
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41

42 While a simple decision rule benefits from less information and analytical effort, its
43 confidence can be compromised by higher bias, as it directs firms to rely on general knowledge
44 or a few generic criteria that are not context-specific. The result of this process is underalignment
45 and low confidence. Underalignment, as shown in Figure 2, occurs when decision makers fail to
46 capture and use relevant information from past knowledge to understand (or learn about) a new
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 idea. Given the lack of information in uncertain environments, proactive DC deployment is
4
5 vulnerable to underalignment in the assessment of new ideas (Hargadon & Douglas, 2001).
6

7
8 Returning to our VCR example, while the JVC team initially was concerned about two
9
10 simple criteria, “Could the device be used at home? Can average consumers afford it?”, their
11
12 lack of information (due to uncertainty) on what might become the industry standard and/or what
13
14 consumers might prefer resulted in low confidence in the new idea and was evident in the new
15
16 product. The new product, despite being small and affordable, failed because it did not meet
17
18 what became the industry standard. More specifically, Ampex’s quadruplex videotape was
19
20 widely adopted by customers and had already become the industry standard. JVC’s smaller and
21
22 cheaper VCR could not compete since its two-head VCR was incompatible with the videotape
23
24 player most customers had (Nayak & Ketteringham, 1986: 9-10).
25
26

27
28 In contrast, drawing excessively on past information is problematic because such
29
30 information may be less relevant to the current context, particularly in uncertain environments.
31
32 In this case, relying too heavily on past information may be distracting to a new assessment and
33
34 can result in overalignment (Gigerenzer, 2002, 2016; see Woodside, 2016). Overalignment, as
35
36 shown in Figure 2, occurs when a decision rule draws on more information than required and
37
38 demands more complex analytical processes. While such a complex decision rule is more robust
39
40 to bias, it can result in a higher level of variance leading to an increase in total error and a decline
41
42 in confidence.
43
44

45
46 In addition, a decision rule that leads to overalignment lacks general and transferable
47
48 information and know-how (i.e., having high context specificity and low adaptability) and thus
49
50 performs poorly when a decision-making context differs from the decision rule’s original
51
52 context. This issue is particularly pronounced in uncertain environments where information is
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 sparse, and the situation is less likely to repeat itself (Gigerenzer & Gaissmaier, 2011; Mousavi
4 & Gigerenzer, 2014). For example, 3M ignored the new idea of Post-it Notes for many years
5
6 because many of the company's observers of new product ideas overly aligned their
7
8 understanding of weak adhesive to existing glues when trying to make sense of it and failed to
9
10 identify its differences and market potential (see Arikan et al., 2020; Nayak & Ketteringham,
11
12 1986).
13
14
15

16
17 Therefore, when assessing new ideas, firms need to alleviate overalignment in order to
18
19 enhance the adaptability of insights drawn from past information and know-how (Bishop, 2006)
20
21 while at the same time avoiding falling prey to underalignment. To do so, firms apply heuristic
22
23 reasoning that makes use of few pieces of past, seemingly relevant information, while
24
25 simultaneously maintaining a sufficient degree of adaptability for future situations that are likely
26
27 to be different.
28
29

30
31 The perspective of ecologically rational heuristic reasoning suggests that heuristic
32
33 reasoning overcomes underalignment and overalignment by focusing decision makers' attention
34
35 on selected information and reducing the need for complicated analytical processes, while still
36
37 using (the seemingly most relevant) past information and existing know-how—that is, “less is
38
39 more” (Mousavi & Gigerenzer, 2014, p. 1677). Accordingly, heuristic reasoning functions well
40
41 under the constraints of limited information and prior knowledge (Gigerenzer & Selten, 2001)
42
43 because it is not concerned with consistency and coherence of past information and existing
44
45 know-how. Instead, it focuses on adaptability by aligning heuristics with the available
46
47 information and structure of the current environment and the simplicity that removes the need for
48
49 a complicated analytical process. Hence, a heuristic reasoning approach is particularly effective
50
51 for assessing new opportunities in an uncertain environment in which collecting or analyzing
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 comprehensive information is challenging (Alvarez & Barney, 2007). Attempts to do the latter
4 may result in analysis paralysis (Huang, 2018) and/or overalignment of the current situation to
5 past knowledge and experience (Gigerenzer & Selten, 2001).
6
7

8
9
10 In essence, while the initial use of heuristic reasoning may result in underalignment in
11 uncertain environments, its simplicity assists firms in adapting to the new context and achieving
12 “good enough” confidence (i.e., the best a firm can achieve given the limited information) during
13 the variation and selection stages of opportunity creation. This level of confidence allows firms
14 to develop a satisfactory understanding about a new idea and the ability to make decisions and
15 move forward with acting and reacting. As firms go through this iterative process, they
16 accumulate and process new information and reprocess past information, which further refine
17 their heuristic reasoning and add to the confidence. While this process may lead to
18 overalignment over time, this tendency is counterbalanced during the retention stage in which
19 specific heuristics undergo simplification cycling to ensure their simplicity for future use.
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32

33 We further argue that while we discuss the concepts of error and confidence in decision
34 making, “optimal” confidence is not a goal, as it has no validity in an uncertain environment due
35 to a general lack of information. Instead, we emphasize the importance of “good enough”
36 confidence because without some initial understanding of an idea, its potential benefits, and the
37 development process, a firm cannot move forward with an idea. Drawing on our VCR example,
38 the team initially focused on two simple criteria (i.e., price and ease of use), making this heuristic
39 prone to underalignment. Despite being initially low in confidence, few criteria used in their
40 heuristic reasoning offered enough understanding to move forward and further develop the VCR.
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50

51 In the next section, we explain why the simplicity and adaptability of heuristic reasoning
52 allow the refinement of confidence as the result of learning from the iterative process of action
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 and reaction during the variation and selection stages of proactive DC deployment. In addition,
4
5 we explain why such characteristics enable a refinement of heuristics during the retention stage.
6
7

8 ***Refining confidence.*** Lack of information and limited understanding are more
9
10 pronounced in the early stages of proactive DC deployment. Despite the usefulness of heuristic
11
12 reasoning in this initial stage, the confidence in its outcome is often problematic (Bingham,
13
14 Howell, & Ott, 2019). In other words, in the early stages of proactive DC deployment, the
15
16 novelty of an idea may result in misunderstanding it or preventing the selection of the most
17
18 relevant criteria or the most relevant heuristic (i.e., Type I error). While Figure 2 illustrates the
19
20 relationship between the degree of simplicity of a decision rule and its error in relation to bias
21
22 and variance, it does not capture the dynamics of how total error of a decision rule may change
23
24 through the process of iterative learning and simplification cycling.
25
26
27

28 To illustrate these dynamics, Figure 3 offers a schematic representation of how simplicity
29
30 and adaptability of heuristic reasoning enable learning from the iterative process and
31
32 simplification cycling that in turn result in changes in the level of bias, variance, total error, and
33
34 confidence. More specifically, Figure 3a illustrates the refinement of confidence through
35
36 learning from the iterative process during the variation and section stages of proactive DC
37
38 deployment. This also reflects our discussion of the “WHY” question (the second row) in the
39
40 variation and selection stages in Figure 1. Figure 3b then demonstrates the refinement of
41
42 confidence through the simplification cycling during the retention stage and represents our
43
44 discussion of the “WHY” question (the second row) in the retention stage in Figure 1.
45
46
47
48

49 -----
50 Insert Figure 3 about here
51 -----

52
53 The baseline in Figure 3a shows that given the lack of information in uncertain
54
55 environments, an initial decision rule tends to be overly simple (located towards the right side –
56
57

1
2
3 high degree of simplicity). It involves high bias and low variance (i.e., underalignment), thereby
4
5 resulting in low, yet “good enough” confidence. However, as firms go through iterative learning,
6
7 they accumulate and process new information, while simultaneously reprocessing the previously
8
9 obtained information to develop a better understanding of the current context. This process
10
11 alleviates underalignment (the solid line moves toward the left along the horizontal axis in Figure
12
13 3a). This is because learning occurring during the iterative feedback loop within and between the
14
15 variation and selection stages (see Figure 1) allows the firm to draw on more information, new
16
17 ideas, and perspectives (i.e., increased variance), thereby refining the decision rule to become
18
19 more complex (lower degree of simplicity) but more confident in relation to the specific context
20
21 (i.e., decreased bias) for which it has been developed (see the solid vertical line in Figure 3a).
22
23
24
25

26 In other words, the iterative nature of proactive DC deployment provides firms with real-
27
28 time market feedback regarding the new idea and allows them to incorporate this learning to
29
30 refine the heuristic reasoning used in the variation and selection stages (Argote, 1999; Sitkin,
31
32 1992). As the learning progresses and new information becomes available, firms gradually
33
34 incorporate and refine this new knowledge by abandoning obsolete criteria, adding new criteria
35
36 proven useful in the current context, and/or modifying their decision rules generated in earlier
37
38 stages. These actions enable firms to update and refine their decision rules based on new
39
40 information—exploiting the benefit of variance—to align the current context in which an
41
42 assessment of a new idea is taking place.
43
44
45
46

47 More specifically, these actions lead to a decrease in bias and an increase in variance of a
48
49 decision rule as the inclusion of context-specific information gained through feedback improves
50
51 an understanding of a new idea and, thus, reduces error and increases the confidence in decision
52
53 rules (Bingham et al., 2019). This process is illustrated by the move from the vertical baseline to
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 the solid vertical line in Figure 3a. Returning to our VCR example, the adaptive nature of
4 heuristic reasoning enabled Shiraishi's team to learn during the variation and selection stages.
5
6 Iterative learning mitigates underalignment (reducing error from bias) as firms include more
7
8 criteria in their heuristic reasoning to reach the balance between bias and variance, thereby
9
10 minimizing total error and improving their confidence.
11
12
13

14
15 This is in line with entrepreneurship research, which suggests that the process of
16
17 opportunity creation is iterative in nature. More specifically, as entrepreneurs act upon their new
18
19 idea, they observe the market reaction and engage in a series of feedback loops (Amabile, 1983)
20
21 throughout the variation and selection stages. The opportunity creation perspective further
22
23 suggests that the opportunity creation process is socially constructed and involves interaction
24
25 with individuals both inside (e.g., engineers, scientists, marketing managers, and finance
26
27 managers [Ross & Fisch, 2018]) and outside the firm (e.g., customers and suppliers [Alvarez et
28
29 al., 2013; Foss, Lyngsie, & Zahra, 2013]).
30
31
32

33
34 As such, firms often incorporate their learning gained from feedback to revisit and refine
35
36 their ideas (Alvarez et al., 2013) until a new opportunity is successfully created or failure occurs.
37
38 This process of learning through feedback has been discussed in the experiential learning and
39
40 strategy-by-doing literature as the elaboration process (e.g., Anand & Khanna, 2000; Chen,
41
42 Wang, Cui, & Li, 2021; Furr & Eisenhardt, 2021; Helfat & Peteraf, 2003), suggesting that
43
44 decision makers often start by relying on a few simple decision rules before gradually
45
46 incorporating knowledge gained through trial and error and social interaction to improve the
47
48 context-specificity and, hence, confidence in their decision rules.
49
50

51
52 Next, Figure 3b demonstrates how the simplification cycling during the retention stage
53
54 leads to an increase in simplicity of a decision rule, resulting in an increase in bias and a decrease
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 in variance, and, hence, a decline in confidence when applying a decision rule to a new context.
4
5 We explained in the retention section that as firms proceed to seize and exploit an opportunity,
6
7 they are likely to accumulate a set of reliable and step-by-step decision rules (Eisenhardt &
8
9 Tabrizi, 1995; Kale & Singh, 2007; Szulanski & Jensen, 2006) formed during the variation and
10
11 selection stages of proactive DC deployment. While such decision rules are valuable in the
12
13 specific context in which they are developed, their lack of simplicity reduces their adaptability to
14
15 different contexts as well as their retrievability from memory. This may also result in confusion
16
17 and even conflicting guidance (Bingham & Eisenhardt, 2011). Therefore, it is important for firms
18
19 to engage in simplification cycling to maintain the simplicity and adaptability of their heuristic
20
21 reasoning (Bingham & Eisenhardt, 2011).
22
23
24
25

26 As firms engage in simplification cycling, they track additions and deletions of their
27
28 decision rules to produce a limited set of simple yet adaptive decision rules. In turn, these rules
29
30 can easily be remembered and retrieved (see the retention stage in Figure 1) to facilitate
31
32 sensemaking, development, and selection of variations of the newly created opportunity as the
33
34 business environment changes (Bingham & Eisenhardt, 2011). In doing so, firms may combine
35
36 or replace certain decision rules with simpler ones. This process results in increasing bias and
37
38 reducing variance of a decision rule (see the move of the vertical line from the solid line on the
39
40 left toward the dashed line on the right along the horizontal axis in Figure 3b). While the
41
42 confidence in such heuristic rules remains intact for the context in which they were developed,
43
44 such simplification cycling will lead to compromised confidence when these decision rules are
45
46 applied in a new context.
47
48
49
50

51 However, given that in the uncertain environments associated with proactive DC
52
53 deployment the future context likely differs from what the firm has experienced and incorporated
54
55
56
57

1
2
3 into its decision rules, the confidence in a decision rule decreases when applied to the new
4 context. Therefore, these decision rules may only be useful for initiating sensemaking and taking
5 early actions on future opportunities. These simplified heuristics will likely undergo an
6 underalignment issue at first. However, their confidence will improve as the result of the iterative
7 process of action and reaction in the future contexts (see the feedback loop between retention and
8 variation stage in Figure 1).
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17

18 **DISCUSSION**

19
20 Unsettled theoretical assumptions and a lack of understanding of the underlying
21 mechanisms of DCs have drawn ongoing criticism (see Barreto, 2010; Peteraf et al., 2013;
22 Schilke et al., 2018), leaving their value to strategic management research in question. For
23 example, while the existing DC literature has related DC deployment to opportunities, questions
24 of how opportunities arise and their underlying processes have been widely overlooked (Schilke
25 et al., 2018). We argued that DC scholarship can clarify these conceptual limitations by
26 providing more specific and in-depth theorizing about DCs' underlying assumptions.
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35

36 Perhaps the most important consideration is a clear distinction between reactive and
37 proactive DC deployment that further elucidates the ongoing debate regarding uncertainty—an
38 important boundary condition of the original conceptualization of the DC view (Teece, 2007;
39 Teece et al., 1997). This also enables a thorough examination of how the conceptualization of
40 DCs might differ in these two settings. By incorporating the concept of ecologically rational
41 heuristic reasoning and the opportunity creation perspective, we responded to Schilke et al.'s
42 (2018) suggestion to extend the DC literature by infusing the DC view with psychological and
43 entrepreneurship theory. In particular, we explicated the underlying process of proactive DC
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 deployment, which is associated with uncertainty: How heuristic reasoning facilitates variation,
4 selection, and retention in opportunity creation during proactive DC deployment.
5
6

7
8 Our explicit distinction between reactive and proactive DC deployment and our focus on
9 the latter also allowed us to respond to the ongoing debate in the DC literature about the
10 usefulness and application of heuristic reasoning (Di Stefano, Peteraf, & Verona, 2014;
11 Eisenhardt & Martin, 2000; Helfat & Peteraf, 2015; Peteraf et al., 2013; Schilke et al., 2018;
12 Teece & Leih, 2016; Teece, 2007). While the application of heuristic reasoning in DC
13 deployment has been acknowledged (Eisenhardt & Martin, 2000), scholars have yet to
14 understand how this type of reasoning can be applied to the conceptualization of DCs (Teece et
15 al., 1997) and what the outcome implications might be (Di Stefano et al., 2014; Helfat & Peteraf,
16 2015; Peteraf et al., 2013).
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27

28 Much previous strategic management research has drawn on the “heuristic and bias”
29 perspective (Tversky & Kahneman, 1974), which emphasizes the inferior outcome of heuristic
30 reasoning, thus neglecting the “ecologically rational heuristic reasoning” perspective (Gigerenzer
31 & Selten, 2002). This has led to a one-sided view of heuristic reasoning and its use in strategic
32 management research. Our theorizing clarified *how* and *why* heuristic reasoning is useful and
33 enhances adaptive decision making, which is necessary for proactive DC deployment and the
34 context of uncertainty. In addition, our discussion shed light on the circumstances under which
35 heuristic reasoning would be beneficial for firms. We, therefore, extend the theoretical
36 assumptions of earlier work that has begun to integrate this ecologically rational heuristic
37 reasoning perspective into management research (Artinger et al., 2015; Bingham & Eisenhardt,
38 2011; Luan, Reb, & Gigerenzer, 2019; Maitland & Sammartino, 2015; Mousavi & Gigerenzer,
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 2014). We also highlighted the usefulness of ecologically rational heuristic reasoning by
4
5 discussing its underlying process and enabling mechanisms.
6
7

8 Our theorizing also contributes to both the DC literature and a broader literature on the
9
10 resource-based view. The key propositions of the resource-based view of the firm are that among
11
12 firms' heterogeneous resources and capabilities, not all resources and capabilities are of equal
13
14 value. That is, firms' sustainable competitive advantage can only be achieved when firms'
15
16 resources and capabilities are valuable, rare, inimitable, and non-substitutable (VRIN) (Barney,
17
18 1991; Barney et al., 2001). Similarly, the DC literature focuses on how DC deployment may
19
20 result in sustainable competitive advantage (see Barreto, 2010; Peteraf et al., 2013; Schilke et al.,
21
22 2018). Our distinction between reactive and proactive DC deployment and our in-depth
23
24 explanation of the underlying process of proactive DC deployment suggest that proactive DC
25
26 deployment more likely contributes to the creation of a new resource base (and, hence, new
27
28 opportunity) with VRIN characteristics. The lack of past information and existing know-how and
29
30 embedded uncertainty of proactive DC deployment makes it unlikely that competitors will come
31
32 up with a similar idea and develop it into a similar new opportunity (Alvarez & Barney, 2007).
33
34
35
36
37

38 Instead, the underlying process of proactive DC deployment is idiosyncratic and path-
39
40 dependent as an outcome of an iterative learning process and accumulated experience. This
41
42 process often leads to a new or unexpected path that could not be created otherwise (Vergne &
43
44 Durand, 2010, 2011). Hence, such a process can ensure that an initial idea of a potential new
45
46 opportunity differs from the ultimate outcome, and its deployment process can only be fully
47
48 understood retrospectively (Alvarez & Barney, 2007), creating a causal ambiguity advantage for
49
50 the firm (Argote, 1999).
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 While our integration of the opportunity creation perspective (Alvarez & Barney, 2007)
4 from entrepreneurship research enabled us to further advance the DC literature (Schilke et al.,
5 2018), we believe that our theorizing on proactive DC deployment also adds to ongoing debates
6 in entrepreneurship research in two ways (e.g., Alvarez & Barney, 2007; Alvarez et al., 2013;
7 Foss & Klein, 2017; Foss, Klein, & Bjørnskov, 2019). First, despite the use of heuristic
8 reasoning in the opportunity creation literature (e.g., Alvarez & Barney, 2007), its role and
9 enabling mechanisms have not yet been fully explained. Our theorizing on how and why
10 heuristic reasoning facilitates successful creation of an opportunity bridges the gaps in this
11 literature and offers a better understanding of how firms create “something out of nothing”
12 (Baker & Nelson, 2005: 330).
13
14

15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26 Second, given that the context of entrepreneurship research is mostly associated with
27 uncertainty where paths and outcomes are not clear (Alvarez & Barney, 2007; Alvarez & Parker,
28 2009), our conceptualization of heuristic reasoning in proactive DC deployment further extends
29 the understanding of entrepreneurial decision making, particularly the underlying mechanism
30 and the value of ecologically rational heuristic reasoning under uncertainty. More broadly, our
31 theorizing at the individual (i.e., decision maker) level of DC deployment also contributes to the
32 behavioral strategy and microfoundations literature (e.g., Powell, Lovallo, & Fox, 2011; Vuori &
33 Vuori, 2014) that have gained increased traction among strategic management scholars in the
34 past decade (e.g., Foss et al., 2019; Teece et al., 2016; Teece, 2016).
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46

47 Our discussion about the underlying process of heuristic reasoning in opportunity
48 creation also explains the collective creation and development of heuristic reasoning at the firm
49 level. We argue that while heuristic reasoning is used by managers to facilitate decision making
50 during the proactive DC deployment process, the interaction between individuals involved in this
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 process further reshapes and refines the heuristics within a firm. This is in line with Bingham et
4
5 al. (2019) argument that suggests that while an initial idea may have been proposed by an
6
7 individual or a group of individuals, it is often top managers who mandate the development
8
9 process, facilitate the interaction between departments, and determine which variant of an idea
10
11 should be selected for future implementation.
12
13

14 15 **Future Research Directions**

16
17 Future research can expand our theoretical framework by investigating the usefulness of
18
19 ecologically rational heuristic reasoning in the process of reactive DC deployment (i.e.,
20
21 opportunity discovery). The opportunity discovery perspective assumes that opportunities are the
22
23 outcome of exogenous shocks. Thus, firms (a) become aware of the opportunity by
24
25 systematically searching the environment and (b) at the time of decision making can collect
26
27 sufficient relevant information to engage in deductive reasoning. To remain competitive, firms
28
29 need to consider both the type (local and distant) and speed of their search for an opportunity,
30
31 while simultaneously responding to the opportunity truly and ahead of their competitors
32
33 (Alvarez & Barney, 2007; Delios & Henisz, 2003; Penrose, 1959; Porter, 1985; see also
34
35 D'Aveni, Dagnino, & Smith, 2010). This poses a competing pressure on firms and raises a
36
37 critical question of whether firms can collect sufficiently trustworthy information for deductive
38
39 reasoning and respond to the newly discovered opportunity in a timely manner. This competing
40
41 demand for trustworthy and speed in reactive DC deployment is particularly challenging, causing
42
43 deductive reasoning (Alvarez & Barney, 2007; Teece, 2007) to be time and effort consuming
44
45 (i.e., in collecting comprehensive information) (Kahneman & Frederick, 2002).
46
47
48
49
50
51

52 Future research in DCs and entrepreneurship can delve deeper into the competing
53
54 requirements that underpin opportunity discovery and investigate how uncertainty plays a role in
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 such contexts. In addition, our work informs future research on the application of ecologically
4 rational heuristic reasoning in the opportunity discovery context. Specifically, we suggest that
5 ecologically rational heuristic reasoning enables sufficiently trustworthy estimation of future
6 outcomes as well as fast responses to changes and opportunities in the environment (Gigerenzer,
7 1996; Kahneman & Tversky, 1996).
8
9

10
11
12 Our proposed theoretical framework also provides opportunities for empirical research.
13 For example, prior studies in managerial cognition (e.g. Barr, Stimpert, & Huff, 1992) have
14 suggested that cognitive processes can be deduced from analyses of language patterns (Duriau,
15 Reger, & Pfarrer, 2007). Hence, we suggest that longitudinal content analyses on firms' data
16 (e.g., emails, meeting minutes of a specific project, conference calls, and annual reports) could
17 provide meaningful insights and a basis for empirically testing the arguments put forward in this
18 paper. Complementary empirical research could also draw on an in-depth, longitudinal case
19 analysis to investigate specific strategic changes (e.g., entering a new market or developing a
20 new business model) and seek to detect management uses of heuristic reasoning in such
21 situations (e.g., Bingham & Eisenhardt, 2011; Maitland & Sammartino, 2015).
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37

38 Our proposed theoretical framework draws on a distinction between proactive and
39 reactive DC deployment, with a focus on the former. However, the question of whether or how
40 proactive and reactive DC deployment are intertwined remains. Our theorizing encompassed the
41 point from which an idea about a potential new opportunity is created to the point from which
42 the idea is fully developed into a newly created opportunity. In principle, one could argue that
43 reactive DC deployment occurs when the new opportunity has been introduced to the market,
44 and a firm learns from customers' and competitors' responses to refine its product. Future
45 research could investigate this suggested interrelationship more deeply.
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Given our focus on proactive DC deployment, our paper described a situation wherein the
4 decision context is uncertain and heuristic reasoning is used. Nevertheless, the question of how
5 decision makers can know *ex ante* whether the decision context is risky or uncertain remains
6 open (Rindova & Courtney, 2020). For example, Miller (2007: 58) suggested that “neither risk as
7 statistical probability nor uncertainty is devoid of personal judgment. Both involve subjective
8 classification of states, albeit with different degrees of difficulty—ranging from straightforward
9 to impossible.” In contrast, Alvarez and Barney (2005: 779) argued “whether a decision to invest
10 in a market opportunity is risky or uncertain depends on the objective properties of that
11 investment, not on the perceptions of decision makers.” The lack of clarity in the literature has
12 further highlighted the importance of this question and the need for future research (Rindova &
13 Courtney, 2020).
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27

28 Misjudgement an uncertain environment as risky or vice versa, however, may result in an
29 inferior decision. This was illustrated in our Post-It Notes example, where some 3M engineers
30 and managers overfit their understanding of the weak glue with the existing market for glue. The
31 development team misjudged the situation as one of risk (rather than uncertainty) and thus
32 overlooked the usefulness of weak glue. Our argument here is in line with that of Alvarez and
33 Barney (2005), which suggested that decision makers may think they can estimate the probability
34 distribution of outcomes associated with a decision even when the necessary data are
35 unavailable.
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46

47 However, decision makers often underestimate the nature of an uncertain environment.
48 Therefore, we encourage future research to bridge the gap between these two lines of
49 argumentation by investigating (a) the factors impacting individual perceptions of risky or
50 uncertain environments (including overconfidence), (b) how and when individual perception of a
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 decision context reflects the true characteristics of the decision context, and (c) how the use and
4 effectiveness of different reasoning approaches depend on the subjectivity or objectivity of the
5 decision context.
6
7
8
9

10 **Conclusion**

11
12 We advanced the theoretical assumptions of the DC view and the broader resource-based
13 view literature by theorizing about the heuristic reasoning process in proactive DC deployment.
14 Specifically, our explicit distinction between reactive and proactive DC deployment highlights
15 the extent to which decisions are characterized by risk or uncertainty. In addition, our
16 incorporation of ecologically rational heuristics extends our understanding about the cognitive
17 foundations of research in entrepreneurship and behavioral strategy. In doing so, we offer a
18 better understanding of *how* and *why* heuristic reasoning effectively facilitates opportunity
19 creation and proactive DC deployment. Finally, our work has implications for critical questions
20 in both the DC and resource-based view literatures: How are heterogeneous resources and
21 capabilities created, and how do they contribute to firms' sustainable competitive advantage?
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

REFERENCES

- 1
2
3
4
5 Adner, R., & Helfat, C. E. 2003. Corporate effects and dynamic managerial capabilities. *Strategic Management Journal*, 24(10): 1011-1025.
6
7
8 Aldrich, H. E., & Ruef, M. 2006. *Organizations evolving* (2nd ed. ed.). Thousand Oaks, Ca: Sage.
9
10 Alvarez, S. A., & Barney, J. B. 2004. Organizing rent generation and appropriation: Toward a theory of
11 the entrepreneurial firm. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 19: 621-635.
12
13 Alvarez, S. A., & Barney, J. B. 2005. How do entrepreneurs organize firms under conditions of
14 uncertainty? *Journal of Management*, 31(5): 776-793.
15
16 Alvarez, S. A., & Barney, J. B. 2007. Discovery and creation: Alternative theories of entrepreneurial
17 action. *Strategic Entrepreneurship Journal*, 1(1-2): 11-26.
18
19 Alvarez, S. A., Barney, J. B., & Anderson, P. 2013. Forming and exploiting opportunities: The
20 implications of discovery and creation processes for entrepreneurial and organizational research.
21 *Organization Science*, 24(1): 301-317.
22
23 Alvarez, S. A., Barney, J. B., McBride, R., & Wuebker, R. 2014. Realism in the study of
24 entrepreneurship. *Academy of Management Review*, 39(2): 227-231.
25
26 Alvarez, S. A., & Parker, S. C. 2009. Emerging firms and the allocation of control rights: A Bayesian
27 approach. *Academy of Management Review*, 34(2): 209-227.
28
29 Alvarez, S. A., & Porac, J. 2020. Imagination, indeterminacy, and managerial choice at the limit of
30 knowledge. *Academy of Management Review*, 45(4): 735-744.
31
32 Amabile, T. M. 1983. The social psychology of creativity: A componential conceptualization. *Journal of*
33 *Personality and Social Psychology*, 45(2): 357-376.
34
35 Amit, R., & Schoemaker, P. J. 1993. Strategic assets and organizational rent. *Strategic Management*
36 *Journal*, 14(1): 33-46.
37
38 Anand, B. N., & Khanna, T. 2000. Do firms learn to create value? The case of alliances. *Strategic*
39 *Management Journal*, 21(3): 295-315.
40
41 Angen, M. J. 2000. Evaluating interpretive inquiry: Reviewing the validity debate and opening the
42 dialogue. *Qualitative Health Research*, 10(3): 378-395.
43
44 Argote, L. 1999. *Organizational learning: Creating, retaining and transferring knowledge*. Norwell,
45 MA: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
46
47 Arikan, A. M., Arikan, I., & Koparan, I. 2020. Creation opportunities: Entrepreneurial curiosity,
48 generative cognition, and Knightian uncertainty. *Academy of Management Review*, 45(4): 808-
49 824.
50
51 Artinger, F., Petersen, M., Gigerenzer, G., & Weibler, J. 2015. Heuristics as adaptive decision strategies
52 in management. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 36: S33-S52.
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Baker, T., & Nelson, R. E. 2005. Creating something from nothing: Resource construction through
4 entrepreneurial bricolage. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 50(3): 329-366.
5
6 Barnes, J. H. 1984. Cognitive biases and their impact on strategic planning. *Strategic Management*
7 *Journal*, 5(2): 129-137.
8
9 Barney, J. 1991. Firm resources and sustained competitive advantage. *Journal of Management*, 17(1):
10 99-120.
11
12 Barney, J., Wright, M., & Ketchen, D. J. 2001. The resource-based view of the firm: Ten years after 1991.
13 *Journal of Management*, 27(6): 625-641.
14
15 Barr, P. S., Stimpert, J. L., & Huff, A. S. 1992. Cognitive change, strategic action, and organizational
16 renewal. *Strategic Management Journal*, 13(S1): 15-36.
17
18 Barreto, I. 2010. Dynamic capabilities: A review of past research and an agenda for the future. *Journal of*
19 *Management*, 36(1): 256-280.
20
21 Bateman, T. S., & Zeithaml, C. P. 1989a. The psychological context of strategic decisions: A model and
22 convergent experimental findings. *Strategic Management Journal*, 10(1): 59-74.
23
24 Bateman, T. S., & Zeithaml, C. P. 1989b. The psychological context of strategic decisions: A test of
25 relevance to practitioners. *Strategic Management Journal*, 10(6): 587-592.
26
27 Benner, M. J., & Tushman, M. 2002. Process management and technological innovation: A longitudinal
28 study of the photography and paint industries. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 47(4): 676-707.
29
30 Berglund, H., Bousfiha, M., & Mansoori, Y. 2020. Opportunities as Artifacts and Entrepreneurship as
31 Design. *Academy of Management Review*, 45(4): 825-846.
32
33 Bingham, C. B., & Eisenhardt, K. M. 2011. Rational heuristics: The 'simple rules' that strategists learn
34 from process experience. *Strategic Management Journal*, 32(13): 1437-1464.
35
36 Bingham, C. B., Howell, T., & Ott, T. E. 2019. Capability creation: Heuristics as microfoundations.
37 *Strategic Entrepreneurship Journal*, 13(2): 121-153.
38
39 Bishop, C. M. 2006. *Pattern recognition and machine learning*. New York, NY: Springer.
40
41 Briscoe, E., & Feldman, J. 2011. Conceptual complexity and the bias/variance tradeoff. *Cognition*,
42 118(1): 2-16.
43
44 Busenitz, L. W., & Barney, J. B. 1997. Differences between entrepreneurs and managers in large
45 organizations: Biases and heuristics in strategic decision-making. *Journal of Business*
46 *Venturing*, 12(1): 9-30.
47
48 Campbell, D. T. 1994. How individual and face-to-face group selection undermine firm selection in
49 organizational evolution. In J. A. C. Baum, & S. J. V. (Eds.), *Evolutionary dynamics of*
50 *organizations*: 23-38. New York: Oxford University Press.
51
52 Chen, L., Wang, M., Cui, L., & Li, S. 2021. Experience base, strategy-by-doing and new product
53 performance. *Strategic Management Journal*, 42(7): 1379-1398.
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 D'Aveni, R. A., Dagnino, G. B., & Smith, K. G. 2010. The age of temporary advantage. *Strategic*
4 *Management Journal*, 31(13): 1371-1385.
5
6 Day, G. S. 2011. Closing the marketing capabilities gap. *Journal of Marketing*, 75: 183-195.
7
8 Deleuze, G. 1995. *Negotiations, 1972-1990*. New York: Columbia University Press.
9
10 Delios, A., & Henisz, W. J. 2003. Political hazards, experience, and sequential entry strategies: The
11 international expansion of Japanese firms, 1980–1998. *Strategic Management Journal*, 24(11):
12 1153-1164.
13
14 Dew, N. 2007. Abduction: A pre-condition for the intelligent design of strategy. *Journal of Business*
15 *Strategy*, 28(4): 38-45.
16
17 Di Stefano, G., Peteraf, M., & Verona, G. 2014. The organizational drivetrain: A road to integration of
18 dynamic capabilities research. *Academy of Management Perspectives*, 28(4): 307-327.
19
20 Dunne, D. D., & Dougherty, D. 2016. Abductive reasoning: How innovators navigate in the labyrinth of
21 complex product innovation. *Organization Studies*, 37(2): 131-159.
22
23 Duriau, V. J., Reger, R. K., & Pfarrer, M. D. 2007. A content analysis of the content analysis literature in
24 organization studies: Research themes, data sources, and methodological refinements.
25 *Organizational Research Methods*, 10(1): 5-34.
26
27 Eisenhardt, K. M., & Martin, J. A. 2000. Dynamic capabilities: What are they? *Strategic Management*
28 *Journal*, 21(10-11): 1105-1121.
29
30 Eisenhardt, K. M., & Tabrizi, B. N. 1995. Accelerating adaptive processes: Product innovation in the
31 global computer industry. *Administrative Science Quarterly*: 84-110.
32
33 Ellis, S., & Shpielberg, N. 2003. Organizational learning mechanisms and managers' perceived
34 uncertainty. *Human Relations*, 56(10): 1233-1254.
35
36 Felin, T., Foss, N. J., Heimeriks, K. H., & Madsen, T. L. 2012. Microfoundations of routines and
37 capabilities: Individuals, processes, and structure. *Journal of Management Studies*, 49(8): 1351-
38 1374.
39
40 Fortmann-Roe, S. 2012. Understanding the bias-variance tradeoff, [http://scott.fortmann-](http://scott.fortmann-roe.com/docs/BiasVariance.html)
41 [roe.com/docs/BiasVariance.html](http://scott.fortmann-roe.com/docs/BiasVariance.html).
42
43 Foss, N. J., & Klein, P. G. 2017. Entrepreneurial discovery or creation? In search of the middle ground.
44 *Academy of Management Review*, 42(4): 733-736.
45
46 Foss, N. J., Klein, P. G., & Bjørnskov, C. 2019. The context of entrepreneurial judgment: Organizations,
47 markets, and institutions. *Journal of Management Studies*, 56(6): 1197-1213.
48
49 Foss, N. J., Lyngsie, J., & Zahra, S. A. 2013. The role of external knowledge sources and organizational
50 design in the process of opportunity exploitation. *Strategic Management Journal*, 34(12): 1453-
51 1471.
52
53 Furr, N. R., & Eisenhardt, K. M. 2021. Strategy and uncertainty: Resource-based view, strategy-creation
54 view, and the hybrid between them. *Journal of Management*, 47(7): 1915-1935.
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Garud, R., & Karnøe, P. 2001. Path Creation as a Process of Mindful Deviation. In R. Garud, & P.
4 Karnøe (Eds.), *Path dependence and creation*. London: Lawrence Erlbaum Association, Inc.
5
6 Gavetti, G. 2005. Cognition and hierarchy: Rethinking the microfoundations of capabilities' development.
7 *Organization Science*, 16(6): 599-617.
8
9 Gigerenzer, G. 1996. On narrow norms and vague heuristics: A reply to Kahneman and Tversky.
10 *Psychological Review*, 103(3): 592-596.
11
12 Gigerenzer, G. 2002. The adaptive toolbox. In G. Gigerenzer, & R. Selten (Eds.), *Bounded rationality:*
13 *The adaptive toolbox*: 37-50. London: MIT press.
14
15 Gigerenzer, G. 2016. Towards a Rational Theory of Heuristics. In R. Frantz, & L. Marsh (Eds.), *Minds,*
16 *Models and Milieux: Commemorating the centennial of the birth of Herbert Simon*: 34-59.
17 New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
18
19 Gigerenzer, G., & Brighton, H. 2009. Homo heuristicus: Why biased minds make better inferences.
20 *Topics in Cognitive Science*, 1(1): 107-143.
21
22 Gigerenzer, G., & Gaissmaier, W. 2011. Heuristic decision making. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 62:
23 451-482.
24
25 Gigerenzer, G., & Goldstein, D. G. 1996. Reasoning the fast and frugal way: Models of bounded
26 rationality. *Psychological Review*, 103(4): 650.
27
28 Gigerenzer, G., & Selten, R. 2001. Rethinking rationality. In G. Gigerenzer, & R. Selten (Eds.), *Bounded*
29 *rationality: The adaptive toolbox*, Vol. 1: 12. Cambridge, UK: The MIT Press.
30
31 Gigerenzer, G., & Selten, R. 2002. *Bounded rationality: The adaptive toolbox*. Cambridge, MA: MIT
32 Press.
33
34
35 Girod, S. J. G., & Whittington, R. 2017. Reconfiguration, restructuring and firm performance: Dynamic
36 capabilities and environmental dynamism. *Strategic Management Journal*(38): 1121-1133.
37
38 Hargadon, A. B., & Douglas, Y. 2001. When innovations meet institutions: Edison and the design of the
39 electric light. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 46(3): 476-501.
40
41 Harrell, J. B., O'Reilly III, C. A., & Tushman, M. L. 2007. Dynamic capabilities at IBM: Driving strategy
42 into action. *California Management Review*, 49(4): 21-43.
43
44 Helfat, C. E., Finkelstein, S., Mitchell, W., Peteraf, M., Singh, H., Teece, D. J., & Winter, S. G. 2007.
45 *Dynamic capabilities: Understanding strategic change in organizations*. Malden: Blackwell
46 Publishing.
47
48 Helfat, C. E., & Peteraf, M. 2003. The dynamic resource-based view: Capability lifecycles. *Strategic*
49 *Management Journal*, 24(10): 997-1010.
50
51 Helfat, C. E., & Peteraf, M. 2015. Managerial cognitive capabilities and the microfoundations of dynamic
52 capabilities. *Strategic Management Journal*, 36(6): 831-850.
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Hodgkinson, G. P., Bown, N. J., Maule, A. J., Glaister, K. W., & Pearman, A. D. 1999. Breaking the
4 frame: An analysis of strategic cognition and decision making under uncertainty. *Strategic*
5 *Management journal*, 20(10): 977-985.
6
7 Hodgkinson, G. P., & Healey, M. P. 2011. Psychological foundations of dynamic capabilities: Reflexion
8 and reflection in strategic management. *Strategic Management Journal*, 32(13): 1500-1516.
9
10 Holmström, B., & Myerson, R. B. 1983. Efficient and durable decision rules with incomplete
11 information. *Econometrica: Journal of the Econometric Society*: 1799-1819.
12
13 Huang, L. 2018. The role of investor gut feel in managing complexity and extreme risk. *Academy of*
14 *Management Journal*, 61(5): 1821-1847.
15
16 Kahneman, D. 2003. Maps of bounded rationality: Psychology for behavioral economics. *The American*
17 *Economic Review*, 93(5): 1449-1475.
18
19 Kahneman, D., & Frederick, S. 2002. Representativeness revisited: Attribute substitution in intuitive
20 judgment. In T. Gilovich, D. Griffin, & D. Kahneman (Eds.), *Heuristics and Biases: The*
21 *Psychology of Intuitive Judgment*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
22
23 Kahneman, D., & Tversky, A. 1996. On the reality of cognitive illusions. *Psychological Review*, 103(3):
24 582-591.
25
26 Kale, P., & Singh, H. 2007. Building firm capabilities through learning: the role of the alliance learning
27 process in alliance capability and firm-level alliance success. *Strategic Management Journal*,
28 28(10): 981-1000.
29
30 Kaplan, S. 2008. Framing contests: Strategy making under uncertainty. *Organization Science*, 19(5):
31 729-752.
32
33 King, G., Keohane, R. O., & Verba, S. 1994. *Designing social inquiry: Scientific inference in*
34 *qualitative research*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
35
36 Knight, F. 1921. *Risk, uncertainty and profit*. New York: Hart, Schaffner & Marx.
37
38 Kvale, S. 1994. *Interviews: An introduction to qualitative research interviewing*: Sage Publications, Inc.
39
40 Lampert, C. M., Kim, M., & Polidoro Jr, F. 2020. Branching and Anchoring: Complementary Asset
41 Configurations in Conditions of Knightian Uncertainty. *Academy of Management Review*, 45(4):
42 847-868.
43
44 Lavie, D. 2006. Capability reconfiguration: An analysis of incumbent responses to technological change.
45 *Academy of Management Review*, 31(1): 153-174.
46
47 Lovallo, D., Brown, A. L., Teece, D. J., & Bardolet, D. 2020. Resource re-allocation capabilities in
48 internal capital markets: The value of overcoming inertia. *Strategic Management Journal*.
49
50 Luan, S., Reb, J., & Gigerenzer, G. 2019. Ecological rationality: Fast-and-frugal heuristics for managerial
51 decision making under uncertainty. *Academy of Management Journal*, 62(6).
52
53 Maine, E., Soh, P.-H., & Dos Santos, N. 2015. The role of entrepreneurial decision-making in opportunity
54 creation and recognition. *Technovation*, 39: 53-72.
55
56
57
58
59
60


- 1
2
3 Maitland, E., & Sammartino, A. 2015. Decision-making and uncertainty: The role of heuristics and
4 experience in assessing a politically hazardous environment. *Strategic Management Journal*,
5 36(10): 1554-1578.
6
- 7 McBride, R., & Wuebker, R. 2020. Social objectivity and entrepreneurial opportunities. *Academy of*
8 *Management Review*, 47(1): 75-92.
9
- 10 Meyer-Doyle, P., Lee, S., & Helfat, C. E. 2019. Disentangling the microfoundations of acquisition
11 behavior and performance. *Strategic Management Journal*, 40(11): 1733-1756.
12
- 13 Miller, D., & Friesen, P. H. 1983. Strategy-making and environment: The third link. *Strategic*
14 *Management Journal*, 4(3): 221-235.
15
- 16 Miller, K. D. 2007. Risk and rationality in entrepreneurial processes. *Strategic Entrepreneurship*
17 *Journal*, 1(1-2): 57-74.
18
- 19 Mousavi, S., & Gigerenzer, G. 2014. Risk, uncertainty, and heuristics. *Journal of Business Research*,
20 67(8): 1671-1678.
21
- 22 Munn, Z., Porritt, K., Lockwood, C., Aromataris, E., & Pearson, A. 2014. Establishing confidence in the
23 output of qualitative research synthesis: The ConQual approach. *BMC Medical Research*
24 *Methodology*, 14(1): 1-7.
25
- 26 Nayak, P. R., & Kettingham, J. M. 1986. *Breakthroughs!* New York: Rawson Associates.
27
- 28 Ocasio, W. 1997. Towards an attention-based view of the firm. *Strategic Management Journal*, 18(S1):
29 187-206.
30
- 31 Peirce, C. S. 1932. *Elements of Logic*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
32
- 33 Penrose, E. T. 1959. *The theory of the growth of the firm*. New York: John Wiley & Sons.
34
- 35 Peteraf, M., Di Stefano, G., & Verona, G. 2013. The elephant in the room of dynamic capabilities:
36 Bringing two diverging conversations together. *Strategic Management Journal*, 34(12): 1389-
37 1410.
38
- 39 Pitelis, C. N., & Teece, D. J. 2010. Cross-border market co-creation, dynamic capabilities and the
40 entrepreneurial theory of the multinational enterprise. *Industrial and Corporate Change*, 19(4):
41 1247-1270.
42
- 43 Porter, M. E. 1985. *Competitive advantage: Creating and sustaining superior performance*. New York:
44 Free Press.
45
- 46 Powell, T. C. 2001. Competitive advantage: Logical and philosophical considerations. *Strategic*
47 *Management Journal*, 22(9): 875-888.
48
- 49 Powell, T. C., Lovallo, D., & Fox, C. R. 2011. Behavioral strategy. *Strategic Management Journal*,
50 32(13): 1369-1386.
51
- 52 Rindova, V., & Courtney, H. 2020. To shape or adapt: Knowledge problems, epistemologies, and
53 strategic postures under Knightian uncertainty. *Academy of Management Review*, 45(4): 787-
54 807.
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Ross, J.-M., & Fisch, J. 2018. How to launch products in uncertain markets: In volatile times, uncertainty
4 can be turned into a competitive advantage. *MIT Sloan Management Review*, 60(1): 61-64.
5
6 Schilke, O. 2014. On the contingent value of dynamic capabilities for competitive advantage: The
7 nonlinear moderating effect of environmental dynamism. *Strategic Management Journal*, 35(2):
8 179-203.
9
10 Schilke, O., Hu, S., & Helfat, C. 2018. Quo Vadis, Dynamic capabilities? A content-analytic review of
11 the current state of knowledge and recommendations for future research. *Academy of*
12 *Management Annals*, 12(1): 390-439.
13
14 Schwenk, C. 1984. Cognitive simplification processes in strategic decision-making. *Strategic*
15 *Management Journal*, 5(2): 111-128.
16
17 Schwenk, C. R. 1985. Management illusions and biases: Their impact on strategic decisions. *Long Range*
18 *Planning*, 18(5): 74-80.
19
20 Shane, S. 2003. *A general theory of entrepreneurship: The individual-opportunity nexus*. Cheltenham:
21 Edward Elgar.
22
23 Shane, S., & Venkataraman, S. 2000. The promise of entrepreneurship as a field of research. *Academy of*
24 *Management Review*, 25(1): 217-226.
25
26 Simon, H. A. 1955. A behavioral model of rational choice. *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 69(1): 99-
27 118.
28
29 Simon, H. A. 1976. *Administrative behavior. A study of decision-making processes in administrative*
30 *organization* (3rd ed ed.). New York: Free Press.
31
32 Sitkin, S. B. 1992. Learning through failure: The strategy of small losses. *Research in Organizational*
33 *Behavior*, 14: 231-266.
34
35 Szulanski, G., & Jensen, R. J. 2006. Presumptive adaptation and the effectiveness of knowledge transfer.
36 *Strategic Management Journal*, 27(10): 937-957.
37
38 Tasheva, S., & Nielsen, B. B. 2020. The role of global dynamic managerial capability in the pursuit of
39 international strategy and superior performance. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 53:
40 689-708.
41
42 Teece, D., & Leih, S. 2016. Uncertainty, innovation, and dynamic capabilities: An introduction.
43 *California Management Review*, 58(4): 5-12.
44
45 Teece, D., Peteraf, M. A., & Leih, S. 2016. Dynamic capabilities and organizational agility: Risk,
46 uncertainty and entrepreneurial management in the innovation economy. *California Management*
47 *Review*, 58(4): 13-35.
48
49 Teece, D. J. 2007. Explicating dynamic capabilities: the nature and microfoundations of (sustainable)
50 enterprise performance. *Strategic Management Journal*, 28(13): 1319-1350.
51
52 Teece, D. J. 2016. Dynamic capabilities and entrepreneurial management in large organizations: Toward
53 a theory of the (entrepreneurial) firm. *European Economic Review*, 86: 202-216.
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Teece, D. J., Pisano, G., & Shuen, A. 1997. Dynamic capabilities and strategic management. *Strategic*
4 *Management Journal*, 18(7): 509-533.
5
- 6 Todd, P., & Miller, G. 1999. From pride and prejudice to persuasion: Realistic heuristics for mate choice.
7 In P. T. a. t. A. R. G. G. Gigerenzer (Ed.), *Simple heuristics that make us smart*: 287-308. New
8 York: Oxford University Press.
9
- 10 Todd, P. M., & Gigerenzer, G. 2000. Précis of simple heuristics that make us smart. *Behavioral and*
11 *Brain Sciences*, 23(05): 727-741.
12
- 13 Tversky, A., & Kahneman, D. 1974. Judgment under uncertainty: Heuristics and biases. *Science*,
14 185(4157): 1124-1131.
15
- 16 Vergne, J.-P., & Durand, R. 2010. The missing link between the theory and empirics of path dependence:
17 Conceptual clarification, testability issue, and methodological implications. *Journal of*
18 *Management Studies*, 47(4): 736-759.
19
- 20 Vergne, J.-P., & Durand, R. 2011. The path of most persistence: An evolutionary perspective on path
21 dependence and dynamic capabilities. *Organization Studies*, 32(3): 365-382.
22
- 23 Vogel, P. 2017. From venture idea to venture opportunity. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 41(6):
24 943-971.
25
- 26 Vogel, R., & Güttel, W. H. 2013. The dynamic capability view in strategic management: A bibliometric
27 review. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, 15(4): 426-446.
28
- 29 Vuori, N., & Vuori, T. 2014. Comment on “Heuristics in the strategy context” by Bingham and
30 Eisenhardt (2011). *Strategic Management Journal*, 35(11): 1689-1697.
31
- 32 Woodside, A. G. 2016. The good practices manifesto: Overcoming bad practices pervasive in current
33 research in business. *Journal of Business Research*, 69(2): 365-381.
34
- 35 Zahra, S. A., Sapienza, H. J., & Davidsson, P. 2006. Entrepreneurship and dynamic capabilities: A
36 review, model and research agenda. *Journal of Management studies*, 43(4): 917-955.
37
- 38 Zollo, M., & Winter, S. G. 2002. Deliberate learning and the evolution of dynamic capabilities.
39 *Organization Science*, 13(3): 339-351.
40
- 41 Zott, C. 2003. Dynamic capabilities and the emergence of intraindustry differential firm performance:
42 Insights from a simulation study. *Strategic Management Journal*, 24(2): 97-125.
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

FIGURE 1

Heuristic Reasoning in Proactive Dynamic Capability Deployment



		How is a new idea made sense of?	What are the possible paths for developing a new idea?	Which variant of a new idea should be selected for further development?	How can the firm retain useful heuristics?
HOW (simplicity and adaptability of heuristic reasoning facilitates proactive DC deployment)	<i>Simplicity</i>	Few pieces of past information and less analytical effort to reasonably make sense of a new idea	Few pieces of know-how and less analytical effort to sufficiently understand how to act	Few selection criteria and less analytical effort to pursue a variant of a new idea	Role of Simplification Cycling in HOW and WHY
	<i>Adaptability</i>	Identify those pieces of past information that are most relevant for making sense of a new idea	Identify those pieces of existing know-how that are most relevant for developing a new idea	Identify from the existing criteria that best suit the new market for pursuing a variant of a new idea	
WHY (simplicity and adaptability of heuristic reasoning is effective in proactive DC deployment)	<i>Overcoming Underalignment/Overall ignment (see Figure 2*)</i>	Enable bias-variance trade-off to sufficiently make sense of a new idea	Enable bias-variance trade-off to sufficiently identify development path of a new idea	Enable bias-variance trade-off to select sufficient market criteria to pursue a variant of a new idea	
	<i>Refining confidence (see Figure 3a*)</i>	Enable learning from the iterative process to refine heuristics used to make sense of a new idea	Enable learning from the iterative process to refine heuristics used to develop a new idea	Enable learning from the iterative process to refine criteria and heuristics used in idea selection	
					Pruning heuristics through simplification cycling ensures that the simplicity and adaptability of heuristic reasoning are maintained
					Simplified and more adaptable heuristics are both more memorable and useful for future use (see Figure 3b*)

*Figures 2, 3a, and 3b explicitly illustrate the underlying processes at these stages.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

FIGURE 2

**Why Heuristic Reasoning is Effective in Proactive Dynamic Capability Deployment:
Overcoming Underalignment and Overalignment^a**

^a The curves are general representations. In reality, their shapes may be less symmetric.





FIGURE 3

**Why Heuristic Reasoning is Effective in Proactive Dynamic Capability Deployment:
Refining Confidence^b**

^b The curves are general representations. In reality, their shapes may be less symmetric.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60


(a) Iterative Learning
(during Variation and Selection)



As firms go through the iterative learning process (move from right to left):

- A decision rule is refined to aligns with the current context and becomes more complex
- The extent of information and analytical effort increases
- Confidence increases for the current context
- The adaptability to new contexts decreases

(b) Simplification Cycling
(during Retention)



As firms go through the simplification cycling (move from left to right):

- A decision rule is simplified
- The extent of information and analytical effort decreases
- Trustworthiness:
 - Decreases when applied in new contexts
 - Remains intact when applied in the current context
- The adaptability to new contexts increases

1
2
3 **Atefeh Maghzi** (a.maghzi@soton.ac.uk) is an Assistant Professor at Southampton Business
4
5 School, University of Southampton. She received her PhD from the University of Newcastle in
6
7 Australia. Her research focuses on strategic and entrepreneurial decision making with a specific
8
9 interest in heuristic reasoning and dynamic capability.
10
11
12
13
14

15 **Nidthida Lin** (nidthida.lin@mq.edu.au) is an Associate Professor of Strategy, Innovation and
16
17 Entrepreneurship at Macquarie Business School, Macquarie University. She completed her Ph.D.
18
19 from Australian Graduate School of Management (AGSM), University of New South Wales and
20
21 University of Sydney, and her Master's degree in Computer Science from Cornell University.
22
23 Nidthida's scholarly interests are predominantly in the areas of behavioral strategy, managerial
24
25 decision making and design cognition in the context of innovation and entrepreneurship.
26
27
28
29
30

31 **Michael D. Pfarrer** (mpfarrer@uga.edu) is the C. Herman and Mary Virginia Terry
32
33 Distinguished Chair of Business Administration and Associate Dean for Research and Executive
34
35 Programs in the Terry College of Business at the University of Georgia. He received his Ph.D.
36
37 from the University of Maryland. His research focuses on strategic decision making,
38
39 organizational reputation and celebrity, media and corporate communications, and crisis
40
41 management.
42
43
44
45
46

47 **Siegfried Gudergan** (siggi.gudergan@jcu.edu.au) is Professor of Strategy within James Cook
48
49 University in Australia. He also is a Visiting Distinguished Professor at Aalto University in
50
51 Finland, Visiting Professor at Vienna University of Economics and Business (WU Wien) in
52
53 Austria, and Emeritus Professor at the University of Waikato in New Zealand. He received his
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Ph.D. from the Australian Graduate School of Management that was awarded by both the
4
5 University of Sydney and the University of New South Wales in Australia. His research focuses
6
7 on strategic decision making and change in the contexts of organizational innovation,
8
9 transformation, and performance (e.g., dynamic capabilities).
10
11
12
13

14 **Ralf Wilden** (ralf.wilden@mq.edu.au) is a Professor of Strategy & Innovation at Macquarie
15
16 Business School, Macquarie University. He holds a PhD from the University of Technology
17
18 Sydney. His research focuses on firm and innovation strategy, with a special focus on dynamic
19
20 capabilities, open and ecosystem innovation, as well as firm and managerial decision making
21
22 leading to resource reconfigurations.
23
24
25
26
27

28 **Acknowledgments**

29
30 We would like to thank Associate Editor Sharon Alvarez for her prudent guidance throughout the
31
32 review process, as well as the two anonymous reviewers for their most constructive feedback and
33
34 suggestions. We are also thankful to Anne-Wil Harzing, Stratos Ramoglou, and Hari Bapuji for
35
36 their valuable comments throughout the process of this paper.
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60