CEOs' managerial cognition and dynamic capabilities: a meta-analytical study from the microfoundations approach – CORRIGENDUM

William Fernando Durán[1,2]* and David Aguado[3]

[1]Department of Business Administration, Pontificia Universidad Javeriana, Cra 7 No. 40 B – 36 Piso 4, Bogotá, DC, Colombia, [2]Autonomous University of Madrid, Madrid, Spain and [3]Department of Social Psychology and Methodology & Research, Center for Organizational Effectiveness – TalentoUAM, Autonomous University of Madrid, Madrid, Spain
*Corresponding to author: E-mail: duran.w@javeriana.edu.co, wil.duran@estudiante.uam.es

DOI: https://doi.org/10.1017/jmo.2022.24. Published by Cambridge University Press on 12th of May

The tables 3 (p. 18), 4 (p. 21), and 5 (p. 22) in the above article published contain some numerological errors. Please see the updated version of the tables below. The authors apologize for the mistakes.

Reference

Durán, W., & Aguado, D. (2022). CEOs' managerial cognition and dynamic capabilities: A meta-analytical study from the microfoundations approach. *Journal of Management & Organization*, *28*(3), 451–479. doi:10.1017/jmo.2022.24

Table 3. Results of the meta-analysis

Managerial dynamic capacity	No. of studies	No. of effects	r (error)	Confidence interval		t	p	Intra-studies variance	Inter-studies variance
Sensing	19	61	.188 (.043)	.103	.270	4.393	<.001	.037***	.013
	15	43	.196 (.041)	.114	.274	4.808	<.001	.037***	.006
Managerial attention	5	8	.261 (.126)	−.031	.512	2.120	.072	.120***	0
	4	7	.247 (.144)	−.099	.530	1.756	.120	.139***	0
Entrepreneurial alertness	4	5	.393 (.123)	.073	.640	3.369	.028	.017	.038
	3	3	.387 (.185)	.045	.647	2.202	.159	–	.044
Perception of opportunities	6	15	.335 (.049)	.238	.425	7.094	<.001	.030 ***	0
	3	5	.385 (.060)	.235	.517	6.773	.003	.001	.007
Perception of dynamism	5	11	.092 (.037)	.009	.173	2.477	.033	.007*	.001
	4	8	.091 (.057)	−.043	.222	1.598	.154	.122*	.003
Perception of hostility	3	5	−.032 (.137)	−.392	.335	−0.237	.824	.033*	.024
	3	5	.007 (.132)	−.344	.357	.055	.959	.033*	.023
Perception of uncertainty	4	17	.077 (.014)	.047	.107	5.350	<.001	<.001	0
	3	14	.072 (.013)	.045	.100	5.667	<.001	<.001	0
Seizing	7	30	.153 (.041)	.071	.233	3.785	.007	.011***	.004
	6	27	.136 (.049)	.037	.233	2.819	.009	.006***	.008
Pioneering disadvantages	2	6	−.181 (.025)	−.117	−.243	7.214	<.001	0	0
	2	6	−.185 (.024)	−.244	−.124	7.782	<.001	0	0
Pioneering advantages	2	16	.142 (.091)	−.052	.325	1.565	.139	.006**	.015*
	2	16	.162 (.091)	−.030	.343	1.799	.092	.006**	.015*
Divergent thinking	2	1	.010	–	–	–	–	–	–
Management attitude toward exports	2	4	.241 (.149)	−.223	.616	1.657	.196	.076***	0
	1	1	.236 (.173)	–	–	–	–	–	–
Proactive logic	2	3	.084 (.181)	−.601	.698	.465	.688	.004	.054
	2	3	.040 (.044)	−.611	.659	.229	.840	.030	.535
Reconfiguration	3	5	.188 (.047)	.060	.310	4.046	.016	0	.002
	3	5	.170	.051	.285	3.940	.017	0	.002
Strategic mental model complexity	4	5	.286 (.220)	−.308	.719	1.335	.253	0	.169
	2	3	−.460 (.321)	−.959	.732	−1.496	.273	0	.212

Note. To calculate the correlation in sensing and seizing the negatives variables perception of hostility and pioneering disadvantages were reversed. Using '–' indicates no value calculated.
*$p < .05$, **$p < .01$, ***$p < .001$.

Table 4. Moderation in managerial sensing capability

Sensing	No. of studies	No. of effects	Correlation (error)	Confidence interval		t	p	Omnibus test	p	Intra-studies variance	Inter-studies variance
Firm size								$F(1, 55) = 0.191$	.664	.021***	.019**
								$F(1, 25) = 5.04$	.0343	.035***	.004
SMEs	12	36	.194 (.061) **	.074	.310	3.203	.002				
	8	17	.239	.128	.343	4.392	<.001				
Big	5	21	.150 (.084)	−.016	.309	1.813	.075				
	3	9	.022	−.145	.188	.271	.789				
Dynamism								$F(1, 42) = 3.105$	.235	0374***	.009
								$F(1, 36) = 3.1051$	.0865	.034***	.002
Low	9	35	.117 (.053)*	.011	.221	2.237	.031				
	7	29	.086	−.002	.174	1.978	.056				
High	5	9	.232 (.083)**	.069	.383	2.848	.007				
	4	8	.235	.088	.375	3.205	.003				
Sampling								$F(1, 59) = 2.758$	.102	.037***	.009
								$F(1, 40) = .410$	.526	.038***	.018
Random	9	32	.127 (.057)*	.013	.283	3.171	.002				
	9	32	.173	.045	.301	2.733	.009				
Non-random	10	29	.253 (.055)***	.149	.353	4.742	<.001				
	5	10	.230	.050	.396	2.563	.014				
Design								$F(1, 59) = 0.214$	.645	.037***	.014
								$F(1, 40) = .015$	.903	.038***	.019
Cross-sec	12	44	.177 (.056)**	.066	.283	3.171	.002				
	9	30	.187	.056	.312	2.864	.007				
Longitudinal	7	17	.217(.071)**	.078	.348	3.102	.003				
	5	12	.200	.023	.383	2.278	.028				
Data collection								$F(1, 59) = 2.012$	.161	.036***	.012
								$F(1, 40) = 2.0316$	.162	.038***	.014
Archive			(.122)**								

(Continued)

Table 4. (*Continued.*)

Sensing	No. of studies	No. of effects	Correlation (error)		Confidence interval		t	p	Omnibus test	p	Intra-studies variance	Inter-studies variance
	4	6	.327 (.107)**		.124	.503	3.167	.002				
	3	5	.335		.101	.534	2.851	.007				
Self-report	15	55	.172 (.046) ***	(.053)**	.082	.260	3.802	<.001				
	12	38	.157		.051	.266	2.974	.005				
Country									$F_{(3, 57)} = 1,534$	.216	.037***	.01
									$F_{(3, 38)} = 1.073$	.372	.037***	.02
USA	10	26	.153 (.054)**	(.068)*	.045	.256	2.837	.006				
	8	21	.155		.018	.287	2.290	.027				
China	1	12	.071 (.112)	(.144)	−.151	.387	.064	.525				
	1	12	.072		−.215	.348	.504	.617				
Europe	4	15	.278 (.082)**	(.154)*	.121	.422	3.476	.001				
	2	3	.387		.096	.617	2.649	.012				
Other	4	8	.299 (.090)**	(.119)*	.128	.452	3.441	.001				
	3	6	.251		.016	.460	2.160	.037				

Table 5. Moderation in managerial seizing capabilities

studies Seizing	No. of studies variance	No. of effect	r (error)	Confidence interval		t	p	Omnibus test	p	Intra-studies variance	Inter-studies variance
Firm size								$F_{(1, 20)} = .647$	.431	.013***	.003
								$F_{(1, 17)} = 1.010$	.329	.007****	.006
SME	3	3	.051 (.096)	−.148	.247	.535	.599				
	3	3	.032 (.09)	−.159	.221	.355	.727				
Big	3	19	.137 (.049)*	.037	.235	2.384	.010				
	2	16	.144 (.066)*	.007	.276	2.217	.041				
Dynamism								$F_{(1, 24)} = -.067$	.798	.006***	.005
								$F_{(1, 24)} = -.001$	.975	.006****	.006
Low	3	4	.174 (.073)*	.028	.316	2.446	.022				
	3	4	.169 (.073)**	.020	.310	2.345	.028				
High	2	22	.152 (.057)**	.035	.265	2.680	.013				
	2	22	.166 (.057)**	.050	.277	2.944	.007				
Sampling								$F_{(1, 28)} = 0.055$	.817	.010***	.008***
								$F_{(1, 25)} = 1.370$	.253	.006****	.012*
Random	3	23	.158 (.068)*	.023	.290	2.247	.026				
	3	23	.186 (.073)*	.038	.327	2.571	.017				
Non-random	4	7	.136 (.071)	−.010	.275	1.914	.066				
	3	4	.056 (.086)	−.120	.229	.657	.517				
Design								$F_{(1, 28)} = -.030$	.864	.010***	.006
								$F_{(1, 25)} = 2.076$	.162	.006****	.005
Cross-sec Cross-country	4	6	.140 (.076)	−.014	.288	1.860	.074				
	3	3	.031 (.088)	−.148	.209	.355	.726				
Longitudinal	3	24	.156 (.059)*	.037	.271	2.680	.012				
	3	24	.174 (.049)**	−.075	.269	3.611	.001				
Data collection								$F_{(1, 28)} = 4.311$	.047	.009****	.003
								$F_{(1, 25)} = 4.884$	.037	.006***	.004

(Continued)

Table 5. (*Continued.*)

studies Seizing	No. of studies variance	No. of effect	r (error)		Confidence interval		t	p	Omnibus test	p	Intra-studies variance	Inter-studies variance
Archive	1	1	−.150 (.148)	(.139)	−.425	.150	−1.024	.315				
	1	1	−.149		−.410	.135	−1.081	.290				
Self-report	6	29	.306 (.152)*	(.038)***	.004	.556	2.076	.047				
	5	26	.166		.089	.242	4.380	<.001				
Country									F(3, 26) = 0.109	.954	.010***	.022
									F(3, 24) = .010	.990	.006***	.026
USA	2	10	.188 (.118)	(.104)	−.053	.408	1.611	.119				
	3	11	.123		−.090	.325	1.191	.245				
China	1	14	.109 (.152)	(.164)	−.200	.399	0.720	.477				
	1	14	.109		−.225	.420	.667	.511				
Europe	1	3	.226 (.171)		−.120	.524	1.348	.189				
Other	2	2	.152 (.188)	(.150)	−.156	.432	1.014	.189				
	2	2	.140		−.167	.422	.938	.358				