

MAN 6235
Organization Theory
Spring 2023



Professor: Horacio Rousseau, Ph.D.
Classroom: Thursdays 11:30-2:30 PM EST
Office: RBB 362
Mobile: 850-339-6362
Office hours: one hour before class, by appointment
E-mail: hrousseau@fsu.edu

Introduction

Over the past half-century, Organization Theory (OT) has significantly enhanced our comprehension of economic and managerial activities by introducing innovative perspectives, theories, and methodological tools for management research.

This doctoral-level course offers a comprehensive survey of the principal theoretical discussions within OT and examines their impact on empirical research and management practice. Through the critical examination of seminal and modern theoretical and empirical works, we will delineate the current cutting-edge of the discipline, and understand the role that theory plays in how we present our ideas as academics.

Objectives

By the end of the course the students will be able to frame a scientific research question from a theoretical point of view and develop original scientific research ideas to advance scholarship in organizational theory.

The course provides an overview of the theoretical groundings of the discipline: why organizations exist, how they operate, change, and perform. It seeks to help students craft scientific inquiries within a theoretical framework and formulate innovative research proposals that contribute to the field of organizational theory. Moreover, it aims to foster students' ability to critically assess and creatively extend our scientific knowledge of organizations.

Learning Outcomes

1. Critically appraise the significance of theoretical developments in scholarly articles in OT.
2. Assess the scientific rigor and methodological integrity of past and current research studies in OT.
3. Be able to conduct a comprehensive literature review that synthesizes various scholarly works within a specific area of OT.
4. Develop innovative theoretical models that propel our understanding of organizational dynamics.
5. Facilitate and conduct an in-depth discussion that incorporates multiple scholarly viewpoints.
6. Effectively present and rigorously defend one's scientific concepts and findings.

General and Specific Competences

- Acquire knowledge, skills, abilities, and attitudes required to conduct high quality research in the field of management and organizational sociology.

- Demonstrate knowledge and understanding of the field's main theories to provide a foundation for originality in developing novel ideas.
- Understand the concepts of social and human sciences relevant and necessary to carry out high quality research projects in management.
- Organize, plan, and implement a research project related to social sciences.
- Ability to understand state-of-the-art research in OT published in the top academic journals (*Administrative Science Quarterly, Academy of Management Journal, Organization Science, Strategic Management Journal, American Journal of Sociology*) and compare and contrast the arguments developed in the papers from a logical and empirical point of view.
- Assess current management and organizational problems and identify how different theories of organizations can help us understand them.

Content

The content of the class will cover readings from all the major streams of organizational theory. Each week a new theoretical perspective will be explored and compared to the previous ones. Every perspective relies on different assumptions about a) why organizations exist and b) how organizations work.

Required readings can be found [here \(it's a OneDrive folder with PDFs\)](#)

Methodology

The course will be run in a doctoral seminar format. The professor's role is to facilitate and direct the discussion. The students' role is to engage each other in developing the best critical understanding of each paper.

Specifically, for each session, students should:

- Read all the 6 required readings
- Be prepared to discuss the material in class
- Complete the assignment
- Think about questions, topics, and issues to be raised for discussion.

As they go through the readings, students should think about the following questions:

- 1) What is the basic argument made by the author(s)? What are its strengths?
- 2) What are the weaknesses of the argument?
- 3) If you disagree with an argument, what would it take to convince you?
- 4) Are there critical differences between these authors' arguments and those of others we have read?
- 5) Can these differences be resolved through an empirical test? How would you design a test to resolve these differences?
- 6) If an empirical paper, what alternative explanations can account for the findings of the authors?
- 7) Important: be critical but always thinking about how new ideas may further the current perspective!

In addition to preparing the papers for discussion, each student will lead the discussion several times during the course. We will assign the topics on the first day of class. Discussion leaders are required to read all the memos in advance and be prepared to open the general discussion by identifying some

key debate issues and questions.

Evaluation

Grading type	Weight	Evaluation elements and learning outcomes
I. Class participation	30%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> effectively communicate the analysis of the underlying theoretical logic of the assigned readings, and effectively compare them to the previous weeks engage in an open constructive dialectic process to expose the contributions and limitations of the assigned readings
II. Written Assignment (Memo or Quiz)	25%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the evaluation is based on the ability of each student to grasp, summarize and criticize the theoretical perspective of the week, applying scientific standards in a written formal language
III. Final paper	30%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the final paper will be used to evaluate the students' written ability to answer a theoretical question integrated in an existing stream of research using publishable standards.
IV. Final presentation	15%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the final presentation will be used to evaluate the students' ability to answer a theoretical question integrated in an existing stream of research using publishable standards.

I. Class participation (30%)

Performance will be a function of both quantity and quality. In order for the class to succeed, students must have read the readings and be prepared to talk critically about them.

II. Written Assignments: Memos and Quizzes (25%)

Each week, students are asked either to prepare a memo (MAX 2-3 pages or 1000 words total) or to complete a Quiz related to the readings of the class. Memos should be sent via email by 9am (same day of class). Students are encouraged to share and read one another's memo before class.

The memo should be divided in two parts:

The first part requires you to synthesize the required readings into a coherent thought process, highlighting key assumptions behind a specific school of thought. This part is the most important part of the memo.

The second part should focus on only one reading and evaluate it critically. You can use any of the questions I created to motivate this part of the essay.

Alternatively, you can focus your critical essay around these points (no need to address them all):

1. **Motivation:** Assess the author's rationale for the study's importance and how it addresses gaps in existing research.
2. **Theory:** Identify the unique theoretical perspective and the causal mechanisms emphasized. Discuss the benefits and limitations of such focus.
3. **Evidence:** Evaluate the evidence used to support the argument and which empirical analyses stand out.

4. **Big Picture:** Consider the reading's impact on broader research in "organizations and environments" and suggest how it could have a greater influence.

All memos must follow the AMJ style guide for authors and be in Word format:

<https://aom.org/docs/default-source/events/amjstyleguide.aspx>

Quizzes should be completed prior to the class.

III. Final Paper (30%)

You are required to submit a final paper (no later than the last day of the final exam week). You are strongly encouraged to build on previous ideas, however, you may start a new paper as well. The paper should build on the material in class to stretch your idea.

The paper should be around 15-17 pages, double-spaced, including references and figures. The paper must include at least:

- 2 pages of introduction.
- 5 pages of theory and hypotheses development.
- 5 pages of discussion and expected contributions.
- 2 pages single space appendix to the "7 questions" (developed by Claus Rerup)

(Students who would like to add a quantitative component can add 2 more pages for setting and 3 more pages for simple analysis of one dependent variable and one independent variable – no regression, only figures or examples)

These are the seven (7) questions that your paper should follow:

<u>Question</u>	<u>Answer</u>
1. What is the phenomenon (X) in your study? Why is it interesting? Why is it important?	<u>Phenomenon:</u> <u>Interesting?</u> <u>Important:</u>
2. What specific question(s) about X are you investigating?	
3. What do we know about X (literature review)?	
4. What don't we know about X? So what? Who cares?	
5. What do you do theoretically and methodologically in your study to address what we don't know about X? Why is it appropriate / timely? Who cares?	<u>Theoretically:</u> <u>Empirically:</u> <u>Timely?</u>

6. What new / counterintuitive insights (theoretical and practical) about X are your study generating? Why are these insights important and interesting?	
7. What are the boundary conditions and limitations of your study? What are future research directions?	

IV. Final Paper Presentation (15%)

On the final day of class, you will be asked to present a first version of your paper ideas.

The final paper presentation will be an Academy of Management Conference style presentation. Each author has a set amount of time to present their work (to be defined).

The audience will ask critical questions about the study, as well as provide feedback on the paper, offer suggestions.

COURSE OUTLINE

Session 1. Introduction to Organization Theory (OT)

Deliverable(s):

1. Submit a one-page introduction of yourself, explaining which research ideas excite you the most, and what idea you are planning to pursue for the class final paper (and why).
2. Choose your favorite empirical paper so far. This should be a paper that you consider a role model. Prepare a five-minute presentation, explaining:
 - a. Why you liked the paper;
 - b. “Deconstruct” the article using Zuckerman’s notes below as a guideline (included in reading package):
 - Zuckerman, E. W. Tips to Article-Writers.
 - Zuckerman, E. W. On Genre: A Few More Tips to Article-Writers.

Required Readings:

1. Corley, Kevin G., and Dennis A. Gioia. “Building theory about theory building: what constitutes a theoretical contribution?" *Academy of management review* 36.1 (2011): 12-32.
2. Sutton, R. I., and Staw, B. M. 1995. What theory is not. *Administrative Science Quarterly*: 371-384.
3. Davis, G. F. 2015. What is Organizational Research For? *Administrative Science Quarterly*. 60: 179-188.
4. Davis, M. S. (1971). That's interesting! Towards a phenomenology of sociology and a sociology of phenomenology. *Philosophy of the social sciences*, 1(2), 309-344.
5. Lounsbury, M., and Beckman, C. M. 2015. Celebrating organization theory. *Journal of Management Studies* 52 (2):288–308.
6. Bergh, Donald D. "Thinking strategically about contribution." *Academy of Management*

Journal 46.2 (2003): 135-136.

Additional (optional) readings on the current debate on organizational theory:

- Davis, G. F. 2015. Celebrating organization theory: The after-party. *Journal of Management Studies* 52(2): 309-319.
- Fligstein, Neil. 2001. "Organizations: Theoretical Debates and the Scope of Organizational Theory" in Calhoun Craig, Chris Rojek, and Bryan Turner (eds.) *International Handbook of Sociology*. Sage Press.
- Davis, G. F. 2017. Organization theory and the dilemmas of a post-corporate economy. *Research in the Sociology of Organizations* 48B: 311-322.

Session 2. Overview of the OT Field

Deliverable(s):

1. Written Memo (Max 4 pages). These are guiding questions you may use (not mandatory):
 - How well do economic models account for the complexities and variabilities of human behavior within organizations?
 - Can social models of behavior provide a better framework for understanding organizational dynamics than economic models?
 - To what extent do the assumptions underlying economic models of behavior become self-fulfilling within organizations?
 - How do the different models of behavior impact the formulation of organizational policies and practices?

Required Readings:

1. Pfeffer, J. 1997. *New directions for organization theory problems and prospects*. New York, Oxford University Press. (Chapters 1 to 3)
2. Scott, W. R. and Davis, G. F. 2007. *Organizations and organizing: rational, natural and open system perspectives*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall. (Chapters 1 to 4)

Additional (optional) readings on Theories in Management:

- Ferraro, F., Pfeffer, J., & Sutton, R. I. (2005). Economics language and assumptions: How theories can become self-fulfilling. *Academy of Management Review*, 30(1), 8-24.
- Felin, T., & Foss, N. J. (2009). Social Reality, the Boundaries of Self-Fulfilling Prophecy, and Economics. *Organization Science*, 20(3), 654-668.

Session 3. The Carnegie School

Deliverable(s):

1. Complete Quiz in Canvas prior to our session

Required Readings:

1. March, J. G. (1991). Exploration and exploitation in organizational learning. *Organization Science*, 2(1), 71–87.
2. Gavetti, G., Levinthal, D., & Ocasio, W. (2007). Perspective—Neo-Carnegie: The Carnegie School's past, present, and reconstructing for the future. *Organization Science*, 18(3), 523–536.
3. Cohen, W. M., & Levinthal, D. A. (1990). Absorptive capacity: A new perspective on learning and innovation. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 35, 128–152.
4. Feldman, M. S. (2000). Organizational routines as sources of continuous change. *Organization Science*, 11, 611–629.
5. Argote, L., Lee, S., & Park, J. (2020). Organizational learning processes and outcomes: Major findings and future research directions. *Management Science*, 67(9), 5399–5429.
6. Sobrepera i Profitós, X., Keil, T., & Kuusela, P. (2022). The two blades of the scissors: Performance feedback and intrinsic attributes in organizational risk taking. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 67(4), 1012–1048.

Additional readings on the Carnegie School:

- Greve, H. R. (1998). Performance, aspirations, and risky organizational change. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 43(1), 58–86.
- Ocasio, W. (1994). Political dynamics and the circulation of power: CEO succession in U.S. industrial corporations, 1960–1990. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 39(2), 285–312.
- Greve, H. R. (2003). A behavioral theory of R&D expenditures and innovations: Evidence from shipbuilding. *Academy of Management Journal*, 46(6), 685–702.
- Audia, P. G., & Greve, H. R. (2006). Less likely to fail: Low performance, firm size, and factory expansion in the shipbuilding industry. *Management Science*, 52(1), 83–94.
- Gavetti, G., & Levinthal, D. (2000). Looking forward and looking backward: Cognitive and experiential search. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 45(1), 113–37.
- Ocasio, W., Laamanen, T., & Vaara, E. (2018). Communication and attention dynamics: An attention-based view of strategic change. *Strategic Management Journal*, 39(1), 155–167.
- Ocasio, W. (1997). Towards an attention-based view of the firm. *Strategic Management Journal*, 18.
- Salvato, C., & Rerup, C. (2017). Routine regulation: Balancing conflicting goals in organizational routines. *Administrative Science Quarterly*.

Session 4. Neo Institutionalism

Deliverable(s):

2. Written Memo (Max 4 pages). These are guiding questions you may use (not mandatory):
 - Is the pursuit of legitimacy always beneficial, or can it lead to ethical or strategic compromises?
 - In the digital age, how has social media influenced the dynamics of organizational legitimacy?
 - Can organizations lose legitimacy or suffer severe legitimacy crises? What strategies are most effective in such situations?
 - How can organizations balance the need for legitimacy (through isomorphism) with the need for innovation and differentiation in a competitive market?
 - To what extent can the pursuit of legitimacy through adherence to institutional norms hinder an organization's adaptability and innovation?
 - Can an organization be successful without conforming to the institutional norms and

myths prevalent in its environment?

- How do the concepts presented in the article apply to contemporary issues like CSR and sustainability practices?
- Can the "Nixon-in-China effect" be generalized to other contentious corporate practices, such as environmental sustainability or labor rights?
- How might the dynamics of the "Nixon-in-China effect" change in industries that are less public-facing than the Fortune 500 companies?

Required Readings:

1. Meyer, J. W., & Rowan, B. (1977). Institutionalized organizations: Formal structure as myth and ceremony. *American Journal of Sociology*, 83(2), 340–363.
2. DiMaggio, P. J., & Powell, W. W. (1983). The iron cage revisited: Institutional isomorphism and collective rationality in organizational fields. *American Sociological Review*, 48(2), 147–160.
3. Powell, W. W., & DiMaggio, P. J. (Eds.). (1991). Introduction. *The New Institutionalism in Organizational Analysis*. University of Chicago Press.
4. Suddaby, R., Bitektine, A., & Haack, P. (2017). Legitimacy. *Academy of Management Annals*, 11(1), 451–478.
5. Tolbert, P. S., & Zucker, L. G. (1983). Institutional sources of change in the formal structure of organizations: The diffusion of civil service reform, 1880-1935. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 28, 22-39.
6. Briscoe, F., & Safford, S. (2008). The Nixon-in-China Effect: Activism, Imitation, and the Institutionalization of Contentious Practices. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 53(3), 460–491.

Additional readings on Neo-institutional theory:

- Oliver, C. (1997). Sustainable competitive advantage: combining institutional and resource-based views. *Strategic Management Journal*, 18(9), 697-713.
- Oliver, C. (1991). Strategic responses to institutional processes. *Academy of Management Review*, 16(1), 145-179.
- Suchman, M. (1995). Managing legitimacy: Strategic and institutional perspectives. *Academy of Management Review*, 20(3), 571–611.
- Edelman, L. B., Uggen, C., & Erlanger, H. S. (1999). The endogeneity of legal regulation: Grievance procedures as rational myth. *American Journal of Sociology*, 105(2), 406–454.
- Jonsson, S., Greve, H., & Fujiwara-Greve, T. (2009). Undeserved loss: The spread of legitimacy loss to innocent organizations in response to reported corporate deviance. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 54, 195-228.
- Suddaby, R., Elsbach, K., Greenwood, R., Meyer, J., & Zilber, T. (2010). Organizations and their institutional environments – bringing meanings, values, and culture back in: Introduction to the special research forum. *Academy of Management Journal*, 53, 1234-1240.
- Baron, J. N., Dobbin, F. R., & Jennings, P. D. (1986). War and peace; the evolution of modern personnel administration in U.S. industry. *American Journal of Sociology*, 92, 350-383.

Session 5. Population Ecology of Organizations

Deliverable(s):

1. Complete Quiz in Canvas prior to our session

Required Readings:

1. Hannan, M. T., & Freeman, J. (1977). The population ecology of organizations. *American Journal of Sociology*, 82(5), 929–964.
2. Stinchcombe, A. L. (1965). Social Structure and Organizations. In J. G. March (Ed.), *Handbook of Organizations* (pp. 142–193). Chicago, IL: Rand McNally & Company.
3. Carroll, G. R., & Swaminathan, A. (2000). Why the Microbrewery Movement? Organizational Dynamics of Resource Partitioning in the U.S. Brewing Industry. *American Journal of Sociology*, 106, 715–62.
4. Sørensen, J. B., & Stuart, T. E. (2000). Aging, Obsolescence, and Organizational Innovation. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 45(1), 81–112.
5. Singh, J. V., Tucker, D. J., & House, R. J. (1986). Organizational legitimacy and the liability of newness. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 31(2), 171–193.
6. Zuzul, T., & Tripsas, M. (2020). Start-up inertia versus flexibility: The role of founder identity in a nascent industry. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 65(2), 395–433.

Additional readings on Population Ecology:

- Carroll, G. R. (1985). Concentration and specialization: Dynamics of niche width in populations of organizations. *American Journal of Sociology*, 90(6), 1262–1283.
- Carroll, G. R., & Hannan, M. T. (1989). Density dependence in the evolution of populations of newspaper organizations. *American Sociological Review*, 54(4), 524–541.
- Podolny, J. M., Stuart, T. E., & Hannan, M. T. (1996). Networks, knowledge, and niches: Competition in the worldwide semiconductor industry, 1984–1991. *American Journal of Sociology*, 102, 659–89.
- Young, R. C. (1988). Is population ecology a useful paradigm for the study of organizations? *American Journal of Sociology*, 94(1), 1–24.
- Zucker, L. G. (1989). Combining institutional theory and population ecology: No legitimacy, no history. *American Sociological Review*, 54(4), 542–545.

Session 6. Contingency Theory and Resource Dependence Perspective

Deliverable(s):

1. Complete Quiz in Canvas prior to our session

Required Readings:

1. Lawrence, P., & Lorsch, J. (1967). Differentiation and integration in complex organizations. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 1, 1-47.
2. Schoonhoven, C. B. (1981). Problems with contingency theory: Testing assumptions hidden within the language of contingency theory. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 26, 349-377.
3. Davis, G. F., & Cobb, J. (2010). Resource dependence theory: Past and future. In *Research in the Sociology of Organizations* (Vol. 28, pp. 21–42).
4. Casciaro, T., & Piskorski, M. (2005). Power imbalance, mutual dependence, and constraint absorption: A closer look at resource dependence theory. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 50(2), 167–199.

5. Sutton, T., et al. (2021). Resource dependence, uncertainty, and the allocation of corporate political activity across multiple jurisdictions. *Academy of Management Journal*, 64(1), 38-62.
6. Gulati, R., & Sytch, M. (2007). Dependence asymmetry and joint dependence in interorganizational relationships: Effects of embeddedness on a manufacturer's performance in procurement relationships. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 52(1), 32–69.

Additional readings on Contingency Theory and Resource Dependence:

- Pfeffer, J., & Salancik, G. (1978). *The External Control of Organizations*. Harper and Row.
- Cook, K. S., Emerson, R. M., & Gillmore, M. R. (1983). The distribution of power in exchange networks: Theory and experimental results. *American Journal of Sociology*, 89(2), 275–305.
- Doty, D. H., Glick, W. H., & Huber, G. P. (1993). Fit, equifinality, and organizational effectiveness: A test of two configurational theories. *Academy of Management Journal*, 36(6), 1196-1250.
- Rogan, M., & Greve, H. R. (2014). Resource dependence dynamics: Partner reactions to mergers. *Organization Science*, 26(1), 239–255.
- Drazin, R., & Van de Ven, A. H. (1985). Alternative forms of fit in contingency theory. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 30, 514-539.
- Sytch, M., & Kim, Y. H. (2020). Quo Vadis? From the Schoolyard to the Courtroom. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 66(1), 177–219.
- Perrow, C. (1967). A framework for the comparative analysis of organizations. *American Sociological Review*, 32(2), 194–208.

Session 7. Transaction Cost Approach

Deliverable(s):

1. Written Memo (Max 4 pages). These are guiding questions you may use (not mandatory):
 - In what ways can TCE be adapted or expanded to better account for the complexities and dynamics of modern organizational environments?
 - Are transaction costs always a decisive factor in determining the boundaries of a firm, or are there instances where other considerations might override their influence?
 - Can organizations effectively transition between market, bureaucratic, and clan structures based on changing circumstances, or are they confined to a single organizational form?
 - How does the rise of technology and remote work impact the relevance of Ouchi's framework in modern organizations?
 - How does the concept of transaction costs reconcile with the increasing trend towards outsourcing and globalization in business?
 - Is the emphasis on opportunism in transaction cost economics overly pessimistic about human nature and business relationships?
 - How do transaction costs affect decision-making in modern corporations regarding in-sourcing versus outsourcing?
 - How do Coase's ideas on the nature of the firm apply to contemporary issues like gig economy and remote work?
 - What are the implications of the variability in operationalization and measurement of

key TCE constructs for the theory's validity and applicability?

- How can future research address the identified gaps and methodological challenges in testing TCE to enhance the theory's empirical foundation?

Required Readings:

1. Coase, R. H. (1937). The nature of the firm. *Economica*, 4, 386–405.
2. Williamson, O. E. (1981). Economics of organization: The transaction cost approach. *American Journal of Sociology*, 87(3), 548–577.
3. Ouchi, W. (1980). Markets, bureaucracies, and clans. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 25, 129–141.
4. David, R. J., & Han, S.-K. (2004). A systematic assessment of the empirical support for transaction cost economics. *Strategic Management Journal*, 25(1), 39–58.
5. Ghoshal, S., & Moran, P. (1996). Bad for practice: A critique of the transaction cost theory. *Academy of Management Review*, 21(1), 13–47.
6. Brusoni, S., Prencipe, A., & Pavitt, K. (2001). Knowledge specialization, organizational coupling, and the boundaries of the firm: Why do firms know more than they make? *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 46(4), 597–621.

Additional readings on Transaction Cost Approach:

- Azoulay, P. (2003). Acquiring knowledge within and across firm boundaries: Evidence from clinical development. Working paper, Columbia University.
- Fama, E. F., & Jensen, M. C. (1983). Separation of ownership from control. *Journal of Law and Economics*, 26, 301–325.
- Kapoor, R., & Adner, R. (2012). What firms make vs. what they know: How firms' production and knowledge boundaries affect competitive advantage in the face of technological change. *Organization Science*, 23(5), 1227–1248.
- Williamson, O. E. (1991). Comparative economic organization: The analysis of discrete structural alternatives. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 36, 269–296.
- Jacobides, M. G., & Billinger, S. (2006). Designing the boundaries of the firm: From “make, buy, or ally” to the dynamic benefits of vertical architecture. *Organization Science*, 17(2), 249–261.
- Zenger, T., Felin, T., & Bigelow, L. (2011). Theories of the firm–market boundary. *Academy of Management Annals*, 5(1), 89–133.

Session 8. Social Networks

Deliverable(s):

1. Written Memo (Max 4 pages). These are guiding questions you may use (not mandatory):
 - How generalizable are Burt's findings about brokerage and structural holes across different types of organizations and cultures?
 - Could the emphasis on brokerage and structural holes overlook other critical factors in idea generation and innovation?
 - How can organizations practically implement strategies to leverage brokerage for innovation without disrupting existing structures and relationships?
 - How should organizations structure their interunit relationships to optimize knowledge

- sharing – through fostering weak ties broadly or developing strong ties selectively?
- In what ways can organizations effectively manage the transfer of complex, tacit knowledge that is not easily codified?
 - How might the dynamic evolution of tie strength impact the long-term knowledge sharing and innovation capabilities of an organization?
 - How relevant is the concept of embeddedness in today's digitally connected economy?
 - How does the concept of embeddedness vary across different cultural contexts?
 - Is the distinction between networks as pipes and prisms sufficient to capture the complexity of market dynamics?
 - Can the perception of an individual's network position have more influence on their innovation performance than their actual network position?
 - Can the same dynamics of actual versus perceived brokerage be observed in non-corporate environments, such as academia or non-profit organizations?
 - Are there inherent limitations in using self-reported survey data and the roster method to measure complex constructs like actual and socially perceived brokerage?
 - How should organizations adjust their management and evaluation strategies considering these findings from network research?
 - How can organizations foster a culture where trust is balanced with the need for innovative ideas coming from diverse network positions?
 - What strategies can be employed to ensure that trust does not become a barrier to embracing novel ideas from those perceived as outsiders?

Required Readings:

1. Granovetter, M. (1985). Economic action and social structure: The problem of embeddedness. *American Journal of Sociology*, 91(3), 481–510.
2. Burt, R. S. (2004). Structural holes and good ideas. *American Journal of Sociology*, 110(2), 349–399.
3. Hansen, M. T. (1999). The search-transfer problem: The role of weak ties in sharing knowledge across organization subunits. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 44, 82–111.
4. Podolny, J. M. (2001). Networks as the pipes and prisms of the market. *American Journal of Sociology*, 107(1), 33–60.
5. Ibarra, H. (1992). Homophily and differential returns: Sex differences in network structure and access in an advertising firm. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 37(3), 422–447.
6. Iorio, A. (2022). Brokers in disguise: The joint effect of actual brokerage and socially perceived brokerage on network advantage. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 67(3), 769–820.

Additional readings on Social Networks

- Coleman, J. (1988). Social capital in the creation of human capital. *American Journal of Sociology*, 94: S95–S120.
- Baker, W. E. (1984). The social structure of a national securities market. *American Journal of Sociology*, 89(4): 775–811.
- Uzzi, B. (1997). Social structure and competition in interfirm networks: The paradox of embeddedness. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 42(1): 35–67.
- Granovetter, M. (1973). The strength of weak ties. *American Journal of Sociology*, 78(6): 1360–1380.
- Davis, G. F., & Greve, H. R. (1997). Corporate elite networks and governance changes in

the 1980s. *American Journal of Sociology*, 103(1): 1–37.

- Obstfeld, D. 2005. Social networks, the tertius iungens orientation, and involvement in innovation. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 50(1): 100–130.
- Kilduff, M., and Krackhardt, D. 1994. Bringing the individual back in: A structural analysis of the internal market for reputation in organizations. *The Academy of Management Journal* 37 (1): 87–108.
- Soda, G., Tortoriello, M., & Iorio, A. (2018). Harvesting value from brokerage: Individual strategic orientation, structural holes, and performance. *Academy of Management Journal*, 61(3): 896–918.
- Hernandez, E., & Shaver, J. M. (2019). Network synergy. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 64(1): 171–202.

Session 9. Categories and Social Evaluation

Deliverable(s):

1. Complete Quiz in Canvas prior to our session
2. Provide alternative paths to Rousseau & Shang category-switching project

Required Readings:

1. Zuckerman, E. W. (1999). The categorical imperative: Securities analysts and the illegitimacy discount. *American Journal of Sociology*, 104, 1398-1438.
2. Hsu, G. (2006). Jacks of all trades and masters of none: Audiences' reactions to spanning genres in feature film production. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 51, 420-450.
3. Negro, G., Koçak, Ö., & Hsu, G. (2010). Research on categories in the sociology of organizations. In *Categories in markets: Origins and evolution* (pp. 3-35). Emerald Group Publishing Limited.
4. Audia, P. G., Rousseau, H. E., & Stimmiller, M. K. (2022). Public opinion and impression management in the communication of performance during the Second Iraq War. *Organization Science*.
5. Zhang, R., Wang, M. S., Toubiana, M., & Greenwood, R. (2021). Stigma beyond levels: Advancing research on stigmatization. *Academy of Management Annals*, 15(1), 188-222.
6. Sadri, M., Piazza, A., Phung, K., & Helms, W. (2023). The disparate economic outcomes of stigma: Evidence from the arms industry. *Strategic Management Journal*.

Additional readings on Categories and Social Evaluation

- Pontikes, E. G. (2012). Two sides of the same coin: How ambiguous classification affects multiple audience evaluations. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 57, 81-118.
- Sgourev, S. V., & Althuizen, N. (2014). "Notable" or "Not Able": When are acts of inconsistency rewarded? *American Sociological Review*, 79(2), 282-302.
- Paolella, L., & Durand, R. (2016). Category spanning, evaluation, and performance: Revised theory and test on the corporate law market. *Academy of Management Journal*, 59(1), 330-355.
- Goldberg, A., Hannan, M., & Kovacs, B. (2016). What does it mean to span cultural boundaries? Variety and atypicality in cultural consumption. *American Sociological Review*, 81, 215-241.
- Zuckerman, E. W. (2017). The categorical imperative revisited: Implications of

categorization as a theoretical tool. In *From Categories to Categorization: Studies in Sociology, Organizations and Strategy at the Crossroads* (Research in the Sociology of Organizations, Vol. 51, pp. 31–68). Emerald Publishing Limited.

- Tilcsik, A., Anteby, M., & Knight, C. R. (2015). Concealable stigma and occupational segregation. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 60(3), 446-481.
- Hsu, G., Koçak, O., & Hannan, M. T. (2009). Multiple category memberships in markets: An integrative theory and two empirical tests. *American Sociological Review*, 74, 150-169.

Session 10. The Institutional Logics Perspective

Deliverable(s):

1. Written Memo (Max 4 pages). These are guiding questions you may use (not mandatory):
 - What is institutional complexity, and how can firms respond to it?
 - Under what conditions should we expect to see an institutional logic dominate versus seeing a co-existence of a plurality of logics?
 - How can the institutional logics approach be integrated with other management and organizational theories to provide a more comprehensive understanding of organizational behavior and change?
 - How might cultural and regional differences affect the dynamics between community and financial logics in entrepreneurial ventures?
 - How does economic stability or turbulence influence the integration of competing logics in founding teams, and what implications does this have for entrepreneurial strategy during economic downturns?
 - What additional research is needed to understand better the impact of institutional logics on entrepreneurial success in different settings?
 - How applicable are the findings of these studies to other industries or sectors that have undergone shifts in institutional logics?
 - To what extent do external factors (e.g., economic changes, globalization) influence the shift in institutional logics, and how do they interact with internal organizational dynamics?
 - How can the paradoxical role of the financial logic in the founding of SRI funds inform strategies for promoting sustainable investment practices?
 - How does the global diffusion of the financial logic impact the prospects of SRI funds in emerging economies?

Required Readings:

1. Thornton, P. H., & Ocasio, W. (2008). Institutional logics. In R. Greenwood, C. Oliver, R. Suddaby, & K. Sahlin-Andersson (Eds.), *The SAGE Handbook of Organizational Institutionalism* (pp. 99-129). Sage Publications.
2. Battilana, J., Sengul, M., Pache, A. C., & Model, J. (2015). Harnessing productive tensions in hybrid organizations: The case of work integration social enterprises. *Academy of Management Journal*, 58(6), 1658–1685.
3. Lounsbury, M. (2007). A tale of two cities: Competing logics and practice variation in the professionalizing of mutual funds. *Academy of Management Journal*, 50(2), 289–307.

4. Thornton, P. H., & Ocasio, W. (1999). Institutional logics and the historical contingency of power in organizations: Executive succession in the higher education publishing industry, 1958–1990. *American Journal of Sociology*, 105(3), 801–43.
5. Yan, S., Ferraro, F., & Almandoz, J. (2019). The rise of socially responsible investment funds: The paradoxical role of the financial logic. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 64(2), 466–501.
6. Almandoz, J. (2012). Arriving at the starting line: The impact of community and financial logics on new banking ventures. *Academy of Management Journal*, 55(6), 1381–1406.

Additional readings on Institutional Logics:

- Dunn, M. B., & Jones, C. (2010). Institutional logics and institutional pluralism: The contestation of care and science logics in medical education, 1967-2005. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 55, 114–149.
- McPherson, C. M., & Sauder, M. (2013). Logics in action: Managing institutional complexity in a drug court. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 58, 165-196.
- Lounsbury, M. (2007). A tale of two cities: Competing logics and practice variation in the professionalizing of mutual funds. *Academy of Management Journal*, 50(2), 289–307.
- Ocasio, W., Thornton, P. H., & Lounsbury, M. (2017). Advances to the institutional logics perspective. In *The SAGE Handbook of Organizational Institutionalism* (Vol. 2, pp. 509-531).
- Battilana, J., & Dorado, S. (2010). Building sustainable hybrid organizations: The case of commercial microfinance organizations. *Academy of Management Journal*, 53(6), 1419–1440.
- Marquis, C., & Tilcsik, A. (2016). Institutional equivalence: How industry and community peers influence corporate philanthropy. *Organization Science*, 27(5), 1325–1341.
- Greenwood, R., Raynard, M., Kodieh, F., Micelotta, E. R., & Lounsbury, M. (2011). Institutional complexity and organizational responses. *Academy of Management Annals*, 5, 317-371.

Session 11: Optimal Distinctiveness

Deliverable(s):

1. Written Memo (Max 4 pages). These are guiding questions you may use (not mandatory):
 - How do a) individuals and b) organizations strike a balance between conformity and differentiation?
 - What are the assumptions that the authors use to think about conformity/differentiation? Please provide a critical review of these assumptions.
 - How do the findings of these papers challenge or reinforce existing perceptions of penalties for categorical nonconformity?
 - How adaptable are the strategies of optimal distinctiveness and strategic categorization in rapidly evolving markets or industries other than digital platforms?
 - Can the strategies of aligning with exemplars and differentiating from prototypes sustain long-term competitive advantage, or are they more suited for short-term gains?
 - How can firms balance the need for innovation (differentiation) with the need for legitimacy (conformity) in rapidly evolving industries?
 - How does the level of market saturation influence the effectiveness of optimal distinctiveness? Would these strategies be as effective in less crowded market categories?
 - How might technological advancements and changing consumer behaviors impact the

strategies of new market entrants in achieving optimal distinctiveness?

- How might the concept of strategic balance apply to non-traditional industries (i.e., banking), especially those with different competitive dynamics?

Required Readings:

1. Deephouse, D. L. (1999). To be different, or to be the same? It's a question (and theory) of strategic balance. *Strategic Management Journal*, 20(2), 147-166.
2. Durand, R., & Kremp, P.-A. (2016). Classical deviation: Organizational and individual status as antecedents of conformity. *Academy of Management Journal*, 59(1), 65–89.
3. Barlow, M. A., Verhaal, J. C., & Angus, R. W. (2019). Optimal distinctiveness, strategic categorization, and product market entry on the Google Play app platform. *Strategic Management Journal*, 40(8), 1219-1242.
4. Zhao, E. Y., Fisher, G., Lounsbury, M., & Miller, D. (2017). Optimal distinctiveness: Broadening the interface between institutional theory and strategic management. *Strategic Management Journal*, 38(1), 93-113.
5. Brewer, M. (1991). The social self: On being the same and being different at the same time. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 17, 475-82.
6. Sabanci, H., & Elvira, M. (2023). The outcomes of cross-category career moves: How cross-industry mobility and industry prestige jointly impact executive compensation. *Academy of Management Journal*. (In Press).

Additional readings on Optimal Distinctiveness

- Van Angeren, J., G. Vroom, B. T. McCann, K. Podoyntsyna, and F. Langerak (2022). Optimal distinctive- ness across revenue models: Performance effects of differentiation of paid and free products in a mobile app market. *Strategic Management Journal*.

Session 12. Identity and Status

Deliverable(s):

1. Complete Quiz in Canvas prior to our session

Required Readings:

1. Azoulay, P., Stuart, T., & Wang, Y. (2014). Matthew: Effect or fable? *Management Science*, 60(1), 92-109.
2. Phillips, D. J., & Zuckerman, E. W. (2001). Middle status conformity: Theoretical restatement and empirical demonstration in two markets. *American Journal of Sociology*, 107(2), 379-429.
3. Maoret, M., Marchesini, G., & Ertug, G. (2022). On the status shocks of tournament rituals: How ritual enactment affects productivity, input provision, and performance. *Academy of Management Journal*. (Note: Volume and issue numbers are needed for a complete citation.)
4. Phillips, D. J., Turco, C., & Zuckerman, E. W. (2013). Betrayal as market barrier: Identity-based limits to diversification among high-status corporate law firms. *American Journal of Sociology*, 118(4), 1023-1054.
5. Hahl, O., & Ha, J. K. (2020). Committed diversification: Why authenticity insulates against penalties for diversification. *Organization Science*, 31(1), 1-22.

6. Kovács, B., Carroll, G. R., & Lehman, D. W. (2017). The perils of proclaiming an authentic organizational identity. *Sociological Science*, 4, 80-106.

Additional readings on Identity and Status:

- Sorenson, O. (2014). Status and reputation: Synonyms or separate concepts? *Strategic Organization*, 12(1), 62-69.
- Podolny, J. P. (2005). *Status signals: A sociological study of market competition*. Princeton University Press.
- Hahl, O., Kim, M., & Sivan, E. W. Z. (2018). The authentic appeal of the lying demagogue: proclaiming the deeper truth about political illegitimacy. *American Sociological Review*, 83(1), 1-33.
- Hsu, G., Koçak, Ö., & Kovács, B. (2018). Co-opt or coexist? A study of medical cannabis dispensaries' identity-based responses to recreational-use legalization in Colorado and Washington. *Organization Science*, 29(1), 172-190.
- Padgett, J. F., & Ansell, C. K. (1993). Robust action and the rise of the Medici, 1400-1434. *American Journal of Sociology*, 98(6), 1259-1319.

Session 13. Expanding the Reach of OT

Deliverable(s):

No deliverable this week.

Required Readings:

1. Wang, W., Gao, G., & Agarwal, R. (2023). Friend or foe? Teaming between artificial intelligence and workers with variation in experience. *Management Science*.
2. von Krogh, G., Roberson, Q., & Gruber, M. (2023). Recognizing and utilizing novel research opportunities with artificial intelligence. *Academy of Management Journal*, 66(2), 367-373.
3. Felten, E., Raj, M., & Seamans, R. (2021). Occupational, industry, and geographic exposure to artificial intelligence: A novel dataset and its potential uses. *Strategic Management Journal*, 42(12), 2195-2217.
4. Lumineau, F., Wang, W., & Schilke, O. (2021). Blockchain governance—A new way of organizing collaborations? *Organization Science*, 32(2), 500-521.
5. Gartenberg, C., Prat, A., & Serafeim, G. (2019). Corporate purpose and financial performance. *Organization Science*, 30(1), 1-18.
6. Zhang, M., Briscoe, F., & DesJardine, M. R. (2023). Corporate boards with street smarts? How diffuse street protests indirectly shape corporate governance. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 68(4), 1056-1093.

Additional readings:

- de Bakker, F. G. A., den Hond, F., King, B., & Weber, K. (2013). Social movements, civil society and corporations: Taking stock and looking ahead. *Organization Studies*, 34(5-6), 573-593.
- McDonnell, M.-H., & King, B. (2013). Keeping up appearances: Reputational threat and impression management after social movement boycotts. *Administrative Science Quarterly*,

58(3), 387-419.

- Krakowski, S., Luger, J., & Raisch, S. (2022). Artificial intelligence and the changing sources of competitive advantage. *Strategic Management Journal*, 44(6), 1425-1452.

COURSE POLICIES

UNIVERSITY ATTENDANCE POLICY:

Excused absences include documented illness, deaths in the family and other documented crises, call to active military duty or jury duty, religious holy days, and official University activities. These absences will be accommodated in a way that does not arbitrarily penalize students who have a valid excuse. Consideration will also be given to students whose dependent children experience serious illness.

ACADEMIC HONOR POLICY:

The Florida State University Academic Honor Policy outlines the University's expectations for the integrity of students' academic work, the procedures for resolving alleged violations of those expectations, and the rights and responsibilities of students and faculty members throughout the process. Students are responsible for reading the Academic Honor Policy and for living up to their pledge to "...be honest and truthful and...[to] strive for personal and institutional integrity at Florida State University." (Florida State University Academic Honor Policy, found at <http://fda.fsu.edu/Academics/Academic-Honor-Policy>)

AMERICANS WITH DISABILITIES ACT:

Florida State University (FSU) values diversity and inclusion; we are committed to a climate of mutual respect and full participation. Our goal is to create learning environments that are usable, equitable, inclusive, and welcoming. FSU is committed to providing reasonable accommodations for all persons with disabilities in a manner that is consistent with academic standards of the course while empowering the student to meet integral requirements of the course.

To receive academic accommodations, a student:

- (1) must register with and provide documentation to the Office of Accessibility Services (OAS);
- (2) must provide a letter from OAS to the instructor indicating the need for accommodation and what type; and,
- (3) should communicate with the instructor, as needed, to discuss recommended accommodations. A request for a meeting may be initiated by the student or the instructor.

Please note that instructors are not allowed to provide classroom accommodations to a student until appropriate verification from the Office of Accessibility Services has been provided.

This syllabus and other class materials are available in alternative format upon request.

For more information about services available to FSU students with disabilities, contact the Office of Accessibility Services

874 Traditions Way

108 Student Services Building

Florida State University

Tallahassee, FL 32306-4167

(850) 644-9566 (voice)

(850) 644-8504 (TDD)

oas@fsu.edu
<https://dsst.fsu.edu/oas>

FREE TUTORING FROM FSU:

On-campus tutoring and writing assistance is available for many courses at Florida State University. For more information, visit the Academic Center for Excellence (ACE) Tutoring Services' comprehensive list of on-campus tutoring options - see <http://ace.fsu.edu/tutoring> or contact tutor@fsu.edu. High-quality tutoring is available by appointment and on a walk-in basis. These services are offered by tutors trained to encourage the highest level of individual academic success while upholding personal academic integrity.

SYLLABUS CHANGE POLICY:

Except for changes that substantially affect implementation of the evaluation (grading) statement, this syllabus is a guide for the course and is subject to change with advance notice.