

## **BMGT 878B: Meso-Organizational Theory: Behavioral Foundations**

Fall 2016 – Term B

Wednesday, October 19 – December 7, 1:00 PM – 4:35 PM, Room: VMH 4534

Prof. Christine Beckman

Office: VMH 4526

Email: [cbeckman@rhsmith.umd.edu](mailto:cbeckman@rhsmith.umd.edu)

### **Objectives**

This course introduces students to many of the core theoretical underpinnings of meso-organizational theories, and behavioral theories in particular. We will examine multiple research topics that are seeking to claim this space of 'behavioral theory'. In general, the focus is on understanding what firms actually do and how that departs from economic assumptions of how firms should act.

We will discuss the theoretical underpinnings of the assigned articles, the relationship between the different streams of research, and the methods employed in devising empirical evidence of these suppositions (including a rudimentary understanding of how the data was gathered and the statistical proof employed). Students should therefore come prepared to discuss the main arguments in the readings for the week, to explain how they may relate to one another, and to proffer possible extensions to these papers.

### **Participation**

As this is a PhD-level seminar class, discussions should be predominantly student driven. Please coordinate among yourselves so that each person takes up the lead role of discussion on an assigned paper. Your participation in this seminar is crucial for its success. I will facilitate and direct the discussion while your responsibility is to engage each other in developing a critical understanding of each topic and paper. I will guide the discussion in a more focused direction if I feel the point is being lost. While I will not take attendance per se, participation is a substantial part of your grade and it will likely suffer with excessive absences. Participation and facilitation are 20% of your grade.

Participation is expected each week. There are about 4-6 papers that are marked as assigned readings that we will focus on during class. Please organize among yourselves so that there will be at least one student in charge of summarizing the paper and leading the discussion on that paper. The procedure we will follow every week is as below:

- (i) To lead the discussion, prepare a summary of the readings to be handed out to your classmates for later reference (useful for PhD exams; not to be read in class).
- (ii) During the class, facilitate a discussion the paper.

1. You first present to the rest of the class a brief summary of what the paper is about—this can be brief as I expect everyone has read the papers. It should be a paragraph of talking, not a page.
2. Next, entertain questions from your fellow students. You can also use the chance to discuss your own questions and doubts about the paper.
3. To wrap up the discussion, present to the class your view of the strength (theoretically and empirically) and weakness of the paper. Pay particular attention to where a paper stands in the theoretical landscape, particularly among all the papers you have read in a session, and among the relevant topics and themes that we focus in the week.

### **Weekly memos and analytic papers**

Students will learn how to ask good research questions and practice their analytic thinking. Asking good questions, in particular, is a crucial skill for contributing to the literature and does not come naturally. It requires practice. For each class you will complete one of two tasks:

For five class sessions you should submit a 1-page sketch of a research idea or question that was stimulated by the readings. These write-ups should clearly state the question, how it follows from the readings, and how answering such a question may advance our understanding of the issues at hand. If you don't have a research question, you can use this space to share your critiques and questions about the week's readings. We will discuss some of the proposed ideas and questions in class. These weekly memos are worth 5% of your grade. **Please submit your write-up to Canvas before midnight on the day before class so that I can read them before class.**

For two class sessions (of your choice), you will write a brief analytic paper on the readings for that week. These papers will be 3-4 pages each (double spaced) and will be relevant to the weeks' readings. The paper should discuss at least three of the readings and include ideas or arguments you found stimulating; and questions about or disagreements with the concepts or measures. In addition, what are some questions that remain unanswered? The intent of the papers is to facilitate discussion during the seminar. You are encouraged to bring up ideas in the papers during the class session. These two analytic papers are worth 15% of your grade. **Please submit your write-up to Canvas before midnight on the day before class so that I can read them before class.**

### **Scholarly Book Presentation**

At the first class session, each student will also sign up to read and present the work of an organizational scholar who has impacted the field. We will match students to a scholar and a presentation week at the first class session. Presentations should highlight the key contributions of the scholar to the field, offer critiques and address any conceptual issues unresolved; please highlight how the book fits in with the other course readings. Presentations should be a 2-3 slide powerpoint presentation. Each student

should also prepare a 2-3 summary of the book for her or his fellow students. The scholar presentation will be 20% of your grade. Possible scholars to read and present include (this list is only a start):

1. Barnard, Chester. 1938. *Functions of the Executive*. Harvard University Press.
2. Bromiley, Phil. 2004. *Behavioral Foundations of Strategic Management*. Wiley.
3. Douglas, Mary. 1986. *How institutions think*. Syracuse University Press.
4. Gouldner, Alvin W. 1954. *Patterns of Industrial Bureaucracy*. New York: Free Press. Chapters 1-8.
5. March, James G. and Herbert Simon. 1958. *Organizations*. Wiley. (or other March books)
6. Nelson, R.R., and S.G. Winter. 1982. *An evolutionary theory of economic change*. Belknap Press.
7. Penrose, E. 1959. *The Theory of the Growth of the Firm*. New York: Oxford University Press.
8. Perrow, C. 1984. *Normal accidents: Living with high-risk technologies*. Basic Books.
9. Perrow, C. 1986. *Complex Organizations: A Critical Essay*. 3rd. Ed. New York: Random House.
10. Selznick, P. 1957. *Leadership in Administration*. London: Harper & Row.
11. Simon, Herbert. 1997. *Administrative Behavior, 4th ed*. The Free Press. (or other Simon books)
12. Swedberg, Richard. 2014. *The Art of Social Theory*. Princeton University Press.
13. Weick, Karl. 1979. *The Social Psychology of Organizing*. Addison-Wesley Publishing.

### **Final Paper(s)**

The portion of the assignment is flexible. You have two options.

(1) Standard term paper: You will submit a 10-15 page paper that develops, in-depth, an approach to one of the research questions of your choice. The paper is due at the end of finals week. This paper should explain why the question is interesting and theoretically important, develop an argument drawing on appropriate theory, identify specific hypotheses, and sketch a way to test one or more implications of the argument empirically (including, as much as possible, research contexts, variable operationalization, and statistical tests, etc.). During the last week of class you will need to submit a one-page summary of your topic for approval and feedback.

(2) Two critical-review write-ups: With this option, you pick two of the papers we have read in our class and write a critical review and reaction essay on each of them. The format and requirements are similar to what we sketched out for each class session, except that your review needs to be more thorough and comprehensive –written as a review that you might submit to a journal. This might mean additional reading outside the scope of our syllabus to get a good grip of the relevant literature. Your feedback should be critical but also constructive – what suggestions to you have to fix the problems in the reviewed paper? Deadline for this option is the same as option 1.

### **Grading**

This class must be taken for a letter grade. Assignments and their approximate weights are as follows:

1. Weekly participation and facilitation (20%)
2. Weekly memos (5%)
3. Analytic Papers (15%)
4. Scholarly Book Presentation (20%)

5. Major assignment (40%)

### **Overview of Schedule and Topics**

- Oct 19: Behavioral Theory Foundations
- Oct 26: Organizational Learning, Routines and Performance Feedback
- Nov 2: Biases and Attention
- Nov 9: Cognition, upper echelon, and Mental Models
- Nov 16: Multidisciplinary approaches to narcissism
- Nov 30: Organizational Identity
- Dec 7: Entrepreneurship & Imprinting

### **Readings List**

Most published papers are available on the Web of Science (access via library electronic resources). Check the canvas for the course first; many of the readings are already in the folder and the rest can be found from WoS. Book chapters are in canvas already, so there is no need for you to purchase any textbook. A good overview of organizational research that I suggest for organizational scholars to get an overview of the field:

Scott, W.R. & Davis, G.F. 2007. *Organizations and Organizing: Rational, Natural and Open System Perspectives*.

#### **Oct 19: Behavioral Theory: Foundations**

1. Simon, Herbert. 1997. *Administrative Behavior*, 4<sup>th</sup> edition. Free Press. Ch. 5. "The psychology of administrative decisions."
2. March, James G., and Herbert Simon. 1958. *Organizations*. McGraw-Hill, Ch. 6, "Cognitive Limits on Rationality."
3. Cyert, Richard and James G. March. 1963. *The Behavioral Theory of the Firm 2<sup>nd</sup> edition*. Chapter 7: A Summary of Basic Concepts.
4. Cohen, M. D., March, J. G., & Olsen, J. P. (1972). A garbage can model of organizational choice. *Administrative science quarterly*, 1-25.
5. Levinthal, D. A. 2011. A behavioral approach to strategy – what's the alternative?" *Strategic Management Journal*, 32: 1517-1523.
6. Gavetti, Giovanni. 2012. Toward a behavioral theory of strategy. *Organization Science*, 23: 286-287. Read Response by Winter.
7. Gavetti, G., Greve, H. Levinthal, D., and W. Ocasio. 2012. The Behavioral Theory of the Firm: Assessment and Prospects, *The Academy of Management Annals*.

#### Questions

1. Putting these classic books in context (the first 3 readings), what is happening in the field at this time?
  2. From today's perspective, what do you find surprising in the classic readings? What is now taken as established fact?
  3. What is the relationship between behavioral theory of the firm and behavioral strategy as described by Levinthal? As described by Gavetti? By Winter?
- 

8. Background: Richard Cyert and James G. March. 1963. *The Behavioral Theory of the Firm*. Chapters 1-5.
9. Background: Greve, H. R. 2003. *Organizational Learning from Performance Feedback*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. Chapter 3.
10. Optional: Bromiley, P. and S. James-Wade. 2003. Putting Rational Blinders Behind Us: Behavioral Understandings of Finance and Strategic Management. *Long Range Planning*, 36: 37–48.
11. Optional: Cohen, M.D., J.G. March, & J.P. Olsen. 2012 [“A Garbage Can Model” At Forty: A Solution that Still Attracts Problems](#) *Research in the Sociology of Organizations*, 36: 19-30.
12. Optional 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.
13. Optional: Felin, Teppo, and Nicolai Foss. 2005. Strategic organization: a field in search of micro-foundations. *Strategic Organization*, 3: 441-455.
14. Optional: Eisenhardt, Kathleen, Nathan Furr and Chris Bingham. Microfoundations of performance: Balancing efficiency and flexibility in dynamic environments. *Organization Science*,
15. Optional: Vaara, E., and Richard Whittington. Strategy-as-practice: taking social practices seriously. *Academy of Management Annals*, 2012.

### **Oct 26: Organizational Learning, Absorptive Capacity, Routines, and Performance Feedback**

1. Cohen, W.M. & Levinthal, D.A. 1990. Absorptive Capacity: A new perspective on learning and innovation. *Administrative Science Quarterly* 35: 128-152.
  2. Tsai, W. 2001. Knowledge transfer in intraorganizational networks: Effects of network position and absorptive capacity on business unit innovation and performance. *Academy of management journal*, 44(5), 996-1004.
  3. March, J. G. (1991). Exploration and exploitation in organizational learning. *Organization science*, 2(1), 71-87.
  4. Fang, Christina, Jeho Lee and Melissa Schilling. 2010. Balancing Exploration and Exploitation through Structural Design: The Isolation of Subgroups and Organization Learning. *Organization Science*. 21(3), 625-642.
  5. Moliterno, T. P., Beck, N., Beckman, C. M., & Meyer, M. (2014). Knowing your place: social performance feedback in good times and bad times. *Organization Science*.
  6. Joseph, J. Klingebiel, R. and Wilson, A. (2016) Organizational Structure and Performance Feedback: Centralization, Aspirations and Termination Decisions, *Organization Science*.
  7. Gavetti, G., & Levinthal, D. (2000). Looking forward and looking backward: Cognitive and experiential search. *Administrative science quarterly*, 45(1), 113-137.
-

8. Background: Levitt, Barbara and James G. March. 1988. Organizational Learning. *Annual Review of Sociology* 14: 319-340.
9. Background: Greve, Henrich R. 1998. "Performance, aspirations and risky organizational change." *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 43: 58-86.
10. Optional: Feldman, Martha S. and Brian T. Pentland. 2003. "Reconceptualizing organizational routines as a source of flexibility and change." *Administrative Science Quarterly* 48: 94-118. (Best Paper)
11. Optional: Joseph, J. and Gaba. V. 2015. The Fog of Feedback: Ambiguity and Firm-Responses to Multiple Aspiration Levels. *Strategic Management Journal*, 36: 1960-1978.
12. Optional: Levinthal, Daniel A., & Rerup, Claus. 2006. Crossing an apparent chasm: Bridging mindful and less mindful perspectives on organizational learning. *Organization Science*, 17: 502–513.
13. Optional: Zahra, S. A., & George, G. (2002). Absorptive capacity: A review, reconceptualization, and extension. *Academy of management review*, 27(2), 185-203.
14. Optional: Schilling, Melissa A., et al. 2003. Learning by doing something else: Variation, relatedness, and the learning curve. *Management Science* 49,1: 39-56.
15. Optional: Lehman, D. W., & Hahn, J. (2013). Momentum and Organizational Risk Taking: Evidence from the National Football League. *Management Science*, 59(4), 852-868.
16. Optional: Kacperczyk, Aleksandra, Christine M. Beckman, and Thomas P. Moliterno. Forthcoming. "Social Performance Feedback, Risk-Taking and Change: Evidence from the U.S. Mutual Fund Industry." *Administrative Science Quarterly*.
17. Classic: Walsh, J. P., & Ungson, G. R. (1991). Organizational memory. *Academy of management review*, 16(1), 57-91.
18. Classic: Linda Argote and Dennis Epple (1990), "Learning Curves in Manufacturing," *Science*, New Series, Vol. 247, No. 4945. (Feb. 23, 1990), pp. 920-92.

## **Nov 2: Biases and Attention**

1. Tversky, A. and Kahneman, D. (1974) "Judgment under uncertainty: heuristics and biases." *Science* 185 (4157), 1124-1131.
  2. Denrell, Jerker. 2003. Vicarious learning, undersampling of failure, and the myths of management. *Organization Science*, 14: 227-243.
  3. Denrell, Jerker, and James G. March. "Adaptation as information restriction: The hot stove effect." *Organization Science* 12.5 (2001): 523-538.
  4. Ocasio, W. 1997. Towards an attention-based view of the firm. *Strategic Management Journal*, 18 summer: 187-206.
  5. Vuori, T. O., & Huy, Q. N. (2015). Distributed Attention and Shared Emotions in the Innovation Process How Nokia Lost the Smartphone Battle. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 0001839215606951.
  6. Joseph, J. and Ocasio, W. 2012 Architecture, Attention and Adaptation in the Multibusiness Firm: General Electric, 1951-2001. *Strategic Management Journal*, 33 6: 633-660.
- 
7. Optional: Stanko, T., and C.M. Beckman. Forthcoming "Watching you watching me: Boundary control and capturing attention in the context of ubiquitous technology use." *Academy of Management Journal*.

8. Optional: Hoffman, Andrew J., and William Ocasio. "Not all events are attended equally: Toward a middle-range theory of industry attention to external events." *Organization Science* 12.4 (2001): 414-434.
9. Optional: Gaba, V., and J. Joseph. 2013. "Corporate Structure and Performance Feedback: Aspirations and Adaptation in M-Form Firms." *Organization Science*, 24(4): 1102-1119.
10. Optional: Joseph, J., & Ocasio, W. (2012). Architecture, attention, and adaptation in the multibusiness firm: General electric from 1951 to 2001. *Strategic Management Journal*, 33(6), 633-660.

### **Nov 9: Cognition, Upper Echelons and Mental Models**

1. Background: Hambrick, Donald and Phyllis Mason. 1984. Upper Echelons: The Organization as a refelection of its top managers. *Academy of Management Review*.
2. Background: Hambrick, Donald C. "Upper echelons theory: An update." *Academy of management review* 32.2 (2007): 334-343.
3. Porac, Joseph F., Howard Thomas, and Charles Baden-Fuller. (1989). "Competitive Groups as Cognitive Communities: The Case of Scottish Knitwear Manufacturers." *Journal of Management studies* 26.4: 397-416.
4. Kaplan, S. 2008. Cognition, capabilities, and Incentives: Assessing firm response to the fiber-optic revolution. *Academy of Management Journal*, Vol. 51 Issue 4, p672-695.
5. Benner, Mary J., and Mary Tripsas. "The influence of prior industry affiliation on framing in nascent industries: the evolution of digital cameras." *Strategic Management Journal* 33.3 (2012): 277-302.
6. Gupta, A., & Wowak, A. J. (2016). The Elephant (or Donkey) in the Boardroom How Board Political Ideology Affects CEO Pay. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 0001839216668173.

- 
7. Classic: Walsh, J. P. 1995. Managerial and organizational cognition: Notes from a trip down memory lane. *Organization Science*, 6 (3): 280-322.
  8. Classic: Weick, K.E. 1993. The collapse of sensemaking in organizations – the Mann Gulch disaster. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 38 (4): 628-652. (Classic)
  9. Optional: Porac, J. F. Thomas, H., Wilson, F., Paton, D., & Kanfer, A. 1995. Rivalry and the Industry Model of Scottish Knitwear Producers, *Administrative Science Quarterly*, Vol. 40, 203-227
  10. Optional: Reger, R. K., & Huff, A. S. 1993. Strategic Groups: A Cognitive Perspective. *Strategic Management Journal*, 14: 103-124.
  11. Optional: Sonenshein, S. 2010. We're Changing or Are We? Untangling the Role of Progressive, Regressive and Stability Narratives during Strategic Change Implementation, *Academy of Management Journal*, June 2010.
  12. Optional: Kaplan, S. (2011), Research in Cognition and Strategy: Reflections on Two Decades of Progress and a Look to the Future. *Journal of Management Studies*, 48: 665–695. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-6486.2010.00983.x
  13. Optional: M. K. Chin, Donald C. Hambrick, and Linda K. Treviño. 2013. Political Ideologies of CEOs: The Influence of Executives' Values on Corporate Social Responsibility. *Administrative Science Quarterly* June 2013 58: 197-232, doi:10.1177/0001839213486984

14. Optional: Porac, J.F., Ventresca, M.J., & Mishina, Y. Interorganizational cognition and interpretation. In J.A.C. Baum's Companion to Organizations.
15. Optional: Weber, K., Heinz, K., & DeSoucey, M. 2008. Forage for thought: Mobilizing codes for grass-fed meat and dairy products. *Admin. Sci. Quart.* **53** 529-567
16. Optional: Kaplan, Sarah. 2008. Framing contests: Strategy making under uncertainty. *Organization Science*. 19, 729: 752.
17. Optional: Gary, M. S. and Wood, R.E. 2011. Mental Models, Decision Making, and Performance Heterogeneity, *Strategic Management Journal*, 32: 569-594.

### **Nov 16: Multidisciplinary Approaches to Personality & Organizational Outcomes: Narcissism**

1. Colin Camerer and Daniel Lovallo. (1999). Overconfidence and excess entry: an experimental approach, *American Economic Review* 89, pp. 306–318.
2. Malmendier, Ulrike & Tate, Geoffrey (2005). CEO overconfidence and corporate investment. *Journal of Finance*, 60, 2661-2700.
3. Chatterjee, Arijit & Hambrick, Donald C. (2011). Executive personality, capability cues, and risk taking: How narcissistic CEOs react to their successes and stumbles. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 56, 202-237.
  - Read the blog interview: <https://asqblog.com/2015/12/17/chatterjee-and-hambrick-2011-executive-personality-capability-cues-and-risk-taking-how-narcissistic-ceos-react-to-their-successes-and-stumbles/>
4. Zhu, David H. & Chen, Guoli (2015). CEO narcissism and the impact of prior board experience on corporate strategy. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 60, 31-65
5. Frino, Alex, Ming Ying L., Mollica, Vito & Palumbo, Ricardo (2015). CEO narcissism and earnings management. SSRN Paper #2539555.
6. Carey, Angela L., Brucks, Melanie S., Kuefner, Albrecht C., Holtzman, Nicholas, S., Deters, Fenne, Back, Mitja D., Donnellan, M. Brent, Pennebaker, James W. & Meehl, Matthias R. (2015). "Narcissism and the use of personal pronouns revisited." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 109, in press
7. And choose one of the articles below (or find your own) – from the discipline of your choice.

#### Questions

1. How would you characterize the disciplinary differences in how papers approach this topic? What approaches do you find most convincing and why?
- 

8. Finance: Hirshleifer, D., Low, A. and Teoh, S.H., 2012. Are overconfident CEOs better innovators?. *The Journal of Finance*, 67(4), pp.1457-1498.
9. Strategy: Patel, Pankaj C. & Cooper, Danielle (2014). The harder they fall, the faster they rise: Approach and avoidance focus in narcissistic CEOs. *Strategic Management Journal*, 35, 1528-1540.
10. Accounting: Buchholz, Frerich, Lopatta, Kerstin & Maas, Karen (2014). The strategic engagement of narcissistic CEOs in earnings management. SSRN Paper #2520528.
11. Accounting: Schrand, Catherine M. & Zechman, Sarah L. (2012). Executive overconfidence and the slippery slope to financial misreporting. *Journal of Accounting and Economics*, 53, 311-329. S
12. Accounting: Judd, J. Scott, Olsen, Kari J. & Stelkelberg, James M. (2015). CEO narcissism, accounting quality, and external audit fees. SSRN Paper # 2605172.

13. Management: Chatterjee, Arijit and Donald C. Hambrick, 2007, It's All about Me: Narcissistic Chief Executive Officers and Their Effects on Company Strategy and Performance, *Administrative Science Quarterly*, Vol. 52, No. 3 (Sep., 2007), pp. 351-386 ,  
<http://www.jstor.org/stable/20109929>

### **Nov. 30: Organizational Identity**

1. Whetten, D.A. 2006. Albert and Whetten revisited: strengthening the concept of organizational identity. *Journal of Management Inquiry*, 15 (3), 219-234
2. Hsu, G., & Hannan, M. T. (2005). Identities, genres, and organizational forms. *Organization science*, 16(5), 474-490.
3. Rao, H., Davis, G.F. & Ward, A. 2000. Embeddedness, social identity and mobility: why firms leave the NASDAQ and join the New York stock exchange. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 45 (2), 268-292
4. Smith, Edward. 2011. Identities as Lenses: How Organizational Identity Affects Audiences' Evaluation of Organizational Performance. *Administrative Science Quarterly* 56:61-94;
  - a. Read blog interview: <https://asqblog.com/2015/01/14/smith-2011-identities-as-lenses-how-organizational-identity-affects-audiences-evaluation-of-organizational-performance/>
5. Petriglieri, J. L. (2015). Co-creating Relationship Repair Pathways to Reconstructing Destabilized Organizational Identification. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 0001839215579234.
6. Daniel M. Cable, Francesca Gino, and Bradley R. Staats. 2013. Breaking Them in or Eliciting Their Best? Reframing Socialization around Newcomers' Authentic Self-expression. *Administrative Science Quarterly* March 2013 58: 1-36,doi:10.1177/0001839213477098
  - a. Read also the blog interview: <https://asqblog.com/2014/12/08/cable-gino-staats-2013-breaking-them-in-or-eliciting-their-best-reframing-socialization-around-newcomers-authentic-self-expression/>

- 
7. Background: Albert, S., & Whetten, D.A. 1985. Organizational identity. In L.L. Cummings & B.M. Staw (Ed.), *Research in Organizational Behaviour*, vol.7: 263-295. Greenwich, CT: JAI Press
  8. Background: Albert, S., Ashforth, B. E., & Dutton, J. E. 2000. Organizational identity and identification: Charting new waters and building new bridges. *Academy of Management Review*, 25(1): 13-17.
  9. Background: Dutton, J.E. & Dukerich, J.M. 1991. Keeping an eye on the mirror: the role of image and identity in organizational adaptation. *Academy of Management Journal*, 34, 3, 517-554
  10. Optional: Kramer, R. & Elsbach, K. 1996. Members' responses to organizational identity threats: encountering and countering the Business Week rankings. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 41 (3), 442-476.
  11. Optional: Tripsas, M. 2009. Technology, identity and inertia. *Organization Science*
  12. Optional: Corley, K.G & Gioia 2004 Identity ambiguity and change in the wake of a corporate spin-off. *Administrative Science Quarterly*
  13. Optional: Glynn, M. A. (2000). When cymbals become symbols: Conflict over organizational identity within a symphony orchestra. *Organization Science*, 11(3), 285-298.
  14. Optional: Rao, Monin and Durand. 2003. Institutional change in Toqueville: novella cuisine as an identity movement in French gastronomy. *American Journal of Sociology*

15. Optional: Bunderson, J. Stuart and Jeffery A. Thompson. 2009. The Call of the Wild: Zookeepers, Callings, and the Double-edged Sword of Deeply Meaningful Work. *Administrative Science Quarterly* 54:32-57;doi:10.2189/asqu.2009.54.1.32

### **December 7: Entrepreneurship & Imprinting**

1. Freeman, J. 1986. Entrepreneurs as organizational products. In G. Libecap, ed., *Advances in the Study of Entrepreneurship, Innovation, and Economic Growth*, 1: 33-52. Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
2. Eisenhardt, K.M. & Schoonhoven, C.B., 1990. "Organizational growth: Linking founding team, strategy, environment, and growth among U.S. semiconductor ventures, 1978-1988." *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 504-529.
3. Beckman, C.M. & Burton, M.D. 2008. Founding the future. *Organization Science*.
4. Hallen, B., Pahnke, E. C. 2016. When Do Entrepreneurs Accurately Evaluate Venture Capital Firms' Track Records? A Bounded Rationality Perspective. *Academy of Management Journal*, Forthcoming
5. Haveman, Heather A., Jacob Habinek, and Leo A. Goodman. 2012. How Entrepreneurship Evolves: The Founders of New Magazines in America, 1741–1860 *Administrative Science Quarterly* December 2012 57: 585-624,doi:10.1177/0001839212467168
  - a. Read ASQ Blog Interview: <https://asqblog.com/2015/07/01/haveman-habinek-goodman-2012-how-entrepreneurship-evolves-the-founders-of-new-magazines-in-america-1741-1860/>

6. Optional: Simon, T., and Roberts, P.W. 2008. Local and non-local pre-founding experience and new organizational form penetration: The case of the Israeli wine industry. *Administrative Science Quarterly*.
7. Optional: Johnson, Victoria. 2007. What is organizational imprinting? Cultural entrepreneurship in the founding of the Paris Opera. *American Journal of Sociology*, 113: 97-127.
8. Optional: Almandoz, Juan. 2014. Founding Teams as Carriers of Competing Logics: When Institutional Forces Predict Banks' Risk Exposure. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, doi:10.1177/0001839214537810

### **Dropped: Search, Adaptation and Knowledge**

1. Levinthal, Dan. 1997. "Adaptation on rugged landscapes". *Management Science*, 43: 934-950.
2. Gavetti, Giovanni and Daniel Levinthal. 2000. "Looking forward and looking backward: cognitive and experiential search," *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 45: 113-137.
3. Katila, R., Chen, E.L. 2008. Effects of search timing on innovation: The value of not being in sync with rivals. *Administrative Science Quarterly*.
4. Benner, Mary J., and Michael Tushman, 2002. Process Management and Technological Innovation: A longitudinal study of the photography and paint industries. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 47: 676-706.
5. Siggelkow, Nicolaj and Jan W. Rivkin. 2009. Hiding the Evidence of Valid Theories: How Coupled Search Processes Obscure Performance Differences among Organizations. *Administrative Science Quarterly* 54:602-634;doi:10.2189/asqu.2009.54.4.602
6. Stefano Brusoni, Andrea Prencipe, and Keith Pavitt. Knowledge Specialization, Organizational Coupling, and the Boundaries of the Firm: Why Do Firms Know More than They Make? *Administrative Science Quarterly* 2001 46:597-621; doi:10.2307/3094825