

# **SASE 25th Annual Conference**

June 27-29, 2013 - University of Milan

## **States in Crisis**

Call for Papers and Sessions for network F:  
Knowledge, Technology and Innovation

# Call for Papers and Sessions for network F: Knowledge, Technology and Innovation

## Goal of network F: Knowledge, Technology and Innovation

This network focuses on the interactions between knowledge, technology, firm's innovation strategies, and institutions. To explain how different socio-economic institutions can account for variation in firms' and countries' patterns of technological specialization in disruptive or sustaining innovations to an even greater extent, new studies are required. Such studies need to take into consideration firms' and other organizations' embeddedness within sub-national, national, international, and sectoral institutions: innovation raises a number of challenges for firms (the assessment of knowledge and workers' skills, collaboration, funding, employee motivation, knowledge spill-overs, etc.) and the ways in which firms' institutionally diverse settings help them to resolve these problems requires greater scrutiny. We welcome contributions that address these and related issues. *Topics of particular interest are:* national, regional, local and sectoral systems of innovation; knowledge-based economies, including the creative industries; firms as knowledge systems; the influence of financial systems and labour markets on firm capabilities and business models; the impact of internationalization on firms' innovation strategies; technological change-based innovation; consequences of technological change for organizations and the economy; social and organizational conditions for entrepreneurship and innovation; the diffusion of innovation and markets for innovation; intellectual property rights regimes; and product piracy.

## Paper and Session Proposals

Different sessions in network F will be primarily organized around the themes of the papers submitted. However, as always, scholars are strongly encouraged to submit their own session proposals. Session proposals involve session themes that are geared toward a specific topic within the ambit of network F and attract peers active in a particular field of interest. In order to facilitate network building on central topics of network F, also this year, we would like to invite paper and session proposals around the following themes:

- Institutional diversity and innovation
- Multinational corporations, institutional voids and entrepreneurship in emerging markets
- Innovation and trust in family businesses

Please find an outline of the respective themes below!

### **Deadlines and Submission Guidelines**

**The deadline for submitting proposals is January 15, 2013**

The SASE office will notify you formally if your paper or session has been accepted or rejected by April 1st, 2013.

**Please go to: [www.sase.org](http://www.sase.org) for submission**

All submissions will be processed through SASE's online submission system, which will open in mid-November. You will be asked to create an account in order to make your submission. Abstracts should not exceed 250 words, except for mini-conference submissions, which should be 1,000 words in length. With your login and password you can then come back to the site to edit your submission until the deadline for submissions, January 15, 2013.

## **Contact details of network F organizers**

Prof. Dr. Florian Becker-Ritterspach  
Professor of International Business  
German University in Cairo (GUC)  
Faculty of Management Technology  
11835 New Cairo City  
Cairo, Egypt  
Tel.: +20 2 2759 0769

Dr. Knut Lange  
Surrey Business School  
University of Surrey  
Guildford, Surrey, GU2 7XH,  
United Kingdom  
Tel.: +44 1483 68 9751

Dr. Matthew Allen  
Senior Lecturer in Organization  
Studies  
Manchester Business School  
The University of Manchester  
Booth Street West  
Manchester  
M15 6PB  
United Kingdom  
Tel: +44 161 306 3469

# Special call for paper and session proposals

## **Institutional Diversity and Innovation**

Patterns of innovation and technological specialization continue to vary considerably between countries (Hall and Soskice, 2001; Schneider and Paunescu, 2012). Whilst much early comparative capitalisms research on innovation patterns focused on the macro-institutional context (see, for instance, Casper *et al.*, 1999; Hall and Soskice, 2001), more recent studies have examined in greater detail the links between the specific institutional settings of firms, their organizational capabilities, and their abilities to innovate (Allen and Whitley, 2012; Crouch and Voelzkow, 2009; Herrmann, 2008; Lange, 2009). Consequently, there has been a greater recognition of institutional diversity within economies. This diversity can take several forms. Firstly, there is a greater awareness of the different functions that institutions can perform (Storz, 2008). Secondly, there is a growing recognition of the importance of previously neglected institutions (see, for example, Parker and Tamaschke, 2005). Finally, institutional diversity has resulted from the internationalization of product, capital, and some labour markets; this has altered the institutional resources that firms can, potentially, tap into (Casper and Mataves, 2003; Herrmann, 2008).

We invite contributions that examine theoretically and empirically the ways in which firms are able to draw on institutional diversity to support their innovation strategies. In particular, we encourage the submission of papers that examine the ways in which firms' innovation strategies are constrained and enabled by their specific institutional context. This is likely to lead to a better understanding of the types of organizational capabilities that firms must develop, the types of institutional resources that firms need, their ability to access those resources, and the extent to which firms are able to combine resources drawn from altered or non-dominant domestic institutional arrangements as well as foreign settings.

## **Bibliography**

Allen, Matthew M. C./Richard Whitley (2012), 'Capabilities, Sectors and Institutions: The Influence of Sectoral Variations and Dominant Institutions on Firms' Responses to Increasing

Internationalization'. In C. Lane and G. T. Wood (eds), *Capitalist Diversity and Diversity within Capitalism*, London: Routledge, pp. 97-120.

Casper, Steve/Mark Lehrer/David Soskice (1999), 'Can High-Technology Industries Prosper in Germany? Institutional Frameworks and the Evolution of the German Software and Biotechnology Industries', *Industry and Innovation*, 6, 5-24.

Casper Steve/Catherine Matraves (2003), 'Institutional Frameworks and Innovation in the German and UK Pharmaceutical Industry', *Research Policy*, 32, 1865-1879.

Crouch, Colin/Helmut Voelzkow (eds) (2009), *Innovation in Local Economies: Germany in Comparative Context*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.

Hall, Peter .A./David Soskice (2001), 'Introduction'. In P.A. Hall and D. Soskice (eds), *The Varieties of Capitalism: The Institutional Foundations of Comparative Advantage*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, pp. 1-70.

Herrmann, Andrea.M. (2008) 'Rethinking the Link between Labour Market Flexibility and Corporate Competitiveness: a Critique of the Institutional Literature', *Socio-Economic Review*, 6, 637-669.

Lange, K. (2009) 'Institutional Embeddedness and the Strategic Leeway of Actors: The Case of the German Therapeutical Biotech Industry', *Socio-Economic Review*, 7, 181-207.

Parker, R. and Tamaschke, L. (2005), Explaining Regional Departures from National Patterns of Industry Specialization: Regional Institutions, Policies and State Coordination, *Organization Studies*, 26, 1787-1807.

Schneider, Martin .R./Mihai Paunescu (2012), 'Changing Varieties of Capitalism and Revealed Comparative Advantages from 1990 to 2005: a Test of the Hall and Soskice Claims', *Socio-Economic Review*, 10, 731-753.

Storz, Cormelia (2008), 'Innovation, Institutions and Entrepreneurs: The Case of "Cool Japan"', *Asia Pacific Business Review*, 14, 401-424.

## **Multinational corporations, institutional voids and entrepreneurship in emerging markets**

Emerging markets offer substantial growth opportunities for domestic firms and multinational corporations (MNCs) alike. Leveraging such opportunities, however, has been associated with tremendous challenges particularly for MNCs from developed economies as host institutional contexts are often seen as institutionally hazardous, distant, weak or even void (e.g. Henisz 2000, Khanna and Palepu 2000, Kostova and Roth 2002).

While the international business literature has focused on (rather passive) organizational adaptation in the face of misfit and distance, there is paucity of research on how MNCs proactively engage in institutional change and work or entrepreneurship when facing situations of institutional contradiction, hazard or institutional voids (e.g. Jackson & Deeg 2008, Cantwell et al. 2010, Kostova et al. 2008, Kwok and Tadesse 2006).

We invite contributions that explore empirically and theoretically how we can capture institutional environments in emerging markets and how MNCs from different market economies perceive and deal with these environments. We particularly welcome papers that leverage the potential of comparative capitalism and new institutional theory. We particularly encourage the employment of the concepts of institutional work, entrepreneurship and institutional change or innovation (e.g. Maguire et al. 2004, Dorado 2005, Greenwood and Suddaby 2006, Battilana et al. 2009, Phillips *et al.* 2009) as we see these as key to developing a better understanding of how firms in emerging markets proactively shape their institutional environments (e.g. Mair and Marti 2009, Khanna and Palepu 2010, Puffer et al. 2010, Tracy and Phillips 2011).

### **Bibliography**

Battilana, J., Leca, B., & Boxenbaum, E. 2009. How Actors Change Institutions: Towards a Theory of Institutional Entrepreneurship. *The Academy of Management Annals*, 3(1): 65-107.

Cantwell, J., Dunning, J. H., & Lundan, S. M. 2010. An evolutionary approach to understanding international business activity: The co-evolution of MNEs and the institutional environment. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 41: 567-586.

Dorado, S. 2005. Institutional Entrepreneurship, Partaking, and Convening. *Organization Studies*, 26(3): 385-414.

Greenwood, R., & Suddaby, R. 2006. Institutional entrepreneurship in mature fields: The big five accounting firms. *Academy of Management Journal*, 49(1): 27-48.

Henisz, W. J. 2000. The institutional environment for multinational investment. *Journal of Law, Economics and Organization*, 16: 334-364.

Jackson, G., & Deeg, R. 2008. Comparing capitalisms: understanding institutional diversity and its implications for international business. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 39: 540-561.

Khanna, T., & Palepu, K. G. 2000. The Future of Business Groups in Emerging Markets: Long-Run Evidence from Chile. *The Academy of Management Journal*, 43(3): 268-285.

Khanna, T., & Palepu, K. G. 2010. *Winning in emerging markets: A roadmap for strategy and execution*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business Press.

Kostova, T., & Roth, K. 2002. Adoption of an Organizational Practice By Subsidiaries Of Multinational Corporations: Institutional and Relational Effects. *Academy of Management Journal*, 45: 215-233.

Kostova, T., Roth, K., & Dacin, M. T. 2008. Note: Institutional Theory in the Study of Multinational Corporations: A Critique and new Directions. *The Academy of Management Review*, 33(4).

Kwok, C. C. Y., & Tadesse, S. 2006. The MNC as an agent of change for host-country institutions: FDI and corruption. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 37: 767-785.

Maguire, S., Hardy, C., & Lawrence, T. B. 2004. Institutional entrepreneurship in emerging fields: HIV/AIDS treatment advocacy in Canada. *Academy of Management Journal*, 47(5): 657-679.

Mair, J., & Marti, I. 2009. Entrepreneurship in and around institutional voids: A case study from Bangladesh. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 24(5): 419-435.

Phillips, N., Tracey, P., & Karra, N. 2009. Rethinking institutional distance: strengthening the tie between new institutional theory and international management. *Strategic Organization*, 7(3): 339-348.

Puffer, S. M., McCarthy, D. J., & Boisot, M. 2010. Entrepreneurship in Russia and China: The Impact of Formal Institutional Voids. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 34(3): 441-467.

Tracey, P., & Phillips, N. 2011. Entrepreneurship in Emerging Markets Strategies for New Venture Creation in Uncertain Institutional Contexts. *Management International Review (MIR)*, 51(23): 23-39.

## **Innovation and Trust in Family Businesses**

Family businesses are much more widespread than previously thought (La Porta, Lopez-de-Silanes, and Shleifer, 1999; Morck & Yeung, 2004). This is even true for countries such as the United States (Astrachan & Schanker, 2003). Since less developed countries have even more family-dominated firms, it is quite likely that families dominate most firms worldwide (Granovetter, 2005). Despite this empirical dominance, the research on family business management is still in its early stages (Chrisman, Chua, and Steier, 2005). In addition, the particularities of firms in family ownership have been largely ignored by innovation scholars (with the notable exception of Craig and Moores, 2006 as well as Pittino and Visintin, 2009). This is surprising, since there are indications that family businesses are less risk averse and conservative and more innovative than is often assumed (Aronoff, 1998). Therefore, we would like to invite contributions that analyze both the extent to which and the ways in which family firms pursue distinctive innovation strategies. More specifically, we are interested in submissions that address research questions such as: How do family businesses differ from non-family businesses with regard to their innovativeness? What kind of impact does family ownership have on firms' innovativeness and innovation strategies? How, if at all, does knowledge management within family businesses differ from other firms and what are the implications for innovation?

Furthermore, we would like to connect family business research with the large body of literature on trust in organizational studies (Kramer and Tyler, 1996; Lane and Bachmann, 1998; Rousseau, et al., 1998; Child and Moellering, 2003). A first attempt to integrate these fields has been made by Sundaramurthy (2008). However, the question of how institutional settings affect trust in family businesses has been hardly addressed so far. This might be also a consequence of the fact that many relevant studies have been carried out in an Anglo-Saxon context. Therefore, we welcome submissions that analyze how trust in family businesses is influenced by different institutional settings. In addition, we invite contributions that investigate the implications that the particular forms of trust within family businesses have on innovation and knowledge management.

## **Bibliography**

- Astrachan, J.H., & Shanker, M.C. (2003). Family Businesses' Contribution to the U.S. Economy: A Closer Look. *Family Business Review* 16, 211-219.
- Aronoff, C.E. (1998). Megatrends in family businesses. *Family Business Review*, 11, 181-186.
- Child, J. & Moellering, G. (2003). Contextual confidence and active trust development in the Chinese business environment. *Organization Science*, 14, 69-80.
- Chrisman, J.C., Chua, J.H., & Steier, L. (2005) Sources and Consequences of Distinctive Familiness: An Introduction. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 237-247.
- Craig, J.B.L., & Moores, K. (2006). A 10-Year Longitudinal Investigation of Strategy, Systems, and Environment on Innovation in Family Firms 19, 1- 10.
- Granovetter, M. (2005). Business Groups and Social Organization. In: Smelser, N.J. & Swedberg, R. (eds.) *The Handbook of Economic Sociology*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Kramer, R.M. & Tyler, T.R. (1996). *Trust in organizations: Frontiers of theory and research*. Thousand Oaks. Thousand Oaks, Sage.
- Lane, C. & Bachmann, R. (1998). *Trust within and between organizations: conceptual issues and empirical applications*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- La Porta, R., Lopez-de-Silanes, F., & Shleifer, A. (1999). Corporate Ownership Around the World. *Journal of Finance*, 54, 471-519.
- Morck, R., & Yeung, B. (2003). Agency Problems in Large Business Family Groups. *Entrepreneurship Theory & Practice*, 27, 367 – 382.
- Pittino, D. & Visintin, F. (2009). Innovation and strategic types of family SMEs. A test and extension of Miles and Snow's configurational model, *Journal of Enterprising Culture*, 17, 257-295.
- Rousseau, D., Sitkin, S., Burt, R., & Camerer, C. (1988). Not so different after all: A cross discipline view of trust. *Academy of Management Review*, 23, 405-421.
- Sundaramurthy, C. (2008). Sustaining Trust within Family Businesses, *Family Business Review*, 11, 89-101.