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Greetings and thank you all for your contributions to OMT!

This year's division highlights include some familiar traditions, and some newly created ones:

- In Boston we launched a new PDW, "Navigating the First Years of the PhD." Conceived by OMT's Executive Committee and led by Past Division Chair Eva Boxenbaum, it was a huge success, and supports our ongoing plans for ensuring a globally diverse next-generation of OMTers

- We were also excited to announce the new "Ned Smith Rising Star" award, given to an OMT scholar who has established a research record of exceptional quality and creativity early in their career (see who won it below)

- At our annual Business Meeting in Boston, incoming program chair Wendy Smith revealed an annual OMT Artifact worthy of our times: OMT Juggling Balls. I think they're my new favorite, displacing the Revise and Resubmit yo-yo, and "Reviewer #2" pen

- This fall we continue our OMT “Doing Organizational Research Around the World” Paper Development Workshops, after a successful event in Kyoto Japan last April. Next up is our December event in Singapore (apply here)

A huge thanks to all the sponsors who have provided financial support for our division activities. You can find out more about them here, including information on the research and paper development workshops they sponsored.

Now, here are the updates on everything that happened in Boston at the Annual Meeting this summer:

- Program Chair Emilio Castilla reports on the outstanding program he assembled
- PDW Chair Wendy Smith provides her pre-conference program, including all of our PDWs & Consortia
- Kisha Lashley and Madeline Toubiana provide an update on the successful Junior Faculty Consortium
- Danielle Logue and Pedro Monteiro do the same for our Doctoral Consortium
- Global reps Vidya Jandhyala and Shubha Patvardhan share an update on our Global Consortium, and also our Paper Development Workshops
- Membership Outreach Chair Shelby Gai shares an overview of our innovative and very successful off-program events in Boston--including 6 themed “OMT Drinks/Meets” events, 2 “OMT Moves” events, and an “OMT Hits” baseball game at Fenway!
- Our Research Committee Chair Massimo Maoret highlights all of the award winners for 2023.
- Our Past OMT Chair Eva Boxenbaum reports on the new Navigating the First Years of the PhD PDW.
- Likewise, our new Social Media Chair Giada Baldessarelli discusses our ever expanding OMT online presence, with input from outgoing chairs Christine Moser and Kevin Lee.
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• Special thanks once again to Renate Meyer for chairing the OMT Best Published Paper committee, which is composed of 20 distinguished OMT members who selected Suntae Kim and Todd Shifeling as winners of the award for the OMT Best Paper Published in 2022. You can read the paper here.

• Further, let me especially congratulate our 2023 OMT Distinguished Scholar, Willie Ocasio, and our 2023 OMT Distinguished Educator, Ruthanne Huising. Both are inspiring scholars, and it was terrific to see how the OMT community honored them in Boston. You can find the slides for Willie’s memorable talk here.

• And congratulations to our inaugural Ned Smith Rising Star award, Julia DiBenigno. This award is established in honor of Edward "Ned" Bishop Smith (1981-2021), and you can read more about the award here.

As every year, it is also time to say farewell to some of our officers and welcome others:

• Martin Kilduff completed his five years in the executive leadership position of the division. He has been an inspiration, courageously leading through remote and hybrid conferences. Thank you, Martin! At the same time, Joel Gehman joins us as the new Division Program Chair-Elect, starting the first of his five-year term.

• Srividya Jandhyala, Kisha Lashley, and Danielle Logue stepped down from their terms as Division Representatives-at-Large. They are succeeded by Emily Block, Hila Lifshitz-Assaf, and Andrea Prado, whom you elected this spring.

• We are excited for OMT leader Christine Moser to transition this year into a newly created Membership Outreach Chair responsible for our expanding OMT activities that happen around the year, outside of the annual conference event.

• A special thanks to Eva Boxenbaum, who moved on to the role of Past Division Chair. She has embodied the ideals of the OMT Division, with a collaborative approach to leading through unprecedented changes, and a contagious spirit of innovation as we contemplate a more global OMT, including AOM Copenhagen 2025.

This is the fall newsletter, which of course is a reminder that it is time to start preparing for the 2024 meeting in Chicago. Here are a few things to do:

• Sign-up to review for OMT! We need you more than ever… The reviewer system will open later this October, so please sign up. This is YOUR division and Program Chair Wendy Smith cannot make it happen without your help.

• Thinking of organizing a PDW? Contact PDW Chair Joel Gehman.

• Thinking of an OMT Café in Chicago next year? Contact Shelby Gai.

• Send your papers and symposium proposals to OMT!

To conclude, I’d like to thank you all for being part of our community and for continuing to make OMT The Place to Be!

Best wishes,
Forrest Briscoe
OMT Division Chair
Dear fellow Organization and Management Theory (OMT) members,

I trust this message finds you in good health and spirits as we transition into the fall season.

Reflecting on our recent Academy of Management Meeting in Boston, I would like to extend my heartfelt gratitude. Thank you to the dedicated authors, meticulous organizers, insightful reviewers, captivating presenters, and engaged attendees. Every single one of you played a pivotal role in curating and delivering a diverse, rich, and stimulating program for OMT.

OMT received 514 paper submissions and 125 symposium proposals this year, which represents an increase from last year, although still shy of pre-COVID levels. Around 750 reviewers from 47 countries signed up with OMT to help curate the program—thank you so much for your dedicated work. The 92% review completion rate was outstanding, and much appreciated! Special thanks to the 179 new reviewers who volunteered to review for OMT for the first time this year. Reviewers also had access to our relatively new OMT Reviewer Guidelines. Please continue to volunteer to review for OMT next year.

Like the entire AOM program this year, 100% of our OMT sessions took place in person. Our paper sessions and symposia took place Monday, August 7th and Tuesday, August 8th. This year, OMT was allowed by AOM to accept 255 papers and 88 symposia, including many that were co-sponsored with other divisions. The topics were wide-ranging and included: Diversity and Workplace Inequality; Crises and Grand Challenges; Authenticity, Identity, and Identification; Networks; Stigma; Organizational Learning and Culture; Paradox Theory and Paradoxes; Digital Platforms; Family Businesses; Temporality; Alliances and Acquisitions; Strategic Frames and Narratives; Social Movements and Activism; Misconduct and Scandals; Transparency and Secrecy; Careers and Job Mobility; and many more.

The table below provides an overview of the most prevalent keywords chosen by both paper submitters and reviewers for theories and methods (since 2021).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theories Keywords</th>
<th>Chosen by Authors 2023 ('22, '21)</th>
<th>Chosen by Reviewers 2023 ('22, '21)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Theory</td>
<td>105 (101, 80)</td>
<td>318 (305, 296)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavioral Theory &amp; Decision Making</td>
<td>43 (52, 37)</td>
<td>150 (154, 142)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Networks and Embeddedness</td>
<td>54 (51, 40)</td>
<td>140 (129, 132)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sensemaking and Cognition</td>
<td>31 (30, 25)</td>
<td>142 (129, 132)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practice Theory</td>
<td>22 (23, 15)</td>
<td>98 (94, 87)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Methods Keywords</th>
<th>Chosen by Authors</th>
<th>Chosen by Reviewers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Empirical, quantitative</td>
<td>180 (155, 125)</td>
<td>311 (294, 263)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empirical, qualitative</td>
<td>170 (131, 117)</td>
<td>396 (384, 349)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theoretical/Conceptual (no data)</td>
<td>92 (91, 69)</td>
<td>243 (255, 234)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The grouping of accepted papers into paper sessions is a key aspect of the OMT program creation, and perhaps one of the most challenging ones. To illustrate the richness of topics covered by OMT this year, see a few of the paper session titles below (in alphabetical order):
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- Building Legitimacy in Organizations and Institutions
- Categories and Category Emergence
- Digital Platforms and Organizations
- Family and Family Businesses in Today's World
- Gender Diversity at the Top: Antecedents and Consequences
- Institutional Logics: New Research in Organizations and Management
- Networks, Network Positions, and Organizational Performance
- Organizational and Institutional Responses to Stigma
- Organizational Responses to Performance Shortfalls and Technological Change
- Social Networks and Innovation in Organizations
- Strategic Firm Alliances and Acquisitions
- Strategic Frames and Narratives in Organizational Life
- Tackling Grand Challenges
- The Effects of Misconduct, Wrongdoings, and Scandals
- Time Will Tell: Temporality in Organizational Life
- And many more!

This year, we also showcased a few of our symposia (in alphabetical order):

- Advancing New Theoretical and Empirical Approaches to Categorizing Firms
- Connections and Opportunities for Integration Between Carnegie Perspective and Institutional Logics
- Firms, Occupations, and Markets as Tools for Combating Systemic Racism: Challenges and Opportunities
- Full-Cycle Organizational Research: Status and Opportunities
- New Approaches to Understanding Organizational Networks, Inequality, and Inclusion
- Organizational Culture: Emerging Perspectives and Practices
- Scientific Decision-Making in Large Organizations: Challenges, Opportunities, and Questions
- Solving Societal Grand Challenges: Emerging Frameworks and Practical Implications
- The Dynamics of Organizational Change: Understanding Change Across Levels and Time in Organizations
- The Evolution of Industries: Integrating Across Multiple Perspectives.

We also were able to offer a number of our Symposia with strong connections to the 2023 AOM theme, “Putting the Worker Front and Center”:

- Centering Workers in Voice Research: Emerging Frontiers in Worker Voice
- From a Work(er) Point of View: Reinvigorating Management Research Through the Study of Work
- The Humanness of Work in an Era of Artificial Intelligence
- The Worker Perspective on AI Across Occupational, Organizational, and Geographic Boundaries
- Top Down and Bottom Up: Connecting Strategic Leadership and Employees
- Understanding Employee Activism
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- Workers On the Front Lines of Global Conflict: Economic Blockades and Business Retreats from Russia.

As in previous years, we recognized our members with awards, including ABCD (Above and Beyond the Call of Duty) best reviewers, Best Published Paper, Best Paper, Best Student Paper, Best Paper on Environmental and Social Practices, Best International Paper (sponsored by Organization Studies/ SAGE), Best OMT Entrepreneurship Paper (Sponsored by Macquarie University), Best Symposium, Responsible Research (Sponsored by the University of Delaware, Lerner Business & Economics), and the Louis Pondy Best Dissertation Paper (Sponsored by IESE Business School).

The Academy also recognized the excellence of OMT scholarship: Laura Adler of Yale University was one of the 2023 finalists for the William H. Newman Award presented at the conference, for her paper “The Paradox of Individual Equity: How Employers Explain the Fairness of Unequal Pay.”

In addition to the Academy-wide paper awards, OMT scholars/members also were finalists for the George R. Terry Book Award this year.

The Academy of Management also recognized many of our OMT scholars/members for their “best articles” published in 2023 or recent years. The list includes Pedro Monteiro and Paul S. Adler for their Best Article in Academy of Management Annals; Christine Moser, Frank den Hond, and Dirk Lindebau for their Best Article in Academy of Management Learning & Education; and Trish Ruebottom, Sean Buchanan, Maxim Voronov, and Madeline Toubiana for their Best Article in Academy of Management Review, among many. Congratulations to all of you!

On Monday August 7th, the recipient of our Distinguished Scholar Award, Professor William Ocasio, gave his address, “Outline of a Theory of Attentional Control: Through Institutions, Organizations, Management, and Algorithms.” Ocasio, currently at the Gies College of Business at the University of Illinois Urbana-Champaign, shared how his intellectual journey into studying the importance of attention in institutions, organizations, and management began as a doctoral student at Stanford University. Starting his acceptance speech with a beautiful quote in Spanish from Ortega y Gasset’s Meditations on Quixote (1914), “Yo Soy Yo y Mis Circunstancias” (“I Am Myself and My Circumstances”), Ocasio went on to lead us into a fascinating presentation about his important ideas and work on institutional logics and attention, including his most recent investigation into attention and algorithms. He concluded by encouraging us scholars to “go beyond local parsimony and local conversations toward open paradigms, shared vocabulary, mixed methods, interdisciplinary (cross-level) research,” with many of us in the audience paying very close attention (pun intended) to such important and inspiring words of advice. Ocasio ended by thanking a list of impressive coauthors, colleagues and friends, including his special thanks to his husband, Michael Warrell, who we were also delighted to have in the audience. You can view Professor Ocasio’s inspiring talk here.

At the OMT Business Meeting on Monday, Ruthanne Huising of Emlyon Business School received the Distinguished Educator Award for her exceptional contributions to organization and
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management theory education. This OMT award is a tribute to individuals who have positively influenced educational practices within the broader OMT field.

Additionally, at this year’s OMT Business Meeting, we for the first time awarded the new OMT Ned Smith Rising Star Award. The [OMT Ned Smith Rising Star Award](#), which was given this year to Julia DiBenigno of Yale University, was created to recognize an OMT scholar who has established a research record of exceptional quality and creativity early in their career (within 10 years, excluding leaves, of completing their PhD). The Ned Smith Rising Star Award will be presented every other year and was established in honor of Edward "Ned" Bishop Smith (1981-2021). We were delighted to have Ned’s wife, children, and parents join our OMT Business Meeting this year in Boston, as this was the first time that we were presenting this important award.

Our sincere congratulations again to all of the awardees this year!

As we begin a new academic year, Wendy Smith of the University of Delaware has already begun working on next year’s program as OMT Program Chair, and we welcome Joel Gehman of George Washington University as our elected PDW Chair. I’m confident that their combined efforts will ensure the 2024 meeting in Chicago will be a resounding success. Should you have any queries or suggestions concerning the OMT Program for the 2024 AOM Annual Meeting, please reach out to Wendy or Joel.

Thank you for all your contributions. I look forward to seeing you all next year as we continue to make OMT the Place to Be!

Best wishes for the 2023-2024 academic year,

Emilio J. Castilla

2023 OMT Division Chair-Elect
The 2023 OMT pre-conference offered an array of consortia, PDWs, and off program events for current and new OMT members to learn, grown and connect. These events sought to BOTH exploit – continue providing the high-quality programs you have expected in the past AND explore – introduce novel theories, topics, ideas and formats.

Consortia
Each year, OMT sponsors consortia to engage doctoral students, early career scholars and colleagues conducting research in and about global communities typically underrepresented at AOM. If you have not joined us in the past, we hope you can do so this coming year. THANK YOU to all the organizers of these fabulous events.

- Doctoral Student Consortium – Danielle Logue and Pedro Monteiro
- Junior Faculty Consortium – Kisha Lashley and Madeline Toubiana
- Global Research Consortium – Vidya Jandhyala and Shubha Patvardhan
- Navigating the first years of your PhD – Eva Boxenbaum
- New and Returning Member Networking – Shelby Gai and Samira Nazar

PDWs
We hosted 33 PDWS (up from 28 in 2022) and co-sponsored many more. We continued to support recurring PDWs that make OMT their home including communities around social networks, ethnography, sports management, occupations and professions, optimal distinctiveness, paradox theory, and others. We also introduced new topics including PDWs on indigenous theorizing, leading social impact centers and others. This year, due to changes in the AOM system, we encouraged many of you who submitted multiple PDWs on similar themes to work together toward a more impactful PDW. We valued this experiment and are grateful to the many successes that emerged from this process.

We continue to seek a diverse and engaging PDW program. If you have ideas for PDWs, reach out to Joel Gehman, incoming PDW chair to let him know what you are thinking about.

Off-Program Events
OMT continues to organize multiple events allowing casual connections across small groups of people. Thank you to Shelby Gai and Ilaria Orlandi for organizing this program.

- OMT Moves – Morning Walks, Pick up Baseball game
- OMT Hits – Baseball game at Fenway
- OMT Morning Coffee – THANK YOU Christine Moser
If you have ideas for future events, or want to help organize in the future, please reach out to Shelby Gai.

Artifact
And finally, it was an honor (mixed with a bit of trepidation) to choose this year’s OMT Artifact.

OMT juggling balls
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We wish you all success as you juggle the competing (or dare I say... paradoxical) demands in your life. (By the way, these juggling balls can also serve as stress balls in case of need!)

I look forward to connecting with many of you in Chicago, 2024.

Wendy Smith
2022-23 PDW Chair
Massimo Maoret (IESE Business School), Chair of the Research Committee, announces the 2023 research award winners and acknowledges this year’s Research Committee members.

2023 OMT AWARD WINNERS

I am delighted to report that the OMT Research Committee completed the process of selecting the eight winners of the OMT paper and symposium awards that will be presented at the 2023 Academy of Management (AOM) Annual Meeting. Congratulations to all the award-winning and nominated authors!

Winners were selected through a dual-stage process. Nominees were first identified by Program Chair Emilio Castilla based on the ratings of the OMT reviewers. Then each Research Committee member was randomly assigned to one of the eight award subcommittees and asked to carefully read and rank their assigned award-nominated submissions. The resulting rankings reflected the most outstanding work submitted to this year’s AOM conference.

The formal presentation of the OMT Division’s awards will take place at the OMT Business Meeting and Social Hour at the next Academy of Management Meetings in Boston. We hope you will join us there to celebrate all the winners and the nominees! Here are all the winners and nominees:

OMT Division Best Paper Award

Winner

Too Legit to Quit: Discursive Strategies in Cryptocurrency’s Categorical Emergence

Jack Sadek, McGill U. - Desautels Faculty of Management

Robert Nason, McGill U. - Desautels Faculty of Management

Runner-Up

Organizational Limits of Market Design

Georg Rilinger, MIT Sloan School of Management

Also Nominated

An Ecological Model of Task Disruption: The Impact of Partial Automation of Jobs through AI

Matissa Hollister, McGill U.

Arvind Karunakaran, Stanford U.

Lisa Ellen Cohen, McGill U.

The Genesis of Gender Diversity at the Top: The Imprinting Effect of Graduate Business Education

Taekjin Shin, San Diego State U.

Jiwook Jung, U. of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign

Social Astuteness: How People Picking Happens in Social Networks

Mark Kennedy, Imperial College Business School

Antoine Vernet, U. College London

Sankalp Chaturvedi, Imperial College London
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Sarah M. G. Otner, Kingston Business School

Louis Pondy Best Dissertation Paper Award

Winner

The Paradox of Individual Equity: How Employers Explain the Fairness of Unequal Pay
Laura Adler, Yale School of Management

Runner-Up

Racialized Expertise: The Consequences of Perceiving the Race of Workers as a Type of Expertise
Sandra Portocarrero, Columbia Business School

Also Nominated

How Hiring Former Founders as Employees Shapes Incumbent Firms' Creative Performance
Hangjun Cho, INSEAD

Infrastructures for Institutional Change: Inscription and the Role of Technological Prefiguration
Moritz Jan Kleinaltenkamp, Copenhagen Business School

Best International Paper Award

Winner

Deep play, work engagement, and creative problem solving in a high-tech organization
Anca Metiu, ESSEC Business School
Jinia Mukerjee, Montpellier Business School

Runner-Up

Guanxi and Structural Holes
Ronald S. Burt, U. Of Chicago
Sonja Opper, Department of Management and Technology, Bocconi U.

Also Nominated

“We Are Still Here”: The Everyday Work of Coping with Intergenerational Trauma
Ketan Madan Goswami, Warwick Business School
Katrin Marike Smolka, Warwick Business School
Ali E. Ahmed, Warwick Business School
Deniz Ucbasaran, U. of Warwick

Category Emergence and Viability through Optimal Distinctiveness Work
Chenjian Zhang, U. of Bath
Mia Raynard, U. of British Columbia
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**Best Student Paper Award**

**Winner**

*Moral Escalation: Contested Category Emergence and its Consequences in the Toy Industry*

Ryann Noe, Harvard U.

**Also Nominated**

*How Using Contractors Affects Organizational Learning: Evidence from U.S. Hospitals*

Jisoo Park, Carnegie Mellon U. - Tepper School of Business

*Deprioritizing Diversity: Organizational Uncertainty and the Stalled Diversification of Faculty*

Kwan Woo Kim, Harvard U.

**Best Entrepreneurship Paper Award**

**Winner**

*How Institutional Logics Influence Growth: A Field Experiment with Tunisian Women Entrepreneurs*

Kylie Heales, U. of Alberta

Angelique Slade Shantz, U. of Alberta School of Management

Desiree F. Pacheco, IESE Business School

Luciano Barin Cruz, HEC Montreal

Charlene E. Zietsma, U. of Michigan

**Runner-Up**

*How Professional and Family Ties Affect Idea Elaboration for Men and Women*

Francesca Nannetti, ESSEC Business School

Elisa Operti, ESSEC Business School

**Also Nominated**

*Honor Among Thieves: Vulnerable Network Positions, Norms of Reciprocity, and IPO Rates*

Andrew Joseph Foley, Cornell SC Johnson College of Business

Gautam Ahuja, Cornell U.

*Burdensome gifts: Interactional Trials between Nascent Social Entrepreneurs & Impact Intermediaries*

Karthik Rapaka, Erasmus U. Rotterdam

**OMT Responsible Research Award**
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Winner

A Tale of Two Moral Cultures? The Diffusion of Commercialization Among Non-Profits in China
Haochi Zhang, Northwestern Kellogg School of Management
Edward J. Zajac, Northwestern U.
Jianhua Ge, Renmin U. of China
Di Zhu, Renmin U. of China

Runner-Up

How Structural Disadvantages Affect Job Histories of African American Applicants at a Tech Company
Ming De Leung, U. of California, Irvine
Prasanna Parasurama, Emory U., Goizueta Business School

Also Nominated

Hanging on for Employees: Managerial Prosocial Preferences, Firm Exit Thresholds, and Risk-Taking
Dongil Daniel Keum, Columbia Business School
Xin Lucy Liu, Columbia Business School

System Level Dynamics in the Emergence and Navigation of Multi-Actor Paradoxes
Iris Seidemann, U. of Hamburg (iris.seidemann@uni-hamburg.de)
Daniel Geiger, U. of Hamburg (Daniel.Geiger@uni-hamburg.de)
Lisa Harborth, U. of Hamburg (lisa.harborth@uni-hamburg.de)

‘Not My CEO’: Employee Reactions to the Threat of Female Leadership
Steffen Brenner, Copenhagen Business School
Isabelle Solal, ESSEC Business School
Georg Wernicke, HEC Paris

Best Paper on Environmental and Social Practices

Winner

Devaluation by Association: Gender Diversity and Performance Recognition in Masculine Occupations
Jennifer M. Merluzzi, George Washington U.

Runner-Up

Imagined Labor Markets, Open-Access, And Inclusion in Tech: Getting a Job Without a CS Degree
Dilan Eren, Boston U.

Also Nominated
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Vote the Assholes Out: How Value Congruence Work Aligns Stakeholders for Corporate Activism
Sean Buchanan, U. of Manitoba
Mojtaba Mohammadnejad Shourkaei, U. of Manitoba
Bruno Dyck, U. of Manitoba

Diverse but not Inclusive: How Organizational Status Maintenance Undermines Social Inclusion
Sandra Portocarrero, Columbia Business School
Andrea Wessendorf, U. of Edinburgh business school
Gerardo Okhuysen, U. of California, Irvine

The Art of Engaging Audiences: How Impact Producers Run Film-based Campaigns for Social Change
Stephan Davys Manning, U. of Sussex
Ana Paula Suarez Lopez, U. of Sussex

Best Symposium Award Winner
New Approaches to Understanding Organizational Networks, Inequality, and Inclusion
Mabel Abraham, Columbia Business School
Sanaz Mobasseri, Boston U. Questrom School of Business
Lara Yang, Stanford Graduate School of Business

Runner-Up
Drivers of Racial and Gender Workplace Inequalities
Manuela Collis, U. of Toronto, Rotman School of Management
Xuege (Cathy) Lu, U. of Minnesota Carlson School of Management
Daphné Baldassari, U. of Toronto

Also Nominated
Firms, Occupations, and Markets as Tools for Combating Systemic Racism: Challenges and Opportunities
Summer Jackson, Harvard Business School
Vic Marsh, U. of Toronto, Rotman School of Management

Organizational Culture: Emerging Perspectives and Practices
Glenn R. Carroll, Stanford

Connections and Opportunities for Integration Between Carnegie Perspective and Institutional Logics
Pino G. Audia, Dartmouth College
Henrich R. Greve, INSEAD
Michael Lounsbury, U. of Alberta
William Ocasio, U. of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign
Patricia H. Thornton, Texas A&M and HEC Paris
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2023 OMT Research Committee Members

My sincere and heart-felt thanks go out to all the OMT members who volunteered to be part of the 2023 OMT Research Committee. I would like to especially acknowledge the heroic service of our seven members who will be given the Research Committee Service Award this year for serving the committee for five years: Balazs Kovacs, Wei Shen, Sam Garg, Shipeng Yan, Pavel Zhelyazkov, Eugene Paik, Kunyuan Qiao.

As you can see below, the Research Committee broadly represents OMT’s global membership.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Affiliation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alessandro Piazza</td>
<td>Rice University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amanda Sharkey</td>
<td>Arizona State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arvind Karunakaran</td>
<td>Stanford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balazs Kovacs</td>
<td>Yale School of Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brittany Bond</td>
<td>Cornell ILR School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chengwei Liu</td>
<td>ESMT Berlin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chenjian Zhang</td>
<td>University of Bath</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dennis Jancsary</td>
<td>WU Vienna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diego Coraiola</td>
<td>University of Victoria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elisa Operti</td>
<td>ESSEC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eugene Paik</td>
<td>University of Mississippi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eunice Yunjin Rhee</td>
<td>University of Seattle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francisco Brahm</td>
<td>London Business School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georg Reischauer</td>
<td>WU Vienna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grace Agustine</td>
<td>University of Bath</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Halil Sabanci</td>
<td>Frankfurt School of Finance &amp; Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ivana Katic</td>
<td>Yale School of Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jade Lo</td>
<td>Drexel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jane Bjorn Vedel</td>
<td>Copenhagen Business School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johan Chu</td>
<td>MIT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John-Paul Ferguson</td>
<td>McGill University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jon Bundy</td>
<td>Arizona State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julien Jourdan</td>
<td>HEC Paris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaisa Snellman</td>
<td>INSEAD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kate Odziemkowska</td>
<td>University of Toronto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kunyuan Qiao</td>
<td>Cornell University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lindsey Cameron</td>
<td>Wharton School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark de Rond</td>
<td>University of Cambridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massimo Maoret</td>
<td>IESE Business School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minjae Kim</td>
<td>Rice University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MK Chin</td>
<td>Indiana University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nathan Wilmers</td>
<td>MIT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ozgecan Kocak</td>
<td>Emory University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pavel Zhelyazkov</td>
<td>HKUST</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Affiliation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pedro Monteiro</td>
<td>Copenhagen Business School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piervittorio Mannucci</td>
<td>Bocconi University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romain Boulongne</td>
<td>IESE Business School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ryann Elizabeth Manning</td>
<td>University of Toronto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sam Garg</td>
<td>HKUST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarah Otner</td>
<td>Kingston Business School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shipeng Yan</td>
<td>University of Hong Kong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ting Yao</td>
<td>University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tiona Zuzul</td>
<td>Harvard Business School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tristan Botelho</td>
<td>Yale School of Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vanessa Conzon</td>
<td>Boston College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vanessa Pouthier</td>
<td>University of Melbourne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voni Deeds Pamphile</td>
<td>George Washington University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wei Shen</td>
<td>Arizona State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yonghoon Lee</td>
<td>HKUST</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How do I become a member of the OMT Research Committee? Volunteer!

Approximately fifty OMT division members annually volunteer their time to serve on the OMT Research Committee. Volunteers are randomly assigned to one of eight award sub-committees and are asked to read and rank the four to six papers or symposia that have been nominated. The committee’s work is done in a very compressed time frame, usually between the end of February and mid-April. Each year a few new members are added to the Research Committee as long-serving members who have provided five years of valuable service to the division begin to cycle off. If you want to be a part of selecting which papers and symposia win awards, please volunteer! The requirements are that you are an active reviewer for the OMT division and that you can commit to being available during the time we review papers for awards. If you are interested, please contact Massimo Maoret (IESE Business School) via email (mmaoret@iese.edu).
Hi OMTers,
Firstly, I would like to thank the OMT members who actively engage with us on our social media platforms. You are the reason we’re able to share such awesome content! ✨

Like in the past, we have dedicated ourselves to growing our social media presence with three key objectives in mind: (1) to disseminate information about important events, deadlines, and topics of interest to both current and prospective members of our community; (2) to support and enhance our division’s goals and strategies, specifically, the expansion of our global reach to promote greater diversity and inclusivity within the OMT community; and finally (3) to facilitate year-round engagement and community building with all our members, not just during the AOM Annual Meeting.

As a testament to the continued success of our work, here are a few highlights:

- Our X account (formerly Twitter) has 5,488 followers as of September 2023, which remained stable compared to the previous year (despite the Twitter exodus at the beginning of 2023). X has been our flagship account since its launch. We are especially proud to share that the OMT Division continues to have the largest X following of any Academy division. 🙌🏿🙌🏻
- Our Facebook page has over 2k followers. As in the past, our Facebook account mirrors our X/Twitter account in its strategy, allowing us to reach our members in another way.
- Our Instagram account has over 200 followers. Its visual content, particularly celebratory posts, adds uniqueness to our social media presence, complementing our other outreach platforms.
- Finally, our LinkedIn account has registered the highest growth during the past year: with 1,531 followers as of September 2023, we have doubled the number from last year. 🕺🏼💃🏽

During the upcoming year, our team will continue to strive to develop and expand upon the solid foundation we have established thus far. We are actively seeking out novel approaches to foster stronger connections with members of the OMT community. This includes exploring new channels of engagement (e.g., YouTube) to ensure that we meet our members’ diverse interests and reach prospective members.

Last (but far from least), I want to give a big shout-out to Kevin W. Lee and Christine Moser, who are stepping down as Social Media Co-chairs to take on new leadership roles at OMT, for the outstanding job they have done over these past few years! They have been the driving forces behind the division’s effort to make our social media presence effective and engaging.

And … Oh, hey there, I am Giada, incoming Social Media Chair for OMT. For the past couple of years, I’ve had the pleasure of managing the content of our Instagram account, working closely with Kevin and Christine. I’m thrilled to take on this new role and continue to engage with you via our social media platforms.

Again, Thank you for your support and for being part of our incredible community.

Please stay in touch and follow us on X/Twitter, Facebook, Instagram, and LinkedIn for updates and celebrations.

Giada Baldessarelli
(Incoming) Social Media Chair
At AOM 2023 in Boston, the OMT Executive Committee held the inaugural edition of “Navigating the First Years of Your PhD”, a new recurring PDW. This workshop replaces OMT’s longstanding “Doctoral Dissertation Proposal Workshop”, of which attendance had gradually declined. The new PDW gives doctoral students in their first or second year of study an opportunity to meet international peers at the same career stage and to discuss their research ideas with OMT’s leadership.

The inaugural edition of the new PDW welcomed 26 early-stage PhD students from around the world. Participants explored with peers and experienced scholars how OMT scholarship and the OMT Division can help them turn their research ideas into robust and impactful academic knowledge. Through the OMT Meet Up initiative, they were invited to meet one-on-one with scholars who share their research interests and who can help them navigate the early stages of their PhD. They also shared with other participants their experiences of being a doctoral student and began to build their own international network.

Participants expressed high satisfaction with the experience and applauded the opportunity to connect with both peers and established scholars in their research domain at an early stage of their doctoral education. Many also found the event useful for coping with the overwhelming experience as a first-time attendee of the AOM Annual Meeting. Several participants voiced a desire to expand this workshop beyond two hours and expressed additional ideas for how to further enhance opportunities for doctoral students in the OMT Division. The OMT Executive Committee will address some of their ideas at the OMT Winter Meeting in February 2024.

Big applause to members of OMT’s Executive Committee who contributed generously as co-hosts, mentors, and roundtable facilitators to the success of this new event: Martin Kilduff, Emilio Castilla, Forrest Briscoe, Wendy Smith, Paul Tracey, Srividya Jandhyala, Pedro Monteiro, Massimo Maoret, and Shelby Gai.
2023 OMT Doctoral Student Consortium (DSC) Report

The 2023 OMT Doctoral Student Consortium convened 50 doctoral students from around the world selected from a strong pool of applications. They all joined in person for a day of presentations, round-table discussions, and informal chats with 22 faculty members from Asia, Europe, the UK, North America, and Latin America, who generously volunteered their time and expertise to make this OMT doctoral consortium a success.

The DSC was kindly sponsored by the USC Marshall School of Business, and journals Organization Studies, and Organization Theory. The informal kick-off to the consortium saw a group of 35 students and faculty gather for a welcome reception.

The next day, the formal proceedings opened with keynote by Marya Besharov (University of Oxford) on taking a “both/and” approach to your academic career, as we navigate tensions and demands between “rigour and relevance”, “professional and personal”, “global and local”. Marya suggested adopting a paradox mindset, developing your own guardrails, and making dynamic decisions and space to experiment.

This was followed by a panel of editors from five major journals in our field, who offered guidance on doing research and getting it published. The editors panel was chaired by Namrata Malhotra (Imperial) and included presentations by: Joep Cornelissen (Erasmus), Editor in Chief, Organization Theory; J.P. Eggars (NYU), Associate Editor, Administrative Science Quarterly; Julianne Reineke (Oxford), Associate Editor, Academy of Management Journal; Brayden King (Northwestern), Senior Editor, Organization Science; Paolo Quattrone (Manchester), Editor-in-Chief, Organization Studies.

This panel set the scene for our research mentoring session. Each faculty member was also assigned two or three doctoral students for in-depth conversations about their current work in progress. These personal and small group mentorship encounters provided opportunities for detailed feedback and close dialogue.

This was followed by a mini-panel of recently hired assistant professors chaired by Pedro Monteiro (CBS) – Laura Dupin (University of Amsterdam), Rebecca Karp (Harvard University), Milo Wang (Arizona State University) – sharing insights on the process of landing a job and securing a position. Rachel Balven from the AoM Ethics Education Committee also provided an introduction to the committee’s work and where students can go for advice, resources, and support.

The afternoon was then filled with a set of roundtables on topics and common issues across research, and then teaching. A first set of research roundtables covered the following topics: How to Deal with Manuscript Rejections? How to Develop a Strong Research Profile? How to start and manage collaborations? How to Go from a Dissertation to a Research Program? When is a Paper Ready for Submission? How to Think about Real World Impact? How to manage Inductive Qualitative Research Projects? How to Write Strong Theoretical Introductions?
A second set of teaching roundtables included: How to Develop Synergies between Teaching & Research? How to Teach in the era of AI and ChatGPT? How to Incorporate OMT Scholarship into Teaching? Challenges of Undergraduate vs. MBA Teaching? How to incorporate societal concerns into business courses? Teaching Real-Life vs Online Classes? Teaching in national contexts different from your doctoral training? How to Create Inclusive Teaching Environments?

The following faculty agreed to participate as mentors, speakers, and/or panelist, and we wish to thank them all for their valuable contributions to the event and for supporting the next generation of OMT scholars:

- Pablo Fernandez
- Amit Nigam
- Tammar Zilber
- Silvia Dorado-Banacloche
- Namrata Malhotra
- Milo Wang
- Michael Lounsbury
- Bryant Hudson
- Shahzad Ansari
- Mark Zbaracki
- Aruna Ranganathan
- Brayden King
- Susan Perkins
- Paolo Quattrone
- Marya Besharov
- Dahlia Mani
- Peer Fiss
- Shipeng Yan
- Rebecca Karp
- Filippo Carlo Wezel
- Jean Phillipe Vergne
- J.P. Eggers
- Joep Cornelissen
- Julianne Reineke
- Laura Dupin

The co-organizers of the 2023 OMT Doctoral Student Consortium
Danielle Logue, UNSW Sydney
Pedro Monteiro, Copenhagen Business School
We kickstarted this year’s OMT Junior Faculty Consortium (JFC) on the evening of Thursday, August 3rd, with a social event that featured wonderful Mexican food and drink, and an opportunity for junior faculty to connect with each other and with senior faculty. The main consortium took place on Friday, August 4 with 46 junior faculty participants and 24 senior faculty mentors from around the world (USA – 46%, Europe – 21%, Canada – 17%, Australia – 4% and South America – 4%).

We had lively discussions and a productive exchange of ideas on topics ranging from what it means to have an impactful career, managing the tenure process and research and publishing strategies throughout the life-cycle of your career. Those discussions took place in the context of two panel discussions:

- **PANEL 1: Creating an Impactful Career.**
  Panelists: Lakshmi Balachandra, Christine Beckman, Joep Cornelissen, Jerry Davis, Marvin Washington

- **PANEL 2: Preparing for Promotion and Tenure.**
  Panelists: Sekou Bermisss, Farah Kodeih, April Wright, Charlene Zietsma

In addition to panel discussions, junior faculty received focused feedback on a specific research project during roundtable discussions, and advice on such topics as work-life balance and teaching during a working lunch. We received many positive comments, including:

Everything was good; The two panels sessions and the mentorship program were particularly great; you were also very thoughtful to include a social one evening before the JFC

The schedule worked really well with alternating a panel and a roundtable discussion. Also, the topics covered in the panels and the diversity of experiences of the panelists were a huge plus as they tremendously helped to put share the message that impact has a personal meaning and that tenure is a process allowing to meet great people along the way!

Everything worked well; Very well organized and structured. I enjoyed the panels and the mentor sessions.

A successful JFC is due to the efforts and contributions of all involved. We would like to especially thank the dedicated senior faculty mentors who shared their time and wisdom with this year’s participants:
# 2023 OMT Junior Faculty Consortium Report

**Faculty Mentors:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mentors and their university affiliations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abhijith Acharya: Wilfrid Laurier University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aimee Hamilton: University of Denver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April Wright: Warwick Business School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baniyelme Zoogah: McMaster University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlene Zietsma: Ross, University of Michigan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christine Beckman: USC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erica Salvaj Carrera: University of Desarrollo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farah Kodeih: IESEG School of Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jerry Davis: University of Michigan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joep Cornelissen: Rotterdam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Josh Keller: University of New South Wales</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lakshmi Balachandra: Babson College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.K. Chin: Indiana University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marvin Washington: Alberta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maxim Voronov: Schulich School of Business</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nelson Phillips: UC Santa Barbara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patricia H. Thornton: Texas A&amp;M, HEC Paris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sekou Bermiss: UNC-Chapel Hill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siobhan O'Mahoney: Questrom, BU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sun Hyun Park: SNU Business School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Roulet: Judge Business School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tim Pollock: Haslam College of Business</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tina Dacin: Queen's University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trish Reay: University of Alberta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vibha Gaba: INSEAD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We also would like to thank the JFC sponsors Telfer School of Management, Organization Studies and Organization Theory.

We are looking forward to the 2024 Junior Faculty Consortium, and we encourage early career faculty members to apply. Details on the application process will be available in Spring 2024.

Kisha Lashley, University of Virginia
Madeline Toubiana, University of Ottawa
Hello OMT community!

We hope you all had a wonderful time at AOM Boston. We had an amazing line up of OMT Off-Program events ranging from repeat events such as baseball games, dim sum, sunset boat cruises, morning walks, and ethnographic meetups, to some new events including the Women of OB meetup, security and defense studies, sustainable investing, and pick up basketball. As always, our goal of building community—both within the OMT division as well as across different divisions—remains constant. You can’t spell community without OMT!

As we head into the 2023-2024 academic year, we seek to continue to search for new ways to better serve our members. To that end, I want to thank Ilaria Orlandi for all her help in supporting the OMT Off-Program events. I also want to thank Christine Moser for running the OMT Morning Coffee, as well as becoming the new Membership Outreach Chair (virtual, year-round activities). As always, we are looking for volunteers to help organize OMT events and other social activities throughout the year. Please contact me directly if you would like to be part of the amazing OMG team!

-Shelby
The 2023 OMT Global Research Consortium took place on Saturday, August 5 with 26 participants and 17 faculty mentors. The senior mentors who volunteered their time and expertise came from institutions in Asia, Europe, and North America, and had research experience across different regions of the world. The consortium kicked off with opening remarks by Forrest Brisco, Division Chair Elect, and a talk by Pablo Martin de Holan (HEC), a former OMT Rep-at-Large. It was followed by three panel discussions and two roundtable sessions.

**Panel 1 – Authors’ perspectives** with Stefan Dimitriadis (Toronto), Leena Kinger Hans (ISB), Yujin Jeong (American), Leandro Pongeluppe (Wharton), and Markus Taussig (Rutgers). The panelists shared the story behind successful papers and discussed the joys and challenges of undertaking and publishing organizational research based in different contexts.

**Panel 2 – Practical tips for doing global research** with Jordan Siegel (Michigan), Daniel Blake (IE), Anca Metiu (ESSEC), Ileana Stigliani (Imperial), and Sherry Thatcher (Tennessee). The panelists shared their thoughts on choosing research questions, sourcing data from non-traditional sources, theorizing from context, ensuring data quality, funding, and collaborations.

**Panel 3 – Publishing global research** with Lori Yue (Columbia), Sun Hyun Park (SNU), and Yanbo Wang (HKU). The panelists discussed how authors of research from global contexts can approach the publication process in mainstream management journals, the common roadblocks, managing the review process, and framing the paper.

The consortium also had two roundtable sessions. The first was a faculty led small table discussion on various aspects of doing research in global contexts. The second was a mentoring session between the participants and faculty mentors. Each participant was matched with mentor(s), who read and provided feedback on the project/paper submitted. These meetings provided opportunities for detailed feedback and close dialogue.

The consortium closed with a presentation from the AOM Ethics Committee and a lively discussion.

Overall, there was a strong desire for participants to connect with each other. We had an excellent set of accomplished and dedicated faculty panelists and mentors. The mentors were generous in sharing their time and expertise and expressed enthusiasm and continued commitment to the global consortium. We wish to thank and recognize each one of them for their valuable contributions. The following faculty served as panel participants, mentors, and speakers:

- Daniel Blake (IE Business School)
- Stefan Dimitriadis (University of Toronto)
- Caroline Fry (University of Hawai’i)
- Ileana Stigliani (Imperial College London)
- Leena Kinger Hans (Indian School of Business)
- Niron Hashai (Arison School of Business)
- Yujin Jeong (American University)
- Reddi Kotha (Singapore Management University)
- Pablo Martin-de-Holan (HEC)
- Anca Metiu (ESSEC Business School)
- Sun Hyun Park (Seoul National University)
- Leandro Pongeluppe (University of Pennsylvania)
- Jordan Siegel (University of Michigan)
- Markus Taussig (Rutgers University)
- Sherry Thatcher (University of Tennessee)
- Yanbo Wang (Hong Kong University)
- Lori Yue (Columbia University)
Interview with Distinguished Scholar Award Winner

Winner: William Ocasio (University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign)
Interviewer: Laura Adler (Yale School of Management, Louis Pondy Best Dissertation Paper Award Winner)

Here is the link to the video of this interview.
Interview with Responsible Research Award Winner

Awardee Paper: “A Tale of Two Moral Cultures? The Diffusion of Commercialization Among Non-Profits in China”
Winner: Haochi Zhang (Northwestern Kellogg School of Management), Edward J. Zajac (Northwestern University), Jianhua Ge, Renmin University of China
Interviewer: Bingkun Zhang (The University of Hong Kong)

Here is the link to the video of this interview.
Interview with Louis Pondy Best Dissertation Paper Award Winner

Awardee Paper: “The Paradox of Individual Equity: How Employers Explain the Fairness of Unequal Pay”
Winner: Laura Adler (Yale School of Management)
Interviewer: Farzam Borromand (University of Minnesota)

Farzam: Congratulations on winning the Louis Pondy Best Dissertation Paper Award. Just to start, could you please tell us about yourself, your research and tell us more about your award-winning individualized equity paper.

Laura: Thank you! I’m doing a number of projects that all come out of the dissertation, which looks at organizational pay practices and gender inequality. I started out conducting interviews with people who are involved in setting pay. My goal was really to understand, how do they do it and why? And that led me to a number of research questions that I then answered with different datasets.

So, the first question was about how we moved away from a bureaucratic approach to pay that was common across organizations before the 1980s. In this system, you would evaluate the job, figure out how much it was contributing in terms of skills and responsibility, and tally it up in terms of points, and then pay would be based on the points. And now we don’t do that at all. Now we basically say, here’s the market rate for job, which sets a general range, and then we ask, “What were you making in your last job?” So, we went from this very bureaucratic approach to this market-based and highly personalized approach. One paper looks into historical archives to understand how that change came about.

The individualized equity paper then thinks about the ramifications of our current process. The way we set pay now is looser and more individually tailored, which means people might be paid quite different amounts to do the same job. My question was: how do employers make employees feel okay with this? We know employees really get upset about pay inequity. So, I asked what employers do when there’s a pay dispute. They described this approach to me that I call the individualized equity account, which is a narrative that centers on the individual employee and tries to say, “Here’s all the reasons you can’t compare yourself to someone else. The fair thing to do is to treat you in a way that’s specific to your own performance, your own experience, all of qualitative things about you.” I argue that they use these accounts to resist comparison, or commensuration, across cases.

Farzam: Is there any backstory to your dissertation, how it took shape? If there were any particular life experiences that influenced your thoughts?

Laura: I was trying to figure out what to write my dissertation about, as happens to graduate students. I became really interested in the issue of pay. We had reached a 60 year low in the unemployment rate, it was under 4%, but wages weren’t going up at all. That situation eventually changed, and recent research demonstrates how wages grew dramatically after 2018, driven largely by tight labor markets. But at the time, I was like, this is a situation where our expectations are not bearing out—we would expect tight labor market to push wages up and that wasn’t happening quickly. And that led me to ask, what are the organizational dynamics that are preventing that from happening? If you imagine an HR recruiter who's tasked with going out to hire people, they've been told that they can pay $12 an hour, they're not getting anybody to bite for $12 an hour, they're going back to somebody inside the organization saying, “I'm not getting anyone.” So I wondered, where does the decision to raise pay come from? And I realized at that point that I didn't have what I called an “NPR level of knowledge” about pay—I had no idea how companies do this. First, I went to look for literature and there wasn't a lot. So I decided to go out and interview a bunch of people and find out what they were doing. It just so happened that as I was starting these interviews, this new law became very popular called the salary history ban that prevented employers from asking job candidates what they made in the past. And it created a nice moment of questioning where organizations were like, “We've been doing it this way forever. Now we have to do it some other way. How are we going to do that?” So, I got into that moment and could see how they reasoned about their options.

Farzam: What advice do you have for students who are choosing a dissertation topic?

Laura: I think that you should choose something that you're really curious about, because you're going to spend a lot of time working on it. I think that if you're really interested in it, the rest will follow: you'll read the literature, you'll find where the gaps are, you'll find the puzzles. That curiosity will also take you through tough times in your data collection or analysis. If you're trying to get data from a company and they won't give it to you, you'll persist because you really want to know what's in there. Or if you're setting up an experiment and your code isn't working, you'll keep at it because you care about the outcome.
I also think it's helpful to find something that you think is important. For me, gender equity is a very motivating issue. I'm interested in how intractable gender is as a status marker in our society—we have thrown a lot of different strategies at it and it just keeps sticking around. So, there's a sense of personal motivation if you can find a topic that hooks into something you really care about.

**Farzam** How your research has evolved since your dissertation?

**Laura:** I have collaborative projects with Elena Ayala-Hurtado, Kwan Woo Kim, and others on issues of work and labor markets. But most of my projects pick up on the themes of the dissertation. There are other sorts of data sources that you start to get access to as your dissertation develops. Some of the best stuff you're going to get will arrive after you've started to finalize and share the dissertation itself. So you don't want to shut it down and say, "Oh, I've moved on," but instead keep your ears open to new data sources, case studies, or research questions that you're especially attuned to because you've been doing this work. I think that's a nice way to let your work develop and be cumulative.

**Farzam:** Do you want to share any challenges you experienced going through your dissertation and any advice you may have to overcome those?

**Laura:** I thought I was going to do an ethnography. There were amazing ethnographers in my department and at MIT. I met with them and I got their advice and I went out and I found a company that would let me do observation. And I went in, and I met everyone and they just wouldn't integrate me. I'd gotten approval from the supervisors, from the head of the department and the team lead, but the ground-level people whose work I really needed to observe, I hadn't been able to communicate to them what the purpose of the research was in terms that felt valuable to them, which made it hard to observe their activities directly. So I learned to just pivot a little bit. I turned it into an opportunity to collect a lot of field interviews. Instead of trying to sit side-by-side with them, which wasn't working, I would book 20-minute meetings with them every other week and just talk to them about stuff and they seemed more comfortable in the interview format because it was legible. So I didn't get to write my ethnography but I learned to adjust in the field to the opportunities that are available to you and get some good data.

**Farzam:** What advice do you have for students to get their dissertation work published?

**Laura:** It takes time. When you're in grad school, you're in such a rush to just put things on your CV that you're sending things out as soon as they're reasonably understood as done. And there's a nice moment as you're transitioning into a post-doc or a faculty role where you realize, I have a year to keep thinking about it, keep refining it and advancing it. And I think my dissertation papers have gotten so much better because of that extra time you have to reflect, read more, engage with more people. You also get a ton of feedback when you're on the job market, and you need some time to synthesize all of that. The job market is an incredible time of pushing your work forward. So, I would say, obviously it's great if you can publish something from your dissertation before you go on the market, but if you can't, there's a great wealth of feedback and insight that you get on the market and in the subsequent year that you can put towards really making that work as strong as possible.

**Farzam:** For the last question and to fully appreciate the qualitative part of your dissertation, I wonder if there were any specific challenges associated with doing qualitative research.

**Laura:** The way I learned to conduct qualitative research is that you are trying to find something new in the world that hasn't been known before. There's a radical uncertainty to that. I won't name which one of my committee members called my dissertation prospectus a fishing expedition. They weren't completely wrong, because I wasn't sure what I would find. So, you have to have faith that you'll find something interesting, and you have to keep probing until you find something genuinely new. It's slow and it can be extremely frustrating. The way I think about it, research is always going to be hard at some point. If it's quantitative work, often it can be hard at the beginning, when you're trying to develop hypotheses or set up the data, and easier at the end. With qualitative work often it's easy at the beginning—you just jump in and start asking people questions and follow your nose and see what's interesting. But then, when you go to analyze and try to discover your question, it can be really challenging. There are moments when you feel like it's never going to go anywhere, and then you find something cool, and you forget all about that difficulty.

**Farzam:** Thank you very much for your time, Laura! This was a very interesting conversation.

**Laura:** Thank you!
Interview with Best International Paper Award Winner

Awardee Paper: “Deep play, work engagement, and creative problem solving in a high-tech organization”
Winner: Anca Metiu (ESSEC Business School), Jinia Mukerjee (Montpellier Business School)
Interviewer: Katelyn Sharratt (Copenhagen Business School)

Katelyn Sharratt
Hi everyone, I’m interviewing Jinia Mukerjee today from Montpellier Business School about her paper, co-authored by Anca Metiu, titled Deep Play Work Engagement and Creative Problem Solving in a High-Tech Organization. The paper won the OMT division’s Best International Paper award at this year’s Academy of Management. My name is Katelyn Sharratt. I’m a PhD fellow at Copenhagen Business School’s Department of Strategy and Innovation. I’m really excited to be talking to you today, Jinia! First of all, a big congratulations on winning the award.

Jinia Mukerjee
Thank you so much and thank you so much Katelyn for inviting me for this discussion. Really appreciate it.

Katelyn Sharratt
Can you start out by telling us briefly what the paper is about?

Jinia Mukerjee
Right. So, this paper actually is a part of my PhD dissertation, which I finished seven years ago. So this paper is a product of a very long ethnographic study that I conducted during my PhD years in a high-tech firm in the North of India. I went in as an ethnographer with really no specific question in mind. Having said that, there is always some hunch as to what you're going to study. So my generic idea was to understand how people work together to sustain innovation. How do they continue to work together in groups and teams, and what leads to sustained innovation. Because we know that innovation is not that hard for many companies to achieve, but sustaining it is the hard job. This is what I had in mind when I went there, and I was literally hit in the face when I walked into the organization by play.

It was also a time when I had absolutely no clue about play in a work organization. We had been reading in the last decade about all these organizations, like Google, etcetera, who are using a lot of play, but it's all in the popular press, right? So I had to struggle to figure out what is it that is going on in this organization, and over a period of time I realized the important role of play in anything and everything that these people are doing. Hence my work started to focus on work and play and the relationship between it. So this paper is an account of a type of play that we know exists, though we have not seen it empirically yet. This is the type of incredibly immersive, absorbing play that is carried out voluntarily by people at work organizations, despite the fact that they are in a work setting. And, the way it's interrelated with very deeply engaged work that very competitive industries have to engage in on a regular basis.

So the paper is about this play, that we call deep play. We call it deep play because it has some resemblance with the type of play that we have knowledge about in anthropology, which is symbolically connected to people’s very fundamental concerns, in this case, the employees concern about feeling and being seen as competent, responsible professionals. We show how deep play helps attain work engagement over time, leading to creative problem solving.

Katelyn Sharratt
Ok, so can you tell us a little bit more about how deep play is different from other types of play?

Jinia Mukerjee
Well, we ourselves as knowledge workers, we know the one type of play that we often engage in, which has been termed in the literature as a kind of a diversionary play… play that is light fun voluntary in nature, which gives some respite and replenishment when you’re working. So if I’ve been working for a long time, I need a break right? It comes in the forms of break. I go to the kitchen in my organization, I take a glass of water and find my colleagues there. And I start talking about,
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I don't know, my dog, start cracking jokes, having fun, you know, or going for a drink together, or we might do some celebration at work together. These are the kind of breaks - light fun that we all experience. We know it exists in all work organizations, more or less, right? Some organizations are institutionalizing these things. In the organization I studied there was also diversionary play. We focused on the deep play because that seemed to be the most incredible kind of playful practice that we saw.

And then there is the other type of play that we know in the literature, which is basically playfully working. It’s to make work more enjoyable and often more productive. It increases work productivity. This is serious play. Examples are prototyping, hackathons and stuff like that, which are very common, especially in creative and innovative organizations. And then we see this play that we found in our organization, which is quite different from the two types of play I mentioned just now. So as far as I know, these are the two different types of play that exist in the current literature.

Katelyn Sharratt
What were the most unexpected or interesting findings for you?

Jinia Mukerjee
Well, the most unexpected thing was to see this kind of play and try to make sense of why the hell would people be spending so much time engaging in this activity. I mean, why would you? If you think in a logical way, why would you engage in such a deep, immersive activity that is completely unrelated to your work...that takes your entire focus and attention away from work. Why would an organization allow it? Why would people even do that, given the fact that we are talking about a highly innovative organization in that part of the world which is extremely competitive. People in the Indian market who work in innovation and high-tech, on an average, the maximum time they stay in an organization is 2 years because the market is so competitive. You step out, you cross the road, and somebody else will hire you right now with more money. And if you don't produce innovative products all the time, as a company if you are not constantly developing products, you're written off. It's super competitive as a working environment. And here these people are rolling on the floor, you know, behaving like no adults should be behaving in a work place. So that was the most surprising unexpected thing for us, although for a long time we couldn't make any sense out of it. It took us a lot of going back and forth, to not just organizational literature, but also to anthropology, sociology, to make sense of what we were seeing, what we were hit on the face with. That was one thing. And the second thing was figuring out how it could coexist with such deeply immersive work. Because that seemed like a complete paradox.

Katelyn Sharratt
It's such an interesting topic and I think also often overlooked or under researched in the management literature. How do you think the topic of deep play contributes to existing and new conversations in this literature?

Jinia Mukerjee
Yes, it has been, as you well point out, under researched and to some extent overlooked. I think a lot of that has to do with the fact that as management researchers we want to be working on ‘serious’ stuff, not something as ‘frivolous’ as play. Having said that, we know that it always existed. I mean, if you look at Donald Roy's work in the 50s, Banana Times, I think his was the first real account of play in work organizations and how it's necessary. In his setting, where he was an ethnographer and working in the factory, this banana time and coke time and fish time were actually giving him and others respite from the very repetitive factory work. So it always existed. It's just that it was not looked at because we had ‘more important’ and ‘serious’ things to look at as scholars. I think progressively with the new workplace and new ways of working that we are seeing, where there is high autonomy, where workers are demanding their autonomy in terms of when they work, how they work, how much they work that's becoming more and more prevalent in the current times, certainly play is going to be playing an important role.

Organizations that are working in creative industries are realizing the role of play in employees’ well-being, the role of play in employees’ desire to show up and do stuff in the organization, the role it has on relational contracts between employees. Because innovation is most of the time done in groups and teams. So if I play with you, chances are high that if I’m working
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with you too I'll give my hundred percent because you're my play buddy. That's what I heard in my organization as well. So play does have an impact on work.

I think more and more we have to focus our attention on play because as anthropologists and other theorists have said, play is fundamental to civilization and to our lives. It's a fundamental thing. We see it, I mean, like you said, a while ago when we were informally talking, it's something that we all know about. People relate to it instantly. You can't find a single person who cannot relate to playing. We are doing it all the time. I think it is progressively going to become more and more important. We as human beings, we will always carry this desire to play and to enjoy and have engaging activity that is not necessarily beneficial or related to work, but which we do for its own sake.

Katelyn Sharratt
It really is fundamental to human behavior. In terms of practical implications, in the paper you mentioned that play should be cultivated and not feared by organizations. Why do you think it is feared by organizations?

Jinia Mukerjee
For the obvious logical reason, if you have too much play going on, it will...and it's logical for managers to think that it would take your focus and attention away from work. After all, play is a fun activity. It's enjoyable. It's something that people care more for than serious work activity, which can also be enjoyable for people. But you may have moments when you're not enjoying your work right? So for managers the biggest challenge is that it's a disruption. It's an interruption from focused work, and it can take your mind away from what you are supposed to do. Hence there will always be this tension in work and play. I think cultivating play in the sense of the kind of play that we find in our work, that is actually very hard to craft in an organization. You cannot just copy paste it. It comes with certain contextual environmental factors as well. I cannot go to you and tell you now that Katelyn, you can roll on the floor and dance and play and do what the hell you want from today onwards. It has to have some alignment with the way of the organization, the values of the organization, the way in which you work, and the autonomy you get through your work. The way you're perceived, you know how you as a professional, you're perceived and you're looked at. So a lot of things come with it. It has to be cultivated from the bottom up and over time. You cannot graft it. Then it becomes like an author on play had said that it becomes like chocolate coated broccoli if you try to copy paste play on top of whatever is there. It has to be cultivated.

Katelyn Sharratt
Have you explored any of the boundary conditions around play, where it has a role and where it does not have a role in an organization?

Jinia Mukerjee
Well, boundary conditions in the sense that for play to even happen the way it happened in this organization. One thing that was very important was the autonomy at work. You cannot actually have this kind of play if people don't feel that they can manage their work themselves. That involves choosing your own task to some extent; people were engaging in work chosen by them and having flexible work hours. So if I tell you, you come at 9 and work till 7 and that you know you do this, this, and this at certain periods of time and if there are certain very rigid rules and regulations around the work design, chances are very low that you could actually be able to engage in this kind of play. So that was one thing that was certainly there. There was also this idea of freedom...that these people experienced...their perceived freedom. We can have a lot of discussion about whether it was true or false, but they perceived that they had this freedom to play when they want to play with whoever they want and to play and as much as they want. So those two were very important conditions, contextual boundary conditions you can call it, for play to emerge the way it did. If you don't have that freedom to play, and if you don't have that freedom with your work, it's going to be hard for such an activity to emerge.

Katelyn Sharratt
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I wanted to delve a little bit into the methods that you used in order to research play. You used ethnographic methods in your study. Can you tell us a bit more about your approach to this?

Jinia Mukerjee
So I was very lucky to have Anca who was my PhD supervisor, who’s a great ethnographer, as a mentor for the ethnographic work that I did. It was a very long, hard process. I was doing my PhD in France. I was flying back and forth to India, the north of India where I do not originally come from although I’m of Indian origin. So I was living with the people of this company. And I engaged in participant observation for the three visits that I made to this company in three subsequent years, so it was more than 500 hours in the organization. And my observation data was dating 42 days of observation, from morning till night. So typically I would be the first one to arrive along with the HR people because they were the only people who had kind of relatively stable work hours. They would be coming at 8 or 9, so that's when I would be getting in and I would be leaving the work organization at 9:00 PM because there were many techies who would come to work late in the afternoon and decide to work till nine, for example.

I was basically taking observation data and I was interviewing, but then when it became clear to us about this play and work and how they were alternating, it was necessary for me to do shadowing. So I shadowed nine people in the range of 3 1/2 up to 9 hours. That was obviously quite a bit of a challenge, although I just loved every bit of it. It was really incredibly enriching for me to be in this organization and to see this incredible phenomenon unfolding in front of my eyes, which I absolutely had no idea about when I walked in. So in terms of methods I interviewed 128 employees, pretty much everybody in the organization and some of them several times. I had 136 semi structured interviews. For some time then I would not be there so I would come back and then start the semester. And to stay abreast with what was going on in the company, every month I would make interviews online, on Skype with some of the top management people to understand where the company was going in terms of what they were producing and what problems they were having and how things were going in general for them, so I was a part of this process. So, On top of these 136 interviews, I did another 16 interviews which were not physical, but which were online.

Katelyn Sharratt
Wow, a very intensive process for you. Can you talk a little bit about what some of the biggest challenges were for you and also how you tackled these?

Jinia Mukerjee
So initially when I was there, on the first week, when I went there, they told me that I could choose any place that I wanted to sit. But I would go in the morning to the HR manager and tell her, OK, I would like to spend the first half of the day with the techies and the second half of the day with the writers, the content people. So they would find me a place because everybody sat together in this organization. So they would find me a place to work, sit and observe, whatever I wanted to do.

Initially for me it was like how do I even understand this language that these people are talking about and the fact that it was so different in terms of the way work was being carried out. It was far away from the expectation that I had when I walked into the company to do ethnography. That was one thing.

I am a woman of Indian origin who spoke the language. Obviously, the language that they were speaking mostly was English though they were also speaking Hindi from time to time. I understood the language. So there were certain advantages that I had. But at the same time, as in any ethnography, there would be one or two people who never warmed up to me, and who would always be suspicious. So the HR manager had sent this mail to everybody in the organization the first day that I came, saying who I am and what I do and why exactly I would be there. Subsequently I sent this email about hey having the right to withdraw from the study anytime, you know, all the ethical issues that I needed to handle from my part. So when the HR manager wrote saying who I am, she wrote that I am a clinical psychologist. So the minute that featured on my resume that she sent through, I think there were very few but a few people who had this instant suspicion about me. And it came out
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particularly in one person who never really warmed up to me and who always said that, wow, you’re psychoanalyzing me or trying to find out what's going on in my mind. So that was a challenge, but I think that's a challenge that most ethnographers would face, that there would be some people who would always be very suspicious, thinking why you're constantly hanging around here? Why are you eating with us? That's why you are staying with us all the time, right? What exactly are you doing?

Katelyn Sharratt
How did you manage that?

Jinia Mukerjee
Some things you can manage, some things you can't and that's also part of the wisdom, I guess. For example, one particular person never warmed up to me, whereas there were several who did talk about it when I was interviewing them. Oh yeah you're a psychologist, are you actually going to psycho analyze me? Are you going to give us some questionnaires to understand my personality? Some people will always have tension or fear about why you are snooping around here all the time. And that's justifiable. And I think that's something I learnt in the process, to make them feel comfortable and to make them understand that this is not managerially induced probing, or psychoanalysis that I'm doing here. But sometimes you just also have to accept that there will be one or two people who will never warm up to you. And that's OK.

Katelyn Sharratt
That's good advice, helpful advice for all of us. What is one way that you would like to see this research built upon with future research? Do you have a future agenda?

Jinia Mukerjee
Oh yes, certainly. I think play in general is my research agenda for many years to come. The one thing that we are trying to do with this paper is look at how it's sustaining work engagement and creative work problem solving. We also want to have other angles to how play has an impact on creative work processes. I'm also engaged in other research projects in entrepreneurial settings, especially small to medium enterprises, where I'm trying to look at how play as an organizational practice is playing a role in the way entrepreneurs engage in their entrepreneurial activity, how it's impacting the entrepreneurial process and also how as a practice play has an impact on the myriad of other things that we want to know about, like wellbeing and innovation and all of that; in other words how organizational play is impacting organizations and the people in it in different ways. So I think there's no end to what we can do now with play, as it will become more and more important, I think, currently with the new generation who has already, you know has lot of exposure to gaming, playing. So they will bring play with them, it will follow their heels when they work in organizations. It's something that we just cannot ignore. It's just there. We just have to look it into the eyes, and I think there are huge possibilities for scholars to understand play, the different types of it, and how it unfolds, how it is related to work and how it's helping or not helping on an individual level, on an organizational level, etcetera. So I think there's a huge agenda ahead for management scholars.

Katelyn Sharratt
What's a piece of advice you would have for emerging scholars wishing to contribute to this field?

Jinia Mukerjee
Well, I personally feel that for young scholars, if they're interested in the phenomena of play, the first thing should be to really go out there in the field and experience this. A qualitative study to start with because there's so much we still don't know. And that is really primordial to understand the phenomena, the different types of play which all would be different phenomenon if you may. So my request to young scholars would be that if they are fascinated by play, they should actually go out there in the organization and experience it themselves with the people that they are studying. And following that to engage in quantitative work. So I really believe that this is a phenomenon that demands, requests, begs, a deep profound
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understanding. And it should be looked at in a more qualitative way first and then moving forward in a quantitative way, with scales, for measuring it.

Katelyn Sharratt
So ending on a slightly more personal note, how does deep play or other types of play have a role in your own work?

Jinia Mukerjee
I’ve always been a very artistic person. I used to be a writer. I have published fictions. So I have seen myself how this flow like engagement that I’ve had with writing things completely unrelated to research, (I write short stories and poem), how that has hugely impacted my creative process in general and enriched me as a person and helped me bring more to the table when my work is concerned. I think all of us whether we have reflected upon it or not have this side to us which we can call play. Which may be completely unrelated to the work that we are doing as a professional worker, but which enriches us and which not just is a respite and replenishment, but it does more than that, where we can actually be our own self and connect to our own inner self and soul or whatever you may want to call it and experience that flow. So I think for me writing and music, this has always been my play. My very deep, true play. And it has always been something that has, I think, positively influenced my work.

Katelyn Sharratt
Thanks so much for sharing your insights and experience with us. Was there anything else you wanted to add?

Jinia Mukerjee
No, but I hear that you are a young play scholar and if you can tell me how you sort of got into play.

Katelyn Sharratt
I actually had a similar pathway into play, I think. My background was working with uh entrepreneurs in Australia, early stage entrepreneurs in accelerators and incubators. And I think as you said, play is really unavoidable in those contexts. In the context of high-tech entrepreneurship, you just see it everywhere. So when I when I joined Copenhagen Business School to do my PhD, it wasn't actually with the intention to study play. It was more looking at creativity processes and innovation in high tech firms. But as you've said, it really is unavoidable in that context. So in my research, it's really led me back to play. I'm using both qualitative and experiments as methods in my research. I think what fascinates me about play is how you see it in so many different ways and aspects within the organization. So many different types of play, which is why I thought your paper on deep play, highlighting this different type of play that we hadn't seen before, was so fascinating.

Jinia Mukerjee
Well, I'm so excited to know more as you proceed with your PhD and all the new insights that you're going to bring to us and others who are very interested in play at work.

Katelyn Sharratt
Thanks Jinia and congratulations again on winning the award.

Jinia Mukerjee
Thank you.
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Winner: Kylie Heales (University of Alberta), Angelique Slade Shantz (University of Alberta School of Management), Desiree F. Pacheco (IESE Business School), Luciano Barin Cruz (HEC Montreal), Charlene E. Zietsma (University of Michigan)
Interviewer: Niki Khorasan (University of Ottawa)

Here is the [linkage](#) to the video of this interview.
Interview with Best Student Paper Award Winner

Winner: Ryann Noe (Harvard University)
Interviewer: Zhongyuan SUN (City University of Hong Kong)

1. Firstly, congratulations on your achievement in winning the Best Student Paper Award! Could you please provide a brief overview of your paper?

   Thank you! In this paper, I study how the moral contestation of a nascent category influences category emergence. The context is the emergence of connected toys, which are physical toys that interact with digital devices such as smartphones or tablets. During the course of their emergence, connected toys were criticized by educators, child-development experts, and many parents for threatening children’s safety and development, part of a broader debate over children’s use of screen-based technologies. Nevertheless, toymakers continued to celebrate the category, arguing that the toys promoted STEM education and equipped children with the digital skills of the future. Through qualitative, inductive methods, I build theory about how this moral contestation influences not only the focal category’s emergence, but also has spillover consequences for the broader competitive landscape.

2. Your paper primarily focuses on moral resistance to nascent categories. Could you share how you initially discovered this intriguing research theme? Was it through an extensive exploration of existing literature, or did it arise from observations of phenomena?

   This focus was induced from the phenomenon. At first, I was drawn to connected toys because of their technological hybridity (physical/digital). I had a hypothesis that this hybridity was, at least in part, a consequence of social resistance to change. However, as I delved into the data I was struck by the extremity of the resistance. Connected toys were not merely confusing or uninteresting to audiences, as we see in many preexisting studies of category emergence. Instead, they were actively condemned. It was this moral charge that led me to dig deeper into theories on the moral underpinnings of market categories.

3. Your research background is fascinating. What motivated you to choose the toy industry as the context for your study?

   Broadly, my research focuses on how industries and technologies emerge and evolve, with a focus on the role of collective meaning-making. There are many practical reasons why the toy industry is well-suited to these themes. As just a few examples: (1) the industry has been disrupted by digital technology; (2) the industry sits at an intriguing crossroads of innovation and nostalgia; and (3) children are a culturally sacred group, which makes meaning-making more salient. There are also personal reasons for choosing this context. I wrote my undergraduate thesis on children’s literature, and so I have been thinking about related topics for some time now. But also: the context is fun and compelling! As a qualitative scholar, you spend years immersed in your context. It helps to have a setting that never tires.

4. Through your qualitative investigation, you have discovered that moral contestation of nascent categories operates as a within-category mechanism of industry-level change. In your opinion, what are the boundary conditions that trigger this moral contestation concerning nascent categories?

   Great question! The toy industry is in some ways an extreme case of moral contestation, given that children are viewed as a culturally sacred and protected group. But we see a similar phenomenon occur in numerous other contexts, both historical and contemporary. Many innovations that we now take as morally benign were at first demonized (in the 1600s, coffee was famously referred to as “Satan’s drink”). Even very recently, the emergence of generative artificial intelligence has been met by fierce moral contestation (will it improve daily lives, or will it displace essential jobs?). A task for future research will be to unpack the conditions under which this “moral escalation” – the shift from rational to moral claim-making – occurs during the process of category emergence.
5. **What was the most significant challenge you encountered during your research process, and how did you manage to overcome it?**

I have been working on this paper for multiple years. When you live with something for so long, there is a tendency to lose the forest for the trees. There is a simple solution to this: fresh eyes! I am fortunate to have advisors and peers who I can trust to be honest and critical. Oftentimes friendly reviewers have a desire to “protect” doctoral students out of kindness, but kid gloves do not help sharpen a paper. I also find it helpful to articulate my ideas to non-academics – friends and family – who save me from slipping into jargon and “ivory tower” theorizing.

6. **Once again, congratulations on receiving the Best Student Paper Award! Do you have any advice for students who aspire to achieve this award in the future?**

Thank you again! As a mid-stage doctoral student, I have come to learn that nothing is more important than the people who surround you. I have been particularly fortunate in this regard, and this paper has benefitted from the advice and encouragement of many mentors and readers. Academics sometimes have a tendency to be possessive of their ideas (myself included!), but I try my best to remember that this is a community. I would encourage other students to seek out advisors who are generous, above all else, and to return the favor in kind.
Interview with Best Symposium Award Winner Interview Winner

Awardee Paper: “New Approaches to Understanding Organizational Networks, Inequality, and Inclusion”
Winner: Mabel Abraham (Columbia Business School), Sanaz Mobasseri (Boston University Questrom School of Business), Lara Yang (Stanford Graduate School of Business)
Interviewer: Guanyi Song (Rotterdam School of Management)

Mabel: I think I speak to the three of us when I say that our motivations are creating this symposium really came from our realization that there was so little research at the intersection of thinking about how organizational networks affect issues around DEI and very specifically with the recent call to think about inclusion from this perspective of it's about integrating people from marginalized groups into the organizational culture. It seems like networks should have a lot to say on this topic of how people get integrated into organizations, and when we looked at this research, what we realized was that any work that was at this intersection of networks and DEI really thought about how networks structures differ across groups. So it's this idea that people from marginalized groups maybe women, or people who from underrepresented racial minorities tend to have worth network, than majority group members. There's a whole bunch of evidence on how that's the case.
And then more recently, there has been some work on how even when people have access to high quality network people from these women and racial minorities rather tend to get worse returns from their network, so our interest was really on moving beyond that to think about when do networks actually foster inclusion and what are the conditions that need to be present that help create inclusion within workplaces.

Lara: I think like I wanna echo what Mabel has said. This connection, this lack of explanations between structural explanations and the issues, is really what has motivated us to think about this set of papers. A lot of work in sociology has really tend to look at look for structural explanations and thinking about issues that are similar, things like equality, stellation, adnation and sociologists always tend to trace the solution to these issues to the structure. And we believe that this type of structural thinking really can be helpful in sort of moving the needle and improving the outcomes and experiences of the marginalized employees at work. And we were thinking that we really wanted to find papers that are sort of taking this kind of thinking and basically put together a set of papers that are can help everybody to rethink the issues structurally.

Sanaz: And I'll just close this out by saying that this is a core social science question and I think we were all trained in our doctoral program with papers 20-30 years ago that were investigating this.
And we recognize that there have been a lot of new types of data and new methods that have come out since then that haven't necessarily been applied to this question. So we saw the symposium as an opportunity to start to investigate that as well.

Guanyi: It is “new approaches” to understanding organizational networks, inequality, and inclusion. The four papers presented in the symposium employ a variety of research methods, ranging from qualitative interviews, observational data, to field experiments. As a junior experimental scholar, I do see there is an increasing trend in using (field) experiment in OMT. What do you think about this method in joining this (organizational networks, inequality, and inclusion) dialogue? and what challenges did you face in your own research?

Mabel: So I think when we and thinking about new approaches, this has back to Sanaz previous point on how there's lots of new data coming into the fold in terms of network studies more generally, but not really thinking about the specifically. So when we're thinking about bringing in experiments that work both in the lab and in the field to understanding networks and the equality, we see this as being really critical, really critical steps to move the needle in the space. So network structures are notoriously endogenous. When we think about network structures, it means that people from different groups disproportionately create different kinds of networks. That sort of the research we already have. But to really get it from causal or proximate causal effect here, there's really a great place for experiments that should be able to do that effectively. The challenge often is that in order to chart a path forward in this area and thinking about designing experiments, the decisions that go into effectively decide designing experiments are really difficult, and I think even more difficult when we think about this in the field.
Sanaz: Yeah, I'll just say that in my time being a doctoral student and transitioning to a junior faculty member, I've been really excited by sort of the number and variety of organizations, types of organizational partnerships that researchers have formed to be able to do experiments in real world settings. And I think that was actually a feature of the papers that came together, partnership for data collection and for conducting experiments. I am a huge advocate of field experiments as a research method. I've learned a lot from failed experiments. I think to Mabel's point, there's a lot of pressure on getting the design right and thinking through things ahead, which can be tough for a topic that's new, that doesn't have a lot of, you know, published papers using that method, or for someone who's an outsider to the context or the organization. I would say what my probably my biggest takeaway is if you're thinking about doing a field experiment in this area, I would make sure you had a good sense of what dependent variable you were trying to, you know, detect an effect on or move the needle on and how big that is and really develop a strong, not just intuitive but empirical understanding of it.

Lara: so at the paper that we presented, I presented in this symposium is on a field experiment and that's sort of kind of the issue that I spotted when we were doing this experiment because we were trying to improve belongingness and inclusion and what ended up happening was that it was relatively difficult to get people to agree to becoming a part of the research project. And part of what we think is happening is that people who really don't feel very included or don't feel transitive when they miss. They didn't necessarily want to participate in research initiatives that work because they tend to have lower levels of trust of the organizational leader. So I think this is one of the issues of the field experiments where there might be a sampling on DV in that who samples into who selects into participating in the research is sort of correlated with the dependent variable we're trying to change. And so that's part of the difficulty that we see of doing field experiments. But obviously there are many, many benefits and part of the key is to sort of balance the benefit and the cards and trying to basically figure out where we exactly we would be the most perfect research message for the question at hand.

Mabel: I think it's just important, especially since this is targeted toward PhD students, as I feel like you have to be careful to not fall into the trap of thinking like field experiments are what's hot right now. So therefore, field experiments are how I'm going to answer my question. I think there's a trap that happens here where people have become really tied to the methodology. So even though I completely agree that field experiments are appropriate for many of the questions in this space, and for many questions in order three, more generally, the bigger challenge here is that you have to ask yourself to what extent is this the appropriate and methodology for this specific question that I'm asking, and I think the guidelines that I've used that have been helpful for me is thinking about the ways the field experiments tend to be best suited when you're testing something for which you already have a baseline expectation that a pattern or correlation or an effect exists. So for example, there's some evidence that X is correlated with why? But it's been based on archival data and it's sort of a fuzzy link. And in that case, it's really effective to think about now. I'm gonna design an experiment to test whether that's the case. I think very often we see failed field experiment when we jump the gun and make an assumption that I feel the experiment is a great way to go. And actually there isn't a relationship. So really thinking about like, what do we know from existing evidence or from existing theory that would suggest the relationship to be there because of the cost of creating these partnerships, especially in the field experiments, is so high you want to go in and look for something that you have, the perspective pattern being of a suspicion that the pattern is there and not just think the other experiments with that you I'm gonna run them no matter what the question.

Guanyi: Any suggestions for early career researchers who are interested in this topic (organizational networks, inequality, and inclusion)?
Sanaz: I think it was really excited by how many people were in the room and how much interest there was, suggesting that it's a rich area for people to, you know, invest in for their research careers. I think at the same time, building on what Mabel said about not tying to a specific method, if you're interested in this, I would be thinking about different types of data and different types of research designs that you could be collecting over the course of a few years to start, to triangulate and gather evidence. You know, to test your theory, and I think my other suggestion would be to keep organizing symposia or trying to bring scholars together, because one thing I've learned is the importance of like curating and building a community, both for collaboration, but also for reviewing so that people are familiar with the features of different approaches and the theoretical perspective. So I hope that this symposium is, you know, sort of reigniting the coming together of network and inequality scholars in organizational context.

Guanyi: Any future agenda or avenue after this symposium? Any suggestions for other scholars who are going to organize their first symposium?

Mabel: I think they would just add to that though that when we think about the four papers that were in this symposia, I think I speak for all of us when I say that we were sort of struck by how cohesive the papers were when you design these things, you try to create things cohesion and you hope that you get there. And it's really rare in my experience, having done these to have such cohesion in terms of the topics and interest and sort of the theory that was being drawn on while having such diversity in the method. And that speaks to the last point that I made around. You really have to let the passion dictate with the methodology is and what we're able to see here is that there are so many different approaches for thinking about how to answer these questions. Sort of thinking about how we understand these general patterns without quite as much focus on causality and that can be a way to really generalize and understand how these things are playing out in organization to lay the theory that we need to then go on and do field experiments to test these things more precisely. So it was really exciting. See the diversity of methods brought to the table and really kind of opened up the possibilities of what it means to do productive research in this space.

Lara: I resonate with everything Mabel and so necessarily said. The one thing that I think is really, really helpful for me as a junior scholar is just talking to people outside academia. I think people in this space, we are actually pretty lucky in that people outside of academia really care about the issues. You know, we're studying a more niche topic sometimes. You don't necessarily know what you're talking about, but if you're, you know, study inclusion of belonging, if you talk to anybody who's working in North America right now, they will have something to say on the topic. And oftentimes, I find that talking to them about what they think about quality running inclusion or what they think are the issues in their organization can be really helpful in sort of integrating with all the theory we already have and sort of enlightening you research questions.
Interview with Best Paper Award Winner

Awardee Paper: “Too Legit to Quit: Discursive Strategies in Cryptocurrency’s Categorical Emergence”
Winner: Jack Sadek (McGill University Desautels Faculty of Management), Robert Nason (McGill University Desautels Faculty of Management)
Interviewer: Carolina Jimenez Pena (University of Ottawa)

Here is the link to the video of this interview.
Interview with Best Published Paper Award Winner

Winner: Suntae Kim (Johns Hopkins Carey Business School), Todd Schifeling (Temple University Fox School of Business)
Interviewer: Esther Yau CHAU (City University of Hong Kong)

1. **This research project is relevant for important topics such as business purposes, institutional change, and sustainability commitments—grand issues that scholars and practitioners care about. Would you please share how the collaboration between you two came about? What inspired you to study the B Corp among other NGOs or institutions seeking to make a social and environmental impact?**

We were excited to study this topic because of the ambitious goals of the B Corp movement to transform capitalism, but also because of the puzzling observation that B Corps were mobilizing against both the harms of capitalism (e.g., inequality, pollution, etc.) and against insincerity in the reforms of capitalism (e.g., CSR). The B Corp movement also provided a wonderful research context due to the wide collection of detailed data and relatively open access to them.

2. **The paper proposed a bold theoretical idea that moved steps ahead of our prior understanding of institutional change (i.e., instead of engaging in expansion-focused mobilization or purity-focused mobilization, it was found that B Corps adopted a paradoxical mobilization embracing and balancing the dynamics from two sides). Please share how this theoretical idea unfolded? The question people ask in qualitative analysis—‘What is this a case of’—was it very clear from the beginning?**

Our findings were not clear from the beginning, but we developed them through multiple rounds of revision with our excellent review team, led by Editor Marc-David Seidel. We started from the observation that there was significant heterogeneity in motives across B Corps – some B Corps wanted to expand the movement and others wanted to purify it – and the review team kept pushing us to uncover what the ultimate implications of this diversity were. We traced the multiple motives forward through the unfolding debates about how the B Corp movement should evolve, particularly in relation to public corporations.

3. **Relatdly, did you face any resistance from reviewers and peers when you proposed this idea? How did you reconcile?**

Our reviewers were very helpful in encouraging us to advance and refine our ideas. Some friendly reviewers did wonder about making major changes to the paper at each stage of the revision, often beyond the direct guidance of the journal reviewers. We definitely took some risks, but we were supported by the review team to pursue our vision of how to make the best possible version of the paper. And again, this was possible thanks to our editor, Marc-David, who encouraged us to stay true to what we saw as important and meaningful even though doing so may deviate from conventions. A good example is the structure of our paper where a quantitative study is followed by two qualitative investigations. We had intense internal debates since it is more conventional that a qualitative, hypothesis-generating study precedes a quantitative, theory-testing study. Yet we decided to remain authentic to the way our research was developed, and our editor gave a full support to our efforts.

4. **The research design of this project is comprehensive. It involves three investigations with both quantitative and quality analyses, which answer the research question expediency altogether. Readers can only imagine the tremendous effort spent during the research process. Would you please share how did this multi-method, multi-stage project evolve? E.g., Was it planned as a multi-method study in the first place? Did you always know what the next step is? How did you decide which method to use at each stage?**

It was always a multi-method project to understand the complex case of how and why B Corps were mobilizing through multiple motives, but the specific methods and studies evolved considerably through the review process. Specifically, it originally started with the first investigation that showed that B Corps emerge in response to both corporate harms and apparent corporate reforms. This finding was puzzling and motivated us to further
understand why, leading to the second investigation where our content analysis showed two distinctive motives within the B Corp movement. Then as we mentioned above, the reviewers pushed us to go further to fully articulate the implication of the mixed motives. This led us to undertake the third investigation where we discovered that mixed motives that coexisted within the B Corp movement in fact influenced the historical evolution of the movement, enabling it to address the paradox between movement growth and purity.

5. **Many people find managing and publishing a multi-method project challenging. How was the experience for you? What are the major takeaways you get from this experience?**

As mentioned above, although mixed-method research is relatively rare, there is still a conventional belief on how mixed-method studies should be structured. Deviating from such convention was not easy, but we were able to maintain and develop our original structure thanks to the full support from our editor, as well as friendly reviewers who helped us find ways to make it work. Furthermore, we also realized that along with the evolution of the paper, our understanding of the paper had to dramatically evolve. Especially with the addition of the third investigation, we had to completely overhaul the framing of the paper, which was a daunting task but ultimately made the paper much better. Our two major takeaways are: 1) don’t be afraid of deviating from the convention, and 2) make sure to maximize the paper’s cohesiveness along with constantly restructuring the paper.

6. **Please share your thoughts on this: it was acknowledged in the OMT business meeting that OMT research traditionally gives stronger ivory-tower vibes than that of other divisions. On the other hand, many junior faculties and students (OMTers included) hope to address grand challenges and social issues in their research. Since your study developed theory and advanced our understanding of institutional change, what are your thoughts on the dynamic between theoretical contribution and practical/societal relevance? Did you intentionally strive for a balance?**

We focused on developing the greatest insight into our empirical puzzle that we could. Happily, we later found that the theoretical tools we developed in the process were also useful to practitioners to make sense of their experiences. We do not fully agree with the characterization that theoretical contribution is in tension with practical/societal relevance. It may be that direct application of OMT research is not immediately clear. However, we believe that pursuing theoretical depth is in fact in line with achieving practical relevance. Many OMT studies may not provide immediately implementable interventions, but they can fundamentally change the way we think about our social and organizational world, which in turn can be an essential contribution to addressing wicked problems in our society.

7. **Lastly, is there anything else you’d like to share with the OMT community?**

In addition to our own efforts, this award is a recognition of the collective input of the review team and many colleagues who helped developing our paper. We are tremendously grateful to OMT and the rich theoretical tools that the community continues to innovate.
Interview with Best Paper on Environmental and Social Practices Winner

Awardee Paper: “Devaluation by Association: Gender Diversity and Performance Recognition in Masculine Occupations”
Winner: Jirs Meuris (University of Wisconsin-Madison), Jennifer M. Merluzzi (George Washington University)
Interviewer: Joe (Pyung) Nahm (University of Minnesota)

(1) What motivated the research question or the paper more broadly, and how did the paper evolve?
I have done some work on gender and women in counter-stereotypical occupations and how that affects wages. I was also doing some work on diversification in police departments but more about race, like what happens when the police departments become more racially diverse? At some point, I met Jennifer, who is my co-author on this paper, and she had done some work on women in counter-stereotypical occupations such as the military. We both became interested in the idea of diversity efforts in counter-stereotypical occupations or organizations and what the consequences are for the people within them. We usually think about the consequences of diversity efforts in terms of the women joining those occupations, which we know is terrible in a lot of different dimensions. But if we truly want to understand the effects of diversity efforts, we also have to think about what the effects are on the people who are already in that occupation before more women arrive. If they do not support the diversity effort or if they don’t support the new women workers who are joining, then obviously, those women are going to be discriminated against. That is where this project started. We thought that performance awards that police officers receive would be a good way to look at this idea. I was already working with the law enforcement data. We decided to examine performance recognition when more women are coming into a police department.

(2) Theoretically, the main challenge for us was differentiating what we’re observing from general devaluation. Devaluation from the wage gap literature suggests that any kind of work context with more women is seen as less prestigious, and because of that, everyone receives fewer rewards. What we argue is that this is not about general devaluation but about how performance is evaluated. When there are more women in male-dominated domains, there are lower performance expectations for everyone who is there, and therefore, you get fewer performance awards. Making the case for the distinction between general devaluation and what we are identifying here has theoretically been the most challenging. On the empirical side, there has been less of a challenge because of data advantages, and we are able to take care of what would be the most common empirical pushbacks.

(3) What’s the main mechanism that you and your co-author propose?
The main mechanism is that as more women enter a unit in a male-dominant occupation, evaluators have lower performance expectations of everyone in that unit, both men and women. The lower performance expectations lead to more scrutiny and a higher standard for performance, and evaluators are more likely to attribute your performance contributions to the collective effort rather than to you individually. It is those lower performance expectations that transfer onto everyone. In the paper, we are actually able to show this to some extent because we do a placebo analysis looking at awards that are not based on performance, and we don't find an effect there. So, we are able to show this is really driven by performance evaluation.

(4) Why is there an expectation of low performance when there are more women?
In male-dominant occupations, there is this ideal worker image that gets formed. Most of the literature has been about incongruity at the individual level. A woman who joins the police department is incongruent with the ideal work image. Because of the incongruent image, evaluators expect women to perform worse, and that affects performance evaluations. What we argue is that this happens at the group level as well. When there are more women in a unit, both men and women within it have these lower performance expectations. It is the incongruity argument but at the group level.

(5) What are some managerial or policy implications of this study?
One of the biggest contributions we make is to offer a potential explanation as to why diversity efforts may not be working and why there are mixed results, especially for women in male-dominant occupations. It is not sufficient to think just about how we help women who are coming in. We also have to think about what the consequences are for people who are already in the occupation. How do we make sure that their performance outcomes or career outcomes aren’t being affected by having more women in their work environment? If they are affected, then they might not support the diversity efforts. We cannot necessarily identify the efforts that would be effective for reducing negative effects on incumbents. There has been
a lot of literature that associates diversity efforts with transparency, accountability systems, and bias reduction, and we would assume that these efforts increase support from incumbents for these changes. That is what the implication of our paper is, but we do try to be careful not to make too far of a leap because we can't show what interventions would be effective either. In sum, thinking about incumbents and why diversity efforts might have mixed results is the biggest implication.