

# ORGANIZATION THEORY MEETS STRATEGY: FOSTERING A DIALOGUE BETWEEN RESEARCH FIELDS

Giada Di Stefano and Filippo Carlo Wezel

## ABSTRACT

*This volume was born out of two considerations. On the one hand, we recognized how the identity boundaries that define Organization Theory and Strategy are crucial to emphasize the distinctiveness of these different research traditions, facilitate our engagement with them, and delineate our contributions. On the other, we felt a growing need to cross those boundaries, and broaden the conversation between these fields. Our wish thus was to create a forum where Organization Theory and Strategy may meet and bring together some of the scholars who work at the intersection between these fields. In this introductory piece we share our understanding of what may distinguish Organization Theory from Strategy, and also illustrate how the research intersection between those fields looks like. In closing the chapter, we explain how the different contributions to this volume map onto one another and elaborate on several avenues of future development.*

**Keywords:** Organization theory; strategy; evaluations; categories; value-based strategy; abduction

## INTRODUCTION

One of the most valuable privileges of our profession is the freedom to choose which topics to examine. Some of these topics sit squarely at the heart of a given research field and help us to be “categorized” as scholars of that domain. For instance, if your focus is on resources and capabilities, you will most likely be

---

Organization Theory Meets Strategy

Advances in Strategic Management, Volume 43, 1–9

Copyright © 2024 Giada Di Stefano and Filippo Carlo Wezel

Published under exclusive licence by Emerald Publishing Limited

ISSN: 0742-3322/doi:[10.1108/S0742-332220230000043001](https://doi.org/10.1108/S0742-332220230000043001)

recognized as a Strategy scholar. If you are interested instead in the social and institutional forces that shape organizational outcomes, it is likely that you will be identified as an Organization Theory scholar.

This is only one side of the story, though, as our research identities lie not only in the eyes of the beholder. Many of us, in fact, hold more complex research identities. While we may be perceived as belonging to a primary research community, in the background we engage with different conversations and with different streams of work. Sometimes this is a conscious choice to contribute to a broader debate. At other times, the topics we investigate naturally call for a multifaceted approach. Research on evaluations, for instance, implicates the related issues of ranking and ratings, status and reputation, identity, and image (Bowers & Prato, 2019; Naumovska & Lavie, 2021; Podolny, 2010; Rindova, Pollock, & Hayward, 2006; Rindova, Williamson, Petkova, & Sever, 2004; Wang & Jensen, 2019; Zavyalova, Pfarrer, & Reger, 2007). The study of deviance and conformity is entwined with issues like innovation, positioning, categories, and authenticity (Dupin & Wezel, 2023; Gehman & Grimes, 2017; Kovács, Carnabuci, & Wezel, 2021; Phillips & Zuckerman, 2001; Suarez, Grodal, & Gotsopoulos, 2015; Zhao, Fisher, Lounsbury, & Miller, 2017; Zuckerman, 1999).

This volume was born out of these considerations. On the one hand, we recognized the importance of the identity boundaries that define fields of study to ease the recognition of different research traditions, facilitate our engagement with them, and delineate our contributions. On the other, we felt a growing need to cross boundaries and bridge fields, to be able to study complex phenomena and contribute to a broader conversation. Animated by this spirit, we wish to create a forum in which Organization Theory and Strategy can meet. These fields have much in common, and a sharp distinction between them is hardly motivated by any specific problem under discussion. This volume, therefore, should be interpreted as an attempt to bring together some of the scholars who – implicitly or explicitly – have explored the intersection of these two research fields.

We aim to speak to a community of like-minded researchers who view firms as bundles of capabilities and resources but are also aware of the constraints and opportunities generated by the social forces that shape decisions above and beyond the agency of those firms. The different angles and methodological approaches illustrated in this volume speak well to the richness of this research intersection. We celebrate and embrace such a diversity and the multiple research opportunities it generates.

Before getting the conversation started, however, we feel the need to share our understanding of what may distinguish Organization Theory from Strategy, and how this research intersection looks like. Our goal is to allow the reader to make better sense of how the different contributions to this volume map onto one another and to develop a clearer intuition about some potential avenues of future development. In this respect, our introduction might be a little unorthodox for an edited volume. We hope our choice will be helpful to new scholars who will decide to join the conversation.

## A FEW EXEMPLARY DIFFERENCES

To develop a better understanding of what it means to be working at the intersection of Organization Theory and Strategy, we briefly discuss a few selected topics that, in our opinion, belong to this “Middle Earth.” These topics may not appear proximate at a first glance. We thus begin by highlighting a few ways in which the terminology, as well as the underlying processes and actors involved, may vary between the two fields. Hopefully this overview will clarify that the divide between fields is very salient and actively preserved; at the same time, it is so often crossed and increasingly elusive to nail down in its substantive relevance.

### *Organizations Versus Firms*

A first, fundamental difference between Organization Theory and Strategy is related to the distinction between “organizations” and “firms.” A structural and sociological approach has prevailed in Organization Theory and molded its focus on interdependencies, environmental constraints, and survival (Hannan et al., 2019; Hannan & Freeman, 1989; Powell & DiMaggio, 1991; Thompson, 1967). The ambition of organization theorists is to theorize about any type of organization, including but also beyond for-profit ones. Strategy, meanwhile, has been dominated by a more agentic economics-flavored view, which has shaped its prevalent attention to decision-making, resources and capabilities, innovation, competition, and profits (Leiblein, Reuer, & Zenger, 2019; Mahoney & McGahan, 2007; Makadok, 2011). As a result, Organization Theory puts processes and structures at the center of the discussion, and hence also emphasizes a (de)centralized conception of the “organization.” Conversely, Strategy emphasizes managerial actions and their outcomes. The complex organization, with its processes and structures, is viewed in a more unified and centralized fashion, and often referred to as the “firm.”

### *Audiences Versus Stakeholders*

A second difference between Organization Theory and Strategy is related to an emphasis on “audiences” vis-à-vis “stakeholders.” In both cases, the emphasis is on the set of internal and external actors to whom the organization pays attention. However, the two fields have depicted those actors quite differently. For organization theorists, audiences play an active role in the construction of strategic fields and control key symbolic and material resources (DiMaggio & Powell, 1983; Hsu & Hannan, 2005). Conversely, Strategy scholars tend to depict stakeholders as providers of inputs to firms and as recipients of firms’ actions (Dorobantu & Odziemkowska, 2017; Gao, Zuzul, Jones, & Khanna, 2017; Henisz, Dorobantu, & Nartey, 2014).

### *Value Versus Evaluation*

A third difference is related to a focus on “value” and the effort of firms at creating and capturing it vis-à-vis “evaluations” as the process aimed at

comparing different offerings and producers. Strategy scholars have widely referred to value-based strategy, a framework whose emphasis is on the firm that creates value for its stakeholders, captures some of this value, and adds value to the economic system through innovation (Brandenburger & Stuart, 1996; Chatain & Zemsky, 2011; Gans & Ryall, 2017). The second perspective, centered on evaluations, is more often adopted by Organization Theory scholars. This involves the process through which the relevant audiences reach consensus about how to evaluate different organizations and assess their standing against their peers (Bowers & Prato, 2019; Hsu, Hannan, & Koçak, 2009; Kovács & Sharkey, 2014).

### *Different Ways of Building Theory*

The emphasis on agency in Strategy has led its scholars to highlight managers as key decision makers within firms and data as capable of objectively measuring a firm's actions and outcomes. This has pushed the field predominantly (yet not exclusively) toward a positivistic approach, for instance by discussing more effective identification strategies (Goldfarb & King, 2016; King, Goldfarb, & Simcoe, 2021; Oxley, Rivkin, & Ryall, 2010). Despite following a similar route, Organization Theory has remained more sensitive to contextual differences in structures and processes among organizations that are recognized to operate in different industries and cultural contexts. This emphasis has sustained, much more than in Strategy, the development of an interpretivist approach to research (e.g., Buchter, 2021; Pratt, Kaplan, & Whittington, 2020).

## **A FEW IDEAS TO BRIDGE THE DIVIDE**

Now that we have underlined a few differences across the fields of Organization Theory and Strategy, let us turn our attention to how those perceived differences might generate research opportunities for scholars who wish to work at the intersection of these fields.

### *Markets as Fields*

Markets as conceived by most Strategy scholars involve well-defined preferences and a shared conception of value. Through an Organization Theory lens, however, a few relevant questions emerge: Where do such preferences come from? How do different audience members negotiate and reach consensus on value? Does this process of social construction vary across cultural contexts and institutional fields? Does such a conception of value change over time? Conversely, if we embrace a Strategy-oriented approach and apply it to an Organization Theory-inspired view of markets, we could ask: What role do costs and benefits play for evaluating audiences? Do evaluations converge or diverge over time? How are they interpreted by the evaluated organizations? Some of these questions find increasing interest in the literature (Chatterji, Durand, Levine, & Touboul, 2016; Delmestri & Greenwood, 2016; Hannan et al., 2019), but it would be unfortunate

if Organization Theory and Strategy scholars would not build on each other's knowledge.

#### *An Agentic View of Evaluated Firms*

It is hard to conceive firms as passive objects of evaluations. In fact, they do undertake a variety of strategic actions to cope with and/or shape those evaluations. A few scholars have already started to challenge the depiction of organizations as mere recipients of audiences' evaluations and begun to wonder whether firms may take a more active role in responding to them (Askin & Bothner, 2016; Wang, Wezel, & Forgues, 2016; Zavyalova, Pfarrer, Reger, & Shapiro, 2021). Possible research questions include: Which strategic actions do firms undertake in the face of challenging evaluations? How do they react to reputational rankings and status-based classifications? Which strategic actions do they take to improve their relative ranking? Again, we see some signals of emerging interest in the literature (Favaron, Di Stefano, & Durand, 2022; Gouvard & Durand, 2023; Sharkey, Kovács, & Hsu, 2022), but believe there is much more room to further explore these questions.

#### *Stakeholder Activism and Management of Expectations*

Scholars working at the intersection of Organization Theory and Strategy have helped highlight a more elaborate view of how firms and stakeholders interact. Some scholars have started exploring the extent to which stakeholders take an active role in the form of stakeholder activism and social movements (Flammer, Toffel, & Viswanathan, 2021; Pacheco & Dean, 2015; Reid & Toffel, 2009; Vasi & King, 2012). Various research questions fit into this space. For instance: How do stakeholders' expectations and social movements shape firms' strategic choices and decisions? Related to this, in confronting audiences' activism, do firms attempt to manipulate audiences' expectations by strategically deflecting their attention? When pondering changes, how do firms decide between substantive and ceremonial alternative actions?

#### *Abduction as a Common Platform*

As for the different ways of building theory, an interesting development involves abduction. With its emphasis on inference to the best explanation, abduction involves a generative process of creating and evaluating alternative explanations that may help understand an empirical anomaly or phenomenon understandable (Lipton, 2004; Pillai, Goldfarb, & Kirsch, 2023; Sætre & Van de Ven, 2021). It requires that scholars leverage unusual phenomena, explore them from multiple theoretical angles, and adopt a different approach in writing their manuscripts (King, 2023). On the one hand, detecting an interesting anomaly requires extensive experience with a domain and, thus, rich, context-relevant knowledge. On the other, the development and synthesis of divergent hunches requires deductive reasoning. We believe that the growing diffusion of abduction holds the potential to fuel the dialog between Organization Theory and Strategy.

## LEARNING FROM SCHOLARS WHO WORK AT THIS INTERSECTION

Our characterization of this “Middle Earth” at the intersection of Organization Theory and Strategy suggests the presence of fertile ground for a proliferation of research opportunities. The contributions to this volume provide a few examples of how to seize those opportunities by engaging with different topics, building on different research streams, and relying on different methodological approaches. Still, this diverse set of contributions is linked together by some common themes, which appear in line with our broad-strokes description of this intersection. In the final chapter, [Cattani \(2023\)](#) reflects on the concept of identity as a possible common thread across the various contributions to this volume.

A first recurring theme among the contributions relates to the stream of research that we labeled “markets as fields.” [Ometto, Lounsbury, and Gehman \(2023\)](#) describe the process through which firms can construct a naturalizing framing aimed at legitimizing a novel and uncertain technological field. [Choi, Augustine, and King \(2023\)](#) theorize how organizations engage in collective action to implement moral mandates whose scope and associated practices are ambiguous. [Ha, Grodal, and Zuckerman Sivan \(2023\)](#) illustrate that it is not the mere order of entry that leads organizations to benefit from attributions of legitimacy or authenticity but rather “legitimation work” that allows audience members to appreciate a certain value proposition.

A second theme relates to our description of “an agentic view of evaluated firms.” [Durand, Kremp, and Obloj \(2023\)](#) describe how firms undertake different sets of committed decisions in response to the demands of different stakeholders pushing them to pursue multiple objectives. [Guo, Yu, and Hsu \(2023\)](#) explore how incumbents engage in collaborative dynamics when entrants adopt non-conforming strategy tactics that unsettle a market’s competitive structure. [Zavyalova \(2023\)](#) articulates a path forward for research on reputation in the light of its malleability by firms, as well as in consideration of an increase in stakeholder empowerment via social media.

A third recurring theme fits into the discussion of how firms “manage the expectations of relevant audiences.” [Bowers and Lee \(2023\)](#) study a sample of firms that, caught between strategic incentives and social ties to their audiences, ceremonially adopt voluntary standards. [Naumovska \(2023\)](#) conceptualizes the engagement in corporate misconduct as a rational choice based on considerations about costs and benefits. Similarly, [Rindova and Petkova \(2023\)](#) focus on the socio-cognitive and organizational processes that allow leaders to make organizational changes and, in particular, develop dynamic capabilities.

Incidentally, we find it interesting that this diverse array of contributions leverages qualitative and quantitative methods and adopts both inductive and deductive approaches to inference. To advance novel conclusions, a few chapters of the volume also build on illustrative case studies and on their authors’ deep understanding of empirical phenomena. In some instances, we believe that the structuring of these ideas reflects the spirit of abductive reasoning.

## CONCLUSIONS

We decided to edit this volume out of the conviction that the intersection of Organization Theory and Strategy abounds with research opportunities. Crossing the chasm that divides these fields might be hard, but we believe it is intellectually rewarding. The objective of this introduction was to raise awareness about a few points of contact between these categorically distinct fields and further stimulate a dialogue between different communities of scholars. At the end of the day, agency and structure are just two sides of the same coin (Sewell, 1992). We hope this volume will help fuel discussion at the prolific intersection of Organization Theory and Strategy.<sup>1</sup>

## REFERENCES

- Askin, N., & Bothner, M. S. (2016). Status-aspirational pricing: The “Chivas Regal” strategy in US higher education, 2006–2012. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, *61*(2), 217–253.
- Bowers, A., & Lee, H. J. (2023). Voluntary standards and ceremonial adoption: Strategic registration, competition, and audience in LEED certification. *Advances in Strategic Management*, *43*, 189–210.
- Bowers, A., & Prato, M. (2019). The role of third-party rankings in status dynamics: How does the stability of rankings induce status changes? *Organization Science*, *30*(6), 1146–1164.
- Brandenburger, A. M., & Stuart, H. W. (1996). Value-based business strategy. *Journal of Economics and Management Strategy*, *5*(1), 5–24.
- Buchter, L. (2021). Escaping the ellipsis of diversity: Insider activists’ use of implementation resources to influence organization policy. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, *66*(2), 521–565.
- Cattani, G. (2023). Organizational identity: Paradoxes and open questions. Does organization theory meet strategy? *Advances in Strategic Management*, *43*, 275–282.
- Chatain, O., & Zemsky, P. (2011). Value creation and value capture with frictions. *Strategic Management Journal*, *32*(11), 1206–1231.
- Chatterji, A. K., Durand, R., Levine, D. I., & Touboul, S. (2016). Do ratings of firms converge? Implications for managers, investors and strategy researchers. *Strategic Management Journal*, *37*(8), 1597–1614.
- Choi, T.-U., Augustine, G., & King, B. G. (2023). Have you tried this? Field-configuring spaces and implementing moral mandates. *Advances in Strategic Management*, *43*, 47–89.
- Delmestri, G., & Greenwood, R. (2016). How Cinderella became a queen: Theorizing radical status change. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, *61*(4), 507–550.
- DiMaggio, P. J., & Powell, W. W. (1983). The iron cage revisited: Institutional isomorphism and collective rationality in organizational fields. *American Sociological Review*, 147–160.
- Dorobantu, S., & Odziemkowska, K. (2017). Valuing stakeholder governance: Property rights, community mobilization, and firm value. *Strategic Management Journal*, *38*, 2682–2703.
- Dupin, L., & Wezel, F. C. (2023). Artisanal or just half baked: Competing corrective identities and location choice among French bakeries. *Administrative Science Quarterly*.
- Durand, R., Kremp, P.-A., & Obloj, T. (2023). Flipping the coin again – Redefining strategy through a relational class approach. *Advances in Strategic Management*, *43*, 115–139.
- Favaron, S. D., Di Stefano, G., & Durand, R. (2022). Michelin is coming to town: Organizational responses to status shocks. *Management Science*. Retrieved from <https://pubsonline.informs.org/doi/abs/10.1287/mnsc.2021.4210>

---

<sup>1</sup>The authors wish to thank Clara Depalma, Saverio Favaron, Paul Gouvard, Lorenzo Maulini, and Guang Zhu for the insightful conversations that have helped developing several of the ideas presented in the manuscript.

- Flammer, C., Toffel, M. W., & Viswanathan, K. (2021). Shareholder activism and firms' voluntary disclosure of climate change risks. *Strategic Management Journal*, 42(10), 1850–1879.
- Gans, J., & Ryall, M. D. (2017). Value capture theory: A strategic management review. *Strategic Management Journal*, 38(1), 17–41.
- Gao, C., Zuzul, T., Jones, G., & Khanna, T. (2017). Overcoming institutional voids: A reputation-based view of long run survival. *Strategic Management Journal*, 38(11), 2147–2167.
- Gehman, J., & Grimes, M. G. (2017). Hidden badge of honor: How contextual distinctiveness affects category promotion among certified B corporations. *Academy of Management Journal*, 60(6), 2294–2320.
- Goldfarb, B., & King, A. A. (2016). Scientific apophenia in strategic management research: Significance tests & mistaken inference. *Strategic Management Journal*, 37(1), 167–176.
- Gouvard, P., & Durand, R. (2023). To be or not to be (typical): Evaluation-mode heterogeneity and its consequences for organizations. *Academy of Management Review*. Forthcoming.
- Guo, W., Yu, T., & Hsu, G. (2023). Collaborative dynamics among market incumbents in the U.S. airline industry, 1989–2010. *Advances in Strategic Management*, 43, 141–169.
- Ha, J., Grodal, S., & Zuckerman Sivan, E. W. (2023). On the inauthenticity of first movers and authenticity of second movers: How demand is shaped by legitimation work. *Advances in Strategic Management*, 43, 91–114.
- Hannan, M. T., & Freeman, J. (1989). *Organizational ecology*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Hannan, M. T., Le Mens, G., Hsu, G., Kovács, B., Negro, G., Pólos, L., & Sharkey, A. J. (2019). *Concepts and categories: Foundations for sociological and cultural analysis*. New York, NY: Columbia University Press.
- Henisz, W. J., Dorobantu, S., & Nartey, L. J. (2014). Spinning gold: The financial returns to stakeholder engagement. *Strategic Management Journal*, 35(12), 1727–1748.
- Hsu, G., & Hannan, M. T. (2005). Identities, genres, and organizational forms. *Organization Science*, 16(5), 474–490.
- Hsu, G., Hannan, M. T., & Koçak, Ö. (2009). Multiple category memberships in markets: An integrative theory and two empirical tests. *American Sociological Review*, 74(1), 150–169.
- King, A. A. (2023). Writing empirical reports for readers. Working Paper.
- King, A. A., Goldfarb, B., & Simcoe, T. (2021). Learning from testimony on quantitative research in management. *Academy of Management Review*, 46(3), 465–488.
- Kovács, B., Carnabuci, G., & Wezel, F. C. (2021). Categories, attention, and the impact of inventions. *Strategic Management Journal*, 42(5), 992–1023.
- Kovács, B., & Sharkey, A. J. (2014). The paradox of publicity: How awards can negatively affect the evaluation of quality. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 59(1), 1–33.
- Leiblein, M. J., Reuer, J., & Zenger, T. (2019). What makes a decision strategic? *Strategy Science*, 3(4), 558–573.
- Lipton, P. (2004). *Inference to the best explanation*. London: Routledge.
- Mahoney, J. T., & McGahan, A. M. (2007). The field of strategic management within the evolving science of strategic organization. *Strategic Organization*, 5(1), 79–99.
- Makadok, R. (2011). Invited editorial: The four theories of profit and their joint effects. *Journal of Management*, 37(5), 1316–1334.
- Naumovska, I. (2023). Doing well by doing bad: Towards an organizational and strategic perspective on the rational choice model of corporate misconduct. *Advances in Strategic Management*, 43, 211–234.
- Naumovska, I., & Lavie, D. (2021). When an industry peer is accused of financial misconduct: Stigma versus competition effects on non-accused firms. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 66(4), 1130–1172.
- Ometto, M. P., Lounsbury, M., & Gehman, J. (2023). Beyond the hype: Cultural entrepreneurship in nanotechnology. *Advances in Strategic Management*, 43, 11–45.
- Oxley, J., Rivkin, J., & Ryall, M. (2010). The Strategy Research Initiative: Recognizing and encouraging high quality research in strategy. *Strategic Organization*, 8, 377–386.
- Pacheco, D. F., & Dean, T. J. (2015). Firm responses to social movement pressures: A competitive dynamics perspective. *Strategic Management Journal*, 36(7), 1093–1104.



- Phillips, D. J., & Zuckerman, E. W. (2001). Middle-status conformity: Theoretical restatement and empirical demonstration in two markets. *American Journal of Sociology*, 107(2), 379–429.
- Pillai, S. D., Goldfarb, B., & Kirsch, D. (2023). *Using historical methods to improve abduction and inference to the best explanation in strategy*. Working paper.
- Podolny, J. M. (2010). Status signals. In *Status signals*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Powell, W. W., & DiMaggio, P. J. (1991). *The new institutionalism in organizational analysis*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Pratt, M. G., Kaplan, S., & Whittington, R. (2020). Editorial essay: The tumult over transparency: Decoupling transparency from replication in establishing trustworthy qualitative research. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 65(1), 1–19.
- Reid, E. M., & Toffel, M. W. (2009). Responding to public and private politics: Corporate disclosure of climate change strategies. *Strategic Management Journal*, 30(11), 1157–1178.
- Rindova, V. P., & Petkova, A. P. (2023). For the love of change: How strategic leaders design organizational processes and shape dynamic capabilities. *Advances in Strategic Management*, 43, 235–274.
- Rindova, V. P., Pollock, T. G., & Hayward, M. L. A. (2006). Celebrity firms: The social construction of market popularity. *Academy of Management Review*, 31(1), 50–71.
- Rindova, V. P., Williamson, I. O., Petkova, A. P., & Sever, J. M. (2004). Being good or being known: An empirical examination of the dimensions, antecedents, and consequences of organizational reputation. *Academy of Management Journal*, 48(6), 1033–1049.
- Sætre, A. S., & Van de Ven, A. (2021). Generating theory by abduction. *Academy of Management Review*, 46(4), 684–701.
- Sewell, W. H. (1992). A theory of structure: Duality, agency, and transformation. *American Journal of Sociology*, 98(1), 1–29.
- Sharkey, A., Kovács, B., & Hsu, G. (2022). Expert critics, rankings, and review aggregators: The changing nature of intermediation and the rise of markets with multiple intermediaries. *Academy of management annals*. Academy of management. Retrieved from <https://journals.aom.org/doi/abs/10.5465/annals.2021.0025>
- Suarez, F. F., Grodal, S., & Gotsopoulos, A. (2015). Perfect timing? Dominant category, dominant design, and the window of opportunity for firm entry. *Strategic Management Journal*, 36(3), 437–448.
- Thompson, J. D. (1967). *Organizations in action: Social science bases of administrative theory*. Piscataway, NJ: Transaction publishers.
- Vasi, I. B., & King, B. G. (2012). Social movements, risk perceptions, and economic outcomes: The effect of primary and secondary stakeholder activism on firms' perceived environmental risk and financial performance. *American Sociological Review*, 77(4), 573–596.
- Wang, P., & Jensen, M. (2019). A bridge too far: Divestiture as a strategic reaction to status inconsistency. *Management Science*, 65(2), 859–878.
- Wang, T., Wezel, F. C., & Fergues, B. (2016). Protecting market identity: When and how do organizations respond to consumers' devaluations? *Academy of Management Journal*, 59(1), 135–162.
- Zavyalova, A. (2023). Reputation research at a crossroads. *Advances in Strategic Management*, 43, 171–188.
- Zavyalova, A., Pfarrer, M. D., & Reger, R. K. (2007). Celebrity and infamy? The consequences of media narratives about organizational identity. *Academy of Management Review*, 42(3), 461–480.
- Zavyalova, A., Pfarrer, M. D., Reger, R. K., & Shapiro, D. L. (2021). Managing the message: The effects of firm actions and industry spillovers on media coverage following wrongdoing. *Academy of Management Journal*, 55(5), 1079–1101.
- Zhao, E. Y., Fisher, G., Lounsbury, M., & Miller, D. (2017). Optimal distinctiveness: Broadening the interface between institutional theory and strategic management. *Strategic Management Journal*, 38(1), 93–113.
- Zuckerman, E. W. (1999). The categorical imperative: Securities analysts and the illegitimacy discount. *American Journal of Sociology*, 104(5), 1398–1438.