



TRACK 41: Challenges for Managing Interorganizational Networks

Track Chair:

Prof. Dr. Aimé Heene, Ghent University, aim.heene@Ugent.be

Co-track Chairs:

Prof. Dr. Patrick Kenis, Academic Dean TiasNimbas Business School (The Netherlands),
p.kenis@tiasnimbas.edu

Prof. Dr. Keith G. Provan, University of Arizona (USA) and Tilburg University (The Netherlands), kprovan@eller.arizona.edu

Dr. Annick Willem, HU BRUSSEL (Belgium), annick.willem@hubrussel.be

Organizational coordinator:

Dr. Annick Willem
HU BRUSSEL (Belgium)
e-mail: annick.willem@hubrussel.be

Abstract:

The potential advantages of networks in the nonprofit, public, and private/for-profit sectors are widely accepted. Especially among public sector organizations, networks are considered as solutions for integrated service delivery and to deal with complex policy-making issues.

However, networks are confronted with tensions, paradoxes, and challenges that stem from the difficulties of trying to work collaboratively without hierarchy and in the face of significant differences among organizational members in goals, norms, and level of commitment. Scholars who study the topic are inclined to recognize the challenges. However, we still know very little concerning how tensions and paradoxes are managed and how networks might be organized so they can be managed effectively. The challenge is especially acute when studying “whole networks,” rather than focusing on the networking activity of individual organizations.

This call for papers seeks new conceptual or empirical (qualitative or quantitative) work that provides insight into the management challenges and working of whole networks. We encourage submissions on interorganizational networks, not only in the public sector, but also, in multi-sector networks consisting of organizations in two or all three sectors. Research should shed light on such issues as:

- tensions and paradoxes at the network level,

- network effectiveness,
- organizing and addressing public sector challenges through whole networks,
- management of versus management in a network,
- empirical evidence of the existence of different network forms,
- (in)stability of network forms,
- network governance,
- differences among networks in different sectors and between voluntary and compulsory networks,
- and power in and through networks.

Papers that focus solely on business networks are also welcome, as long as the focus is on the network as a whole and not exclusively on dyadic ties or the ego-centric involvement of individual actors in a network context.

TRACK 42: Evolution, Darwinism and the Theory of the Firm

Track Chairs:

Roberto Cafferata, Full Professor of Management, University of Rome Tor Vergata, Faculty of Economics, Department of Business Studies.

E-mail: cafferata@economia.uniroma2.it

Hans H. Hinterhuber, Emeritus at the University of Innsbruck, Department of Strategic Management, Marketing and Tourism.

E-Mail: hans.hinterhuber@uibk.ac.at

Track coordinators:

Gianpaolo Abatecola, Ph. D., Research Fellow of Business Management, University of Rome Tor Vergata (Italy), Faculty of Economics, Department of Business Studies.

E-mail: gianpaolo.abatecola@uniroma2.it

Phone number: 0039-(0)6-72595816

Sara Poggesi, Ph. D., Research Fellow of Business Management, University of Rome Tor Vergata (Italy), Faculty of Economics, Department of Business Studies.

E-mail: sara.poggesi@uniroma2.it

Phone number: 0039-(0)6-72595817

Abstract:

Following the Charles Darwin theories, evolution studies have been prominent also in the management literature. To date, scholars basically argue that firms cannot be conceptualized as *super-rationale* monoliths with full discretionary power. At the same time, even if dynamic and

pro-active, firms cannot be completely perceived as always changing biological systems (e.g. the living organisms). In particular:

- both human resources and other factors of production, such as land and capital, are integrated into the company. Although coexisting within the same organizational framework, each one does follow behavioural rules which are different;
- artificial intelligence (i.e. computers and process automations) has progressively replaced human intelligence within the firm. Although artificial intelligence adds some *flexibility* to organizational structures, it also presents some *inflexible* behavioural codes;
- after their birth firms do not behave randomly to achieve their goals. They have to be managed as *contrived* systems through strategic planning and bureaucratic organizational structures.

However, there is a number of reasons in support of the Darwinian interpretation of the enterprise nature:

- both the enterprise and the biological system are basically composed of differentiated and reciprocally functional subsystems, whose configurations and relationships may change either radically or marginally over time;
- both systems embrace different *species*, which vary according to specific morphological, physiological or behavioural features;
- the mechanisms that govern the combination of material and immaterial resources within the firm are not so diverse from those that help the functioning of the elements of the human body (i.e. backbone, arms and legs);
- the firm life cycle looks very similar to that of many biological systems, as far as the stages of growth are concerned.

The above mentioned aspects are a promising basis for the research studies in the area of organizational evolution. This track aims at offering a contribution to address three interrelated questions:

First, what are the distinctive features that characterize “evolution studies” within the theory of the firm?

Secondly, what similarities and dissimilarities are emerging when we observe firms and biological systems?

Thirdly, how do firms *adapt*? What is the importance of voluntarism in the management and governance of the firm? What is the role of environmental determinism?

Papers focusing on the conceptual and/or empirical research addressing these questions are invited and welcome.

Keywords: adaptation, Darwinism, decision making, evolution.