

Institutions and how to change them

Syllabus

24th June 2021

Instructor's contact information:	Course information
Name: Sarri Nykänen	Location: Online
Email: Sarri.nykanen@aalto.fi	Language of the course: English
Office hours: by appointment	Credits: 3 + 2
	Schedule: 3-credit module in June, Completion of additional 2-credit module by end of August
	Grading: 1 to 5

Table of Contents

1) Overview	2
2) Pre-requisites	3
3) Learning objectives	3
4) Assessment and grading	3
5) Course structure and assignment instructions:	4
A) Read articles	4
B) Group discussion on articles (30% of grade) (only in the 3-credit module)	5
C) Discussion forum (10% of grade in both modules)	7
D) Individual essays (60% of grade in the 3-credit module, 90% of grade in the additional 2-credit module)	7
6) Course units and readings	9
A) The 3-credit module in June	9
Unit 1: Introduction to institutions and institutional theory	9
Unit 2: Shareholders, stakeholders, and corporate control	11
Unit 3: Sociotechnical institutions: Bias in AI and algorithms	12
Unit 4: Sustainability institutions: Reporting, certification, blockchain tracing, and GHG accounting scopes	13
B) The additional 2-credit module that can be completed at an independent pace by the end of August	15
Unit 5: Framing	15
Unit 6: Free spaces	16
Unit 7: Institutional work: Boundaries, practices, and temporality	17
Unit 8: Resources and coalition building	18
7) Course schedule	19
8) Course workload	20
9) Recommended readings for the inquisitive who want to learn more about related topics after the course (not a part of the course readings)	21

1) Overview

If you ask “Why is this thing done the way it is?” and somebody answers along the lines of “Because it has always been done this way, this is the way it is done, and it will always be this way.”, very probably, you are dealing with an institutionalized practice. Institutions are social structures that are generally taken for granted, such as norms, industry practices, organizational forms, status hierarchies and laws. At their best, institutionalized structures might embed social learning, meaning that they automate wisdom acquired by others. Yet, often, things are done as they are not because it is the most efficient or objectively best way but because it is considered “normal”.

These assumptions often become major barriers for changing organizational practices, industry practices, divisions of roles, and the effects of businesses on society and society on businesses. Institutional theory and research on institutional change seeks to understand how we can change wide-spread taken-for-granted and shared assumptions, practices and norms, and foster the emergence of new institutions.

During the 3-credit course in June, we will start with an introduction of institutions and institutional theory. Then, we review the long-standing debate of whether the purpose of a company is to serve its shareholders or stakeholders. We learn how algorithms and AI have become sociotechnical institutions that shape our daily lives and why they can be so prone to bias. In the last unit of the 3-credit course, we learn about the emergence and development of the sustainability institutions.

In an additional 2 credit part of the course, we discuss theories on changing institutions. Firstly, we discuss framing strategies. Next, we learn how and why to organize free spaces to change wider institutional arrangements, how actors can work on organizational boundaries and practices to reshape industries and organizational fields, and how you can utilize and shape perceptions of time to promote a new institutional order. Finally, we also discuss the role of resources in exerting institutional influence and how coalitions form and acquire resources.

The course is structured into a 3-credit module (in June) and a 2-credit module (completion by end of August). The June 3 credit module has 4 units that each last one week. The course follows the inverted classroom method. In each unit, you will first read the course materials independently. Next, you discuss the articles in a small group of 3 to 5 students and submit a group report of your discussion. Third, you post an individual

question and answer to the discussion forum of the unit. Finally, you write an individual essay on the unit article(s).

The additional 2-credit module of the course can be completed at an independent pace by the end of August. It consists of 4 units. In each unit, you read the course material, post a question and answer on the discussion forum of the unit, and then write a short individual essay on the unit article(s).

2) Pre-requisites

The course is intended for Master level students and students close to finishing their Bachelor degree.

3) Learning objectives

- Ability to recognize how taken-for-granted institutions shape organizational, industry, economic, and social activity
- Awareness and understanding of reasons and solutions of AI and algorithmic bias
- Ability to recognize, understand and apply many of the existing explanations for how institutional arrangements can be altered: framing strategies, constructing free spaces, working with boundaries, practices, and perceptions of time, and mobilizing resources and building advocacy coalitions.
- Gain access to an improved cognitive and strategic toolset for shaping organizational or industry practices and better ability to partake in the processes that change institutions
- Improve skills in working with academic articles and writing structured and evidence-based essays

4) Assessment and grading

The course is graded on a 1 to 5 range.

Module	3-credit module in June:	Additional 2-credit module independently by end of August
Grading	Group discussions and reports: 30%	Individual essays: 90%

	MyCourses discussion forum: 10% Individual essays: 60%	MyCourses discussion forum: 10%
Submission cycle	Weekly submission of group report and individual essay by Friday. Weekly discussion forum questions by Wednesday.	Submission of all essays by end of August. Weekly discussion forum questions by Wednesdays in August.
Recommended schedule	Mon – Tue: Read articles Wed: Group discussion + finalize group report + post individual question to discussion forum Thu – Fri: Write individual essay	Start working on the essays at the beginning of August and don't do everything in the final week. Wednesdays: Post questions and answers to discussion forum

The grading of course submissions will be anonymous. Therefore, please do not write your names or student ids on the submission documents. MyCourses will know whose submission it is. If possible, please also use the same formatting in all submissions to ensure anonymity: Calibri font, 12 pt, and 1.5 spaces between lines. Both group reports and individual essays are submitted through Turnitin to check for instances of plagiarism. For late submissions, 1 point will be deducted.

5) Course structure and assignment instructions:

A) Read articles

Each unit contains a list of readings and a specification of what articles are to be read fully, if you are supposed to read only one article of the provided alternatives, when you only need to read highlighted parts for the purpose of the course, and which readings are voluntary. In order to save the time of students but also ensure a variety of perspectives, sometimes you only need to read the highlighted parts of the articles. The selected parts are chosen based on what is relevant for the learning objectives of the course and the units and sufficient as material for the group discussion and essay assignments. The voluntary articles are there to enable the curious. You do not need to read to the voluntary readings to get full points for the assignments.

As a voluntary, helpful tool to make notes and summarize the academic articles, I suggest using an excel sheet where you record the following information in a table:

- Authors
- Year
- Journal
- Title
- Abstract
- Type (eg. Review article, empirical paper, book chapter ...)
- Research question
- Empirical material / data
- Independent variables / causal factor of interest
- Dependent variable / outcome of interest
- Key findings
- Own learnings. How did this change my understanding?
- Other notes

This is a shortened version of an approach generally used by researchers. An attached excel template contains both the shortened version and a longer version of this summarizing tool. Using the template is voluntary. I recommend it because it tends to make working with articles easier and may also be a helpful tool in later courses or theses. The purpose of making notes in this template is to pay attention to essential aspects of the articles' arguments, to summarize key points of articles in a structured way, and to have an easier time revisiting and referencing articles read earlier. Feel free to adjust the elements of the excel sheet summary to suit your preferences.

B) Group discussion on articles (30% of grade) (only in the 3-credit module)

In the group discussion, you will discuss the articles in groups of 3 to 5 students and submit a written summary as a group discussion report. The groups are randomly assigned. The purpose of the group discussion is to promote learning. At the beginning of each meeting, assign the following roles. The chairperson assigns speaking turns and makes sure that everybody gets to share their views. The secretary makes notes of the meeting so that it will be easier to write the discussion report. Rotate the roles every meeting.

People tend to retain information they discuss in conversation a lot better than of the information they read. This part of the course seeks to promote learning, exploration and

development as opposed to performing and demonstrating already existing skills and knowledge. Thus, you get points for demonstrating effort, for exploring the unknown and uncertain, and for discussing issues you do not understand yet, as long as you elaborate on your thought processes. For example, “We did not understand what x meant or whether it would apply to y. Therefore, we discussed it from the perspectives a, b, and c. According to a, this would happen. [...] We also wondered about how d works.”

Guiding questions for the discussion (discuss some or all points):

- What are the key takeaways from the article(s)?
- What did you learn? How did your understanding of something change?
- What do you not understand?
- What questions do the articles raise?
- How would you apply the implications of an article to a practical context?
- How does the article apply or relate to a contemporary phenomenon?
- Are there claims or assumptions in the articles that you disagree with?

General rules of constructive discussion apply. Listen to each other, be respectful, make sure everybody gets to share their views, build on top of each other’s comments, and give affirmative recognition when others make good points.

The intended length of each discussion is 1,5 hours. The intended length of the report is 1 to 2 pages. With Calibri font, 12 pt, and 1.5 spaces between lines, 2 pages corresponds to about 800 words. Group reports are graded on a scale of 1 to 3.

Points	Description
0	No submission or very incomplete.
1	Okay. Shows some effort, reflection, learning, or contemplation of different viewpoints.
2	Good. Shows moderate effort, reflection, learning, and/or contemplation of different viewpoints.
3	Excellent. Shows high effort, reflection, learning and contemplation of different viewpoints.

The grading of the group discussion reports is anonymous. Therefore, state the names of the group members present in the discussion in another document that you upload

separately. The discussion group report is graded equally for all participants of the discussion. To mitigate the risk of free-riding, group members will rate each other's participation in the discussions at the end of the course.

Given that this is a voluntary summer course, if the number of participants is too low for well-functioning discussion groups, the individual essays will be a bit longer and weigh more in the grade.

C) Discussion forum (10% of grade in both modules)

Each unit has an active discussion forum, where students ask questions and both the course instructor and students answer student questions. The purpose of the discussion forum is to promote learning. You get 1 point for asking a relevant question. You also get 1 point for answering a question asked by another student. The questions or answers are due on Wednesdays the following week. You can also answer questions that have already been answered by someone else but be sure to add something to the discussion.

The discussion forum is the only part of the course that is not graded anonymously because MyCourses does not allow to hide student identifiers in this type of exercise.

Description	Points (2 point maximum per unit)
Relevant question about the unit topic or materials	1
Partial answer to student question	0.5
Full answer to student question	1

D) Individual essays (60% of grade in the 3-credit module, 90% of grade in the additional 2-credit module)

Each round, you write an individual essay on the articles. The following guiding questions are in a sequence of increasing difficulty, from summarizing to analysis, synthesis, and argumentation. An ideal essay would progress through the sequence, or something similar, and spend most time on the more advanced levels of synthesis and argumentation. The purpose of the guiding questions is to help you get started with writing the essay. You can structure your essay differently if you prefer. If writing essays is very difficult for you for a good reason, such as dyslexia, you can discuss with the course

instructor if you can give an individual presentation to the course instructor instead of writing an essay.

Guiding questions for individual essays:

- summarize each article in a short paragraph
- give a short example that illustrates the issue / idea / situation / problem highlighted by / implication etc of the article
- compare the unit articles and relate them to each other (or compare one unit article to an article of a previous unit or other unit material). What do they have in common and what differentiates them? Do they agree with each other? Are they interested in the same things?
- free reflection on whatever you find interesting, such as what you learned or how you would like to apply the ideas of the article
- what emerges when you combine the articles and materials of the unit? (= synthesis)
- what is your take on the topic(s)? Make motivated, evidenced, and structured arguments.

The grading of the essays follows the Structure of the Observed Learning Outcome (SOLO) criteria. The intended length of the essay is 1 to 2 pages in the June 3-credit module. With Calibri font, 12 pt, and 1.5 spaces between lines, 2 pages corresponds to about 800 words. The essays can be a bit shorter in the August 2-credit module: 1 to 1,5 pages.

Solo level	Description	Illustrative example of responses to the question "What is a cow?" *	Corresponding grade
1	Pre-structural. No understanding, uses irrelevant information or misses the point altogether.	"Ääh"	0, 1
2	Uni-structural level. Can identify, do a procedure, or recite.	"A cow is when you are milking."	2
3	Multi-structural level. Can classify, combine, and enumerate.	"Cows give us milk and when slaughtered they give us oil, meat, fat, bone and leather."	3

4	Relational level. Can relate, compare, and analyse.	“The essential difference between a Jersey cow and a Hereford Angus cow is that a Jersey cow produces a lot more milk but is substantially smaller.”	4
5	Extended abstract level. Can generalize, hypothesise, and theorise.	“Cattle, or cows, are domesticated ungulates, a member of the subfamily Bovinae. It seems to me that humans must have been the root cause for the diversification of cattle because they were selected for different genetic characteristics, like draft, milk, meat, size, colour, and behaviour, to name a few.”	5

* The example is taken from the video Teaching teaching and understanding understanding by Claus Brabrand and is based on the "Constructive Alignment" theory developed by Prof. John Biggs.

6) Course units and readings

A) The 3-credit module in June

Unit 1. Introduction to institutions and institutional theory

The first unit is an introduction to institutional theory. The purpose of the unit is to form an initial understanding of what institutions are and how novel things can be institutionalized, meaning that they become widespread on a societal level and are considered “normal”

Start the unit by watching the introductory video "What are institutions and institutionalization" or read its text version.

Next, you select one of the two academic articles and read it fully: either DiMaggio & Powell (1983) or Scott (2014). In this unit, you coordinate with your group who reads what so that not everyone reads the same article (everyone reads either DiMaggio & Powell, 1983 or Scott, 2014). In the group discussion of this unit, your task is to explain your article or book chapter to group members that have not read the same article. When more than one person has read the same article, you augment each other’s explanations. Also, discuss some or all of the general guiding questions for group discussion that are listed in the course syllabus.

The first is an article on how organizations may become more similar with each other not because it is technically justified but because they mimick each other (DiMaggio & Powell, 1983). The second is a book chapter on the how institutions are enforced (Scott, 2014).

In addition, the unit material includes a voluntary reading for the inquisitive. It gives an example of an institution that does not yet exist but might be formed in the future: data trusts (Ruhaak, 24.2.2021).

Article (academic, media or other)	Why this article / what part of the article
DiMaggio, P. J., & Powell, W. W. (1983). The iron cage revisited: Institutional isomorphism and collective rationality in organizational fields. <i>American Sociological Review</i> , 147-160.	Conceptual article on how organizations become more similar with each other. It is a classic. Choose one of the two academic readings. Read the full article. (13 pages)
Scott, W. R. (2014). <i>Institutions and organizations: Ideas, interests, and identities</i> . Sage publications. Pages 56-70. The first edition was published in 1995.	The three pillars framework of Scott is a classic. It describes how institutions are upheld by a regulative pillar, a normative pillar, and a cultural-cognitive pillar. Choose one of the two academic readings. Start reading from the part “Defining institutions” on page 56 and read until page 70 to the end of the part on the cultural-cognitive pillar. (13 pages)
Ruhaak, Anouk (24.2.2021) How data trusts can protect privacy. <i>MIT technology review</i> . https://www.technologyreview.com/2021/02/24/1017801/data-trust-cybersecurity-big-tech-privacy/	Voluntary reading for reflection. Illustrative example of an institution that does not yet exist but might in the future: data trusts. (4 pages of text)

Unit 2. Shareholders, stakeholders, and corporate control

In Finland, it is generally taken for granted that the purpose of a company is to generate profit for its shareholders. Limited company law (osakeyhtiölaki) specifies this as the purpose (toiminnan tarkoitus) of limited companies (osakeyhtiö). Yet, different companies types, such as social enterprises or family companies, follow different principles and different countries follow varying norms. In this unit, we briefly review the evolution of the debate and institutional norms of corporate control, the role of shareholders, managers, employees, and other stakeholders. We read about the different perspectives on the topic, such as fiduciary duty and social responsibility.

This unit includes three articles on corporate control to ensure a diversity of perspectives. But for the sake of saving time, I have highlighted the parts that are essential for the purpose of this unit and you do not have to read more than that to reach full points.

In addition, read or skim the pages 59 – 70 of Scott (2014) so that you understand the Table 3.1 “Three pillars of institutions”. The purpose of this article is to provide a theoretical framework for analysis. In the group discussion of this unit, your task is to identify elements of the three pillars of institutions in the other readings. Also, discuss some or all of the general guiding questions for group discussion that are listed in the course syllabus.

Article (academic, media or other)	Why this article / what part of the article
Kim, S., Karlesky, M. J., Myers, C. G., & Schifeling, T. (2016). Why companies are becoming B corporations. <i>Harvard Business Review</i> , 17, 2-5.	Read the full article. It is short. (4 pages)
Donaldson, T., & Preston, L. E. (1995). The stakeholder theory of the corporation: Concepts, evidence, and implications. <i>Academy of Management Review</i> , 20(1), 65-91.	You only have to read the parts highlighted in yellow. They are parts of the introduction, managerial implications, and conclusion. (7 pages highlighted)
Davis, G. F., & Thompson, T. A. (1994). A social movement perspective on corporate control. <i>Administrative Science Quarterly</i> , 39, 141-141.	Read only the highlighted parts. They are the abstract, introduction, a short part in between, and parts of the conclusion. (6 pages highlighted)

Company forms at https://www.infofinland.fi/en/living-in-finland/work-and-enterprise/starting-a-business/company-forms	A brief description of alternative company forms in Finland. (1 page)
Scott, W. R. (2014). <i>Institutions and organizations: Ideas, interests, and identities</i> . Sage publications. Pages 59-70. The first edition was published in 1995.	The purpose of this article is to provide a theoretical framework for analysis. The three pillars framework of Richard Scott is a classic. It describes how institutions are upheld by a regulative pillar, a normative pillar, and a cultural-cognitive pillar. (11 pages included) Read or skim the pages so that you understand the Table 3.1 “Three pillars of institutions”.
Sajari (8.12.2019). Posti-kiista herätti kysymyksen omistajaohjauksesta ja yhtiöiden hyvästä hallinnoinnista: professorit kertovat, mitä se on. <i>Helsingin sanomat</i> . https://www.hs.fi/talous/art-2000006336235.html	Voluntary news article for reflection, analysis and/or discussion. In Finnish.

Unit 3: Sociotechnical institutions: Bias in AI and algorithms

The influence of AI has become a powerful institutional force on society because algorithms reinforce and perpetuate existing structures or introduce new patterns with far-reaching consequences. Machine learning algorithms and AI are increasingly used in organizations. They make decisions that have important consequences for individuals, such as hiring and loan applications. AI learns from statistical co-occurrences in past data sets, which means that they are prone to perpetuate historical biases. In this unit, we learn about how and why this contemporary issue occurs and learn about some suggestions of how it might be solved.

In the group discussion of this unit, your primary task is to discuss some or all of the guiding questions that are listed in the course syllabus. Further, you can also use the Scott (2014) three pillars framework as a theoretical framework for analysis and identify elements of the pillars in the other readings. AI and algorithms have been included in this course because they constrain, enable and orient human behavior and actions, they can be widespread, have real consequences, are frequently taken for granted, and are made by humans. In the group discussion or your essay, you can, if you want to, also discuss whether AI and algorithms can be seen as a fourth technological pillar of institutions and what a fourth pillar would look like in Scott’s (2014) framework. There is no right answer to this question.

Article (academic, media or other)	Why this article / what part of the article
Morse, L., Teodorescu, M., Awwad, Y., & Kane, G. C. (2020). A Framework for Fairer Machine Learning in Organizations. Available at SSRN 3690570.	Very recent article presented at the AOM2020 conference that proposes solutions as well. Read the full article. (32 pages, double-spaced)
Z_ai (2020). Bias in artificial intelligence. <i>Towardsdatascience.com</i> . https://towardsdatascience.com/bias-in-artificial-intelligence-a3239ce316c9	Technology blog on bias in AI. Read the full blog post. (8 pages)
Dastin (2018). Amazon scraps secret AI recruiting tool that showed bias against women. <i>Reuters</i> . https://www.reuters.com/article/us-amazon-com-jobs-automation-insight-idUSKCN1MK08G	Illustrative example of issues caused by biased algorithms. Voluntary reading.
Scott, W. R. (2014). <i>Institutions and organizations: Ideas, interests, and identities</i> . Sage publications. Pages 59-70. The first edition was published in 1995.	Voluntary article as a theoretical framework for analysis or conceptual development of a four pillar theoretical framework.

Unit 4: Sustainability institutions: Reporting, certification, blockchain tracing, and GHG accounting scopes

In this unit, we discuss the development and institutionalization of sustainability norms, practices, and standards. Everybody reads an empirical article that describes how sustainability reporting became a norm in the 2000s (Etzion & Ferraro, 2010). It explains how using analogies can help establish new institutional arrangements. Also, it introduces the research field of institutional entrepreneurship, which studies how individuals and organizations change institutional arrangements.

In addition, everyone reads one of the three alternatives for discussion and reflection. Coordinate with your group who reads what so that not everyone studies the same material. In the group discussion, your task is to explain your reading to group members that have not read it. When more than one person has read the same reading, you augment each other's explanations. Also, discuss

some or all of the general guiding questions for group discussion that are listed in the course syllabus.

Here are the three alternatives. Firstly, for reflection and discussion of technology as an enabler, we read an explanation of how RFID tags and blockchain technology can be combined to improve traceability of supply chains (European Commission DG Environment News Alert Service, 13.6.2019). Second, for reflection and discussion, we review the definitions of greenhouse gas protocol scopes 1, 2, and 3 that are used for accounting the GHG emissions of companies and how the scopes have been developed (Greenhousegasprotocol.org, 2011). Thirdly, the material includes parts of an empirical case-study article about the evolution and plurality of sustainability standards in certification market in the coffee industry and how sustainability certification standards have both collaborated and competed with each other (Reinecke, Manning, and von Hagen, 2012). Supply chains have become global and multinational corporations can self-select national regulatory systems to some degree. Consequently, one might argue that the role of intergovernmental regulation and voluntary transnational governance systems has increased relative to national regulations.

Article (academic, media or other)	Why this article / what part of the article
Etzion, D., & Ferraro, F. (2010). The role of analogy in the institutionalization of sustainability reporting. <i>Organization Science</i> , 21(5), 1092-1107.	Empirical article on how the reporting of financial, environmental, and social aspects became a corporate norm in the 2000s. Read the full article. (15 pages)
"Science for Environment Policy": European Commission DG Environment News Alert Service. (13.6.2019, issue 527). Blockchain technology could improve traceability of wood through the supply chain. Based on Figorilli et al. (2018).	For reflection and discussion. Brief description of how a combination of RFID and Blockchain technology can influence sustainability certification. (2 pages)
Greenhousegasprotocol.org (2011). <i>Corporate value chain (Scope 3) standard</i> . https://ghgprotocol.org/sites/default/files/standards/Corporate-Value-Chain-Accounting-Reporting-Standard_041613_2.pdf	For reflection and discussion. In particular, Figur 1.1 <i>Overview of</i>

	<p><i>GHG Protocol scopes and emissions across the value chain</i> on page 5. Read or skim the Introduction section of the guide on pages 2 – 9. (7 pages in total)</p>
<p>Reinecke, J., Manning, S., & Von Hagen, O. (2012). The emergence of a standards market: Multiplicity of sustainability standards in the global coffee industry. <i>Organization studies</i>, 33(5-6), 791-814.</p>	<p>For reflection and discussion. Empirical article on the emergence of a plurality of sustainability certification standards. Read only the highlighted sections: introduction, transnational governance and competing standards, the multiplicity of sustainability standards, and the market for sustainable coffee. (3 pages.)</p>

B) The additional 2-credit module that can be completed at an independent pace by the end of August

Welcome to the second part of the course where we focus on how to change institutions.

Unit 5: Framing and discourse

When you take a picture, you can decide what is included within the frame, what parts are excluded, and what you focus on. Similarly, the way that decisions, initiatives, and issues are framed influences how they are perceived and how people respond. Framing contests are typical at the emergence of new institutional arrangements.

Discourses are collections of meaningful texts that influence how we talk about a topic (Phillips et al., 2004). Changing the discourse can change the institution.

In this unit, you will read either an empirical case-study article on the framing contest surrounding the emergence of an environmental standard in an automotive industry (Guérard et al., 2013) or a conceptual article how and when texts shape discourses that shape institutions (Phillips et al., 2004). We also read the introduction of a classic (Tversky & Kahneman, 1981) because it illustrates the effect of framing in an experiment.

In the essay, you can discuss the framing or discourse on an illustrative example of a topic that you find interesting. Also, discuss some or all of the general guiding questions for essays.

Article (academic, media or other)	Why this article / what part of the article
Guérard, S., Bode, C., & Gustafsson, R. (2013). Turning Point Mechanisms in a Dualistic Process Model of Institutional Emergence: The Case of the Diesel Particulate Filter in Germany. <i>Organization Studies</i> , 34(5-6), 781-822	Empirical article on how a social movement uses framing to introduce an environmental standard. You only have to read the highlighted parts of the article. Read either this article or the Phillips et al. (2004) article. (25 pages highlighted in total, 12 pages excluded)
Phillips, Nelson, Thomas B. Lawrence, and Cynthia Hardy. "Discourse and institutions." <i>Academy of management review</i> 29.4 (2004): 635-652.	Conceptual article on how and when texts shape discourses that shape institutions. Read the full article. Read either this article or the Guérard et al. (2013) article. (15 pages)
Tversky, A., & Kahneman, D. (1981). The framing of decisions and the psychology of choice. <i>science</i> , 211(4481), 453-458.	It is a classic. Read only the introduction, which is highlighted in yellow. (1 page highlighted)

Unit 6: Free spaces

Free spaces are collective, insulated, social spaces where restrictive insitutional rules do not apply or cannot be enforced. Individuals that would like to see some specific institutional arrangements changed can interact, organize and encourage each other in free spaces. Free spaces promote collective action and the emergence of new institutional arrangements.

Read the indicated sections of the empirical study (Rao & Dutta, 2012) and read at least two of the illustrative examples for reflection.

Article (academic, media or other)	Why this article / what part of the article
Rao, H., & Dutta, S. (2012). Free spaces as organizational weapons of the weak: Religious festivals and regimental mutinies in the 1857 Bengal Native Army. <i>Administrative Science Quarterly</i> , 57(4), 625-668.	Empirical article that shows the effect of free spaces on mobilization against institutional forces. Read through the abstract, introduction, and literature section “FREE SPACES AS ORGANIZATIONAL WEAPONS OF THE WEAK”, (p. 625 – 631), and discussion (p. 658 – 660). Skim through the sections from “The empirical setting and hypotheses”, “Methods”, and “Results”, (p. 631 – 658) and only read parts that seem essential.
Aalto Entrepreneurship Society (2020). About us. https://www.aaltoes.com/about-us	Illustrative example for reflection.
Zadrozny & Collins (5.1.2021). Violent threats ripple through far-right internet forums ahead of protest. <i>NBC news</i> . https://www.nbcnews.com/tech/internet/violent-threats-ripple-through-far-right-internet-forums-ahead-protest-n1252923	Illustrative example for reflection. News article on far-right online forums just before the US capitol storming on the 6 th January 2021.
Mäkelä (9.6.2018). Miksi lähes 30 000 naista haluaa olla osana uraverkoston? Ompeluseuran perustaja Milla Halme kertoo, miksi naisten omille verkostoille on tilausta. <i>Duunitori</i> . https://duunitori.fi/tyoelama/ompeluseura-upeaura	Illustrative example for reflection. In Finnish.
Calhoun-Brown, A. (2000). Upon this rock: The black church, nonviolence, and the civil rights movement. <i>PS: Political Science and Politics</i> , 33(2), 169-174.	Illustrative example for reflection. Skim through the article to get the general idea.

Unit 7: Institutional work and logics: Boundaries, practices, and temporality

Institutional work (Zietsma and Lawrence, 2010; Granqvist and Gustafsson, 2016) refers to purposive actions with which actors aim to change institutions. Institutional logics are systems of assumptions, values, beliefs, rules, and practices (Smets et al., 2012).

In this unit, you choose one of the three articles to read based on your preference. The first article is an empirical case-study on how change actors influenced industry practices and decision-making

boundaries to renew the British Columbia coastal forest industry, and how boundaries and practices influence each other (Zietsma and Lawrence, 2010). The second article is an empirical case-study of how change actors can use and alter perceptions of time, such as urgency, windows of opportunity, and temporal patterns, to change institutional arrangements (Granqvist and Gustafsson, 2016). The third article presents a bottom-up perspective on institutional change. It is a case study on the collision of two institutional logics of English and German law firms that led to the improvisational creation of new practices and, consequently, how the changes in everyday work led to the formation of a hybrid logic (Smets et al., 2012).

Article (academic, media or other)	Why this article / what part of the article
Zietsma, C., & Lawrence, T. B. (2010). Institutional Work in the Transformation of an Organizational Field: The Interplay of Boundary Work and Practice Work. <i>Administrative Science Quarterly</i> , 55(2), 189-221.	Choose one of the three articles and read it. The article studies how we can influence boundaries, eg. of organizations and who gets to make decisions, to change industry practices.
Granqvist, N., & Gustafsson, R. (2016). Temporal institutional work. <i>Academy of Management Journal</i> , 59(3), 1009-1035.	Choose one of the three articles and read it. The article studies how we can alter and use temporal perceptions to change institutional arrangements.
Smets, M., Morris, T. I. M., & Greenwood, R. (2012). From practice to field: A multilevel model of practice-driven institutional change. <i>Academy of Management Journal</i> , 55(4), 877-904.	Choose one of the three articles and read it. This article studies how improvisational changes in everyday practices can alter institutional logics.

Unit 8: Resources and coalition building

Generally, those with more resources, such as money, power, legitimacy, and human capital, tend to be in a better position to influence institutional arrangements. How then, can we acquire resources if we do not have them already? Larger coalitions also tend to have more influence than singular organizations or individuals. How then, can we build coalitions to join forces? As all units in this course, also this unit is only briefly touching upon wide streams of research.

The first article is an empirical, quantitative study on bricolage of resources (i.e. construction using whatever is at hand) in social enterprises (Desa, 2012). The second article is a literature review on how social movement coalitions form, and what factors influence their long-term survival and success (Van Dyke & Amos, 2017).

Article (academic, media or other)	Why this article / what part of the article
Desa, G. (2012). Resource mobilization in international social entrepreneurship: Bricolage as a mechanism of institutional transformation. <i>Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice</i> , 36(4), 727-751.	Read the full article. (18 pages)
Van Dyke, N., & Amos, B. (2017). Social movement coalitions: Formation, longevity, and success. <i>Sociology Compass</i> , 11(7), e12489.	Read the full article. (11 pages)

7) Course schedule

Summer course

3-credit module

June:

3-credit module with weekly group meetings and written submissions.

The first unit starts on Monday the 7th June.

Weekly submission deadlines for group reports and essays on Fridays: 11th June, 18th June, 25th June, and 2nd July.

Weekly discussion forum questions by Wednesdays: 9th June, 16th June, 23rd June, and 30th June.

Weekly discussion forum answers by Wednesdays: 16th June, 23rd June, 30th June, and 7th July.

July:

Course instructor is on holiday and does not answer messages.

You can already start to work on the 2-credit module if you prefer.

2-credit module

August:

Discussion forum questions by the 25th August.

Discussion forum answers by the 31st of August.

End of August: Final date to submit essays for the additional 2 credit module is on Tuesday the 31st of August.

8) Course workload

3-credit module

Reading syllabus and instructions	4 h
Reading articles (3h per full length article)	30 h
Coordination with group	2 h
Group discussions (1,5h per round)	6 h
Finalizing group reports after discussions (2 h per round)	8 h
Post question to discussion forum and answer student questions	4 h
Writing essays (5h per essay)	20 h
Something always takes more time than assumed (unknown unknowns)	7 h
Total	81 h
Credits (1 ECTS / 27 h)	3 credits

2-credit module

Reading syllabus and instructions	4 h
Reading articles (3h per full length article)	24 h
Post question to discussion forum and answer student questions	4 h
Writing essays (5h per essay)	20 h
Something always takes more time than assumed (unknown unknowns)	2 h
Total	54 h
Credits (1 ECTS / 27 h)	2 credits

9) Recommended readings for the inquisitive who want to learn more about related topics after the course (not a part of the course readings)

Joy, M. (2019). *Powerarchy: Understanding the Psychology of Oppression for Social Transformation*. Berrett-Koehler Publishers.

Engler, M., & Engler, P. (2016). This is an uprising: How non-violent revolt is shaping the 21st century. *Nation*.

Fry, H. (2018). *Hello World: How to be Human in the Age of the Machine*. Random House.

The MIT Technology Review <https://www.technologyreview.com/>