



Review

Microfoundations of institutions: A matter of structure vs. agency or level of analysis?

Journal:	<i>Academy of Management Review</i>
Manuscript ID	AMR-2018-0080-Dialogue
Manuscript Type:	Dialogue
Theoretical Perspectives:	Institutional theory, Microfoundations of strategy, Philosophy of science and/or sociology of knowledge
Topic Areas:	Institutional Entrepreneurship < Entrepreneurship, Social construction of organizational phenomena < Managerial and Organizational Cognition, Change and Inertia < Organization and Management theory
Abstract:	

1
2
3
4
5 **Microfoundations of institutions:**
6 **A matter of structure vs. agency or level of analysis?**
7
8
9

10
11 **Derek J Harmon**
12 Ross School of Business
13 University of Michigan
14

15 **Patrick Haack**
16 HEC Lausanne
17 University of Lausanne
18

19 **Thomas J Roulet**
20 Judge Business School
21 University of Cambridge
22
23

24
25 Dialogue paper in response to:
26 Cardinale, I. 2018. Beyond constraining and enabling: Toward new microfoundations for
27 institutional theory. *Academy of Management Review*, 43, 132-155.
28
29

30 Forthcoming at the *Academy of Management Review*
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Microfoundations of institutions:

A matter of structure vs. agency or level of analysis?

In his recent paper, Cardinale (2018) seeks to advance a new microfoundations of institutions by reformulating two assumptions underlying the structure vs. agency debate—that structure constrains and enables action and that agency is mostly associated with reflexivity—which he argues have been hindering the field’s ability to make substantive theoretical progress. While an intriguing proposition, we argue that equating the microfoundations of institutions with the structure vs. agency dichotomy produces two problems that limit our advancement of this stream of work. First, it leads to the mistaken assumption that the best way to advance our theorizing is to provide another solution to the paradox of embedded agency. Second, it also leads to the mistaken assumption that, by the “micro” in microfoundations, we are rigidly focusing on the role of individuals in institutional processes. We outline the strengths of Cardinale’s argument and then argue that a focus on levels of analysis, which is backgrounded in Cardinale’s theorizing, would serve as a more promising platform upon which to advance our understanding of the microfoundations of institutions.

Starting with structure vs. agency

Cardinale’s two major reformulations to the structure-agency debate are to claim that structure not only constrains and enables action but also “orients” action towards certain possibilities, and that agency is not only reflective but can also be pre-reflective in nature. To make these claims, Cardinale draws on a practice perspective lens (Smets, Aristidou, & Whittington, 2017) so that he can conceptualize social structure as social positions and habitus. Conceptualizing social structure in this manner, instead of as more macro constructs (e.g., logics, fields, complexity, etc.), is an important theoretical move for Cardinale. In particular, it allows him to explain that social structure does not influence individual behavior in an automatic or mindless fashion, which more macro structural concepts are often accused

1
2 of doing, but rather, in an orienting and pre-reflective fashion that is guided by our historical
3
4 positioning and habitus. We find this point insightful insofar as it provides one reasonable
5
6 solution to the paradox of embedded agency (Battilana & D'Aunno, 2009; Garud, Hardy, &
7
8 Maguire, 2007). By defining social structure as social positions or habitus, Cardinale is able to
9
10 critique the oversimplified parallel sometimes made between structure only producing
11
12 mindless individual behavior, and individuals shaping structure only in a deliberate fashion.
13
14 Yet, does it move us towards a new microfoundations of institutional theory?
15
16

17 **What are microfoundations?**

18
19 From our point of view, a microfoundational approach to institutions seeks to explain
20
21 the recursive relationships between macro-level phenomena through some lower level of
22
23 analysis. This is often referred to as the “bathtub model” of Coleman (1986), which outlines
24
25 the basic principles of methodological individualist approach to social action (Felin, Foss, &
26
27 Ployhart, 2015). According to the more stringent forms of this approach, all macro
28
29 phenomena are really just aggregated forms of individual-level behavior. However, our view
30
31 is less stringent and consistent with more sympathetic forms of methodological individualism
32
33 (Udehn, 2002) that acknowledge two important complexities overlooked by the traditional
34
35 “bathtub model.” The first is that there are more than two levels of analysis beyond the social
36
37 system and the individual (e.g., organization, group, etc.). The second, by extension of the
38
39 first, is that the lower levels of analysis do not require us to mean individuals per se. In our
40
41 view, it follows from this that the basis for a microfoundations of institutions should start,
42
43 first and foremost, with a focus on levels of analysis.
44
45
46

47 Note, however, that this statement is not antithetical to the structure-agency debate. In
48
49 fact, the traditional mapping of macro-structure and micro-agency, which has pervaded the
50
51 institutional discussions on microfoundations for some time now (Emirbayer & Mische,
52
53 1998), often directly links the two traditional levels of analysis with the structure-agency
54
55 dichotomy. However, to take this mapping and conclude that examining how macro levels of
56
57
58
59
60

1
2 analysis shape micro levels of analysis (and vice versa) is identical to examining how
3
4 structure shapes agency (and vice versa) overlooks the fact that this traditional one-to-one
5
6 mapping often does not hold. For instance, there are more micro-level instantiations of social
7
8 structure (e.g., social positions, habitus, routines, etc.) that are clearly embedded within social
9
10 structures at a higher level of analysis. Similarly, there are also macro-level instantiations of
11
12 agency (e.g., collective action, social movements, crowdsourcing, etc.) that some contend are
13
14 not simply the aggregation of individual-level behavior (Jepperson & Meyer, 2011). As a
15
16 result, actors can “pull down” structural elements for their actions, and local practices can
17
18 “build up” into structure (Powell & Rerup, 2017). The notion of macro and micro is thus
19
20 distinct from structure and agency.
21
22

23
24 Yet while this traditional mapping of macro-structure and micro-agency does not
25
26 always hold, we want to be clear that both distinctions seem to always be simultaneously
27
28 present in our institutional analyses and both require serious consideration. However, we
29
30 suggest that the key question is which to prioritize in our theorizing. Since they do not
31
32 perfectly map onto one another and, therefore, highlight important yet nevertheless different
33
34 considerations, we contend that prioritizing one over the other may lead to very different
35
36 assumptions of what matters when developing the microfoundations of institutions. For
37
38 instance, to foreground structure vs. agency means that we implicitly prioritize the puzzle of
39
40 embedded agency, which, by extension, leads us to conceptualize the “micro” in
41
42 microfoundations as individuals. What would foregrounding levels of analysis instead mean?
43
44

45 **Starting with levels of analysis**

46
47 To foreground levels of analysis shifts the focus away from the problem of embedded
48
49 agency, and back towards the core aim of microfoundational research—that is, explaining the
50
51 causal and recursive relationships between macro-level phenomena through phenomena at
52
53 lower levels of analysis. A number of institutional scholars already contribute to this line of
54
55 reasoning, implicitly prioritizing levels of analysis over the structure-agency dichotomy. For
56
57
58
59
60

1
2 example, some have focused on how macro-level meanings, like institutional logics, make
3
4 their way into micro-level thinking (Glaser, Fast, Harmon, & Green Jr, 2016) and decision-
5
6 making (McPherson & Sauder, 2013). Others have looked at how micro-level behaviors and
7
8 interactions can build up to change or further maintain meso- and macro-level meanings
9
10 (Cornelissen, Durand, Fiss, Lammers, & Vaara, 2015; Zucker, 1977). By focusing on the
11
12 complexities and interrelationships across multiple levels of analysis, we believe this provides
13
14 a more direct explanation to how macro-level institutional meanings persist or change over time.
15
16

17
18 Foregrounding levels of analysis also removes the requirement that by the “micro” in
19
20 microfoundations, we are referring only to individuals. When considering the nested nature of
21
22 institutions (Friedland & Alford, 1991), everything is micro to something and macro to
23
24 something else. An individual’s values are micro to routines, even more micro to logics, but
25
26 macro to emerging research on the neuroscience of decision-making (Laureiro-Martínez,
27
28 Brusoni, Canessa, & Zollo, 2015). Removing our presumption that individuals are the only
29
30 conceptualization of micro, therefore, frees up our theorizing and enables us to consider the
31
32 deeper complexities of the multi-layered nature of institutions. For instance, not every macro-
33
34 institutional outcome requires or, for that matter, has an individual-level explanation. Indeed,
35
36 some macro-institutional outcomes may be explained by group-level behavior, making it not
37
38 just unnecessary but theoretically inappropriate to treat the micro-level of analysis in such a
39
40 study as another other than the group (Jepperson & Meyer, 2011) or the organization as an
41
42 actor *sui generis* (King, Felin, & Whetten, 2010).
43
44

45
46 From this point of view, while Cardinale does not directly acknowledge the
47
48 importance of levels of analysis, what we find intriguing about his study is that he
49
50 nevertheless introduces social positioning and habitus as crucial “meso” levels of analysis that
51
52 mediate more macro structures and micro-level behavior. In fact, microfoundational research
53
54 often skips over these intermediate levels of analysis, conceptualizing social structure only as
55
56 logics or fields (Thornton, Ocasio, & Lounsbury, 2012). We think that bringing social
57
58
59
60

1
2 structure down to a meso-level is an insightful and potentially useful observation in that it
3
4 suggests that social positions and habitus might function as a refracting, intermediate level
5
6 between more macro meanings and micro behaviors. However, by not further developing the
7
8 implications of this insight and, instead, trying to resolve the structure vs. agency debate, we
9
10 believe that Cardinale misunderstands the very essence of microfoundational research.
11
12 Indeed, it is our contention that the most promising platform upon which to advance our
13
14 understanding of the microfoundations of institutions is an explicit focus on how social action
15
16 operates across multiple levels of analysis.
17
18

19 20 **References**

- 21 Battilana, J., & D'Aunno, T. 2009. Institutional work and the paradox of embedded agency.
22
23 *Institutional Work: Actors and Agency in Institutional Studies of Organizations*,
24
25 31–58.
26
27
28 Cardinale, I. 2018. Beyond Constraining and Enabling: Toward New Microfoundations for
29
30 Institutional Theory. *Academy of Management Review*, 43(1): 132–155.
31
32 Coleman, J. S. 1986. Social theory, social research, and a theory of action. *American Journal*
33
34 *of Sociology*, 1309–1335.
35
36
37 Cornelissen, J. P., Durand, R., Fiss, P. C., Lammers, J. C., & Vaara, E. 2015. Putting
38
39 Communication Front and Center in Institutional Theory and Analysis. *Academy of*
40
41 *Management Review*, 40(1): 10–27.
42
43 Emirbayer, M., & Mische, A. 1998. What is agency? *American Journal of Sociology*, 103(4):
44
45 962–1023.
46
47 Felin, T., Foss, N. J., & Ployhart, R. E. 2015. The microfoundations movement in strategy and
48
49 organization theory. *The Academy of Management Annals*, 9(1): 575–632.
50
51 Friedland, R., & Alford, R. R. 1991. Bringing society back in: Symbols, practices and
52
53 institutional contradictions. *The new institutionalism in organizational analysis*
54
55 (Walter W. Powell and Paul J. DiMaggio (eds.)): 232–263.
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2 Garud, R., Hardy, C., & Maguire, S. 2007. Institutional entrepreneurship as embedded
3
4 agency: An introduction to the special issue. *Organization Studies*, 28(7): 957.
5
6
7 Glaser, V. L., Fast, N. J., Harmon, D. J., & Green Jr, S. E. 2016. Institutional frame
8
9 switching: How institutional logics shape individual action. *How Institutions Matter!*
10
11 35–69. Emerald Group Publishing Limited.
12
13 Jepperson, R., & Meyer, J. W. 2011. Multiple levels of analysis and the limitations of
14
15 methodological individualisms. *Sociological Theory*, 29(1): 54–73.
16
17 King, B. G., Felin, T., & Whetten, D. A. 2010. Perspective—Finding the organization in
18
19 organizational theory: A meta-theory of the organization as a social actor.
20
21 *Organization Science*, 21(1): 290–305.
22
23
24 Laureiro-Martínez, D., Brusoni, S., Canessa, N., & Zollo, M. 2015. Understanding the
25
26 exploration–exploitation dilemma: An fMRI study of attention control and decision-
27
28 making performance. *Strategic Management Journal*, 36(3): 319–338.
29
30 McPherson, C. M., & Sauder, M. 2013. Logics in Action Managing Institutional Complexity
31
32 in a Drug Court. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 58(2): 165-196.
33
34
35 Powell, W. W., & Rerup, C. 2017. Opening the Black Box: The Microfoundations of
36
37 Institutions. In R. Greenwood, C. Oliver, T. B. Lawrence, & R. E. Meyer (Eds.). *The*
38
39 *SAGE Handbook of Organizational Institutionalism* (2nd edition). Thousand Oaks:
40
41 Sage.
42
43 Smets, M., Aristidou, A., & Whittington, R. 2017. *Towards a practice-driven*
44
45 *institutionalism*. In R. Greenwood, C. Oliver, T. B. Lawrence, & R. E. Meyer (Eds.).
46
47 *The SAGE Handbook of Organizational Institutionalism* (2nd edition). Thousand
48
49 Oaks: Sage.
50
51
52 Thornton, P. H., Ocasio, W., & Lounsbury, M. 2012. *The institutional logics perspective: A*
53
54 *new approach to culture, structure, and process*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2 Udehn, L. 2002. The changing face of methodological individualism. *Annual Review of*
3
4 *Sociology*, 28(1): 479–507.
5

6 Zucker, L. G. 1977. The role of institutionalization in cultural persistence. *American*
7
8 *Sociological Review*, 42(5): 726–743.
9

10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60