Organizational Learning and Human Capital: Similarities, Tensions and a Research Proposal

Abstract

We apply a formal model to understand the effects of the relative learning rates of embedded agents and the institutional field on organizational outcomes.

Organizational Learning and Human Capital: Similarities, Tensions & a Research Proposal

Competitive advantage. Both Organizational learning and human capital have been suggested as being important toward developing competitive advantage of firms. Discuss the specific recommendations from each of the two literatures. Exploration and Exploitation, Absorptive Capacity. Firm Specific Human Capital.

At some level, it would seem that Human Capital and Organizational Learning are but part of the same system because it is the Human Capital within firms that . Organizational Learning literature stresses routines and history, which are by themselves anti-thetical to the notion of Human Capital as a driver of competitive advantage. We therefore have this situation

Prior literature has also pitted on against the other. Henderson2004?

Some of these salient similarities and differences to Table 1

Insert TABLE 1 about here.

There is an opportunity to bridge these two literatures and understand with greater nuance the two.

RESEARCH PROPOSAL

The tension that I wish to address in this study is the one between balancing exploration-exploitation and the one between general Human Capital (HC) and Firm Specific Human Capital (FSHC). Conflict - levels of analysis. OL literature assumes all human capital to be homogenous. If one were to accept that HC were heterogenous, and that Organizational Learning is driven by routines, then ...

Plot the 2x2 and suggest that there are costs and sources of profits in each of the quadrants. Discuss it, and suggest that the net effect is unclear. Talk about non-competes, reputations for enforcement etc - if they are in favor of employees then they are more likely to extract rents. Alternatively.

Product market - causal ambiguity of some sort.

Research Question

THEORY

On the topic of the general hypotheses

Figure **??** lays out the average score charts for four agent-field combinations while enforcing the field to start in Right of Center (this is the same as saying $p_{0,F}^0 = 0.75$).

Leading into H1a We do so since the scale is symmetric across the Center (C), any initial mapping

Hypothesis 1a: When the institutional field is open to influence, slow learning adversarial agents will raise overall performance higher than slow learning agents with a neutral orientation

Reference to Table 2

—————————————————

Insert TABLE 2 about here.

—————————————————

Leading into H2a This trend is confirmed further in Figure **??** where the learning rates of agents are increased even further to 'Fast'.

Hypothesis 2a: For the same initial outcome preferences, the overall performance score varies curvilinearly with difference in the rates of learning of the agent and the institutional field

Data and Method

What is the sample. Why is it chosen. How is it going to contribute. Semiconductor industry. Classify. Each of the boxes. Technology change and framework of labor laws as moderating variables. Argue that one is more than the other in the appropriate and therefore leading into the hypothesis. For every year 0 1. Exploration Exploitation - patents filed in that year. Have they been broad or narrow. Legal framework - change when there is a regulatory change. Like when Michigan.

Dependent Variable Firm outcome - Tobin's Q. Some form of market measure.

CONTRIBUTIONS

What do you contribute to each literature. Basically nuance. Adding framework of labor laws, routines, exploration-exploitation. For Organizational Learning, the role of FSHC and GHC.

LIMITATIONS

Suggest how this study may help inform the literatures that it is drawing from, and the interesting research avenues it will open up. Discuss level of generalizability.

SUMMARY

Recap and motivate interest in framework, in theoretical value as well as in the particular empirical setting.

LIMITATIONS AND FUTURE WORK

CONCLUSION

TABLE 1: Comparison of Organizational Learning and Human Capital Literatures

	Organizational Learning	**Human Capital**
Theoretical Tradition	Dynamic Capabilities, Evolutionary Perspectives	Resource Based View
Unit of Focus	Teams and Organizations	Individuals
Recommendations for Competitive Advantage	Theta	Beta
Primary Tensions	Theta	Beta
Tradition	Theta	Beta
Tradition	Theta	Beta
Tradition	Theta	Beta
Tradition	Theta	Beta

TABLE 2: Firm Profit Effects from Organizational Learning and Human Capital Characteristics

Organizational Learning

Human Capital (HC)		Explorative	Exploitative
	General HC	↑ **Schumpeterian Rent** ↓ **Rents to human capital**	↑ **Ricardian Rent** ↓ **Rents to human capital**
	Firm Specific HC	↑ **Schumpeterian Rent** ↑ **No rents to human capital**	↑ **Ricardian Rent** ↑ **No rents to human capital**