

FOR OUR ENGLISH-SPEAKING READERS

OVERLOOKED...

[“Intermediate places” between creation and diffusion in French theater: A theatrical stunt or a tenable model?](#)

Julia Parigot, Institut Supérieur de Gestion.

Diffusion predominates over creation in the value chain of French theater. To redress this situation, a new type of organization is emerging: “intermediate places”, which cut creation free from diffusion and its constraints. What are the characteristics of this new model for theater? What issues must it address? By assembling all means around creation, these places modify the sources of funding and related practices. However the difficulties they encounter raise the question of whether they will last.

TRIAL BY FACT

[Enabling firms to develop in a corrupting environment: The cases of China and India](#)

Paul Labic & Pierre Memheld, Strasbourg University.

A new approach is proposed to this phenomenon for Western firms that want to move into the Chinese and Indian markets. After a review of the literature, the factors abetting corruption, despite its many forms, are classified as internal/external or organizational/individual. Although several studies have concentrated on internal factors, the external ones have often been underestimated. External factors — shown to be dominant in China and India — are described, in particular their effects on decision-making processes in these two countries. Focus is then shifted to the cultural and sociological constituents of the organization of each of these two societies: how to take them into account? By analyzing how corruption operates, this phenomenon can be described as a method for siphoning value. The solutions proposed (specific to the country) open the possibility of siphoning value by developing activities that are secondary to the firm’s core business but that comply with ethics and the law and that protect work teams.

IN QUEST OF A THEORY

[Research in finance: When performativity leads to reflexivity](#)

Hélène Rainelli-Weiss, IGR-IAE, Rennes 1 University.

To assess the impact of research in finance over the past sixty years, how to measure the effect of theories on practices, on the financial industry’s growth and,

too, on the social norms and institutional arrangements that organize the realm of finance? This article’s principal contribution is to insist on the role of theory in the social construction of finance and on the necessity for financial theory to stop neglecting its performative effects. Research will thus have a more ambitious position in debates on the social utility of finance and will suggest novel perspectives, in particular for regulations in this realm.

OTHER TIMES, OTHER PLACES

[Is there a Hawthorne effect?](#)

François Geoffroy, CRIISEA (EA 4286), IAE Amiens.

The experiments conducted by Elton Mayo and his team from Harvard at Western Electric’s Hawthorne factory led to the formulation of the well-known “Hawthorne effect”: the attentive attitude of the staff motivated wage-earners’ behaviors. However more and more studies have questioned these findings and conclusions. This critical, historical reinterpretation of these experiments is based on a review of the literature in several disciplines.


[From paternalism to “patronhumanism”](#)

Amélie Villeger, CEREGE (Centre de Recherche en Gestion), Poitiers University

Whether in the popular press or academic literature, paternalism is often presented like a pernicious, backward form of governance. On the basis of two antagonisms that underlie it, a less Manichean approach is proposed. In the original form of paternalism, traditionalism turned out to be at the service of progressivism. Afterwards, torn between the need to organize the relationship of subordination in work and the fair recognition of the rights and freedoms of everyone, paternalism evolved toward a new equilibrium, a neopaternalism that, described as “patronhumanism”, was strongly influenced by humanist values.

 [For a genealogy of paternalism](#)

Reply from **Pierre Messulam**.

 [On paternalism: A small critique of an approach that is too doctrinal and culturalistic](#)

Reply from **Hervé Dumez**.

MOSAICS

Pierre Messulam: On Elizabeth Currid-Halkett's *The Sum of Small Things, a Theory of the Aspirational Class* (Princeton: Princeton Press, 2017).

Jean-Marc Weller: On Jérôme Denis' *Le travail invisible des données. Éléments pour une sociologie des infrastructures scripturales* (Paris: Presses des Mines, 2018).

Antoine Masingue: Management — Is the comedy over? On Nicolas Bouzou & Julia de Funès's *La Comédie (in)humaine* (Paris: Éditions de l'Observatoire, 2018).

Matthieu Battistelli: A firm with a mission: A model of governance for innovation. On Kevin Levillain' *Les entreprises à mission – un modèle de gouvernance pour l'innovation* (Paris: Vuibert, 2017).

Jacques Sarrazin: On Jean-Paul Bailly's *Réformez! Par le dialogue et la confiance* (Paris: Éditions Descartes & Cie, 2016)