

## **The Contributions**

Here we provide an editor's assessment of each of the articles, sorted by the first author's last name. In the main text, we discuss how the authors leveraged the unique strengths of the experimental approach.

### **When Reflection Hurts: The Effect of Cognitive Processing Types on Organizational Adaptation to Discontinuous Change by Marlon Fernandes Rodrigues Alves, Vincenzo Vastola, Simone Vasconcelos Ribeiro Galina, and Maurizio Zollo**

In face of discontinuous change, such as disruptive innovation or environmental catastrophes, organizations must adapt to survive. Against this background, Alves and colleagues examine two types of cognitive processing, made famous in Daniel Kahneman's (2011) *Thinking Fast and Slow*, in adapting organizational routines to disruption. Counterintuitively, they find that type 1 processing is more effective than type 2 in highly ambiguous environments with limited, hard-to-verify information. This theory was tested in an experiment where managers, grouped in pairs, developed routines in a simulated game, then faced a discontinuous change rendering previous routines obsolete. The results indicate that type 1 processing led to faster and more efficient responses to discontinuous change than type 2. This was particularly true in highly ambiguous environments, while both types of processing performed similarly under low levels of ambiguity. The study contributes to our understanding of the nondeliberative aspect of organizational adaptation, highlighting the value of intuitive thinking over more effortful cognition, particularly in uncertain environments.

### **Microfoundations of Adaptive Search in Complex Tasks: The Role of Cognitive Abilities and Styles by Carsten Bergenholtz, Oana Vuculescu, and Ali Amidi**

Much has been written on exploration-exploitation, but despite the mounds of research, we still know little about how decisionmakers actually go about searching. Bergenholtz, Vuculescu, and Amidi turn a spotlight on the crucial role of cognitive abilities and styles. Weaving organizational theory with insights from neuroscience, they examine how search experience and task decomposition affect the ability of individuals to adapt their search strategies in complex tasks. People who pay more attention to details

are more likely to engage in local search, focusing on specific aspects of the problem. In contrast, those with high creativity are less likely to engage in local search, instead exploring more broadly. When it comes to cognitive abilities, searchers with strong executive functions (the ability to understand new problems, adapt to feedback, and persistently pursue goals) are more likely to engage in local search and less likely to switch strategies quickly after negative feedback. Interestingly, working memory did not much affect search strategies in this complex task setting. The study contributes to our understanding of how cognitive factors influence problem-solving strategies in complex tasks. It also suggests that managers can shape organizational search processes by considering these cognitive factors.

**Network Centralization and Collective Adaptability to a Shifting Environment by Ethan S. Bernstein, Jesse C. Shore, and Alice J. Jang**

Social networks have often been studied in situ, with surveys or records to elicit their structure, a structure then correlated with some measure of interest, like performance. Common as it may be, this approach introduces a host of challenges, from biased responses to correlation-not-causation outcomes. To complement the extent evidence, Bernstein, Shore, and Jang turned to experiments to study how communication network structure affects an organization's adaptability to a shifting environment. Previous studies have suggested that high network centralization (when communication is disproportionately channeled through few members) can hinder collective problem-solving by obstructing the integration of ideas. But this study proposes that it can be beneficial for adaptation to shifting circumstances. The results show that a more centralized communication network can facilitate the spread of novel solutions without getting stuck on an existing inferior solution. Contrary to popular belief, centralization can be beneficial for tasks requiring adaptation, as it promotes social learning while avoiding lock-in. The study also highlights the importance of ensuring two-way communication flow within organizations.

## **Organizing Entrepreneurial Teams: A Field Experiment on Autonomy over Choosing Teams and Ideas by Viktoria Boss, Linus Dahlander, Christoph Ihl, and Rajshri Jayaraman**

Many believe that autonomy improves the performance of entrepreneurs, but what does “autonomy” mean, exactly? Boss and associates conducted a field experiment with hundreds of students enrolled in an entrepreneurship course to examine the effect of autonomy on entrepreneurial team performance. They differentiated between two types of autonomy - autonomy to choose project ideas and autonomy to choose team members. It was found that teams with autonomy over choosing either ideas or team members outperformed teams that were assigned ideas and members. The effect of choosing ideas was stronger than choosing teams. However, teams granted full autonomy over both ideas and team members did not show a performance gain. This suggests that the two forms of autonomy are substitutes rather than complements. The results partially attribute the positive effects of choosing ideas or teams to a better match of ideas with team members’ interests and prior network contacts among team members. Overconfidence and complacency among teams with full autonomy were suggested as reasons for the performance drop. The findings have implications for research on organizational design, autonomy, and innovation, indicating that some autonomy can be beneficial—but full autonomy can lead to decreased performance.

## **Gender Differences in Responses to Competitive Organization? A Field Experiment on Differences Between STEM and Non-STEM Fields from an Internet-of-Things Platform by Kevin J. Boudreau and Nilam Kaushik**

The apparent aversion of women to competition has received much attention in the experimental economics literature (e.g., Gneezy et al. 2009; Niederle 2016; Niederle and Vesterlund 2007), and Boudreau and Kaushik set out to determine whether these findings generalize across the workforce. Using a field experiment, they investigate gender differences in responses to competitive organization in two settings. In non-STEM fields, results were consistent with the usual claims of gender differences, with non-STEM women participating significantly less frequently under competition. But in STEM fields, there were no gender differences in response to competition. Both STEM men and women were more

willing to participate under the collaboration regime. These results were consistent across various specifications, controls, and stratified analyses of 17 narrowly defined STEM subfields. Boudreau and Kaushik conclude that heterogeneity in competitiveness among women and men, particularly across fields, is more striking than population-wide gender differences. The findings suggest that working-age men and women in STEM fields might possess a more contingent willingness to work under either competitive or collaborative conditions, depending on the context. This research contributes to a better understanding of gender differences in competitiveness and its implications for organizational design and personnel management, particularly in the context of STEM fields.

**When Do Evaluators Publicly Express Their Legitimacy Judgments? An Inquiry into the Role of Peer Endorsement and Evaluative Mode by Tijs van den Broek, David J. Langley, Michel L. Ehrenhard, and Aard Groen**

In a study that marries the theoretical notion of organizational legitimacy with social media reality, van den Broek and colleagues examine how peer endorsement influences the public expression of legitimacy judgments about organizations. They delve to assess how this process is affected by the evaluators' preparedness to expend cognitive effort (evaluative mode). Using three vignette experiments and one field study set in social media platforms, the research establishes that peer endorsement encourages people to share their judgments, particularly those with little cognitive effort. Furthermore, people in active and passive evaluative modes act differently when their judgments are based on instrumental, moral, or relational considerations. The study contributes to legitimacy theory by illuminating how peer endorsement serves as a source of validity and when evaluators choose to express their judgments publicly. Understanding these dynamics is vital as individuals' public expressions can trigger a cascade of judgments that alter the consensus on an organization's legitimacy, potentially leading to institutional change. The research also extends theory on evaluators' cognitive effort, finding that passive evaluators are more influenced by peer endorsement cues and relational evaluations, while active evaluators focus more on instrumental and moral evaluations. This knowledge is important for

organizations as it offers insights into why and when people choose to express judgments that may challenge an organization's legitimacy.

### **Context and Aggregation: An Experimental Study of Bias and Discrimination in Organizational Decisions by Michael Christensen, Christian M. Dahl, Thorbjørn Knudsen, and Massimo Warglien**

Much has been written about organizations, and much has been said about individual behavior. The intersection of the two is of particular interest to organizational scholars, and Christensen and colleagues ask how the combination of people's individual choices into organizational decisions is altered by context. Naturally, they use experiments to create organizational structures that are centralized and decentralized. Then, they investigate how assignment of positions, incentive schemes, and structural configuration can prompt adaptation in bias or discrimination capability. They find that evaluators adapt their reservation and discrimination levels in centralized structures, but not in decentralized ones. The paper explores the mechanisms behind these findings and their implications for organizational behavior. It contributes to bridging the gap between organizational economics and organization science regarding predictable bias and imperfect discrimination in organizations. The authors introduce a statistical model to identify bias and discrimination at individual, group, and organizational levels; and conclude that organizational context may prompt individuals to modify their behaviors, potentially affecting aggregate organizational-level functions. This may alter intended outcomes of organizational design, emphasizing the importance of understanding adaptive behavior in organizational decisions.

### **Iterative Coordination and Innovation: Prioritizing Value over Novelty by Surobh Ghosh and Andy Wu**

Organizational scholars often wonder whether their research serves managers, improves society, or is even read by anyone other than their colleagues (Drnevich et al. 2020; Markides 2007; Van de Ven and Johnson 2006). Ghosh and Wu take on this existential question with gusto, exploring how organizations can choose between the often-conflicting goals of novelty and value when pursuing innovation. To answer, they take the surprisingly rare approach of examining managerial practices in the field and then testing the emerging conclusions in the laboratory. The practice they examine — agile

management — prescribes an iterative approach of frequent meetings to choose among multiple goals in innovation. They design and conduct a field experiment, within a software application development competition, to study how the popular practice affects innovation. The field phase is followed by a more controlled laboratory experiment, which examines how the practice affects qualities of software code produced. Iterative coordination, they show, can lead to a reprioritization of goals toward value over novelty, which can result in increased integration but decreased specialization.

**Microfoundations of Problem Solving: The Role of Attentional Engagement in Predicting Problem-Solving Strategies by Daniella Laureiro-Martinez, Jose Arrieta, and Stefano Brusoni**

Adding depth and nuance to our understanding of how wicked problems are addressed in organizations, this work examines the allocation of attention. Drawing on the attention-based view (ABV), it addresses three varieties of attention—selection, engagement, and perspective—and establishes the theoretical import of disentangling them. Experimentally, the authors demonstrate the emergence of two problem-solving strategies: framing and implementation. Each of these differs in the type of deliberation that ultimately shapes managerial actions. What sets this research effort apart is the creative blend of qualitative evidence from verbal reports (Ericsson and Simon 1984) and behavioral experimentation, pioneering a fresh methodological mix.

**Building an Equilibrium: Rules vs. Principles in Relational Contracts by Robert Gibbons, Manuel Grieder, Holger Herz, and Christian Zehnder**

Organizations thrive on collaboration, but what happens to cooperative intentions when circumstances change? Gibbons and associates focus on the "clarity problem," which arises when two parties do not have a shared understanding of the promises made to each other. They designed a laboratory experiment involving a trading game with multiple periods and unforeseen changes. The participants were allowed to reach a non-binding agreement about how to play the game. The results showed that pairs who agreed on a broad principle rather than a narrow rule performed better after the environment changed. In the baseline condition, pairs with principle-based agreements achieved higher

post-shock performance. But high-performing relational contracts were difficult to build, especially when an effective agreement must coordinate parties' adaptation after their environment changes. The authors attempted a nudge to induce more pairs to articulate principles, but it failed to improve long-run performance after the shock. In conclusion, while principle-based agreements may improve organizational performance, they are not easy to establish or maintain.

### **Collateral Damage: The Relationship Between High-Salience Events and Variation in Racial Discrimination by Andreea Gorbatai, Peter Younkin, and Gordon Burtch**

Bias is inherent in human cognition, and therefore organizational life. Gorbatai, Younkin, and Burtch study the impact of high-salience, racially-charged events on individual and organizational biases, specifically focusing on the treatment of minority entrepreneurs. They ask provocatively how the news of the death of an unarmed Black suspect might affect the opportunities available to a Black entrepreneur. Their study combines online experiments and archival data to assess whether racial discrimination intensifies following such events. The experiments exposed participants to a high-salience event, then gauged their evaluation of in-group and out-group startup founders. Results showed a more favorable evaluation of in-group members, with less favorability towards out-group members, especially African American founders, following exposure to a high-salience event. The study further employed police shootings data and Kickstarter fundraising outcomes to test the external validity of these findings. The analysis indicated that the success odds of African American entrepreneurs relative to others were negatively affected by racially salient events. The research concludes that high-salience events can increase discrimination and impact the economic prospects of minority founders, highlighting a hidden cost of events that heighten racial salience.

### **Managing Uncertainty: An Experiment on Delegation and Team Selection by John R. Hamman and Miguel A. Martínez-Carrasco**

Organizations live in an uncertain world, and Hamman and Martínez-Carrasco examine how organizations use team selection and delegation of authority to navigate such environments. The research focuses on how managers determine skill heterogeneity among workers and decide whether to retain or

delegate the ability to allocate tasks. Delegation allows better-informed workers to allocate tasks more efficiently when uncertainty is high, but it can create conflicts between managers and workers. This study reveals that managers delegate decision rights more often as uncertainty increases, with risk tolerance moderating this ability when facing higher uncertainty. Experimental participants tend to under-diversify their teams compared to benchmark predictions, with deliberative thinking showing a strong moderating effect. Deliberative thinking improves decisions in low-uncertainty environments and team selection regardless of the uncertainty level. Risk tolerance improves all decisions in highly uncertain situations and helps managers optimally delegate decision rights in all settings. The results demonstrate that deliberative thinking and risk tolerance complement each other in improving decisions under different levels of environmental uncertainty. Both moderating effects are stronger when decisions are made jointly. The findings highlight the potential pitfalls in managers' decision-making processes but also how deliberative thinking and risk tolerance can enhance performance.

**Social Exchange and the Reciprocity Roller Coaster: Evidence from the Life and Death of Virtual Teams by Jérôme Hergueux, Emeric Henry, Yochai Benkler, and Yann Algan**

Reciprocity is a double-edged sword, find Hergueux and associates, who investigate cooperation problems within organizations and the role of people's reciprocal preferences in sustaining cooperation. Research often emphasized the importance of strong reciprocity in promoting cooperation, but here this notion is challenged with field experimental evidence from open-source software development teams. The study demonstrates that highly reciprocating groups are not necessarily more successful; instead, the relationship between reciprocity and performance follows a U-shaped curve. Highly reciprocal teams are more likely to fail and only outperform other teams if they manage to survive. Reciprocal preferences act as a catalyst at the team level, reinforcing cooperation when positive signals are received but making it difficult to recover from negative signals, resulting in project failure. These findings question the idea that strong reciprocity can prevent cooperation breakdowns and suggest that cooperation needs to be dynamically managed through relational contracts. The authors argue that organizations cannot solely rely on screening workers based on social types or contract design to achieve sustained cooperation. Instead,

they should focus on establishing implicit norms or relational contracts that help individuals interpret signals and prevent inefficient cooperation breakdowns, especially in the face of adverse shocks and imperfect monitoring.

### **Cooperation with Strangers: Spillover of Community Norms by Mario Molina, Victor Nee, and Hakan Holm**

How to sustain cooperation when the shadow of the future is absent? Molina, Nee, and Holm ask when and how businesspeople cooperate with strangers in transactions, notwithstanding the risk of exploitation. They used a random sample of CEOs from manufacturing firms in the Yangzi River Delta region of China and measured social norms through hypothetical vignettes. Years later, the same participants played a one-shot Prisoner's Dilemma game with a stranger. The study found that belief in the reliability of robust norm enforcement was positively associated with a higher probability of cooperation with strangers. The study also suggests that cooperation norms embedded in a business community can influence an organization leader's decision to engage in cooperative exchanges with strangers, despite uncertainty about future transactions. These norms, based on reciprocity and trust, can serve as heuristics guiding social behavior with unknown others. The findings provide insight into how cooperation norms in business communities can spill over to cooperation with strangers in a regional market economy.

### **The (Bounded) Role of Stated-Lived Value Congruence and Authenticity in Employee Evaluations of Organizations by Vontrese Deeds Pamphile and Rachel Lise Ruttan**

Authenticity, the extent to which an entity is perceived as genuine, influences how audiences perceive and reward organizations. Pamphile and Ruttan study how such perceptions affect employee evaluations of organizations, focusing on congruence between an organization's stated and lived values. They combine archival data from an employers' review website with two experiments to demonstrate that perceptions of authenticity are drawn from the alignment between an organization's declared values and its practiced values. But this positive effect is mitigated when audiences have a lower preference for the organization's stated values. Thus, perceived authenticity resulting from value congruence may not yield

positive evaluations — unless the employees highly value the organization's declared values. More generally, the study answers two main research questions: the impact of value congruence on authenticity and positive evaluations, and whether these evaluations are moderated by audience value preferences. Findings highlight that employees, as organizational insiders, are a valuable audience for studying these research questions. This study expands understanding of the conditions under which perceived authenticity affects evaluations, essential for organizations aiming to optimize resources dedicated to values and authenticity work.

**Effects of Social Information on Risk Taking and Performance: Understanding Others' Decisions vs. Comparing Oneself with Others in Short-Term Performance by Sabine Pittnauer, Martin Hohnisch, Andreas Ostermaier, and Andreas Pfingsten**

Learning from others is a crucial social and organizational function, whose impact on performance is not always positive. Pittnauer and her colleagues examine how observing others' decisions influences a person's risk-taking and the resulting performance. The study manipulates two aspects of the social environment: the psychological distance to others whose decisions can be observed and the opportunity for interaction. The researchers predicted that participants observing distant others would perform better and take less risk than those observing decisions of proximal others. The results confirmed the predictions, suggesting that social learning effects vary based on psychological distance and interaction opportunities. So, while learning from others can improve decision making, focusing on short-term social comparison may dampen performance. This study advises organizational interventions to consider the varying interpretations of social information and their diverse effects on decision making. For example, promoting short-term performance comparisons in complex problem scenarios might inadvertently harm long-term performance. The research idea was hatched when the authors collaborated with the late Reinhard Selten, one of the fathers of experimental economics, in a project on rationality in the light of experimental economics.

## **A Matter of Transition: Authenticity Judgments and Attracting Employees to Hybridized Organizations by Nevena Radoynovska and Rachel Ruttan**

Audience evaluations of organizations are central in this study, where Radoynovska and Ruttan investigate how transitioning from a single-category to a multi-category organization affects audience judgments of authenticity and the ability to attract potential employees. The study focuses on social-commercial hybrids, organizations that combine social and commercial goals and identities, straddling nonprofit and for-profit categories. The authors hypothesize that the process of hybridization, rather than hybridity itself, affects attributions of authenticity and organizational outcomes. They assess their theory with two experimental vignettes with potential employees as the audience. The direction of hybridization is found to be meaningful, especially when an organization moves away from prevalent field-level norms regarding profit status. The study also explores the possibility that this relationship may be attenuated in fields where social-commercial hybridity is more prevalent and normative but finds no support for this claim. This research contributes to the literature on category-spanning, authenticity, and hybrid organizations by offering a dynamic view of spanning beyond for-profit, market contexts. It also provides empirical support for the multidirectionality of mission drift in hybrid organizations, suggesting that drifting need not always be detrimental.

## **Delays Impair Learning and Can Drive Convergence to Inefficient Strategies by Hazhir Rahmandad and Michael Shayne Gary**

Rahmandad and Gary ask how managers choose which strategy to adopt and why they are occasionally wrong. Crucially, they pinpoint to time gaps between the commencement of strategy and the revelation of its consequences. As their experiments reveal, such feedback delays reshape strategic choices: Longer delays can lead searchers to choices that provide quicker but suboptimal returns. Delays can also encourage persistence with a priori strategies. In a managerial environment full of uncertainty and change, delays and uncertainty make everyone's strategies and performance more alike. Early submitters to the special issue, Rahmandad and Gary set the methodological bar high. Start with generalizability: Mindful of the limitation of methods and participant population, they strive to improve

generalizability by piloting with a qualitative verbal protocol (“think aloud”) study (Ericsson and Simon 1984; Levine et al. 2018; Reypens and Levine 2017) side-by-side with a behavioral experiment. As participants, they recruit laypeople, students, and managers, and explicitly compare their performance (spoiler: the managers do not always perform differently from students). Or take transparency: Their initial submission included a copy of the user interface (now section S1 in the Appendix) as well as a link to the live experiment (footnote 2), which allowed the reviewers to scrutinize the instrument. They labored to document not just exciting results but their entire experimental effort. For example, the pilot, where participants qualitatively describe their choices and reasoning while taking part in the experimental tasks, is briefly mentioned in the text. Yet an appendix not only details behavior but also links to a set of videos illustrating strategies. The author pair did equally well on reproducibility: They share the complete participant instructions and survey code. And they deposited in the Open Science Framework (OSF) a replication package containing data, code, and replication instructions.

**Converging Tides Lift All Boats: Consensus in Evaluation Criteria Boosts Investments in Firms in Nascent Technology Sectors by Xirong (Subrina) Shen, Huisi (Jessica) Li, and Pamela S. Tolbert**

When experts reach consensus on how a new technology should be evaluated, who benefits? Shen, Li, and Tolbert assert that consensus among technology experts about evaluation criteria for nascent technologies boosts investments in all firms in these new sectors. Using experiments and archival data, the study unpacks the socio-cognitive processes underpinning investors' evaluation of firms in emerging tech fields. Drawing from microinstitutional literature and social psychological literature, the authors theorize that field-level evaluation criteria consensus among experts fosters a collective perception that a nascent technology is accepted and appropriate. This consensus aids investors in forming positive perceptions of the technological competence of firms in the sector and increases investors' confidence in their peers' positive view of the firm, both of which encourage investment. The authors tested these hypotheses through two experiments with Chinese investors and U.S. managers, and two archival studies of investment in AI firms in the U.S. and China. The results showed that consensus on evaluation criteria

positively influences investment decisions. This research provides a microfoundation for the impacts of evaluation criteria in nascent sectors and bridges the micro-macro link in institutionalization processes.

**To Stem the Tide: Organizational Climate and the Locus of Knowledge Transfer by Giada Di Stefano and Maria Rita Micheli**

Knowledge transfer can benefit organizations (Argote 2013; Argote and Ingram 2000; Levine and Prietula 2012), but there is a catch: While exchange within the organizational boundaries is encouraged, moving knowledge outside these boundaries can erode competitive advantage. So, ask Di Stefano and Micheli: How can organizations affect the direction in which knowledge flows? They take a mixed-methods approach, with extensive fieldwork at the scientific organization, laboratory, and framed field experiments. The findings indicate that an organization's climate affects the direction of knowledge transfer: Employees are more inclined to share knowledge internally when they identify strongly with the organization, but they're more likely to transfer knowledge to external competitors when the organization encourages internal competition. To prevent knowledge spillover in an unfavorable organizational climate, companies can direct knowledge transfer internally by adjusting an individual's job design and socialization regime. The paper contributes to understanding how firms can safeguard against knowledge spillovers by influencing their organizational climate and individual job roles, aligning the goals of individuals with those of the organization.

**How Do Performance Goals Influence Exploration—Exploitation Choices? By Marlo Raveendran, Kannan Srikanth, and Tiberiu Ungureanu**

Performance goals, such as sales targets or project deadlines, are commonplace in organizations. While these goals may motivate employees to work harder, do such goals help employees work smarter, to learn which alternatives are superior? Raveendran, Srikanth, and Ungureanu (forthcoming) use experiments to show that goal difficulty affects how people perceive performance feedback. For people facing challenging goals, negative feedback prompts more exploitation, causing them to abandon efforts at exploration, which, unbeknown to them, would have been futile anyway. Because of this tendency, those people facing challenging goals are more likely to settle on exploitation but also reach higher

performance, compared to those with moderate goals. However, those high performers suffer when the environment changes, a shift that rewards exploration. Their exploitation focus, beneficial in stable environments, now turns detrimental.

### **Authenticity-Based Connection as Organizational Constraints and the Paradox of Authenticity in the Market for Cuban Cigars by J. Cameron Verhaal, Oliver Hahl, and Kevin J. Fandl**

Authenticity is much desired but can be paradoxical: Attempts to capture the demand created by perceived authenticity can diminish that authenticity. Verhaal, Hahl, and Fandl examine how different authenticity claims can limit a company's ability to capitalize on the value it derives from authenticity. Using Cuban cigars as an example, they argue that claims based on geographical origin can restrict a company's growth potential, as expanding production may compromise authenticity. However, claims tied to an iconic individual, like Fidel Castro in this case, can be more flexible, enabling growth without undermining authenticity. This research contributes to understanding how authenticity, which can increase product demand and social valuation, can also hinder a company's growth. It suggests that companies should carefully consider the implications of their authenticity claims, as certain types might offer more room for growth.

### **Social Movements, Collective Identity, and Workplace Allies: The Labeling of Gender Equity Policy Change by Cynthia S. Wang, Jennifer A. Whitson, Brayden G King, and Rachel L. Ramirez**

To effect social, political, and organizational change, activists seek allies. How do they gain them? Wang and associates investigate how the labeling of gender equity policies influences the support of potential allies. They theorize that one obstacle to ally mobilization is the misalignment between the labels activists use for new policies and the collective identities with which allies affiliate. Combining interviews and experiments, they demonstrate how people identifying strongly as feminists are more likely to support feminist-labeled (#MeToo, feminist) policies over unlabeled ones. Conversely, those with low feminist identification are less likely to support feminist-labeled policies. Interestingly, participants with high organizational identification — regardless of their feminist identification levels — support policies labeled with their organization's name more than feminist-labeled ones. This suggests

that support can be garnered by appealing to a relevant collective identity, even when the policy's aims may not align with one's collective identity. The study also found that feelings of organizational pride, rather than fear or anger, mediate these effects, signifying the importance of positive emotions in ally mobilization. This research uncovers the micro-dynamics of ally mobilization and highlights the crucial role of policy labeling, collective identities, and emotional resonance in this process.