

Group Cognition as a Foundation for Organizational Strategy: Psychological, Social and Collectives Representations Shared in Perspective

FRANCISCO ANTONIO COELHO JUNIOR

Faculty of Administration, Contability and Economic Sciences, Department of Administration and Postgraduate Program in Administration of University of Brasília, Brazil

Email: fercoepsi@gmail.com

Telephone: +556131070759

CRISTIANE FAIAD

Institute of Psychology of University of Brasília, Department of Social and Work Psychology and Postgraduate Program in Organizational, Social and Work Psychology, Brazil.

Email: crisfaiad@gmail.com

RODRIGO REZENDE FERREIRA

Faculty of Administration, Contability and Economic Sciences, Department of Administration and Postgraduate Program in Management of University of Brasília, Brazil

Email: ferreirarods@gmail.com

GUILHERME LIMA MOURA

Faculty of Administratives Sciences and Postgraduate Program in Management of University of Pernambuco, Brazil

Email: glmoura@gmail.com

Abstract

Theory of management has a set of assumptions about human attitudes and behaviors, managerial actions consistent with these assumptions and expectations about employees mental models if these actions are implemented. Human relations models are nowadays adopted to analyse the reality of organizations. Organizational strategy, in the field of organizational studies, refers to an intentional activity, specifically situated in a given labor context. Its validity is reached by interaction between social organizational actors and their shared beliefs and social perceptions. Little attention is given to embrace psychological and sociological approaches to investigate organizational strategy. The psychological contributions applied to organizational studies relate to the understanding of the forms of human interaction at work and their relational dynamics. The effects of organizational structure on the norms of conduct, social practices and the establishment of rules, visible or invisible, are also studied. This paper aims to discuss ways to interpret strategy, based on the identification of collective beliefs and perceptions socially shared by individuals and groups. We discuss the use of concepts arise from psychology and sociology needed to strategy investigation, considering the organization as social and collective entities. We conclude that strategy must be investigated based on the adoption of socio/interactionist interventions native of social psychology and collective social cognition.

Key Words: *Organizational Strategy; Organizational Behavior, Social Cognition; Collectives Beliefs and Perceptions; Social Representation.*

Introduction

The scientific study of shared social beliefs and perceptions are becoming very common in the field of organizational and work psychology. This is mainly happening because the advancement of multilevel modeling of organizational studies. Some variables are related to the context, such as organizational culture and values (Balogun and Johnson, 2005; Dameron and Torset, 2013). Most of them, moreover, are human. Interpret them theoretically at the organizational level is the major challenge for the field of administration and work and organizational psychology.

An organization is both an articulated purpose and an established mechanism for achieving it. Most organizations engage in an ongoing process of evaluating their purposes and objectives (Brown and Humphreys, 2006). Theoretical frameworks about organizational strategy, in general, considers that managers used to analyze an organization as an integrated and dynamic whole a model that takes into account the interrelationships among strategy, structure, and process. Its a vision based on external variables related to the exit of the organizacional performance. Little attention is given to the understanding of human and psychological factors related to the scope of the strategy and broader organizational goals.

Our purpose here is to discuss mechanisms related to psychological interpretation of an organizational phenomenon (strategy) in the light of sharing beliefs and perceptions among individuals. Our thesis is that individual psychological experiences, as they are shared by their similarity or differences, in a given organizational context, become social. What happens in this bottom-up (individuals to organizational perspectives) phenomenon? What factors are involved? We will seek to discuss these issues here, with reflections on future possibilities of empirical research.

We consider here according to Buerger, Jacobs, and Roos (2005,) that there are process of adaptation which specifies the major decisions needed by the organizations to maintain an effective alignment with its environment. These process involve planning, coordination, monitoring and correctives managerial actions. Nowadays, environment and internal organizational context are difuses.

The scientific study of strategy in the organizational context was consolidated from the perspective of different approaches over time (Abdalla and Langley,2013; Cornelissen, Holt and Zundel, 2011; Silva Junior, Santos Feitosa & Vidal, 2012).

The organizational values and strategy, as practice (Jarzabkowski, 2004), consider the need to redesign the organizational formal structure and its processes in order to give the necessary impetus to the search for competitive advantage. Organizational competitive strategy based on new shared individuals' vision is fundamental to the organization's survival nowadays. Personnel perceptions about organizational life and the social interactions have been becoming increasingly important nowadays.

Social system may have important dynamic, temporal and geospatial elements. The hierarchical structure of social systems typically takes on a multilevel form, with multiple hierarchical layers each establishing the decision premises for the immediately lower layer. Such multilevel structure is intrinsic to social systems, not simply emergent, and so may need explicit representation. This is most commum in formal organizations that are typically designed as multilevel systems with individuals nested within teams, functions, and departments.

Components of the organizational structure are necessarily nested to some larger purpose or broader strategic dimension (Porter, 1999). Psychological and human factors related to the formation and identity of social groups at work that must be considered for its effective implementation. It is urgent, therefore, to investigate how individuals form and shared each other perceptions about organizational values and strategy. What kind of information individuals share? This information supports the sharing of positive attitudes to the strategic positioning of the company? Personnel values always go according to the

organizational values? How do individual prevent the emergence of mental conflicts or cognitive dissonance?

From this perspective, it is useful to clarify the following: relationships between different forms of relational infrastructure (niches and status, for example) are not easy to assess. But, its very important being identified and analysed scientifically. This should become visible when specific social processes are examined and modeled using social and organizational network analysis. In order to be taken into account collectively, knowledge about the organization (rules, vision, values) must be evaluated as appropriate. This elaboration of appropriateness judgments is not trivial, but it is often tacit.

Also it is not exclusively carried out in one person's head, but interactive. Social perceptions about the organizations is thus collective because members of a social setting access tacit knowledge through social interactions with colleagues who may themselves interact with each other. Advice networks are thus a collective social mechanism because they help generate a form of shared knowledge about the organization and model the acceptable individual and group behaviors.

Its necessary considers their internal structure in terms of sets of complex dependencies among social agents in the form of dyadic social ties. Organizational network concept may provide the only way to construct a theory of social structure.

The psychological and sociological knowledge of the human *modus operandi* in the context of organizations is indispensable, especially understanding how the stakeholders build and shared them perceptions and beliefs. The socio-historical reality in which individuals perform their jobs must be associated to their own personnel beliefs. The psychological climate and the shared mental models must be considered by the managers when they decide something about the organization routines.

We consider the basic assumption that a greater engagement of the individual at work occurs due to a greater understanding of the strategic dimensions of the organization. Besides that, as the individual feels belonging to the broader organizational strategy. The consolidation of informal social groups in the workplace, vivid and with constant rearrangements, its essential to understand how they share expectations about the organizational values and strategy. Social psychology or sociology applied to organizations context can make substantial contributions to the research of it, making its scope more feasible.

This paper aims, considering the available theory of organizational strategy, discuss applications of psychological and sociological thought in the scientific analysis of the formation and sharing of collective beliefs among stakeholders on the strategy in organizations. We problematize here research possibilities of study of strategy based on theoretical issues arising from organizational psychology and sociology, focusing on analyzing the behavior of social groups in the work situation.

The thought of social groups is always more difficult to be modified than human thought analyzed individually. The identity of the groups, especially in the development of shared beliefs and attitudes in relation to organizational strategy, need to consider their mental models. Understanding the level of analysis of groups the organizational managers will can plan their actions more effectively.

Theoretical Framework

In the scientific literature on organizational behavior and administration on the strategy doesn't consider the psychic and social representations that individuals have about it. The organizational strategy and innovation literature are based on classical perspectives of research.

Theoretical and empirical references are about the design and impact of repositioning strategic relative to the market and its effects on performance organizational. This repositioning happens in terms of structural internal reconfigurations and changes in economic and financial organizational performance. In this

perspective, focus on optimizing results, the strategy is designed in a functionalist perspective as organizational practice oriented to maximizing performance (De Sordi, 2005).

Another theoretical current, especially discussed by Whittington (2007) and Jarzabkowski, Balogun and Seidl (2007) the strategy must be analyzed as a social practice. Collective social actions derived from human interaction at work would thus be essential to internal strategic position between the members of the organization, culminating with organizational external success. Its important, therefore, investigate scientifically how happens the formation of mental models and beliefs among individuals about the strategy, its importance and components, and how individual shared it.

Investigating the available scientific literature on strategy we observe some converging points, especially regarding the importance of adopting a valid and comprehensibly organizational strategy applied in the work context (Floyd and Lane, 2000, Gavetti and Rivkin, 2005). The strategy provides the organizational shared vision, and favorite decisions about goals and organizational objectives in the short, medium and long term. Through strategy can be expected to reach a result from the manipulation of available resources (Grandy and Mills, 2004). Goals and critical tasks are defined by objectives to be achieved, and the process view of strategy maintains alignment with the achievement of organizational policies (Reed, 1999).

Some researchers, as Beppler, Pereira and Costa (2011), Bertero, Vasconcelos and Binder (2003), Gomes da-Silva (2006) and Jarratt and Stiles (2010), refer to the implementation of strategic planning and its tools, as the application of the resource-based view (as discussed by Walter, Baptista and Augusto, 2008). Or consider the management actions, such as re-configuration of the structure and organizational arrangements, marketing, re-positioning, economic analysis of organizations, analysis of value networks and forming strategic alliances. The variables, according to Hardy and Thomas (2013), are related to organizational strategy at higher level.

The relationship between the organizations and its external environment and the economic planning management are the focus of the scientific literature (Fonseca & Machado-Silva, 2010). Little research is performed at the public organizations contexts (Hoon, 2007). Note, however, that more than the approach taken to the competitiveness and even the need for maximizing organizational performance focusing on enhancement of paradigm of the 'Economicus Man', studies about organizational strategy should focus on empirical research dimensions typical of any organizational structure directly related to the organizational dimensions, as the systems of authority, decision, and centralization of power (Johnson, Melin and Whittington, 2003). These studies should consider the formal and informal activities, and power relations informally established by social groups.

The interpretations that each individual makes and shares on organizational strategy, consider the available organizational resources, it will need to mobilize to its scope. More than the effects of the implementation of the strategy, its mister identify shared beliefs in social groups about the effectiveness and how the strategy can be best achieved.

Being able to implement successfully the organizational strategy involves confronting their practical obstacles in the daily lives of companies. Macro-level variables (organizational), meso (groups and work teams) and even micro (individuals) are able to influence, alone or in interaction, the effectiveness of the shared mental models about strategy. According to Johnson, Prashantham, Floyd, and Bourque (2010) and Peng, Tan and Tong (2004), the traditional focus on economic analysis perspective of organizational strategy relegated to second place the recognition of the policy issues and social power affecting its effective implementation within organizations. The execution of other kinds of strategy, as structural, operational and genetics, also tend to be facilitated by understanding the impact of human factor at work.

The formulation and implementation of an organizational strategy is a management activity directly related to making short, medium and long term decisions (Kaplan, 2011). It relates to the definition and/or re-

positioning of the organization's business, mission, goals, visions and other organizational factors critical to the operation of any organization (Carrieri, 1998). Strategic themes are defined according to the interests of the organization, and are determined on the basis of the adopted strategy type (if more oriented to market differentiation, growth or global leadership, for example).

The analysis of the organizational strategy has been object of study of various types endorsed in the literature, such as Hart (1992) and Miles and Snow (2003). Organizational models such as SWOT analysis, Five Forces of Porter (1999) and the Strategic Portfolio analysis are still regarded as classical references in the literature. Some managers actions are described in the literature (as Eadic, 1989; Monahan, 2001; Andrews, Boyne, Law & Walker, 2009) aimed at the implementation of marketing and production strategy in organizations. Some of them allude to the progressive elimination of repetitive activities stations, technological automation, the recomposition of activities with an emphasis on functional flexibility and re-appreciation of the professional competences of workers with horizontality of the organizational power relations.

We observe some macro organizational actions, oriented only to the achievement of operational or financial results, and by the individual actions at the micro level, in order to maximize their performance through the optimal use of resources and materials. However, reinforcing the discussion made by Fonseca and Machado-Silva (2010), little focus is given to the adoption of organizational practices to increase and become effective participation of individuals in decision-making processes, as active agents in the construction of reality social organization with them needs and personnel interests. We believe that the contemporary research about organizational strategy should consider the mental models shared by individuals of a collective social construction within organizations.

We proposed here some possibilities of understanding the shared strategy as a key phenomenon of social behavior in organizations in which individuals and communities are able to build cognitive maps from thoughts, feelings, and shared behaviors disseminated in a given specific socio-historical reality.

Psychological and Sociological Perspectives of Organizational Strategy Concept: Limits and Possibilities

Little attention has been given to the analysis of multilevel and psychosocial factors that emerge from formally established organizational structure (Kwon, Clarke and Wodak, 2013; Maitlis, 2005). In the studies on strategy, still dominate the analyses of the economic and maximizing results.

Nowadays is difficult to imagine life in society without the presence of the bureaucratic structure (Weber, 1978). Concepts such as the division of labor, hierarchy, command hierarchy, documentation of administrative acts, free contractual relationship established by appointment and paid by money, career-based promotions based on professional competences, among others, are all based on the design of rational-legal authority (Sillince and Brown, 2009).

Studies about organizational strategy, as Mantere (2013) and Vasconcelos and Cyrino (2000), usually are developed at the macro level discussing its organizational effectiveness. The research agenda suggests a lack a psychological and sociological interpretation at the level of behavior of groups and internal teams to the organization. These studies should be oriented with respect to the identification of how share mental models about organizational strategy will generate a common system of organizational values and meanings (Fonseca & Machado-Silva, 2010; Thomas, Sargent and Hardy (2011), which will guide the behaviors manifested by individuals in work situations.

It's important to consider that, as stated by Weber (1978, p. 16), "the association members, while obedient to who is the formal authority, should not obedience to him as an individual, but considering the impersonal order." About it, its true that in bureaucratic organizations the authority comes from the office, but it's

important to consider that in interpersonal relationships of individuals who are part of it there is much more than impersonality.

There is power based on various mechanisms or strategies of action, in which personhood is established in the search for the satisfaction of personal interests of social agents, in games of power in social coalitions and informal relationships, the (real) informal organization. In fact, Weber himself had pointed out the presence of personhood, understood for him as a dysfunction of the bureaucratic model.

Note, therefore, that the human and social experiences at work should be considered in the analysis of the effective implementation of the organizational strategy. People are deeply influenced by their interpretation about the events that happens on the social environment in which they perform their activities. The research variables related to internal social coalition, the interdependence of tasks, competences and people, the power of the social group or even maintaining the status quo within organizations is fundamental to the legitimacy of the vision, objectives and purposes shared in achieving the strategy. The individual at work is the psychosocial actor who (re) formulates and disseminates, daily, mental models about organizational practices, including the values and organizational strategy (Barbosa, 2008; Vaara and Whittington, 2012).

Another factor to consider is the balance of political forces at work based on the understanding of how social groups are formed and what are the support mechanisms of ideological positions and authority, oriented to achieving results. As stated by Benson (1984, p. 99) people are continuously (re) building their social world through their relations with each other, in order to establish a self-guided social structure.

These structures are part of other macro structures through multiple connections in the context of other powerful forces that tend to reproduce these structures. Formal organizations, therefore, cannot be conceived as only in settings such as: "[...] the rational coordination of the activities of some people who try to reach some common and explicit objective through the division of labor and function, as well as through hierarchy of authority and responsibility" (Schein, 1965, p. 8).

Thus, one aspect to consider about this interpretation is the power as the constituent element of the strategy building process between who driving and those who drive on the organizational environment. Benson (1984) considers that the participants' awareness of the organizations on the structures is "partially autonomous". The process of social construction arises from the mediation of personal interest, which establishes the conflict and, in general, is caused by strong influence of the structure of domination on the formation of ideas of the participants.

It's precisely there that the other theories are distinguished from this perspective, because they don't examine the basis of the power of (informal) leadership and don't consider alternative social systems. There is different power bases in this structure of domination based on so-called "official structures of authority." People interpret and behavior themselves based on this formal and informal structure.

Organizations are open systems, according assumptions of contingency theory. Based on the premise that individuals modify their behavior depending on the organizational settings necessary to achieve the organizational mission, and will conduct arrangements (social and even political) oriented within the organizational strategy. In this context of post-contingency approaches, we highlight here prospects of structuralism. This is the case of the Population Ecology, according to which organizations remain living in that are selected by the environment, which consider the reliability of its stability and consistency with their original procedures. The point is: become more or less flexible or innovative doesn't guarantee higher chances of survival.

The Perspective of Social Network Organizations brings a concept (worked by the theory of systems) more "extreme" on the assumption that the various organizations relate without borders, thus building a networked environment in which each organization works like a "point" in the network system. The

Institutional Theory doesn't consider the individual in your focus of analysis, observing the organizational phenomenon from macro structural elements (Tolbert and Zucker, 1998). It considers the institutionalized models in the organization and outside it to enable their survival in the environment. The adherence of organizations to new strategies would be due to new processes of institutionalization.

The New Institutional Theory investigates the role of individual action and their social interactions in the context of transformation of the institutional environment (Beckert, 1999). For institutionalists, the structure and behavior of organizations are based on organizational scripts of the reality and not on maximization of organizational strategies.

The homogeneity of organizational structures and strategies applied in a given field are explained by called 'isomorphic processes of change' (Beckert, 1999). The author defends that, on the one hand, the New Institutional theory has explanatory power of the relationship between organizations and their institutional environments; on the other hand, it tends to underestimate the importance of interest and individual motivation.

Beckert (1999) made an interest question: if, in fact, the organizational structures and strategies are drawn by the institutional environments, which would then be the role of 'strategic choice' in the management of organizations? If we assumed that the relationship between intention and result is weak, the action-oriented results become negligible. If we consider that, often, the social actors make some difference, we can conclude that there lies a theoretical gap of Institutional Theory. Institutionalists have warned of this gap and have researched the issue of organizational heterogeneity, although the relation between personal interest and organizational objectives is still dark.

Considering the role of the agent, the decision maker, in the institutionalization processes, the emphasis is in the methodological need for understanding the individual needs in the practice of real life, arguing that the institutions have an impact and gain their reason for being in the practice of individual. Christensen, Kornoe, Pedersen and Dobbin (1997) consider, too, that in the last two decades, the Neo-Institutional Theory has challenged the functionalist explanations. It offered one of the most creative and promising paradigms of social sciences, but hasn't yet made clear the role of social actors in the creation, dissemination and stabilization of organizational practices.

Selznick (1971) has considered the leader's role one of the important dimensions to be observed in a study based on the institutional approach. The author believes that the transformation of the organization into an institution have to consider the political action of its leader an important role. For the Author, the leader must have domain of the critical decision, "because it involves choices that affect the basic character of the organization, [being] the true field of distinguished leadership when the administrative management".

The Author believes that this role goes beyond the efficiency domain, involving the modeling of the social character of the organization. It's the leadership thus maintaining the institutional integrity of the organizations. Also according to Selznick (1971), such integrity is much more than the formal organization procedures and the informal cohesion of the social group. For the author the essential attributes of institutional leadership is to deal with external pressures to not give up the institution on behalf of the organization's survival.

Psychological and Collective Perceptions Shared about Organizational Strategy: How Analyze it?

What we are proposing here is a new paradigmatic approach is incorporated into the organizational strategy literature: the influence of social groups in the construction and ownership of it, and the study of the collective processes of identification and sharing of mental models and collective beliefs, including the interaction between dyads, triads, groups, teams and the organization as a whole.

To this finality, social psychology and sociology contextual, through axiomatic analysis of the prevailing socio-cultural systems and occupational and historical contexts, can provide important contributions. Essentially, the object of study of social psychology in the context of organizations can be oriented to the understanding the strategy phenomenon through categories and theories of sociological analysis, especially variables related to the investigation of the power relations (domination, authoritarianism, consensus and legitimacy), power of groups (power elites and circulation of elites), political processes, and relations of social influence and ideological positions.

The theoretical conceptions about the application of psychological assumptions in the context of organizations need to investigate the nature of interpersonal relationships. Vision and meanings shared are able to affect individual mental models influencing directly cognitive, behavioral and social internal processes related to appropriation of organizational strategy.

Its urgent, therefore, that identifies the shared beliefs and the effects of social dynamics in social groups at work around the scope of the strategy by analyzing the effect of culturally established practices and their impact on the legitimacy of the strategy at all levels hierarchy in the organization. Probably there are some different brain arrangements between individuals more aligned to organizational strategy, who sharing favorable beliefs about it, and individuals less aligned to it, who are more negative and critical against it. It's a research agenda for the neuropsychologists and others brain researchers!

Beliefs that individuals develop and disseminate among themselves through social interaction refer to sharing of information, assuming the uniformity of perceptions, attitudes and behaviors (Coetzer, 2007; Garavan, McGuire & O'Donnell, 2004). Generate a community that regulates and standardizes the socially acceptable behavior. The challenge to the research in organizational field is identify this collective engagement supporting the strategic practices related to the organizational outcomes.

This, therefore, is a tentative of theoretical approach between theories and categories of psychological analysis to the concept of organizational strategy: elaborate diagnostic management activities aimed to the identification of shared perceptions of the individuals grouped in social teams, understood here as units of action and behavior.

This collectivity tends to favor the creation and maintenance of a guidance system informally passed on to individuals, enabling them to act in their working reality aligned considering what is expected of them. Beliefs, values, norms, cultural signs and normative modes of conduct, which can be disseminated in organizations when the organizational strategy is implemented or re-designed, tend to be more easily implemented when they reflect individual expectations of each social actor, considering how each individual sharing his social perceptions with their peers.

Manage also consider the effects of the asymmetrical social relations (are social relations based on superordination or subordination between people with different power status in the organization) and the symmetric ones (social relationships between people who have the same status or level of subordination). The incorporation of the social shared perceptions organizational strategy by individuals is expected in the organizations. Analysis of the frequency, duration, order and intensity of social relations, including the definition of collective aspirations, goals and values, can also be considered managerial activities aimed at the social effectiveness of shared strategy in organizations.

The labor contextual aspects are crucial, considering that the acceptable social behavior tends to be manifested by the individual in reinforces environments to his behavior. Socialization in organizations must be conceived as a dynamic social process that presents variations and provides understanding of mental maps and interpretative schemes of reality that individuals will individually building and sharing through their interactions.

Formal socialization actions, considering an unrestricted definition of occupational and social roles, stimulating internalization of organizational values, can help meet the effective adoption of strategic practices at the macro (organizational) level, exerting its integrative function to organizational dynamics. Scientific knowledges coming from social psychology, sociometry and organizational anthropology can provide important theoretical framework for understanding how organizational whole is formed considering the influence of different variables, in isolated effects or interaction each other.

The analysis of the collective social processes in organizations also refers to the need to adopt a multilevel perspective of research able to examine the effect size of the variables. Factors and other processes contained in the individual, groups and organizations, as well as examine the mechanisms of social influence involved in the act of interaction, should be consider.

Collective processes are dynamic, cumulative and are relate to the nature of interpersonal relationships established in the workplace, as well as synergy, trust relationships, sharing visions and common meanings about organizational life. According to Bonito (2004) a phenomenon that is social or collectively shared is intended to establish patterns of social participation in the organizational context, determining the types of behaviors that are expected during social interactions related to the achievement of its routine.

Sharing would have a cognitive approach, as it allows to the individual to build mental maps that guide its actions and behavior within organizations. There is a behavior approach too, considering that the standardizes socially mental models are actions acceptable morally.

These dimensions, cognitive and behavioral, are endowed with symbolism and are totally dependent on both the labor context and individual motivations. They considers the basic theoretical assumption that the human being is an intense processor of information in order to appropriate and internalize the environment stimuli to which it is confronted. Thus, the individuals disseminate acceptable conduct in a given organizational context.

The creation of common purpose and the definition of a social structure based on significant elements with components structured around the tactical and strategic division of labor can be considered as important social activities aimed at the realization of strategy in organizations. Its important covenants the planned goal objectives strategic considering the collective interests of groups, small or large, according to Gomes da-Silva (2006).

It can be an important action to organizational strategy effectiveness in the organizational contexts. Aspects of the formal structure of the organization, such as the formalization of the routines, hierarchy levels, subordination relationship and authority, formal rules and regulations, procedures system, impersonality and real and symbolic profits should also be considered, given the fact their direct effects on the formation of mental models by individuals.

Empirical findings on cognition and social representation literature (as Bastos, 2006; Bliese, 2000; Cabecinhas, 2004; Hodgkinson and Healey, 2008; Mason, 2006) suggest that the experiences shared between individuals are crucial to intragroup homogeneity and the consolidation of beliefs and behavioral patterns. Individuals develop beliefs, feelings, attitudes, values and similar perceptions that make them react sharing and re-meaning their experiences of the live, naturalizing certain types of socially acceptable behavior. The collectivity of favorable beliefs about the success of the organizational strategy, considered as a dimension of the current cultural practice, tends to contribute to its effective range, generating a positive impact on organizational results.

The social representations that are shared among members of a group model their behavior maintaining the organizational identity and providing a continuous re-orderings of social reality around common goals and

aspirations disseminated by the own group. Individuals organize their perceptions and behavior in relation to the social environment to which they belong.

The individual mental representations transformed in social mental representations represent the group behavior. The individuals are active in the social construction of their work reality. When we check the scientific literature we noted that other variables, hitherto neglected, such as social perceptions of motivation and affection, are fundamental to the investigation of individual engagement in the interpretation of their reality within the work context, and tend to model their behaviors.

Some researches even longer make reference to the role played by beliefs socially shared between individuals in organizations and its impact on business results (Hollingshead, 2001; Marks, Zaccaro & Mathieu, 2000; Swaab, Postmes, Van Beest & Spears, 2007; Worchel, Rothberger, Day, Hart & Butemeyer, 1998). Importantly, the idea of social constructions by individuals doesn't reduce the impact of the contextual factors have on their behavior.

This has to be considered in the construction of mental models about organizational strategy, such as the enactment of a government decree law, in the case of public organizations, for example. A case of spin off or a fusion between two different organizations, for example, tends to consider the social beliefs shared among workers, in terms of their future expectations about their job. Such factors are external to the modus operandi of the organizations and need to be considered as a driver for building and sharing mental models among individuals in work situation.

The interpretation of the social reality made by the individual is directly related to their perception of their work environment. The shared cognition concept has been developed significantly recently in the organizational studies. According to Hodgkinson and Healey (2008), the nature of the task and contextual factors of work are the areas where growth is higher in empirical research, including multilevel research in the investigation of the group shared cognitions (see Burke, Stagl, Rooms, Pierce & Kandall, 2006). Therefore, it's important to develop scientifically knowledge and management practices aimed to the application of the theoretical framework within the scope of labor organizations. We consider too the necessity of the management policies being created considering the influence of the policy, alone or in interaction, considering the micro, meso and macro level of the variables in achieving the mission and broader strategy.

Conclusions

This study aimed to present possible theoretical perspectives to be established between the fields of social and work psychology, institutionalism, sociology, organizational innovation and strategy. The literature on social cognition applied to the work of organizations context was discussed. Theoretical dimensions of psychological and sociological thought were presented, emphasizing the need for verification of the constitutive features of social groups and the identification of social identity aspects that form the concept of community in the context of formal organizations.

We presented the need for analysis of human relations within the scope of collective social groups, considering the social and labor context of interdependence among the social actors. The multilevel approach is needed to implement the concept of interdependence of tasks and people hoped in the mental modeling shared about organizational strategy.

The role of rules and standards established in the formation of behavioral expectations, as well as issues related to the analysis of the human factor no more in an economic/rational/instrumental perspective, but also considering the political and interpersonal factors arising from a socio-interactionist vision and active interpretation of reality, were also highlighted.

In general, it appears that the design of an organization's operating mechanisms, whether in a structuralism or functionalist emphasis, should consider the participatory social theory. Should consider too the analyses of the tactical factors to the internalizing the own organizational strategy. It should encourage the creation of adaptive and transformative social interaction patterns (as community of practices, for example), based on the favorable shared belief within the organizational strategy.

Other typical features of any organizational structure, such as the design of tasks, individual capacity, professional competences, the role of leadership, job design, rational organization of activities and the degree of autonomy perceived in the expression of new ideas are also fundamental to the analysis of heuristics created by individuals work-related. We believe that understanding these dimensions is possible to have the foundation necessary to investigate how individuals share beliefs to the implementation and effectiveness of the organizational strategy.

It is suggested that empirical studies should be developed considering ethnographic methodologies and action research, in which the effects of collective perceptions among individuals on the organizational strategy should be identified. The participant research is recommended considering that the internal social movements in the organization context are dynamic and alive, be them conservative or revolutionary.

The studies should compare the patterns of judged similarity, the patterns of advice seeking, and the patterns of agreement among the actors on their job tasks. The role of the social capital and informal clusters should be investigate considering their adherence to the organizational strategy.

It's necessary trying to operationalize or decompose the strategy from the macro level to the meso and individual level, considering the behavior of groups and work teams in a top down perspective. It becomes necessary to identify existing social systems, their degree of permanence, shared objectives, structures and symbols characteristic.

It's urgent to understand the forms of construction, appropriation, internalization and interpretation of the social reality. This can be essential to the success or failure in the implementation of organizational strategy and that can make all the difference in marketing survival of a given organization.

Acknowledgement

The authors gratefully acknowledge the financial support provided by the Brazilian National Council for Scientific and Technological Development (CNPq/Brazil).

References

- Abdallah, C. & Langley, A. (2013). The double edge of ambiguity in strategy planning. *Journal of Management Studies*, 51, 235–264.
- Andrews, R., Boyne, G. A., Law, J. & Walker, R. M. (2009). Strategy formulation, strategy content, and performance. *Public Management Review*, 11, 1-22.
- Balogun, J. & Johnson, G. (2005). From intended strategies to unintended outcomes: the impact of change recipient sensemaking. *Organization Studies*, 26, 1573–1601.
- Barbosa, S.L. (2008). A abordagem clássica da estratégia já morreu? Uma análise da evolução do conceito de estratégia nos meios de referência dos atores organizacionais. In Anais do XXXII Encontro dos Programas de Pós-Graduação em Administração. Rio de Janeiro, RJ, Brazil: Associação dos Programas de Pós-Graduação em Administração.
- Bastos, A.V.B. (2006). *Trabalho e qualificação: questões conceituais e desafios postos pelo cenário de reestruturação produtiva*. In J.C., Zanelli; J.E., Borges-Andrade, & A.V.B., Bastos (Orgs), *Psicologia, Organizações e Trabalho no Brasil* (23-40). Porto Al.: Artmed.

- Beckert, J. (1999). Agency, entrepreneurs and Institutional Change. The role of strategic choice and institutionalized practices in organizations. *Organiz. Studies*, 20(5), 777-799.
- Benson, J. K. (1984). *A dialectical view*. In: Foster, W (org.). Loose coupling revisited. A critical view of Weick's. Contribution to educational administration. Victoria, Australia: Deakin University.
- Beppler, M.K.; Pereira, M.F. & Costa, A.M. (2011) Discussão conceitual sobre o processo de estratégia nas organizações: formulação e formação estratégica. *Revista Ibero-Americana de Estratégia*, 10(1), 128-146.
- Bertero, C. O.; Vasconcelos, F. C. & Binder, M. P. (2003) Estratégia Empresarial: A produção Científica Brasileira entre 1991 e 2002. *Revista de Administração de Empresas*, 43(4), 48-61.
- Bliese, P. D. (2000). *Within-group agreement, non-independence, and reliability: Implications for data aggregation and analysis*. In K. J. Klein & S. W. J. Kozlowski (Orgs.), Multilevel theory, research and methods in organizations: Foundations, extensions and new directions (pp.348-381). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Bonito, J. A. (2004). Shared cognition and participation in small groups: similarity of member prototypes. *Communication Research*, 31(6), 704 – 730.
- Brown, A. D. & Humphreys, M. (2006). Organizational identity and place: a discursive exploration of hegemony and resistance. *Journal of Management Studies*, 43, 231–257.
- Buergi, P. T., Jacobs, C. D. & Roos, J. (2005). 'From metaphor to practice: in the crafting of strategy'. *Journal of Management Inquiry*, 14, 78–94.
- Burke, C. S.; Stagl, K. C.; Salas, E.; Pierce, L. & Kendall, D. (2006). Understanding team adaptation: a conceptual analysis and model. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 91(6), 1189-1207.
- Cabecinhas, R. (2004). *Representações sociais, relações intergrupais e cognição social*. Manuscript unpublished.
- Carrieri, A. P. (1998). *Pesquisa sobre estratégia: do discurso dominante a uma nova narrativa*. In Anais do XXII Encontro Nacional da Associação Nacional de Pós-Graduação e Pesquisa em Administração. Foz do Iguaçu, PR: Associação dos Programas de Pós-Graduação em Administração.
- Christensen, S; Kornoe, P; Pedersen, J. S & Dobbin, F. (1997). Actors and institutions. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 40(4):392-396, 1997.
- Coetzer, A. (2007). Employee perceptions of their workplaces as learning environments. *Journal of Workplace Learning*, 19(7), 417-434.
- Cornelissen, J. P., Holt, R. & Zundel, M. (2011). The role of analogy and metaphor in the framing and legitimization of strategic change. *Organization Studies*, 32, 1701–1716.
- Dameron, S. & Torset, C. (2013). The discursive construction of strategists' subjectivities: towards a paradox lens on strategy. *Journal of Management Studies*, 51, 291–319.
- De Sordi, J. O. (2005). *Gestão por Processos: uma abordagem da moderna administração*. São Paulo: Saraiva.
- Eadie, D. C. (1989). *Identifying and managing strategic issues: from design to action*. In J. Rabin, G. J. Miller & W. B. Hildreth (Org.), Handbook of strategic management. New York, NY: Marcel Dekker, 169-186.
- Fonseca, V.S. & Machado-Silva, C.L. (2010). Conversação entre abordagens da estratégia em organizações: escolha estratégica, cognição e instituição. *Revista de Administração Contemporânea*, Edição Especial.
- Floyd, S. & Lane, P. (2000). Strategizing through the organization: managing role conflict in strategic renewal. *Academy of Management Review*, 25, 154–177.
- Garavan, T. N.; McGuire, D. & O'Donnell, D. (2004). Exploring human resource development: a level of analysis approach. *Human Resource Development Review*, 3(4), 417-441.
- Gavetti, G. & Rivkin, J. W. (2005). How strategists really think. *Harvard Business Review*, 834, 54–63.
- Gomes-da-Silva, O. (2006). Discussão crítica da produção científica em estratégia e organizações no âmbito do ENEGEP (2001-2005). *Dissertação de Mestrado*, Programa de Pós-Graduação em Engenharia de Produção, Universidade Federal da Paraíba, Paraíba.
- Grandy, G. & Mills, A. J. (2004). Strategy as simulacra? A radical reflexive look at the discipline and practice of strategy. *Journal of Management Studies*, 41, 1153–1170.

- Hardy, C. & Thomas, R. (2013). Strategy, discourse and practice: the intensification of power. *Journal of Management Studies*, 51, 320–348.
- Hart, S. (1992). An integrative framework for strategy-making processes. *Academy of Management Review*, 17, 327-351.
- Hodgkinson, G. P. & Healey, M. P. (2008). Cognition in organizations. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 59, 387-417.
- Hollingshead, A. (2001). Cognitive interdependence and convergent expectations in transactive memory. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 81, 1080-1089.
- Hoon, C. (2007). Committees as strategic practice: the role of strategic conversation in a public administration. *Human Relations*, 60, 921–952.
- Jarratt, D. & Stiles, D. (2010). How are methodologies and tools framing managers' strategizing practice in competitive strategy development. *British Journal of Management*, 21, 28–43.
- Jarzabkowski, P. (2004). Strategy as practice: recursiveness, adaptation, and practices-in-use. *Organization Studies*, 25(4).
- Johnson, G., Melin, G. & Whittington, R. (2003). Special issue on micro strategy and strategizing: towards an activity-based view. *Journal of Management Studies*, 40, 3–22.
- Johnson, G., Prashantham, S., Floyd, S. W. & Bourque, N. (2010). The ritualization of strategy workshops. *Organization Studies*, 31, 1589–1618.
- Kaplan, S. (2011). Strategy and PowerPoint: an inquiry into the epistemic culture and machinery of strategy making. *Organization Science*, 22, 320–346.
- Kwon, W., Clarke, I. & Wodak, R. (2013). Micro-level discursive strategies for constructing a shared view around strategic issues in team meetings. *Journal of Management Studies*, 51, 265–290.
- Maitlis, S. (2005). The social processes of organizational sensemaking. *Academy of Management Journal*, 48, 21–49.
- Mantere, S. (2013). 'What is organizational strategy? A language-based view'. *Journal of Management Studies*, 56, doi: [10.1111/joms.12048](https://doi.org/10.1111/joms.12048).
- Marks, M. A.; Zaccaro, S. J. & Mathieu, J. E. (2000). Performance implications of leader briefings and team-interaction training for team adaptation to novel environments. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 85, 971-986.
- Mason, C. M. (2006). Exploring the processes underlying within-group homogeneity. *Small Group Research*, 37(3), 233-270.
- Miles, R. E. & Snow, C. C. (2003). *Organizational Strategy, Structure, and Process*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Monahan, K. E. (2001). *Balanced measures for strategic planning: A public sector handbook*. Vienna, VA: Management Concepts.
- Peng, M. W.; Tan, J. & Tong, T.W. (2004). Ownership types and strategic groups in an emerging economy. *Journal of Management Studies*, 41(7), 1105-1129.
- Porter, M. E. (1999). *O que é estratégia*. In Porter, M. E. (Org) *Competição = estratégias competitivas essenciais*. 5. ed. Rio de Janeiro: Campus.
- Powell, T. C. (2003). Strategy without ontology. *Strategic Management Journal*, 24, 285 –291.
- Reed, M. (1999). *Teorização organizacional: um campo historicamente contestado*. Cap. 1. In Clegg, S.; Hardy, C.; & Nord, W. (Orgs). *Handbook de Estudos Organizacionais – Modelos de Análise e Novas Questões em Estudos Organizacionais*. São Paulo: Atlas.
- Selznick, P. (1971). *A liderança na administração*. Rio de Janeiro, Fundação Getúlio Vargas, Serviço de Publicações.
- Schein, E. H. (1965). *Organizational psychology*. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall.
- Sillince, J. & Brown, A. D. (2009). Multiple organizational identities and legitimacy: the rhetoric of police websites. *Human Relations*, 62, 1829–1856.
- Silva Jr.; A.S., Santos, C.I.; Feitosa, M.G.G. & Vidal, R.M.C.S. (2012). Consultoria: Um estudo sobre o papel do consultor na formulação da estratégia organizacional. *Revista Ibero-Americana de Estratégia*, 11(1), 178-203.

- Swaab, R.; Postmes, T.; Van Beest, L. & Spears, R. (2007). Shared cognition as a product of, and precursor to, shared identity in negotiations. *Personality and Social Psychological Bulletin*, 33(2), 187-199.
- Thomas, R., Sargent, L. D. & Hardy, C. (2011). Managing organizational change: negotiating meaning and power-resistance relations. *Organization Science*, 22, 22-41.
- Tolbert, P. S. & Zucker, L. G. (1998). *A institucionalização da teoria institucional*. In: S. Clegg, C. Hardy e W. Nord. *Handbook de estudos organizacionais*. São Paulo, Atlas.
- Vaara, E. & Whittington, R. (2012). Strategy as practice: taking social practices seriously. *Academy of Management Annals*, 6, 285-336.
- Vasconcelos, F. C. & Cyrino, A. B. (2000). Vantagem competitiva: os modelos teóricos atuais e a convergência entre estratégia e teoria organizacional. *Revista de Administração de Empresas*, 40(4), 20-37.
- Walter, S.A.; Baptista, P.P. & Augusto, P.O.M. (2008). *Visão baseada em recursos: uma análise dos delineamentos metodológicos e da maturidade dessa abordagem na área de estratégia do Enanpad 1997-2007*. Anais do XXXII Encontro da Associação dos Programas de Pós-Graduação em Administração. Rio de Janeiro, RJ, Brazil: Associação dos Programas de Pós-Graduação em Administração.
- Weber, M. (1978). *Os fundamentos da organização burocrática: uma construção do tipo ideal*. In: Campos, E. (org.). *Sociologia da burocracia*. 4. ed. Rio de Janeiro: Zahar.
- Whittington, R. (2007) Strategy practice and strategy process: family differences and the sociological eye. *Organization Studies*, 28(10).
- Worchel, S.; Rothberger, H.; Day, A.; Hart, D. & Butemeyer, J. (1998). Social identity and individual productivity within groups. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 37, 389-413.

