

# Sociology 280D – Organizations – Fall 2016 – Professor Heather A. Haveman

**Mondays, 12noon-2pm, 402 Barrows**

Office 494 Barrows Hall

Office Hours Thursdays 2-4m (signup sheet on office door)

Email [haveman@berkeley.edu](mailto:haveman@berkeley.edu)

Telephone 510-642-3495

## ***Course Objectives***

Organizations are the basic building blocks of modern society. From birth to death, the lives of people in modern societies play out in formal organizations. Thus, organizations have an enormous impact on social life; they wield tremendous power and distribute innumerable benefits. All interests – economic, political, social, and cultural – are pursued through formal organizations. It is only through organizations that large-scale planning and co-ordination in modern societies – for the state, economy, and civil society – become possible. To understand the world we inhabit, then, we must appreciate the power and scope of organizations.

This course is an introduction to the sociological study of organizations. It will familiarize you with the main theoretical orientations and show you how they are used to investigate important phenomena. To that end, we will review the classics, but only briefly and with an eye to understanding how these foundational studies continue to reverberate in contemporary research on organizations. The bulk of our time will be spent considering current debates. I also want to help you learn how to *use* these ideas and findings in your own research. Therefore we will spend a lot of time trying to get inside the minds of the scholars whose work we read – figuring out why they did what they did, what you would have done differently, and what you could do next.

The literature on organizations is vast and our time is limited. Therefore, the course touches lightly on many important topics and approaches (*e.g.*, corporate governance) and neglects others entirely (*e.g.*, the social construction of organizational fields). To help you navigate the literature without overloading you, I have assigned a reasonably small set of required readings each week; these were chosen carefully to cover key ideas and findings and to introduce you to the scholars in this field. These readings will be the basis of our in-class discussion. To gain a full understanding of the field, you are going to have to read far beyond this syllabus. To guide you in this, I have listed optional background readings for every session. I have also created a reading list that covers older research traditions (pre-1975 or so); it is available on my website, [www.heatherhaveman.net](http://www.heatherhaveman.net), on the teaching page.

## ***Course Culture and Pedagogy***

You should read the required readings carefully for each session. As you read, ask yourself these questions:

- 1) What is being explained – the dependent variable (DV)?
- 2) What is purported to explain the dependent variable – the independent variable (IV)?
- 3) What is the basic argument – the reason(s) why the IV affects the DV? What assumptions underlie the argument? What are the argument's strengths? Its weaknesses?

- 4) What are the argument's scope conditions? Under what circumstances and to what kinds of organizations is it meant to apply?
- 5) What differentiates this argument from others we have read in past weeks or are reading this week? Can these differences be resolved through an empirical test?
- 6) If you disagree with the argument, what would it take to convince you?
- 7) For empirical articles: How, and how well, is the research designed? Consider sampling frame and measurement (construct validity, internal validity, and reliability), external validity, and statistical conclusion validity (spurious causation and selection/endogeneity). What, if any, alternative explanations could account for the findings?

### **Assignments and Evaluation**

1. Class participation and session leadership	20%
2. Hypothesis development papers (9 during weeks 3-13)	20%
3. Research paper	60%

**Class participation.** To make this seminar successful, you must participate. My role in class sessions is to facilitate and direct the discussion; your role is to engage each other in developing the best critical understanding of each paper. I will lecture only a few times, mostly at the start of the semester to provide you with some background to the readings. If you are uncertain about what constitutes effective participation in class discussions, try anyway (after all, it's only school – a safe place to make mistakes) or ask me for guidance.

Each of you will have the opportunity to lead the discussion. We will assign pairs of discussion leaders during the first class meeting. As session leaders, you should come to class prepared to ask 3 questions to start the ball rolling, and step in to steer the discussion when it gets off track (tangents abound in the discourse of PhD students and at least this faculty member) or gets bogged down.

**Hypothesis development.** Starting in class 3, you will turn in a 2-page assignment detailing 1 (**just 1!**) hypothesis inspired by the readings. I'm looking for 3 things here: (1) A testable hypothesis that builds on at least 1 of the day's readings, (2) a logical argument to support the hypothesis, and (3) a sketch of how you would measure the constructs in the hypothesis. You may opt out of 2 of these if you are really not inspired by the week's readings. They will be graded as check-minus (0 points), check (1 point), or check-plus (2 points).

**Before** you write your first hypothesis statement, **please read** "How to develop arguments and convince readers," a document that previous cohorts of graduate students have found useful. It is my website ([www.heatherhaveman.net](http://www.heatherhaveman.net)), on the teaching page.

**Research paper.** This is to take the form of a research proposal – basically, the front half of an empirical paper. It should contain the following generic sections: introduction, theory development (ending with an explicit statement of 1 or 2 hypotheses – don't try for more), and research design (sampling plan, data sources, measures, and methods of analysis). The paper should be 20-25 pages long, including bibliography but excluding any tables and figures. (As a rule

of thumb, 15 pages is not sufficient to delve into any topic in sufficient depth and 30 pages wears out the reader – at least this one.)

If you have data, you instead write a final paper that summarizes your actual research design (sampling plan, data sources, measures, and analysis techniques – 5 to 10 pages) and a brief presentation of your results (4 to 6 pages), and a conclusion (2 to 3 pages) that explains the theoretical and empirical implication of your results. Such papers should about 30 to 40 pages, including bibliography but excluding tables and figures.

**Before** you start working on your paper, **read this short but extremely helpful paper:**

Bem, Daryl J. 2003. Writing the empirical journal article. In J.M. Darley, M.P Zanna, and H.L. Roediger III, eds., *The Compleat Academic: A Practical Guide for the Beginning Social Scientist, 2<sup>nd</sup> Ed.* Washington, DC: Am. Psychological Assn.

Available on Daryl Bem's personal web page: [http://dbem.ws/online\\_pubs.html#writing](http://dbem.ws/online_pubs.html#writing).

It's the clearest brief guide to writing social-scientific papers.

The final paper will be due 9 days after the end of our class meetings, on **Wed., 7 Dec., by 2pm**. Please **email** the paper to me as a Word document or Adobe pdf. Label it lastname\_firstname.

### **Readings**

The following books will be available at the ASUC Bookstore. You may find second-hand copies at Moe's on Telegraph or at these second-hand web-stores: abebooks.com, powells.com, or alibris.com.

Gouldner, Alvin W. 1954. *Patterns of Industrial Bureaucracy*. New York: Free Press.

Scott, W. Richard, and Gerald F. Davis. 2007. *Organizations and Organizing: Rational, Natural, and Open Systems Perspectives*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

This is suggested, not required. It is *very* expensive. You can easily find a second-hand copy an earlier edition, all written by Scott alone and titled *Organizations: Rational, Natural, & Open Systems*.

In addition to these books, we will read many journal articles and several chapters of books. For journal articles, I listed URLs that are accessible through the UC Berkeley library. All book chapters are on the Soc 280D bcourses site, including book chapters from among the background readings.

1) 29 Aug. Introduction to the Course

2) 12 Sept. Bureaucracy and Its Discontents

Background readings

Scott, W. Richard, and Davis, Gerald F. 2007. *Organizations and Organizing: Rational, Natural, and Open Systems Perspectives*, chapter 1 (“Introduction”). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Guillén, Mauro F. 1994. *Models of Management: Work, Authority, and Organization in a Comparative Perspective*, chapter 1 (“The comparative study of organizational paradigms”). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Provides an overview of pragmatic, rationalist theories of bureaucracy and management from the early twentieth century to the 1970s – the time period before what I am calling “contemporary theoretical orientations” in the sociology of organizations were developed. These managerialist theories are only tangentially related to early sociological theories of complex organizations formulated by Weber and Marx, and developed further by American and European sociologists. We will not read or discuss these managerialist theories in class but you should be aware of these lines of thought.

Blau, Peter M., and Richard Schoenherr. 1971. *The Structure of Organizations*. New York: Basic Books.

Good representative of a huge literature of the 1960s and 1970s. As the title says, the DV=formal organizational structure.

Davis, Gerald F. 2015. What is organizational research for? *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 60 (2): 179-188. (<http://asq.sagepub.com/content/60/2/179>)

Required readings

Note: These readings cover 2 related lines of organizational research, Weber’s highly influential formulation of a theory of formal organizations and reactions to the limits of that theory for explaining real, live organizations.

Weber, Max. 1978 [1968]. *Economy and Society: An Outline of Interpretive Sociology*, part of chapter 10 (“Domination and legitimacy”) and all of chapter 11 (“Bureaucracy”). Berkeley: University of California Press.

Bendix, Reinhard. 1956. *Work and Authority in Industry: Ideologies of Management in the Course of Industrialization*, chapter 1 (“Industrialization, management, and ideological appeals”) and chapter 4 (“The bureaucratization of economic enterprises”). Berkeley: University of California Press.

Merton, Robert S. 1968. *Social Theory and Social Structure, 1968 Enlarged Ed.*, chapter 8 (“Bureaucratic structure and personality”). New York: Free Press.

Gouldner, Alvin W. 1954. *Patterns of Industrial Bureaucracy*, chapters 1-8. New York: Free Press. Gouldner was one of the students of Robert Merton who conducted the first deep sociological studies of organizations (see the companion book, *Wildcat Strike* – 2 books from 1 dissertation!). Several other Merton students – Philip Selznick (*TVA and the Grassroots*), Peter Blau (*Dynamics of Bureaucracy*), and Seymour Martin Lipset, Martin Trow, and James Coleman (*Union Democracy*) – also produced pioneering work.

**3) 19 Sept. Contemporary Theoretical Orientations (I): The Position & Demography of People in Organizations (aka Internal Organizational Demography)**

Background readings

Ryder, Norman B. 1964. Notes on the concept of a population. *American Journal of Sociology*, 69: 447-463. (<http://www.jstor.org/stable/2774272>)

Early example of applying demographic theory to understand the internal dynamics of organizations.

Blau, Peter M. 1977. *Inequality and Heterogeneity: A Primitive Theory of Social Structure*. New York: Free Press.

This is really a theory of the demographic distribution of people in society, but applies beautifully to organizations.

Kanter, Rosabeth Moss. 1977. Some effects of proportions on group life: Skewed sex ratios and responses to token women. *American Journal of Sociology*, 82 (5): 965-990.

(<http://www.jstor.org/stable/2777808>)

For a fuller treatment, see Kanter, Rosabeth Moss. 1977. *Men and Women of the Corporation*. New York: Basic Books. (Reprinted with new afterword in 1993.)

Pfeffer, Jeffrey. 1983. Organizational demography. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 5: 299-357.

Original theoretical statement, although it mostly focuses on a single dimension of demography (distribution of tenure/time in the organization).

Reskin, Barbara F., Debra B. McBrier, and Julie A. Kmec. 1999. The determinants and consequences of workplace sex and race composition. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 25: 235-261.

(<http://www.annualreviews.org/doi/abs/10.1146/annurev.soc.25.1.335>)

Required readings

McPherson, J. Miller. 1983. An ecology of affiliation. *American Sociological Review*, 48 (4): 519-532. (<http://www.jstor.org/stable/2117719>)

Huffman, Matt L., Philip N. Cohen, and Jessica Pearlman. 2010. Engendering change: Organizational dynamics and workplace gender desegregation, 1975-2005. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 55 (2): 255-277. (<http://www.jstor.org/stable/27856107>)

Turco, Catherine J. 2010. Cultural foundations of tokenism: Evidence from the leveraged buyout industry. *American Sociological Review*, 75 (6): 894-913.

(<http://www.jstor.org/stable/25782171>)

Castilla, Emilio J. 2015. Accounting for the gap: A firm study manipulating organizational accountability and transparency in pay decisions. *Organization Science*, 26 (2): 311-333.

(<http://dx.doi.org/10.1287/orsc.2014.0950>)

Dobbin, Frank R., Daniel Schrage, and Alexandra Kalev. 2015. Rage against the iron cage: The varied effects of bureaucratic personnel reforms on diversity. *American Sociological Review*, 80 (5): 1014-1044. (<http://asr.sagepub.com/content/80/5/1014>)

**4) 26 Sept. Contemporary Theoretical Orientations (I): Organizational Position and Demography (aka Organizational Ecology)**

Background reading

Hannan, Michael T., and John Freeman. 1989. *Organizational Ecology*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Summarizes their original theoretical formulations (and some empirical tests) on the dynamics of organizational populations (Hannan and Freeman 1977 AJS), structural inertia (Hannan and Freeman 1984 ASR), the origins and nature of organizational forms (Hannan and Freeman 1986 Sociological Forum), and density dependence in founding and failure (Hannan and Freeman 1987 AJS, 1988 AJS).

Carroll, Glenn R. 1985. Concentration and specialization: Dynamics of niche width in populations of organizations. *American Journal of Sociology*, 90: 1262-1283.

(<http://www.jstor.org/stable/2779636>)

The original formulation of resource-partitioning theory (aka niche-partitioning theory) – IM(NS)HO, one of the two most interesting components of the original constellation of ecological theories (the other being inertia theory).

Required readings

Carroll, Glenn R., and Michael T. Hannan. 2000. *The Demography of Corporations and Industries*, chapter 2 (“The demographic perspective”). Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Hsu, Greta, and Michael T. Hannan. 2005. Identities, genres, and organizational forms. *Organization Science*, 16 (5): 474-90. (<http://www.jstor.org/stable/25145987>)

Carroll, Glenn R., and Anand Swaminathan. 2000. Why the microbrewery movement? Organizational dynamics of resource partitioning in the American brewing industry after Prohibition. *American Journal of Sociology*, 106 (3): 715-762.

(<http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.1086/318962>)

Sharkey, Amanda J. 2014. Categories and organizational status: The role of industry status in the response to organizational deviance. *American Journal of Sociology*, 119 (5): 1380-1433..

(<http://www.journals.uchicago.edu/toc/ajs/2014/119/5>)

Ody-Brasier, Amandine, and Freek Vermeulen. 2014. The price you pay: Price-setting as a response to norm violation in the market for champagne grapes. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 59 (1): 109-144. (<http://asq.sagepub.com/content/59/1/109>)

**5) 3 Oct. Contemporary Theoretical Orientations (II): Power & Politics Within Organizations (aka Resource Dependence and Networks)**

Background readings

Emerson, Richard M. 1962. Power-dependence relations. *American Sociological Review*, 27 (1): 31-41. (<http://www.jstor.org/stable/2089716>)

Pfeffer, Jeffrey. 1981. *Power in Organizations*. Cambridge, MA: Ballinger.

Granovetter, Mark S. 1973. The strength of weak ties. *American Journal of Sociology*, 78 (6): 1360-1380. (<http://www.jstor.org/stable/2776392>)

Granovetter, Mark S. 1985. Economic action and social structure: The problem of embeddedness. *American Journal of Sociology*, 91: 481-510. (<http://www.jstor.org/stable/2780199>)

#### Required readings

Baker, Wayne E. 1990. Market networks and corporate behavior. *American Journal of Sociology*, 96 (3): 589-625. (<http://www.jstor.org/stable/2781065>)

Reagans, Ray, and Ezra W. Zuckerman. 2001. Networks, diversity, and productivity: The social capital of corporate R&D teams. *Organization Science*, 12 (4): 502-517. (<http://www.jstor.org/stable/3085985>)

Mizruchi, Mark S., and Linda Brewster Stearns. 2001. Getting deals done: The use of social networks in bank decision-making. *American Sociological Review*, 66: 647-671.

Liu, Christopher C., and Sameer B. Srivastava. 2015. Pulling closer and moving apart: Interaction, identity, and influence in the U.S. senate, 1973 to 2009. *American Sociological Review*, 80 (1): 192-217. (<http://asr.sagepub.com/content/80/1/192>)

Lutter, Mark. 2015. Do women suffer from network closure? The moderating effect of social capital on gender inequality in a project-based labor market, 1920 to 2010. *American Sociological Review*, 80 (2): 329-358. (<http://asr.sagepub.com/content/80/2/329>)

### **6) 10 Oct. Contemporary Theoretical Orientations (II): Power & Politics Between Organizations (aka Resource Dependence and Networks)**

#### Background readings

Pfeffer, Jeffrey, and Gerald R. Salancik. 1978. *The External Control of Organizations: A Resource Dependence Perspective*. New York: Harper and Row.  
Summarizes a series of articles and provides a coherent overview. Builds on Emerson (1962 ASR). Chapter 6 is on bcourses.

Burt, Ronald S. 1983. *Corporate Profits and Co-optation: Networks of Market Constraints and Directorate Ties in the American Economy*. New York: Academic Press.  
Summarizes a series of articles and demonstrates the clear logical connection between resource-dependence theory and social-network analytical methods. (Note: There is no such thing as network “theory”!)

#### Required readings

Marquis, Christopher. 2003. The pressure of the past: Network imprinting in intercorporate communities. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 48 (4): 655-689. (<http://www.jstor.org/stable/3556640>)

Uzzi, Brian. 1999. Embeddedness in the making of financial capital: How social relations and networks benefit firms seeking capital. *American Sociological Review*, 64 (4): 481-505. (<http://www.jstor.org/stable/2657252>)

Ingram, Paul, Jeffrey Robinson, and Marc L. Busch. 2005. The intergovernmental network of world trade: IGO connectedness, governance, and embeddedness. *American Journal of Sociology*, 111 (3): 824-858. (<http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.1086/497350>)

Lingo, Elizabeth Long, and Siobhán O'Mahony. 2010. Nexus work: Brokerage on creative projects. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 55 (1): 47-81. (<http://www.jstor.org/stable/27856088>)

Askin, Noah, and Matthew S. Bothner. 2016. Status-aspirational pricing: The “Chivas Regal” strategy in U.S. higher education, 2006-2012. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 61 (2): 217-253. (<http://asq.sagepub.com/content/61/2/217>)

## 7) 17 Oct. Contemporary Theoretical Orientations (III): Culture & Cognition within Organizations (aka Institutional Analysis)

### Background readings

Hughes, Everett C. 1936. The ecological aspect of institutions. *American Sociological Review*, 1: 180-189. (<http://www.jstor.org/stable/2084476>)

Classic sociological definition of institutions: “establishment of relative permanence of a distinctly social sort” (p. 180); “those features of social life which outlast biological generations or survive drastic social changes that might have been expected to bring them to an end” (pp. 283-284.)

Swidler, Ann. 1986. Culture in action: Symbols and strategies. *American Sociological Review*, 51: 273-286. (<http://www.jstor.org/stable/2095521>)

Although this paper is not about organizations or people in organizations, it has powerfully shaped the way organizational theorists think about culture.

Vaisey, Stephen. 2009. Motivation and justification: A dual-process model of culture in action. *American Journal of Sociology*, 114 (6): 1675-1715.

(<http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.1086/597179>)

A very different view of culture in action – also not organizational but quite influential.

### Required readings

Berger, Peter L., and Thomas Luckmann. 1967. *The Social Construction of Reality: A Treatise in the Sociology of Knowledge*, chapter 2 (“Society as objective reality”). Garden City, NY: Doubleday / Anchor Books. (Read only p. 53 onward.)

You should read the rest of this book as a background reading.

Zucker, Lynne G. 1977. The role of institutionalization in cultural persistence. *American Sociological Review*, 42 (5): 726-743. (<http://www.jstor.org/stable/2094862>)

Barley, Stephen R. 1983. Semiotics and the study of occupational and organizational cultures. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 28 (3): 393-413. (<http://www.jstor.org/stable/2392249>)

Morrill, Calvin. 1991. Conflict management, honor, and organizational change. *American Journal of Sociology*, 97 (3): 585-621. (<http://www.jstor.org/stable/2781778>)

Fligstein, Neil, Jonah Stuart Brundage, and Michael Schultz. 2016. Seeing like the Fed: The roles of culture, cognition, and framing in the failure to anticipate the financial crisis of 2008.

Working paper, Department of Sociology University of California, Berkeley.

The authors are currently revising this paper for resubmission to ASR. The revised paper will be available on bcourses by mid October.



**8) 24 Oct. Contemporary Theoretical Orientations (III): Culture & Cognition about Organizations (aka Institutional Analysis)**

Background readings

- Selznick, Philip. 1957. *Leadership in Administration: A Sociological Interpretation*. Berkeley: University of California Press.  
Foundational study of how organizations actually work. A deeply sociological meditation on leadership.
- Jepperson, Ronald L. 1991. Institutions, institutional effects, and institutionalization. In Walter W. Powell and Paul J. DiMaggio, eds., *The New Institutionalism in Organizational Analysis*: 143-163. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Schneiberg, Marc, and Elisabeth S. Clemens. 2006. The typical tools for the job: Research strategies in institutional analysis. *Sociological Theory*, 24: 195-227.  
(<http://www.jstor.org/stable/25046721>)

Required readings

- Meyer, John W., and Brian Rowan. 1977. Institutionalized organizations: Formal structure as myth and ceremony. *American Journal of Sociology*, 83 (2): 340-363.  
(<http://www.jstor.org/stable/2778293> )
- DiMaggio, Paul J., and Walter W. Powell. 1983. The iron cage revisited: Institutional isomorphism and collective rationality in organizational fields. *American Sociological Review*, 48 (2): 147-160. (<http://www.jstor.org/stable/2095101>)
- Edelman, Lauren B., Christopher Uggen, and Howard S. Erlanger. 1999. The endogeneity of legal regulation: Grievance procedures as rational myth. *American Journal of Sociology*, 105 (2): 406-454. (<http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.1086/210316>)
- Fiss, Peer C., and Paul M. Hirsch. 2005. The discourse of globalization: Framing and sensemaking of an emerging concept. *American Sociological Review*, 70 (1): 29-52.  
(<http://www.jstor.org/stable/4145349>)
- Sauder, Michael, and Wendy Nelson Espeland. 2009. The discipline of rankings: Tight coupling and organizational change. *American Sociological Review*, 74 (1): 63-82.  
(<http://www.jstor.org/stable/27736048>)

**9) 31 Oct. Selected Topics (I): Entrepreneurship**

Background readings

- Graham, Margaret B.W. 2010. Entrepreneurship in the United States, 1920-2000. In David S. Landes, Joel Mokyr, and William J. Baumol, eds., *The Invention of Enterprise: Entrepreneurship from Ancient Mesopotamia to Modern Times*: 401-442. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Weber, Max. 1904-05 [1958]. *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism*. (Translated by Talcott Parsons.) New York: Charles Scribners' Sons. Excerpts: pp. 47-57, pp. 87-92, pp. 180-183.

Schumpeter, Joseph A. 1942. *Capitalism, Socialism, and Democracy*, chapter VII (“The process of creative destruction,” pp. 81-86) and chapter XII (“Crumbling walls,” pp. 131-139). New York: Harper and Row.

Stinchcombe, Arthur L. 1965. Social structure and organizations. In James G. March, ed., *Handbook of Organizations*: 142-193. Chicago: Rand-McNally.

#### Required readings

Aldrich, Howard E., and C. Marlene Fiol. 1994. Fools rush in? The institutional context of industry creation. *Academy of Management Review*, 19 (4): 645-670. (<http://www.jstor.org/stable/258740>)

Stuart, Toby E., and Waverly W. Ding. 2006. When do scientists become entrepreneurs? The social structural antecedents of commercial activity in the academic life sciences. *American Journal of Sociology*, 112 (1): 97-144. (<http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.1086/502691>)

Johnson, Victoria. 2007. What is organizational imprinting? Cultural entrepreneurship in the founding of the Paris Opera. *American Journal of Sociology*, 113 (1): 97-127. (<http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.1086/517899>)

Hiatt, Shon R., Wesley D. Sine, and Pamela S. Tolbert. 2009. From Pabst to Pepsi: The deinstitutionalization of social practices and the creation of entrepreneurial opportunities. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 54 (4): 635-667. (<http://www.jstor.org/stable/27749360>)

Thébaud, Sarah. 2015. Business as plan B: Institutional foundations of gender inequality in entrepreneurship across 24 industrialized countries. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 60 (4): 671-711. (<http://asq.sagepub.com/content/60/4/671>)

### **10) 7 Nov. Selected Topics (II): Institutional Logics**

#### Background readings

Friedland, Roger, and Robert R. Alford. 1991. Bringing society back in: Symbols, practices, and institutional contradictions. In Walter W. Powell and Paul J. DiMaggio, eds., *The New Institutionalism in Organizational Analysis*: 232-263. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. (on bcourses)  
The original theoretical formulation.

Thornton, Patricia H., William Ocasio, and Michael Lounsbury. 2012. *The Institutional Logics Perspective: A New Approach to Culture, Structure and Process*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

An influential reformulation of the theory. Summarizes much research that has built on the foundation laid by Friedland and Alford. Has many good points, but the analysis has shortcomings.

#### Required readings

Haveman, Heather A., and Gillian Gualtieri. 2016. Institutional logics. Forthcoming in Ray Aldag, ed., *Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Business and Management*.

Haveman, Heather A., and Hayagreeva Rao. 1997. Structuring a theory of moral sentiments: Institutional and organizational coevolution in the early thrift industry. *American Journal of Sociology*, 102: 1606-1651. (<http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.1086/231128>)

- Thornton, Patricia H., and William Ocasio. 1999. Institutional logics and the historical contingency of power in organizations: Executive succession in the higher education publishing industry, 1958 to 1990. *American Journal of Sociology*, 105 (3): 801-843. (<http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.1086/210361>)
- Dunn, Mary B., and Candace Jones. 2010. Institutional logics and institutional pluralism: The contestation of care and science logics in medical education, 1967-2005. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 55: 114-149. (<http://www.jstor.org/stable/27856090>)
- Quattrone, Paolo. 2015. Governing social orders, unfolding rationality, and Jesuit accounting practices: A procedural approach to institutional logics. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 60 (3): 411-445. (<http://asq.sagepub.com/content/60/3/411>)

### 11) 14 Nov. Selected Topics (III): Social Movements

#### Background readings

- McCarthy, John D., and Mayer N. Zald. 1977. Resource mobilization and social movements: A partial theory. *American Journal of Sociology*, 82 (6): 1212-1241. (<http://www.jstor.org/stable/2777934>)
- Davis, Gerald F., and Doug McAdam. 2000. Corporations, classes, and social movements after managerialism. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 22: 193-236. (<http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/journal/01913085/22>)
- Rao, Hayagreeva, Calvin Morrill, and Mayer N. Zald. 2000. Power plays: How social movements and collective action create new organizational forms. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 22: 237-280. (<http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/journal/01913085/22>)
- Meyer, David S. 2004. Protest and political opportunities. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 30: 125-145. (<http://www.jstor.org/stable/29737688>)

#### Required readings

- Snow, David A., E. Burke Rochford, Steven K. Worden, and Robert D. Benford. 1986. Frame alignment processes, micromobilization, and movement participation. *American Sociological Review*, 51 (4): 464-481. (<http://www.jstor.org/stable/2095581>)
- King, Brayden G., and Sarah A. Soule. 2007. Social movements as extra-institutional entrepreneurs: The effect of protests on stock price returns. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 52 (3): 413-443. (<http://www.jstor.org/stable/20109931>)
- Schneiberg, Marc, Marissa D. King, and Thomas Smith. 2008. Social movements and organizational form: Cooperative alternatives to corporations in the American insurance, dairy, and grain industries. *American Sociological Review*, 73 (4): 635-667. (<http://www.jstor.org/stable/25472548>)
- Weber, Klaus, Kathryn L. Heinsze, and Michaela DeSoucey. 2008. Forage for thought: Mobilizing codes in the movement for grass-fed meat and dairy products. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 53 (4): 529-567. (<http://www.jstor.org/stable/27749277>)
- Vasi, Ion Bogdan, Edward T. Walker, John S. Johnson, and Hui Fen Ten. 2015. "No fracking way!" Documentary film, discursive opportunity, and local opposition against hydraulic fracturing

in the United States, 2010 to 2013. *American Sociological Review*, 80 (5): 934-959  
<http://asr.sagepub.com/content/80/5/934>)

**12) 21 Nov. Selected Topics (IV): The Impact of Organizations on Society: Power and Inequality**

Background readings

Coleman, James S. 1982. *The Asymmetric Society*. Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press.  
 (chapter 1 is on bcourses)

Parrow, Charles. 1991. A society of organizations. *Theory and Society*, 20 (6): 725-762.  
<http://www.jstor.org/stable/657602>)

Piketty, Thomas. 2014. *Capital in the Twenty-First Century*, chapter 8 (“Two worlds”), chapter 9 (“Inequality of labor income”), and chapter 10 (“Inequality of capital ownership”).  
 (Translated by Arthur Goldhammer.) Cambridge, MA: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.

Admirable. But note the almost complete absence of organizations from this story. Clearly, there’s work for organizational sociologists to do!

Required readings

Baron, James N., and William T. Bielby. 1980. Bringing the firms back in: Stratification, segmentation, and the organization of work. *American Sociological Review*, 45 (5): 737-765. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2094893>)

Garet, Michael S., and Brian Delany. 1988. Students, courses, and stratification. *Sociology of Education*, 61 (2): 61-77. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2112265>)

Sørensen, Jesper B., and Olav Sorenson. 2007. Corporate demography and income inequality. *American Sociological Review*, 72 (5): 776-783. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/25472491>)

Stainback, Kevin, Donald Tomaskovic-Devey, and Sheryl Skaggs. 2010. Organizational approaches to inequality: Inertia, relative power, and environments. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 36: 225-347. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/25735076>)

Dencker, John C., and Chichun Fang. 2016. Rent seeking and the transformation of employment relationships: The effect of corporate restructuring on wage patterns, determinants, and inequality. *American Sociological Review*, 81 (3): 467-487.  
<http://asr.sagepub.com/content/81/3/467>)

**13) 28 Nov. Selected Topics (V): The Impact of Organizations on Society: Community and Cohesion/Division**

Background readings

Tönnies, Ferdinand. 1887 [1957]. *Community and Society*. (Translated by Charles P. Loomis.) New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers.

Distinguished between two types of society: one a close-knit group united by bonds of blood, soil and tradition which was “natural” and therefore “organic” (*Gemeinschaft*), the other one an “artificial” society which was characterized by opportunistic contact and self-seeking behavior in which individuals only

connected with one another for purely instrumental purposes (*Gesellschaft*), because this type of social arrangement is not natural but a product of man-made conventions, Tönnies referred to it as “mechanical.”

Durkheim, Émile. 1893 [1984]. *The Division of Labor in Society*. (Translated by W.D. Halls.) New York: Free Press.

This was his doctoral dissertation – still in print >120 years later. In an explicit attempt to confuse generations of sociology students, he used the same terms as Tönnies (*Gemeinschaft* and *Gesellschaft*), but gave them opposite meanings. For Durkheim, *mechanical solidarity* was based on shared religious beliefs that integrated traditional societies, while *organic solidarity* was associated with an advanced division of labor.

Maclver, R.M. 1917. *Community: A Sociological Study*. London: Macmillan and Co.

(<http://www.unz.org/Public/MaclverRobert-1917?View=Readit>)

Anderson, Benedict. 1983 [1991]. *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism, Rev. Ed.* London: Verso.

Analyzes the rise of the nation-state, which are among the largest and most common of modern communities – sites of “deep, horizontal comradeship.” They are “imagined” by the people who conceive of themselves as part of those communities. Highlights the importance of shared language and the media in creating and sustaining such large communities.

#### Required readings

Marwell, Nicole P. 2004. Privatizing the welfare state: Nonprofit community-based organizations as political actors. *American Sociological Review*, 69 (2): 265-291.

(<http://www.jstor.org/stable/3593087>)

For more details, see Marwell, Nicole P. 2007. *Bargaining for Brooklyn: Community Organizations in the Entrepreneurial City*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Bail, Christopher A. 2012. The fringe effect: Civil society organizations and the evolution of media discourse about Islam since the September 11th attacks. *American Sociological Review*, 77 (6): 855-879. (<http://asr.sagepub.com/content/77/6/855>)

For more details, see Bail, Christopher A. 2015. *Terrified: How Civil Society Organizations Shape Public Understandings of Islam*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Mora, G. Cristina. 2014. Cross-field effects and pan-ethnic classification: The institutionalization of Hispanic panethnicity, 1965 to 1990. *American Sociological Review*, 79 (2): 183-210.

(<http://asr.sagepub.com/content/79/2/183>)

For more details, see Mora, G. Cristina. 2014. *Making Hispanics: How Activists, Bureaucrats, and Media Constructed a New American*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Haveman, Heather A. 2015. *Magazines and the Making of America: Modernization, Community, and Print Culture, 1741-1860*, chapter 1 (“Introduction”), chapter 4 (“Launching magazines”), and chapter 5 (“Religion”). Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.