

Sociology 280D – Organizations – Spring 2019 – Professor Heather A. Haveman

Mondays, 4-6pm, 402 Barrows

Office 494 Barrows Hall

Office Hours Wednesdays 3-5pm (signup sheet on office door)

✉ haveman@berkeley.edu ☎ 510-642-3495 🌐 <http://www.heatherhaveman.net/>

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 organizations. It is only through organizations that large-scale planning and co-ordination in modern societies – for the state, the 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 to cover key ideas and findings and introduce you to a wide array of 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 (either early theory work or review pieces) and recommended readings (extensions of required readings) as well. Since the course focuses primarily on three research traditions (demographic, relational, and cultural) that have dominated sociological and management research on organizations since the 1970s, I have also created a reading list that covers older research traditions. It is available on bcourses.

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 second class meeting. As session leaders, you should come to class prepared to ask three 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 two-page assignment detailing one (**just one!**) hypothesis inspired by the readings. I'm looking for three things here: (1) A testable hypothesis that builds on at least one 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 two 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).

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 one or two hypotheses – don't try for more, and the two should be logically related), 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 – five to ten pages) and a brief presentation of your results (four to six pages), and a conclusion (two to three 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 the following short but extremely helpful paper.** It's the clearest brief guide to writing social-scientific papers.

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, 2nd Ed.* Washington, DC: Am. Psychological Assn. ([link](#) at bottom of webpage)

My own guide to writing for doctoral students is on bcourses (at the top of the files, listed as cl0): Haveman, Heather A. 2019. *Organizations*, chapter 11. Book manuscript draft chapter.

The final paper will be due 9 days after the end of our class meetings, on **Wed., 8 May., by 4pm.** Please **email** the paper to me as a Word document or Adobe pdf. Label it lastname_firstname.

Readings

There is one required book:

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

It is 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.

I recommend you purchase another book as a reference:

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

Because it is expensive, I suggest you find a second-hand copy of this or of an earlier edition. All earlier editions were 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 and recommended readings.

1) 28 Jan. Introduction to the Course

2) 4 Feb. Bureaucracy and Its Discontents

Background readings

Haveman, Heather A. 2019. *Organizations*, chapters 1, 2, and 4. Book manuscript draft chapters.

Haveman, Heather A., and Rachel Wetts. 2019. Contemporary organizational theory. Working paper being revised for resubmission to *Sociology Compass*.

Required readings

Note: These readings cover two 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.

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.

Recommended readings

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.

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.

3) 11 Feb. 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

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. (<https://doi.org/10.1177/0003122415596416>)

Ferguson, John-Paul, and Rembrand Koning. 2018. Firm turnover and the return of racial establishment segregation. *American Sociological Review*, 83 (3): 445-474.

(<https://doi.org/10.1177/0003122418767438>)

4) 18 Feb. Contemporary Theoretical Orientations (I): Organizational Position and Demography (aka Organizational Ecology)

Background readings

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).

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

A bridge between internal organizational demography and organizational ecology.

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.

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>)

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

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) 25 Feb. **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>)

Burt, Ronald S. 1992. *Structural Holes: The Social Structure of Competition*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Burt, Ronald S. 2005. *Brokerage and Closure*. New York: Oxford University Press.

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. (<https://www.jstor.org/stable/3088952>)

Goldberg, Amir, Sameer B. Srivastava, V. Govind Manian, William Monroe, and Christopher Potts. 2016. Fitting in or standing out? The tradeoffs of structural and cultural embeddedness. *American Sociological Review*, 81 (6): 1190-1222. (<https://doi.org/10.1177/0003122416671873>)

Clement, Julien, Andrew Shipilov, and Charles Galunic. 2018. Brokerage as a public good: The externalities of network hubs for different formal roles in creative organizations. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 63 (2): 251-286. (<https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/0001839217708984>)

6) 4 Mar. **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). Chapters 3 & 5-8 are 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”!)

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>)

Podolny, Joel M. 2001. Networks as pipes and prisms of the market. *American Journal of Sociology*, 107: 33-60. (<https://www.jstor.org/stable/10.1086/323038>)

Required readings

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>)

Childress, Clayton C. 2016. *Under the Cover: The Creation, Production, and Reception of a Novel*, chapter 1 (“Introduction”), chapter 4 (“Literary agents and double duties”), and chapter 5 (“Decision making, taste, and financial commitment to culture”). Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press. (The entire book is available at [https://muse.jhu.edu/book/56270/.](https://muse.jhu.edu/book/56270/))

Doering, Laura. 2018. Risks, returns, and relational lending: Personal ties in microfinance. *American Journal of Sociology*, 123 (5): 1341-1381. (<https://www.journals.uchicago.edu/doi/abs/10.1086/696214>)

7) 11 Mar. **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.

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>)

Rivera, Lauren A. 2012. Hiring as cultural matching: The case of elite professional service firms.

American Sociological Review, 77 (6): 999-1022. (<https://www.jstor.org/stable/41723081>)

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.

American Sociological Review, 82 (5): 879-909.

(<https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/0003122417728240>)

8) 18 Mar. 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.
- Zucker, Lynne G. 1977. The role of institutionalization in cultural persistence. *American Sociological Review*, 42 (5): 726-743. (<http://www.jstor.org/stable/2094862>)
- 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.
- Clemens, Elisabeth S., and James M. Cook. 1999. Politics and institutionalism: Explaining durability and change. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 25: 441-466.
(<https://www.jstor.org/stable/223512>)
- 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>)

***** No class 25 Mar. – Spring Break 25-29 Mar. *****

9) 1 Apr. Selected Topics (I): EntrepreneurshipBackground readings

Gordon, 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) 8 Apr. Selected Topics (II): Institutional LogicsBackground 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. The original theoretical formulation. Not the easiest thing to read!

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 (see Haveman and Gualtieri 2017).

Required readings

Haveman, Heather A., and Gillian Gualtieri. 2017. Institutional logics. In Ray Aldag, ed., *Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Business and Management*. New York: Oxford University Press. (<http://oxfordre.com/business/view/10.1093/acrefore/9780190224851.001.0001/acrefore-9780190224851-e-137>)

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>)

Gupta, Abhinav, and Adam J. Wowak. 2016. The elephant (or donkey) in the room: How board political ideology affects CEO pay. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 62 (1): 1-30. (<https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/0001839216668173>)

11) 15 Apr. Selected Topics (III): Social MovementsBackground 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/10.1086/210361>)

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>)

Dokshin, Fedor. 2016. Whose backyard and what's at issue? Spatial and ideological dynamics of local opposition to fracking in New York State, 2010 to 2013. *American Sociological Review*, 81 (5): 921-948. (<https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/0003h122416663929>)

12) 22 Apr. Selected Topics (IV): The Impact of Organizations on Society: Power and InequalityBackground readings

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

Perrow, 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>)

Sørensen, Jesper B., and Olav Sorenson. 2007. Corporate demography and income inequality. *American Sociological Review*, 72: 776-783.

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>)

Cobb, J. Adam, and Flannery G. Stevens. 2017. These unequal states: Corporate organization and income inequality in the United States. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 62 (2): 304-340. (<https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/0001839216673823>)

13) 29 Apr. 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/Pub/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.