

Sociology 280D – Organizations – Spring 2021 – Professor Heather A. Haveman

Thursdays 2-4pm

Zoom <https://berkeley.zoom.us/j/93221569499?pwd=eE4xQ3dNR3RXRIRVS1crZmloOWxrZz09>

Zoom through bcourses:

<https://berkeley.zoom.us/j/94248175782?pwd=MjBBR294Wjhqd3BGaEl0UW1YUzhWQT09>

Office Hours <https://www.wejoinin.com/sheets/qplrg>; zoom link at top of wejoinin sheet

✉ haveman@berkeley.edu ☎ 510-833-0807 🌐 <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 during this weird pandemic-driven time, I have assigned a smaller set of required readings than usual. These were chosen to cover key ideas and findings and introduce you to a wide array of scholars in this field. Required 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 an extended reading list that covers older research traditions. It is available on bcourses.

New This Year: The course is built around the book I am writing for Princeton University Press, titled *Organizations and Organizational Theory: Past, Present, and Future*. I am going to be revising the book, based on reviews, during the semester. This is the first time that students in 280D have had the entire book manuscript to help them navigate the field, so I hope that you will give me feedback on what you found (most) useful, what was confusing, and what was useless or distracting. I'm happy to take your critical commentary anonymously if you don't feel comfortable sharing it under your own name – I *do* understand the power dynamics at play here.

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?

Special Pedagogical Techniques to Manage Remote Learning

- I recognize that it's more difficult to learn remotely, so I have reduced the required readings each week, removing one item (article or section from a book). This will give us a chance to compensate for the informational "thinness" of zoom meetings with more in-depth discussions of each reading.
- I will be recording lectures (if you will, class-casts) that I will distribute via bcourses. Please listen to them before we "meet" on zoom. They will provide introductions to each week's readings – summarize background readings and situation the theories/topics within the larger landscape of organizational theory. These lectures will be brief – usually about 20 minutes. In exchange, I will reduce our meeting time by 20 minutes each session. These sessions will begin promptly at 2:10pm (Berkeley time for 2:00 classes) and end at 3:40pm.
- I have invited several guest speakers – authors of the work we are discussing each week – to attend the seminar during the last half-hour. (Their last names are underlined in the

readings.) They will briefly describe why they did the research they did, how they came up with ideas, and where their research went after the work we read was published. Their discussions will be guided by your questions – these guest cameos are intended to be very interactive. Each of you will add 1-2 questions to the discussion section of bcourses the day before class. There will be 1 discussion document for each session with a guest speaker. I will email your questions to the speaker the morning of class. (Please feel free to add your own student-run discussion documents to this section of bcourses.)

Assignments and Evaluation

- | | |
|--|-----|
| 1. Class participation | 20% |
| 2. Hypothesis development papers (8 during weeks 3-12) | 20% |
| 3. Final 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. 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.

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: (1) An empirically testable hypothesis that builds on at least one of the day's readings, (2) a logical argument to support the hypothesis (a series of "if, then" statements based on empirical facts, extant theory, and your own logic), 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 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 already have data, you instead write a final paper that summarizes your theory, research design (sampling plan, data sources, measures, and analysis techniques) and a brief presentation of your results, and a conclusion that explains the theoretical and empirical implication of your results. Such papers should about 30-35 pages long, including bibliography but excluding tables and figures.

Before you start working on your paper, please read the following short but extremely helpful piece. It's the clearest brief guide to writing social-scientific papers, although it's couched in experimental terms (Bem is a social psychologist), it's quite applicable to research designs using observational data (surveys, interviews, ethnographies, web scrapings) and administrative data (government, private company).

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 Bem's webpage)

You might also benefit from reading my guide to writing for doctoral students, which is chapter 10 of *Organizations and Organizational Theory*.

The final paper will be due 10 days after the end of our class meetings, on **Mon. 10 May by 4pm**. Please **email** the paper to me as an Adobe file. Label it Lastname_Firstname.pdf (e.g., Haveman_Heather.pdf). I will return your paper with comments.

Readings

There are two required books:

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

If you're in Berkeley, look for second-hand copies at Moe's on Telegraph. Otherwise, look at these second-hand web-stores: abebooks.com, powells.com, or alibris.com.

- 2) Haveman, Heather A. 2020. *Organizations and Organizational Theory: Past, Present, and Future*. Under review, Princeton University Press.

This is on bcourses. For ease in maneuvering this long document, the pdf contains internal hyperlinks between chapter beginnings and endings, on the one hand, and the table of contents, on the other.

In addition to these books, we will read many journal articles and several chapters of books. For journal articles, the syllabus contains links that are accessible through the library. All book chapters are on the Soc 280D bcourses site, including book chapters from among the background, recommended readings, and any articles that require association membership to read.

1) 21 Jan. Introduction to the CourseRequired reading

Haveman, Heather A. 2020. *Organizations and Organizational Theory*, chapters 1 and 2.

2) 28 Jan. Bureaucracy and Its DiscontentsBackground reading

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.

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.

Required readings

Haveman, Heather A. 2020. *Organizations and Organizational Theory*, chapter 3.

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.

***** No class 4 Feb. – I'm giving a (zoom) talk at the University of Toronto *****

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.

Important agenda-setting paper. But it focuses mostly on a single dimension of demography (distribution of tenure/time in the organization).

Required readings: focus primarily on gender and secondarily on race)

Haveman, Heather A. 2020. *Organizations and Organizational Theory*, chapter 4, pp. 97-108, 119-120.

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>)

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), density dependence in founding and failure (Hannan and Freeman 1987 & 1988 AJS), and age dependence in failure rates.

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(not so) HO, one of the two most interesting components of the original constellation of ecological theories (the other being inertia theory).

Hsu, Greta, and Michael T. Hannan. 2005. Identities, genres, and organizational forms.

Organization Science, 16 (5): 474-90. (<http://www.jstor.org/stable/25145987>)

A brief exposition on the most recent strand of organizational ecology – the theory of organizational forms as socially constructed categories. Blends demographic and cultural perspectives on organizations.

Required readings

Haveman, Heather A. 2020. *Organizations and Organizational Theory*, chapter 4, pp. 108-118, 120-121.

Greve, Henrich R. 1999. The effect of change on performance: Inertia and regression to the mean. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 44: 590-614.

(<https://www.jstor.org/stable/2666963>)

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>)

Le Mens, Gaël, Michael T. Hannan, and László Pólos. 2011. Founding conditions, learning, and organizational life chances: Age dependence revisited. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 56: 95-126.

(<https://www.jstor.org/stable/41410249>)

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

Haveman, Heather A. 2020. *Organizations and Organizational Theory*, chapter 5, pp. 126-127, 132-149.

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 E., Ezra W. Zuckerman, and Bill McEvily. 2004. How to make the team: Social networks vs. demography as criteria for designing effective projects in a contract R&D firm. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 49: 101-133. (<https://www.jstor.org/stable/4131457>)

Mizruchi, Mark S., Linda Brewster Stearns, and Christopher Marquis. 2006. The conditional nature of embeddedness: A study of borrowing by large U.S. firms, 1973-1994. *American Sociological Review*, 71: 310-333. (<https://www.jstor.org/stable/30038990>)

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>)

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.

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

Haveman, Heather A. 2020. *Organizations and Organizational Theory*, chapter 5, pp. 126-127, 132-149 (again).

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>)

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. (<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.)

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. It's mind-blowing!

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 from Ann's – also not organizational but quite influential.

Required readings

Haveman, Heather A. 2020. *Organizations and Organizational Theory*, chapter 6, pp. 152-156.

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

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>)

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

Haveman, Heather A. 2020. *Organizations and Organizational Theory*, chapter 6, pp. 156-165, 173-175.

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>)

Crilly, Donal, Morten Hansen, and Maurizio Zollo. 2016. The grammar of decoupling: A cognitive-linguistic perspective on firms' sustainability claims and stakeholders' interpretation. *Academy of Management Journal*, 59 (2): 705-729. (on bcourses)

***** No class 25 Mar. – Spring Break 22-26 Mar. *****

9) 1 Apr. 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

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 2020: 166-175).

Required readings

Haveman, Heather A. 2020. *Organizations and Organizational Theory*, chapter 6, pp. 166-175.

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>)

Jung, Jiwook. 2016. Through the contested terrain: Implementation of downsizing decisions by large U.S. firms, 1984 to 2005. *American Sociological Review*, 81 (2): 347-373. (<https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/0003122416629756>)

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>)

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>)

Meyer, David S., and Debra C. Minkoff. 2004. Conceptualizing political opportunity. *Social Forces*, 82 (4): 1457-1492. (<https://www.jstor.org/stable/3598442>)

Required readings

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 Inequality

Background 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>)
Original statement about how employing organizations have the power to generate or reduce gender and ethnoracial inequality.

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

Haveman, Heather A. 2020. *Organizations and Organizational Theory*, chapter 9, pp. 217-223.

Fernandez, Roberto M., and Isabelle Fernandez-Mateo. 2006. Networks, race, and hiring. *American Sociological Review*, 71 (1): 42-71. (<https://www.jstor.org/stable/30038975>)

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

Chan, Curtis K., and Michel Anteby. 2016. Task segregation as a mechanism for within-job inequality: Women and men of the Transportation Security Administration. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 61 (2): 184-216.
(<https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/0001839215611447>)

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 close-knit groups united by bonds of blood, soil and tradition which were “natural” and therefore “organic” (Gemeinschaft), and “artificial” or “man-made” societies characterized by opportunistic contact and self-seeking behavior, with individuals connected with one another for purely instrumental purposes (Gesellschaft) and therefore “mechanical.”

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

In an explicit attempt to confuse generations of sociology students, Durkheim 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.

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. (<https://muse.jhu.edu/book/47734>)