



Sociology of Organizations

Fall 2012 | SOC 63820-01
Monday 6-8:30 PM, Flanner 824

Professor Erin McDonnell
erin.mcdonnell@nd.edu
Office: 744 Flanner Hall
Office Hours: X or by appointment.

The goal of the course is to gain understanding of the origins, structure and dynamics of complex organizations, and their relationship to their environment.

In the first weeks, we'll cover some of the history of the field, beginning with several foundational research pieces that are touchstones for nearly all of the organizations research that followed. We will place the development and subsequent fracturing of the field in context to understand how these diverse research streams within organizations arose in relation to each other and what came before. Many of the streams of research you are familiar with now arose in a particularly fruitful time in the 1970s and in response to the vision of rational complex organizations. We'll examine these reactions—especially neoinstitutional theory, population ecology, resource dependence, and networks—as major paradigms for thinking about organizations that are, in different ways, still influential today. As we trace the development of these literatures forward, we will see how they intersected with important questions from other sociology subfields, such as discrimination in the workplace. We will also attempt to understand how those earlier paradigms gave rise to hybrid theoretical work, such as how the density of organizations (pop ecology) affects legitimacy (neoinstitutionalism). I hope that by thinking about the multiple approaches drawn on by these studies you will develop a fuller sense of the strengths and weaknesses of each approach and that it will help you think about how you might use them in your own work.

We will read great works by great thinkers, the proverbial minds that launched a thousand ships. In doing so you will learn not merely how to copy a recipe, but begin to understand how to generate novel and important research of your own that advances what came before. My ultimate goal for this course is that facilitates your professional development as a scholar and intellectual, with the ability to read, write, think, analyze and communicate at the graduate level. There is more to the organizations literature than what we can cover here, but this syllabus is an entry point into some of the major changes that continue to

move the field today. Organizations research is a vast and rich field, filled with the work of sociology, economics, political science, anthropology and management scholars, to name a few. As such, no class can be a comprehensive guide to everything you would need to know to “master” the field. That said, this syllabus has been carefully designed to include some of the most canonical readings found on syllabi at top programs across the country; after finishing you should be able to engage in informed dialogue with anyone in the subfield without feeling lost. To further your explorations of this field, the syllabus is constructed in the Chicago style: some topics include suggested works beyond those required for class. Think of these as mini roadmaps for deeper exploration of particular topics if they pique your interest.

Though there are a number of important books in the field of organizations, much of the literature is article-based. The triumvirate of journals for sociologists of organizations are the American Journal of Sociology (AJS), the American Sociological Review (ASR) and Administrative Science Quarterly (ASQ). AJS and ASR are sociology generalist journals that also publish sociology of organizations work; ASQ is an interdisciplinary journal focused on organizational topics. There are also a number of other good journals in the subfield: Organization, Organization Science, Academy of Management Journal, Management Science etc. I also recommend you follow orgtheory.wordpress.com, a great blog where smart young org theorists (including ND’s own Omar Lizardo) discuss contemporary issues in organizations in a more casual format.

Course Goals

By the end of the semester, students will be able to:

- Identify, articulate, evaluate, apply, and criticize major theories and debates in the Sociology of Organizations from the mid-20th Century to the present.
- Identify and articulate the sequential development of a literature within the sociology of organizations.
- Identify the framing of some of the field’s most prominent research projects, and be able to apply those framing practices to their own work.
- Modify and transpose those theoretical tools to generate novel questions or theoretical contributions to substantive fields—such as education, social movements, religion, culture and more—that intersect with the Sociology of Organizations.

Required and Recommended Reading

Required readings appear under the headings for each week. Beneath required readings you will sometimes see additional “see also” lists, which serve as good roadmaps if you are interested in learning more about a particular topic. Discussion of any of those recommended materials would be welcomed in class, but is not required. All required readings are available online, either

through JSTOR or another online source. Most are linked through the syllabus, but for those that are not you can search on Google Scholar and follow the link.

Likely the best writing guide you'll ever see:

Williams, Joseph M. *Style: The Basics of Clarity and Grace*

Good Readers to build your library (NOT required):

Powell, Walter, and Paul DiMaggio. 1991. *The New Institutionalism in Organizational Analysis*. University of Chicago Press.

Wharton, Amy, ed. 2007. *The Sociology of Organizations*. Los Angeles, CA: Roxbury.

Grading

30% Participation & Participatory Exercises
(of which 10% may be Leading Class Discussion)

10% Literature timeline

20% Two Mini Research Proposals (10% each)

10% Future of Org Soc Presentation

30% Final Paper

- Assignments must be emailed before the start of class on the due date.
- All emailed files must include your last name and the assignment name in the doc title as well as the paper header.
- Except in cases of serious personal, health, or family emergencies, late assignments will be penalized by a half a grade for every 24 hours they are late. That is, if the quality of the work would have merited a B+, but it was turned in 20 hours late, you would receive a B. If you intend to take a late penalty on a paper, or if you are seeking an extension for a personal emergency, please contact me by email as soon as possible.
- Your participation grade will include the completion of several "participatory assignments" that will feed into classroom activities and help fill your comprehension of the material and the professional practice of organizational research (including but not limited to "Analyzing a Business Decision" and "Sociology Mad Libs"). Because they will be used in class, paper copies must be turned into class on the day they are due, and late P.A.s will receive a zero towards that portion of your participation grade.
- Mini Research Proposals are 3 page thought pieces that summarize and synthesize the readings from one week, and then extend them to think about how you might use those ideas to make a new research contribution, eg by transporting those ideas to a new domain, or testing something etc. They are due the week of the readings you select (eg if you write on week 3 readings, they are due before class week 3), but one must come from the first seven weeks, and one from the last seven weeks.

Final Paper

The final paper is intended to advance what you, as a scholar, most need to work on. As such, it could take several potential formats. I will highlight the three most likely formats, though you are welcome to propose an alternative format in consultation with me.

1. A research proposal. Here the goal is to consider the relevant literature and use it to develop a research project, which should include research questions or hypotheses and identify how you would collect evidence. This is a great way to explore possible dissertation topics. I assume most of the class will write research proposals.
2. A research paper. If you have already begun a research project or have data (qualitative or quantitative) that you would like to use, you may use the final paper as a space to draft an article-style paper. In this case, a relatively smaller part of the paper would focus on literature review, identifying questions and data sources, etc., and more would focus on actual analysis.
3. A Theory Paper. This style of analysis would involve relatively greater attention to the sociology of knowledge, tracing the development and content of a particular stream of organizations theory and adding something novel to our understanding of that literature. This might include, for example, documenting the treatment of Bourdieu in organizational theory and making a corrective to how he has been misunderstood, or intersecting a stream of theory from sociology of organizations with a body of literature from another field to show something novel and useful, etc. In many ways, this is the most difficult option. The model for this is likely an article that could ultimately be published in *Theory and Society* or *Sociological Theory*.

Regardless of the option you select, I expect most of the papers to be around 20 pages of text plus bibliography. For example, if you are writing a proposal, the paper should include an introduction (2-4 pp.), a review of the literature (5-12 pp.), a statement of your question that arises logically out of your presentation of the literature (1-5 pp.), a section on proposed research design (5-10 pp.), a conclusion (2-3 pp.), and works cited. If you write a research paper, less of the paper would focus on literature review and relatively more on actual analysis, the section on research design would instead become your methodology section etc. These are just guidelines, not rigid rules.

Remember that the expectation is that the final product will demonstrate a deep engagement with and mastery of the material from this class. Therefore, for example, a three page memo on organizations inserted into the middle of a paper you already wrote for another class is not likely to meet the criteria of substantially engaging the literature on organizations.

Participation Attendance & Preparation Policy

- Reading and thinking will make you a student, but debating ideas in a public forum will make you an intellectual. Therefore, in this course, YOU NEED TO TALK. Expressing your ideas with the others in the class is the ideal way to learn (and it is an integral part of your grade).
- If you struggle to communicate your ideas in front of a group, please arrange to see me privately during office hours and we will discuss strategies for helping you be more actively involved in class.
- It is okay to have questions, to be confused, even to be “wrong.” But it is not okay to blow off preparation for this class. If you are not prepared for class, then you are not ready to be a member of our learning community. It is disrespectful to your colleagues to be an intellectual free-rider.
- Any student with a verified disability requiring special accommodations should speak to me and to the Office of Disability Services (574-631-7157) as early as possible in the semester, preferably within the first two weeks of the course. All discussions will remain confidential.

Academic Integrity

You are expected to know, understand and abide by all the guidelines on academic honesty as described in the University of Notre Dame Academic Code of Honor located at www.nd.edu/~hnr/code. This course will hold you accountable to the strictest standards of academic integrity. Failures of academic integrity include, but are not limited to, cheating, plagiarizing, fabricating information or citations, facilitating acts of academic dishonesty by others, having unauthorized possession of examinations, submitting work of another person, resubmitting your own previously used work without informing the instructor, or tampering with the academic work of other students.

Plagiarism undermines the entire enterprise of learning. It harms you and your fellow students. It destroys the trust and fellowship between students and the teacher. If you borrow someone else's words or ideas, whether in print or on the internet, in whole or in part, you must give credit where that credit is due. If you are in doubt, ask someone qualified to help you. This includes your instructor or someone at the writing center. *You would always be better off taking a late penalty on a paper than turning in a plagiarized paper for lack of time.*

 FOUNDATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS RESEARCH & THEORY

- Framing in Academic Work
- Introduction to Mayo and the Hawthorne Experiments
- Hawthorne vs Weber's Piece-rates Essay
- Max Weber's US lineage

Weber, Max. 1978. *Economy and Society*. "Characteristics of Modern Bureaucracy" through "Bureaucratic Objectivity, Raison D'Etat and Popular Will" (pp 956-980); "Bureaucracy and Politics" through "The Political Limitations of Bureaucracy" (pp 1393-1405)

Stinchcombe, Arthur L. 1959. "Bureaucratic and Craft Administration of Production." *ASQ* 4:168-87. ([JSTOR](#))

- See also:
 - Roethlisberger, Fritz J. and William J. Dickson. 1939. *Management and the Worker*
 - Parsons, Talcott. 1956. "Suggestions for a Sociological Approach to the Theory of Organizations: I." *Administrative Science Quarterly* 1(1):63-85.
 - Taylor, Frederick. 1911. *The Principles of Scientific Management*. ([ONLINE](#))
 - Barnard, Chester I. 1938. *The Functions of the Executive*.
 - Drucker, Peter F. 1954. *The Practice of Management*.
 - Anteby and Khurana. "[A New Vision](#)" through "The Hawthorne Effect." Harvard Business School, Historical Collections. (Online)
 - Sonnenfeld, J.A. 1985. "Shedding Light on the Hawthorne Studies" *Journal of Occupational Behavior* 6(2): 111-130
 - Levitt, Steven D and John A List. 2011. "Was There Really a Hawthorne Effect at the Hawthorne Plant? An analysis of the original illumination experiments" *American Economic Journal* 3(1): 224-238 ([ONLINE](#))

 SECOND GENERATION ORGANIZATIONAL STUDIES

- Intellectual genealogy of early organizational researchers

Selznick, Philip. 1966. Ch 7: "The Voluntary Association at the End Point" and "Conclusion." in *TVA and the Grass Roots*. New York: Harper & Row, (note: "Introduction" chapter is optional if you want more of an orientation to the topic)

Stinchcombe, Arthur. 1965. "Social Structure and Organizations" pp 142-169 (only) in *Handbook of Organizations*, edited by James March. New York: Rand McNally.

Macaulay, Stewart. 1963. "Non-Contractual Relations in Business: A Preliminary Study." *American Sociological Review* 28:55-67. ([JSTOR](#))

- See also:
 - Parsons, Talcott. 1956. "Suggestions for a Sociological Approach to the Theory of Organizations II." *Administrative Science Quarterly* 1(2):225-39.

- March, James, and Herbert Simon. *Organizations*. New York: Wiley, 1958, especially chs. 1, 3, 6, 7.
- Blau, Peter M. 1955. *Dynamics of Bureaucracy*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Blau, Peter M. 1970. "A Formal Theory of Differentiation in Organizations." *American Sociological Review* 35:201-18.

WEEK 3.

SEPT 10

ORGS AND RATIONALITY

- Key terms: free rider, excludability, externality, rivalry, public goods, private goods, club goods
- Simon went on to win the 1978 Nobel Prize in Economics for his path-breaking work. He's also wildly readable, especially for an economist.

Simon, Herbert. 1955. "A Behavioral Model of Rational Choice" *The Quarterly Journal of Economics* 69(1): 99-118([JSTOR](#))

March and Simon. 1981. "Decision-Making Theory" pp135-150 in *The Sociology of Organizations* Grusky and Miller eds.

Richard Cyert, Herbert Simon, and Donald Trow. 1956. "Observation of a Business Decision," *Journal of Business* 29: 237-248. ([JSTOR](#))

Olson, Mancur. 1965. "Introduction" and "A Theory of Groups and Organizations" (p1-52) in *The Logic of Collective Action: Public Goods and the Theory of Groups*

See also:

Simon, Herbert. 1979. "Rational Decision Making in Business Organizations," *American Economic Review* 69: 493-513. ([JSTOR](#))

Wooders, Myrna. 2012. "Theory of Clubs and Competitive Coalitions" *Annual Review of Economics*, 4.

DUE: Analyzing a Business Decision

See also:

Simon, Herbert A. 1947. "Rationality in Administrative Behavior" and "The Psychology of Administrative Decisions." Chapters 4 and 5 in *Administrative Behavior*.

Scott, W. Richard, and Davis, Gerald F. 2006. "Organizations as Rational Systems." Chapter 2 in *Organizations and Organizing: Rational, Natural, and Open Systems Perspectives*. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Pearson Prentice Hall, Inc.,

Simon, Herbert A. 1962. "On the Concept of Organizational Goal." *ASQ* 9:1-22. ([JSTOR](#))

March, James G. and Herbert A Simon. 1958. *Organizations*.

Buchanan, James M. 1965. "An Economic Theory of Clubs" *Economica* 32(125): 1-14. ([JSTOR](#))

Cornes, Richard, and Todd Sandler. 1996. "The Theory of Externalities, Public Goods and Club Goods." *Cambridge University Press*. P3-8

Sandler and Tschirhart. 1995. "Club Theory: Thirty years later." *Public Choice* 93:335-355 ([ONLINE](#))

Silberman, Bernard S. 1993. *Cages of Reason: The Rise of the Rational State in France, Japan, the United States, and Great Britain*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

RESOURCE DEPENDENCE AND TRANSACTION COSTS

Pfeffer and Salancik. 1978. *External Control of Organizations: A Resource Dependence Perspective*. "Introduction to the Classic Edition" (pp xi-xxvi) and "The External Control of Organizations" (pp 39-60). Stanford: Stanford Univ Press. ([ONLINE](#))

Ouchi, William. 1980. "Markets, Bureaucracies and Clans." *ASQ* 25(1):129-141. ([JSTOR](#))

Granovetter, Mark. 1985. "Economic Action and Social Structure: The Problem of Embeddedness." *AJS* 91: 481-510. ([JSTOR](#))

In addition, choose one of the following two pieces on Transaction Costs:

1. Coase, Ronald. 1937. "The Nature of the Firm." *Economica* 4:386-385. ([JSTOR](#))

2. Williamson, Oliver E. 1981. "The Economics of Organization: The Transaction Cost Approach" *AJS* 87(3): 548-577 ([JSTOR](#))

- See also:

Scherer, Ross P. 1988. "A New Typology for Organizations: Market, Bureaucracy, Clan and Mission, with Application to American Denominations." *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion* 27:475-498.

Ghoshal and Moran. 1996. "Bad for Practice: A critique of the Transaction Cost Theory" *The Academy of Management Review* 21(1):13-47 ([JSTOR](#))

Rindfleisch and Heide. 1997. "Transaction Cost Analysis: Past, Present and Future Applications" *Journal of Marketing* 61(4): 30-54 ([JSTOR](#))

Williamson, Oliver. "Transaction Cost Economics and Organizational Theory" Ch 4 in Smelser *Handbook of Econ Soc* 1994 edition. (Williamson indirectly responds to Granovetter).

THE RISE OF NEOINSTITUTIONALISM

Meyer, John W., and Brian Rowan. 1977. "Institutionalized Organizations: Formal Structure as Myth and Ceremony." *AJS* 83:340-363. (AKA Ch 2 in *NIOA*.)

DiMaggio, Paul J., and Walter W. Powell. 1983. "The Iron Cage Revisited: Institutional Isomorphism and Collective Rationality in Organizational Fields." *American Sociological Review* 48:147-160. (AKA Ch 3 in *NIOA*)

DiMaggio, Paul J., and Walter W. Powell. 1991. "Introduction." Ch. 1 in *The New Institutionalism in Organizational Analysis*. ([ONLINE](#))

Karl Weick, 1976. "Educational Organizations as Loosely Coupled Systems," *ASQ* 21: 1-19.

- See also:

Stinchcombe, Arthur. 1997. "On the Virtues of the Old Institutionalism" *ARS*: 1-18

NEOINSTITUTIONALISM REDUX

Kraatz, Matthew S. and Edward J. Zajac. 1996. "Exploring the Limits of the New Institutionalism: The Causes and Consequences of Illegitimate Organizational Change." *American Sociological Review* 61:812-36.

Henisz, Witold J., Bennet A. Zelner, and Mauro F. Guillén. 2005. "The Worldwide Diffusion of Market-Oriented Infrastructure Reform 1977-1999." *American Sociological Review* 70:871-897.

Westphal, James D. and Edward J. Zajac. 1998. "The Symbolic Management of Stockholders: Corporate Governance Reforms and Shareholder Reactions." *ASQ* 43: 127-53. ([JSTOR](#))

Hallett, Tim. 2010. "The Myth Incarnate: Recoupling Processes, Turmoil, and Inhabited Institutions in an Urban Elementary School." *American Sociological Review* 75(1). ([ONLINE](#))

- See also:
 - March and Olsen. 1984. "The New Institutionalism: Organizational factors in Political Life" *The American Political Science Review*.
 - Zucker, Lynne G 1987. "Institutional Theories of Organization." *Annual Review of Sociology*.
 - Zucker, Lynne G. 1983. "Organizations as Institutions." *Research in the Sociology of Organizations*. ([ONLINE](#))
 - Doburn. 2004. "Beyond Decoupling: Rethinking the Relationship between the institutional environment and the classroom." *Soc of Ed* 77(3)
- For more on Symbolic Management, see also:
 - Pretty much anything by Westphal and Zajac.
 - Westphal, James D. and Edward J. Zajac. 2001. "Explaining Institutional Decoupling: The Case of Stock Repurchase Programs." *Administrative Science Quarterly* 46:202-28. ([JSTOR](#))
 - Westphal, James D., and Edward J. Zajac. 1994. "Substance and Symbolism in CEOs' Long-Term Incentive Plans." *Administrative Science Quarterly* 39:367-90. ([JSTOR](#))
 - Zajac, Edward J. and James D. Westphal. 2004. "The Social Construction Of Market Value: Institutionalization and Learning Perspectives on Stock Market Reactions." *American Sociological Review* 69:433-457.
 - Fabrizio, Ferraro, Jeffrey Pfeffer, and Robert I. Sutton. 2005. "Economics Language and Assumptions: How Theories Can Become Self-Fulfilling." *Academy of Management Review* 30:8-24.
- For a different approach, see Cultural Anthropologists:
 - Douglas, Mary. 1986. *How Institutions Think*. Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press.
 - Scott, James C. 1998. *Seeing Like a State*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
 - Herzfeld, Michael. 1992. *The Social Production of Indifference: Exploring the Symbolic Roots of Western Bureaucracy*. New York: Berg Publishers, Inc.

ORGANIZATIONAL ECOLOGY and ORGANIZATIONAL MORTALITY

- Hannan, Michael T., and John Freeman. "The Population Ecology of Organizations." *AJS* 82 (March 1977):929-964. ([JSTOR](#))
- Young, Ruth. "Is Population Ecology a Useful Paradigm for the Study of Organizations?" *AJS* 94 (1988):1-24. ([JSTOR](#))
- Brüderl, Josef, and Rudolf Schüssler. 1990. "Organizational Mortality: The Liabilities of Newness and Adolescence." *Administrative Science Quarterly* 35(3):530-47. ([JSTOR](#))
- Carroll, Glenn R., and Anand Swaminathan. 2000. "Why the Microbrewery Movement? Organizational Dynamics of Resource Partitioning in the U.S. Brewing Industry." *AJS* 106:715-762. ([JSTOR](#))

- See also:
 - Michael Hannan and John Freeman. 1986. "Where do Organizational Forms Come From?" *Sociological Forum* 1(1):50-72 ([ONLINE](#))
 - Pinto, Jo Ann M. 2005 "The Population Ecology Paradigm: Review and Critique" *Journal of Business and Economics Research* 3(10) ([ONLINE](#))
 - Freeman, John, Glenn R. Carroll, and Michael T. Hannan. 1983. "The Liability of Newness: Age Dependence in Organizational Death Rates." *American Sociological Review* 48(5):692-710.
 - Hannan, Michael T., and John Freeman. 1984. "Structural Inertia and Organizational Change." *ASR* 49:149-164. ([JSTOR](#))
 - Baum, Joel A. C., and Walter W. Powell. 1995. "Cultivating an Institutional Ecology of Organizations: Comment on Hannan, Carroll, Dundon, and Torres." *ASR* 60(4):529-38.
 - Singh, Tucker and House. 1986. "Organizational Legitimacy and the Liability of Newness" *ASQ* 31(2): 171-193 (intersect OE and NI) ([JSTOR](#))
 - Blau, Peter M. 1995. "A Circuitous Path to Macrostructural Theory" *ARS* 21:1-19
- See also, Field Theory:
 - Martin, John Levi. 2003. "What Is Field Theory?" *American Journal of Sociology* 109(1):1-49.
 - Bourdieu, Pierre. 1980. *Logic of Practice*. Book I: Section 3 – "Structures, habitus, practices." Stanford University Press. *Online*
 - Lareau, Annette. 2003. *Unequal Childhoods: Class, Race and Family Life*. The University of California Press. *Buy*
 - Zietzma and Lawrence. 2010. "Institutional work in the transformation of an organizational field: The interplay of boundary work and practice work." *ASQ*

NOTE: On or before this week, you must have turned in Mini Proposal #1

OCT 15: NO CLASS, MIDTERM BREAK

CONFLICT and INEQUALITY in ORGANIZATIONS

- Hirschman's framework has been applied to capitalist firms, unions, marriages, the collapse of East Germany, social movements, higher

education, migrant diasporas and more.

Hirschman, A. O. 1970. [Selection TBD] *Exit, voice, and loyalty: Responses to decline in firms, organizations, and states*: Harvard Univ Pr. ([Online Access](#))

Rosabeth Moss Kanter, 1977. "Some Effects of Proportions on Group Life," *AJS* 82: 965-990. ([JSTOR](#))

Castilla, Emilio. "Gender, Race, and Meritocracy in Organizational Careers" *AJS* 113(6): 1479-1526 ([JSTOR](#))

In addition, find one more contemporary application of "exit voice and loyalty" in a journal article or book, and briefly introduce it to the class.

- See also:
 - Withey and Cooper. 1989. "Predicting Exit, Voice, Loyalty, and Neglect." *ASQ* 34(4): 521-539
 - Ely and Thomas "Cultural Diversity at Work: The effects of diversity on work group processes and outcomes" Wharton ed. *Soc of orgs*
 - Zald, MN. 1978. "Social Movements in Organizations: Coup d'Etat, Insurgency, and Mass Movements" *AJS*.
 - Frank Dobbin, *Inventing Equal Opportunity*
 - Isabel Fernandez-Mateo, "Cumulative Gender Disadvantage in Contract Employment."
 - Martin Ruef, Howard Aldrich and Nancy Carter, "The Structure of Founding Teams: Homophily, Strong Ties, and Isolation among U.S. Entrepreneurs"
 - Becker, Penny Edgell. 1999. *Congregations in Conflict* ([ONLINE](#)), p1-20 and
 - Kanter, Rosabeth Moss. 1977. *Men and Women of the Corporation*
 - Arndt, Margarete and Barbara Bigelow. 2005. "Professionalizing and Masculinizing a Female Occupation," *ASQ* 50: 233-261.
- For more on people in organizations generally, see:
 - Babb, Sarah L. 2001. *Managing Mexico: Economists from Nationalism to Neoliberalism*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
 - Schneider, Ben Ross. 1993. "The Career Connection: A Comparative Analysis of Bureaucratic Preferences and Insulation." *Comparative Politics* 25:331-350.
 - Calvin Morrill, *The Executive Way*
 - Robert Jackall, *Moral Mazes*.
 - Rakesh Khurana, *Searching for a Corporate Savior*

NOTE: On or before this week, you must have discussed your preliminary final paper idea with the professor

WEEK 9.

OCT 29

ORGANIZATIONS: MAKING DECISIONS

"Evidently, organisms adapt well enough to 'satisfice'; they do not, in general, 'optimize.'" –Herbert Simon, 1956

- The "Carnegie School" related hierarchical organizational structures to the limited cognitive abilities of human actors to cope with complexity and uncertainty.

March and Olsen. 1976. "Organizational Choice under Ambiguity" pp248—260 in *The Sociology of Organizations*, Grusky and Miller eds.

Michael D. Cohen, James G. March and Johan P. Olsen "A Garbage Can Model of Organizational Choice" *ASQ* 17: 1-18, 1972. ([JSTOR](#))

Tversky, Amos, and Daniel Kahneman. 1974. "Judgment under Uncertainty: Heuristics and Biases." *Science* 185:1124-1131. ([JSTOR](#))

Espeland, W. N., and M. L. Stevens. 1998. "Commensuration as a Social Process." *Annual Review of Sociology* 24(1).

Plus, select one of the following three options:

1. Bechky, & Okhuysen, 2011. "Expecting the unexpected? How SWAT officers and film crews handle surprises." *Academy of Management Journal*. ([ONLINE](#))
2. Karlene Roberts, Suzanne Stout, Jennifer Halpern, "Decision Dynamics in Two High Reliability Military Organizations," *Management Science* 40: 614-624, 1994. ([JSTOR](#))
3. Anderson, Paul A. 1983. "Decision Making by Objection and the Cuban Missile Crisis." *Administrative Science Quarterly* 28(2):201-22. ([JSTOR](#))

- See also:

Simon, Herbert A. 1956. "Rational Choice and the Structure of the Environment" *Psychological Review*. ([ONLINE](#)) (Popularization of the idea of "Satisfice" in rational decision making)

Schwartz, Barry et al. 2002. "Maximizing versus satisficing: Happiness is a matter of choice." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 83(5):1178-1197 (see also, Schwartz 2005 *The Paradox of Choice*)

Kahneman, Daniel. 2003. "Maps of Bounded Rationality: Psychology for Behavioral Economics." *The American Economic Review* 93:1449-1475. ([JSTOR](#))

Camerer, Colin, George Loewenstein, and Matthew Rabin (Eds.). 2004. *Advances in Behavioral Economics*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Barbara Levitt and Clifford Nass, 1989. "The Lid on the Garbage Can: Institutional Constraints on Decision Making in the Technical Core of College-Text Publishers," *ASQ* 34: 190-207.

Eisenhardt, Kathleen M. 1989. "Making Fast Strategic Decisions in High-Velocity Environments" *Academy of Management Journal* 32(3): 543-576 ([JSTOR](#))

Johnson, Eric and Daniel Goldstein. 2003. "Do Defaults Save Lives?" *Science* 302: 1338-1339.

Cerulo, Karen. 2006. *Never Saw It Coming: Cultural Challenges to Envisioning the Worst* ([ONLINE](#))

WEEK 10.

NOV 5

ECONOMIC AGENCY THEORY

Holmstrom, Bengt. 1982. "Moral Hazard in Teams." *The Bell Journal of Economics* 13(2):324-40. ([JSTOR](#))

Eisenhardt, Kathleen M. 1989. "Agency Theory: An Assessment and Review." *The Academy of Management Review* 14(1):57-74.

Kiser, Edgar. 1999. "Comparing Varieties of Agency Theory in Economics, Political Science, and Sociology: An Illustration from State Policy Implementation."

Sociological Theory 17(2):146-70.

Dilulio, John D. Jr. 1994. "Principled Agents: The Cultural Bases of Behavior in a Federal Government Bureaucracy." *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 4(3):277-318.

- For contrary perspective, see:
Spillane, James. 2004. Standards Deviation: How Schools Misunderstand Education Policy ([ONLINE](#))
Brehm, John and Scott Gates. 1999. Working, Shirking and Sabotage: Bureaucratic Response to a Democratic Public
Grindle, Merilee S. 1997. "Divergent cultures? When public organizations perform well in developing countries." *World Development* 25(4):481-95.
- See also:
Alchian and Demsetz 1972
Jensen and Meckling 1976
Kiser, Edgar, and Xiaoxi Tong. 1992. "Determinants of the Amount and Type of Corruption in State Fiscal Bureaucracies." *Comparative Political Studies* 25(3):300-31.
Kiser, Edgar. 1994. "Markets and Hierarchies in Early Modern Tax Systems: A principal-agent analysis." *Politics & Society* 22(3):284-315.

WEEK 11.

NOV 12

NETWORKS

As a class we will vote on four of the following options to read together:

Reviews of Networks

Brass, D. J., J. Galaskiewicz, H. R. Greve, W. Tsai. 2004. Taking stock of networks and organizations: A multilevel perspective. *Acad. Management J.* 47(6) 795–817. ([JSTOR](#))

Borgatti, S. and Foster, P. (2003). The network paradigm in organizational research: A review and typology. *Journal of management*, 29(6):991–1013. ([ONLINE](#))

Networks as Organization

Powell, Walter W. 1990. "Neither Market Nor Hierarchy: Network Forms of Organization." *Research in Organizational Behavior* 12:295-336. ([ONLINE](#))

Joel Podony and Karen Page, "Network Forms of Organization," *Annual Review of Sociology*, 24: 57-76. ([JSTOR](#))

Networks and Creativity

Burt, Ronald. 2004. "Structural Holes and Good Ideas." *AJS* 110:349-399. ([JSTOR](#))

Vedres and Stark. 2010. "Structural Folds: Generative Disruption in Overlapping Groups" *AJS* 115(4): 1150-1190 ([JSTOR](#). Note: winner of AJS Gould Prize)

Uzzi, Brian, and Jarrett Spiro. 2005. "Collaboration and Creativity: The Small World

Problem." *AJS* 111(2):447-504. ([JSTOR](#)) (*note, this is read in Lizardo's Networks class)

Networks and Competition

Podolny, Joel M., Toby E. Stuart, and Michael T. Hannan. 1996. "Networks, Knowledge, and Niches: Competition in the Worldwide Semiconductor Industry, 1984-1991," *AJS* 102:659-689 ([JSTOR](#))

Uzzi, Brian. 1997. "Social Structure and Competition in Interfirm Networks: The Paradox of Embeddedness." *ASQ* 42:35-67. ([JSTOR](#))

- See also:
Yochai Benkler, *The Wealth of Networks*
Clay Shirky, *Here Comes Everybody*
Rob Cross and Laurence Prusak, 2002. "The People Who Make Organizations Go- or Stop," [Harvard Business Review](#) June 2002
Burt, Ronald. 1987. "Social Contagion and Innovation: Cohesion versus Structural Equivalence." *AJS* 92(6): 1287-1335
Brian Uzzi, "Embeddedness in the Making of Financial Capital."

WEEK 12.

NOV 19

AUTONOMY & EMBEDDEDNES

- What does embeddedness mean in each of these cases?
- How does embeddedness change understanding and analysis of the organization?
- How do these authors conceive of the relationship between autonomy and embeddedness? Under what conditions is organizational autonomy possible and desirable?
- How is this perspective similar and different from resource dependency or network approaches?

Carpenter, Daniel P. 2001. [Pages TBD] *The Forging of Bureaucratic Autonomy: Reputations, Networks, and Policy Innovation in Executive Agencies, 1862-1928*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Carruthers, Bruce G. 1994. "When is the State Autonomous? Culture, Organizational Theory, and the Political Sociology of the State." *Sociological Theory* 12:19-44.

Evans, Peter. 1995. "Introduction" *Embedded Autonomy: States and Industrial Transformation*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Vaughn, Dianne. 1990. "Autonomy, Interdependence, and Social Control: NASA and the Space Shuttle Challenger." *ASQ* 35(2): 225-257

ORGANIZATIONS, INSTITUTIONS and CHANGE

- What is an institution? How does it relate to an organization?
- What are the different visions for how institutions change? How is this similar or different from ideas about *organizational* change?
- How do these theoretical models of institutional and organizational change apply to the historical case of the development of bureaucratic practices, as explained in Lancaster?

Mahoney, James, and Kathleen Thelen (Eds.). 2010. *Explaining Institutional Change: Ambiguity, Agency, and Power*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Scott, W. Richard. 1995. *Institutions and Organizations: Theory and Research*. Thousand Oaks, Calif.: Sage Publications. "Institutional Theory Meets Organizational Studies" pp 19-25 and "Ch 3: Crafting an Analytic Framework 1" pp 47- 70.

Mohr and White. 2008. "How to Model an Institution." *Theory and Society* 37(5):485-512

Lancaster, Ryon. 2005. [Pages TBD] *The Office of St Peter: The emergence of bureaucracy in the English Catholic Church, 1066-1250*. Ph.D. Dissertation, Northwestern University. ([ProQuest](#))

- See also:
 - Sewell W.H. 1992. "A Theory of Structure: Duality, Agency and Transformation" *AJS* 2008. Special issue "Theorizing Institutions: Current Approaches and Debates" *Theory and Society* 37(5)
 - Hallett, Tim and Marc J Ventresca. 2006. "Inhabited Institutions: Social Interactions and Organizational Forms in Gouldner's *Patterns of Industrial Bureaucracy*." *Theory and Society* 35: 213-236
 - Thelen, Kathleen. 1999. "Historical Institutionalism in Comparative Politics" *Annual Review of Political Science*
 - Thelen, Kathleen 2004. *How Institutions Evolve: The Political Economy of Skills in Germany, Britain, the United States and Japan*.

NOTE: On or before this week, you must have turned in Mini Proposal #2

FUTURE DIRECTIONS for ORG SOC?

Scott, W Richard. 2004. "Reflections on a Half-Century of Organizational Sociology" *Annual Review of Sociology* 30:1-21 ([ONLINE](#))

Davis, Gerald F., and Christopher Marquis. 2005. "Prospects for Organization Theory in the Early Twenty-First Century: Institutional Fields and Mechanisms." *Organization Science* 16:332-343. ([JSTOR](#))

Dobbin, Frank. 2008. "The Poverty of Organizational Theory: Comment on Bourdieu and Organizational Analysis" *Theory and Society* 37(1):53-63 ([JSTOR](#))

In addition, choose your own adventure:

Select one article published 2008-2012 in ASQ, AJS or ASR that directly engages organizational sociology (and that was not assigned in class). Present the article to the class in conference presentation format (eg as though you were the author giving an ASA talk or a job talk), presenting the ideas and findings but moreover, making an argument for why it represents a particularly interesting or fruitful direction for future organizational research.

DUE: Presentation

See also:

Palmer, Donald. 2006. "Taking Stock of the Criteria We Use to Evaluate One Another: ASQ 50 Years Out." *Administrative Science Quarterly* 51:535-559. ([JSTOR](#))

Lounsbury, Michael, and Marc Ventresca. 2003. "The New Structuralism in Organizational Theory." *Organization* 10:457-480. ([ONLINE](#))

Davis, Morrill, Rao and Soule. 2008. "Introduction: Social Movements in Organizations and Markets" *ASQ* 53(3):389-394 ([JSTOR](#))

Monday December 10, 2012: 7:30PM FINAL PAPER DUE