

**ORGANIZATION THEORY**  
**Winter 2016**  
**Professor Massimo Maoret**

**Contact Information**

Professor: Massimo Maoret  
Tel.: 4037  
Room: Q-626  
Email: [mmaoret@iese.edu](mailto:mmaoret@iese.edu)

Assistant: Carolina Dolz  
Tel.: 6402  
Room: Q-629  
Email: [cdolz@iese.edu](mailto:cdolz@iese.edu)

**Room:** **TBD**

**Introduction**

In the last 50 years, the field of Organization Theory has contributed to the enrichment of our understanding of economic and management action, providing novel approaches, theories and methodological tools to management inquiry. This doctoral course provides a broad overview of the major theoretical debates within organization theory, and how they have influenced research in more applied fields. We will read and discuss theoretical and empirical papers, both classic and contemporary, and identify the current frontier of the field. Learning more about how organizations are structured and work can help us to improve organizational processes and their outcomes.

**Objectives**

By the end of the course the students will be able to frame a scientific research question from a theoretical point of view, and develop original scientific research ideas to advance scholarship in organizational theory. The goals are to provide students with the theoretical groundings that explain why organizations exist, how they operate, change and perform – and how to further our understanding of organizations from a scientific perspective.

**Learning outcomes**

1. Evaluate the relevance of the theoretical advancements of scientific publications in organization theory
2. Evaluate the scientific standards and quality of the methodologies of scientific publications in organization theory
3. Write a literature review of a sub-stream of research of organization theory, integrating several scientific contribution
4. Generate new theory that advances our current understanding of organizations
5. Lead a dialectic discussion that integrates several scientific contributions
6. Communicate and debate the merits of one's scientific ideas

**General competences**

- Acquire knowledge, skills, abilities and attitudes required to conduct research on a global basis in the field of business management.

- Conduct a critical analysis, evaluation and synthesis of new and complex ideas with the objective to produce general principles applicable to business situations.
- Demonstrate knowledge and understanding that provide a basis or opportunity for originality in developing and / or application of ideas, often related to a research context.
- Students should be able to communicate clearly and concisely their conclusions, underlying knowledge and reasons to a specialized and non-specialized audience.

### **Specific competences**

- Understand the concepts of social and human sciences relevant and necessary to carry out research projects of international level in the area of business management.
- Organization, planning and implementation of a research project related to social sciences.
- Ability to understand state-of-the-art research in organization theory published in the top academic journals (Administrative Science Quarterly, Academy of Management Journal, Organization Science, American Journal of Sociology, etc.) and compare and contrast the arguments developed in the papers from a logical and empirical point of view.
- Ability to take current management and organizational problems and identify how different theories of organizations can help us understand them.
- Ability to design research programs in the area of Business Management.
- Analyze business phenomena formal analysis tools (logic and mathematics) in order to develop consistent structural theories.

### **Content**

The content of the class will cover all the major streams of organizational theory. Each week a new theoretical perspective will be explored, and compared to the previous ones. Every perspective relies on different assumptions about a) why organizations exist and b) how organizations work. We will thus cover:

1. Intro to organizational economics
2. Networks and social embeddedness
3. Resource dependence and status theories
4. Neo-Institutionalism
5. The Population Ecology of Organizations
6. The Carnegie School
7. Social constructionism
8. Institutional change
9. Intra-organizational networks
10. Theories of organizational identity

### **Methodology**

The course will be run in a doctoral seminar format. For each doctoral-style session, students are expected to read all the required readings, provide a written answer for the assigned memo questions in advanced (see section on weekly memos), and be prepared to discuss the material in class on the schedule indicated in the syllabus. All students should come to class with questions, topics, and issues to be raised for discussion. The professor's role is to facilitate

and direct the discussion. The students' role is to engage each other in developing the best critical understanding of each paper.

As you do the readings, think about the following questions:

- 1) What is the basic argument made by the author(s)? What are its strengths?
- 2) What are the weaknesses of the argument?
- 3) If you disagree with an argument, what would it take to convince you?
- 4) Are there critical differences between these authors' arguments and those of others we have read?
- 5) Can these differences be resolved through an empirical test? How would you design a test to resolve these differences?
- 6) If an empirical paper, what alternative explanations can account for the findings of the authors?

In addition to preparing the papers for discussion, each student will lead the discussion once during the course. We will assign the topics on the first day of class. Discussion leaders are required to read all the memos in advance, and be prepared to open the general discussion by identifying some key debate issues and questions.

### **Evaluation**

| <b>Grading type</b> | <b>Weight</b> | <b>Evaluation elements and learning outcomes</b>   |
|---------------------|---------------|--|
| Class participation | <b>30%</b>    | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- effectively communicate the analysis of the underlying theoretical logic of the assigned readings, and effectively compare them to the previous weeks (LO 1, 5)</li> <li>- engage in an open constructive dialectic process to expose the contributions and limitations of the assigned readings (LO 2, 6)</li> </ul> |
| Weekly memo         | <b>40%</b>    | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- the evaluation is based on the ability of each students to grasp, summarize and criticize the theoretical perspective of the week, applying scientific standards in a written formal (LO 1, 2, 3)</li> </ul>  |
| Final exam          | <b>30%</b>    | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- the final take-home exam will be used to evaluate the students' written ability to answer a theoretical question integrated in an existing stream of research using publishable standards. (LO 2, 3, 4, 6)</li> </ul>   |

#### ***Class participation***

Class participation: 25% of the grade. Performance will be a function of both quantity and quality. In order for the class to succeed, students must have read the readings and be prepared to talk critically about them.

#### ***Weekly memo***

Each week, students are asked to prepare a two-part memo (MAX 2000 words total, single-spaced) related to the readings of the class. Memos should be posted by NOON on Dropbox the day before class (my assistant Carolina Dolz will send you the Dropbox link). Students are

encouraged to read one another's memo before class. Memos that are posted after NOON will be reduced by a full grade for every hour they are late.

As mentioned, the memo should be divided in two parts. **The first part** (synthetic) requires you to answer the weekly "memo questions" listed in the syllabus. These questions usually require you to synthesize the focal readings into a coherent thought process, highlighting key assumptions behind a specific school of thought. This part is the most important part of the memo, so feel free to use more space if you need so (i.e. the overall length should be between 1000 and 1400 words). Please note that there may be an extra memo question to answer. This question is completely optional but will be considered for a potential extra grading bonus (you can use an additional 300 words for the extra question).

**The second part** of the memo (critical review) should focus on a single reading for which you will provide a critical reading. In approaching the critical review, it is recommended that you organize your thoughts in terms of the following questions (some of which will be more or less relevant depending on the readings):

1. **Motivation:** Why do the authors think that their topic or question is important? What does the author (implicitly or explicitly) regard as incomplete in existing research such that his or her research constitutes a significant contribution? How is the motivation provided by the various others similar or different to each other?
2. **Theory:** What distinguishes the theoretical viewpoint of the authors under consideration? What causal mechanism or mechanisms do the authors focus on and why? What are the potential advantages of a given focus and what are the drawbacks?
3. **Evidence:** What types of evidence do the authors bring to bear to support their argument? Which sorts of analyses do you find most compelling and why?
4. **Big Picture:** To what extent do you regard this reading as making a significant contribution to the larger questions that animate research in the "organizations and environments?" How could the work have made a bigger contribution?

You are required to write a minimum of 8 memos over the course of the term. If you submit N > 8 memos, your weakest N-8 memos will be dropped from your grade.

### ***Final exam***

The final exam will be a week-long take-home exam, consisting of a choice of 2 questions from a universe of 3-4 questions. The questions will be similar to those asked on general exams, and each response is limited to 3200 words.

**Alternatively** to the final exam, students can negotiate with me alternative forms of final evaluation. This has to be done before the third session of the course. Alternative forms include a throughout literature review of one of the class topics, or a draft of a new research proposal.

### **Course Material**

All the required readings will be in the course reader. Student might find useful the following reference books (available in the library) and an extended bibliography is provided at the end of this document:

- Scott, W. Richard and Gerald F. Davis, 2007. *Organizations and Organizing: Rational, Natural, and Open Systems Perspectives*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Baum, Joel A.C. (ed.) 2002. *Companion to Organizations*. Oxford, UK: Blackwell.
- Pfeffer, J. 1997. *New directions for organization theory problems and prospects*. New York, Oxford University Press.
- Clegg, S., C. Hardy, et al. 1996. *Handbook of organization studies*. London, Thousand Oaks, Sage Publications.
- Perrow, C. 1986. *Complex Organizations: A Critical Essay*. Glenview, IL, Scott, Foresman.

## COURSE OUTLINE

**Thursday January 8<sup>th</sup>, 09:00 h. – 11:45 h.**

### **Session 1. Introduction to Organization Theory: A Map of the Territory**

#### **Memo question(s):**

1. If you had to pick one definition of the organization as the most useful (rational, natural, or open), which would you pick? Defend your choice with one or more examples from your experience.
2. What definition of organization would you say Coase and Fama and Jensen are using in their analyses? Which conception of the organizational environment (from Scott' & Davis's chapter 5) would you say they are using?

#### **Required readings:**

Scott, W. Richard and Gerald F. Davis. Organizations: Rational, Natural, and Open Systems. Prentice Hall. Chapters 1 & 5. (skim 2-3-4)

Coase, Ronald H. 1937. The Nature of the Firm. *Economica*, New Series 4: 386-405.

Fama, Eugene F., and Michael C. Jensen. 1983. "Separation of Ownership and Control." *The Journal of Law & Economics* 26 (2): 301–25.

Astley, G. & A.H. Van de Ven. 1983. Central perspectives and debates in organization theory. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 28: 245-273. (**Skim—look at 2x2 table and contrast with Scott's framework**)

---

**Thursday February 19<sup>th</sup>, 09:00 h. – 11:45 h.**

### **Session 2. Network embeddedness, Organizations and Inter-organizational networks**

#### **Memo question(s):**

1. Compare and contrasts' economic sociologists' view of organizations with the one from organizational economists (refer to Coase and Fama and Jensen). How does their view differ?
2. Compare how the authors use the term "embeddedness". What kind of research questions does "embeddedness" help us to answer?
3. (Extra): How does Azoulay et al. relate to the other readings?

#### **Required readings:**

Granovetter, Mark. 1985. "Economic Action and Social Structure: The Problem of Embeddedness." *American Journal of Sociology* 91: 481-510.

Uzzi, Brian. 1997. "Social Structure and Competition in Interfirm Networks: The Paradox of Embeddedness." *Administrative Science Quarterly* 42: 35-67.

Ingram, Paul & Peter W. Roberts. 2000. Friendships among Competitors in the Sydney Hotel Industry. *American Journal of Sociology*, 106: 387-423.

- Powell, Walter W. 1990. "Neither Market nor Hierarchy: Network Forms of Organization." *Research in Organizational Behavior* 12: 295-396.  
[http://www.stanford.edu/~woodyp/papers/powell\\_neither.pdf](http://www.stanford.edu/~woodyp/papers/powell_neither.pdf)
- Davis, Gerald F. 1991. "Agents without Principles? The Spread of the Poison Pill through the Intercorporate Network." *Administrative Science Quarterly* 36 (4): 583–613.

**Extra (optional) reading:**

- Azoulay, Pierre, Nelson P. Repenning, and Ezra W. Zuckerman. 2010. "Nasty, Brutish, and Short: Embeddedness Failure in the Pharmaceutical Industry." *Administrative Science Quarterly* 55 (3): 472–507.

**Thursday February 5<sup>th</sup>, 09:00 h. – 11:45 h**

**Session 3. Resource dependence, Power and Status**

**Memo question(s):**

1. Economic sociologists view both power and status as "positional", i.e. as outcomes originating from specific positions in a social structure. What are the differences among these two concepts? How do they relate in your mind?
2. Compare and contrast Gould and Podolny's theories, in terms of the questions they are trying to explain and how they go about addressing those questions.
3. (Extra): How does Ibarra's concept of power relate to resource dependence?

**Required readings:**

- Emerson, Richard M. 1962. Power-dependence relations. *American Sociological Review*, 27: 31-41.
- Pfeffer, Jeffrey and Gerald Salancik. 1978. *The External Control of Organizations*, Harper & Row, Chs. 3, pp. 39-61.
- Casciaro, Tiziana and Mikolaj Piskorski. 2005 Power imbalance, mutual dependence and constraint absorption: A Closer Look at Resource Dependence Theory". *Administrative Science Quarterly*, June.
- Podolny, Joel P. 2005. *Status Signals: A Sociological Study of Market Competition*. Princeton University Press. Chapters 1-3, 5.
- Gould, Roger V. 2002. The origins of status hierarchies: A formal theory and empirical test. *American Journal of Sociology*, 107: 1143-1178 (**this is a long article – please focus on substantive part of the model and skim technicalities**)
- Gargiulo, Martin. 1993. Two-Step Leverage: Managing Constraint in Organizational Politics. *Administrative Science Quarterly*. Vol. 38, No. 1, Mar, 1993. (**skim**)

**Extra (optional) reading:**

- Ibarra, Herminia. 1992. Homophily and differential returns: Sex differences in network structure and access in an advertising firm. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 37: 422-447.

**Optional readings:**

- Allison, Graham, 1969. Conceptual Models and the Cuban Missile Crisis. *APSR* Sept: 689-718.
- Chandler, Alfred D. 1977. *The Visible Hand*. Read Ch. 14 and the conclusion (pp. 455-500).
- Pfeffer, J. "Merger as a response to organizational interdependence," *ASQ* 17, 1972: 382-394
- Mizruchi, Mark. 1996. What do interlocks do? An analysis, critique, and assessment of research on interlocking directorates. *Annual Review of Sociology* 22: 271-98.
- 

**Thursday January 22<sup>nd</sup>, 09:00 h. – 11:45 h.**

#### **Session 4. Institutional theory: Conformity and diffusion**

##### **Memo question(s):**

1. Meyer and Rowan's 1977 article and DiMaggio and Powell's 1983 article are frequently cited together as having inaugurated the "neo-institutional" school of organizational analysis. But are these articles making the same argument? And how do these versions of institutionalism compare with those proposed by Selznick? Which of these institutionalist arguments do you find most compelling?
2. Westphal et. al. and Zbaracki are analyzing the same phenomenon (the diffusion and adoption of TQM). How do these two approaches differ and how are they similar? Do you believe their arguments and conclusions? Which one compels you the most? How do they map on neo-institutionalism?
3. (Extra): How does Tolbert and Zucker's diffusion model compare with the one proposed by Westphal and colleagues?

##### **Required readings:**

- Powell, Walter W., and Paul J. DiMaggio, eds. 1991. Introduction, *The New Institutionalism in Organizational Analysis*. University of Chicago Press, pp. 1-38.
- Selznick, Philip. 1996. Institutionalism 'Old' and 'New.' *Administrative Science Quarterly* 41 (2): 270–77.
- Meyer, John W. and Brian Rowan. 1977. Institutionalized Organizations: Formal Structure as Myth and Ceremony. *American Journal of Sociology* 83: 340-63.
- DiMaggio, Paul J. and Walter W. Powell 1983. "The iron cage revisited: Institutional isomorphism and collective rationality in organizational fields," *ASR* 48: 147-60.
- Westphal, James D., Ranjay Gulati, and Stephen M. Shortell. 1997. "Customization or Conformity? An Institutional and Network Perspective on the Content and Consequences of TQM Adoption." *Administrative Science Quarterly* 42 (2): 366–94.
- Zbaracki, Mark J. 1998. "The Rhetoric and Reality of Total Quality Management." *Administrative Science Quarterly* 43 (3): 602–36.

##### **Extra (optional) reading:**

- Tolbert, Pamela S., and Lynne G. Zucker. 1983. "Institutional Sources of Change in the Formal Structure of Organizations: The Diffusion of Civil Service Reform, 1880-1935." *Administrative Science Quarterly* 28 (1): 22–39.
-



**Thursday February 26<sup>th</sup>, 09:00 h. – 11:45 h.**

## **Session 5. Organizational Ecology**

### **Memo question(s):**

1. How does Hannan and Freeman's famous question ("Why are there so many kinds of organizations?", p.936) compare to DiMaggio and Powell's equally famous "What makes organizations so similar?" What are the differences and similarities between institutional theory and organizational population ecology? How do they consider the concept of "legitimacy"?
2. Arguably, Hannan and Freeman (1984) developed a sociological theory of the formal organization. Do you agree? How does that theory relate to (a) Coase's theory of the firm; and (b) neo-institutional theory?
3. (Extra): Is Aldrich and Fiol's approach "ecological" or "neo-institutional"?

### **Required readings:**

- Hannan, M. T. & Freeman, J. 1977. The population ecology of organizations. *American Journal of Sociology*, 82: 929-964.
- Hannan, Michael T. and John Freeman. 1984. "Structural Inertia and Organizational Change." *American Sociological Review*, Vol. 49, No. 2., pp. 149-164.
- Carroll, Glenn R., and Michael T. Hannan. 1989. "Density Dependence in the Evolution of Populations of Newspaper Organizations." *American Sociological Review* 54 (4): 524–41.
- Sørensen, Jesper B., and Toby E. Stuart. 2000. "Aging, Obsolescence, and Organizational Innovation." *Administrative Science Quarterly* 45 (1): 81–112.
- Barnett, William P., and Elizabeth G. Pontikes. 2008. "The Red Queen, Success Bias, and Organizational Inertia." *Management Science* 54 (7): 1237–51.

### **Extra (optional) reading:**

- Aldrich, Howard E., and C. Marlene Fiol. 1994. Fools Rush in? The Institutional Context of Industry Creation. *The Academy of Management Review* 19 (4): 645–70.

**Thursday January 15<sup>th</sup>, 09:00 h. – 11:45 h.**

## **Session 6. The Carnegie School: Towards a Neo-Behavioral Theory of the Firm**

### **Memo question(s):**

1. Identify the key constructs of the Carnegie school. What theoretical mechanisms link these constructs into a school? Looking back at past weeks' readings, which mechanisms relate to embeddedness, institutional theory and/or population ecology? Make explicit references.
2. The behavioral theory of the firm (and especially the Cyert & March reading) is frequently described as a critique of the rational actor model of organizations. Do you think this is an accurate characterization? Why or why not?

3. (Extra): How is the garbage-can model related to the behavioral theory of the firm? Which key assumptions differ between these two theories?

**Required readings:**

- Cyert, R.M. & March, J.G. 1964. A Behavioral Theory of the Firm, chapter 6—A summary of basic concepts, pp. 114-127. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Greve, Henrich R. 1998. Performance, Aspirations, and Risky Organizational Change. *Administrative Science Quarterly* 43 (1): 58–86.
- Gavetti, Giovanni, and Jan W. Rivkin. 2007. “On the Origin of Strategy: Action and Cognition over Time.” *Organization Science* 18 (3): 420–39.
- Gavetti, Giovanni, Henrich R. Greve, Daniel A. Levinthal, and William Ocasio. 2012. “The Behavioral Theory of the Firm: Assessment and Prospects.” *The Academy of Management Annals* 6 (1): 1–40.
- Feldman, M.S. 2000. Organization routines as sources of continuous change. *Organization Science*, 11: 611-629.

**Extra (optional) reading:**

- Cohen, M.D., March, J.G. & Olsen, J.P. 1972. A garbage can model of organizational choice. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 17: 1-25.

**Thursday February 12<sup>th</sup>, 09:00 h.– 11:45 h.**

**Session 7. Social constructionism: Sense-making, Structuration and Symbolic Interactionism**

**Memo question(s):**

1. This week’s readings share a common perspective (I think), but are also quite different in their interpretation of such perspective (they are loosely-coupled!). How do they relate to one another? Which perspective do you find more compelling, and why? Which one has more predictive power?
2. How do the assumptions of a “practice” theoretic approach to organizations differ from the assumptions of other approaches you have studied in the previous weeks?
3. (Extra): Also consider Orlikowski optional paper when answering the previous question.

**Required readings:**

- Fine, Gary Alan. 1993. The Sad Demise, Mysterious Disappearance, and Glorious Triumph of Symbolic Interactionism. *Annual Review of Sociology* 19: 61–87.
- Weick, Karl E. 1969. *The Social Psychology of Organizing*. New York: Random House. Skim Chapter 2 pp. 25-64 and READ chap 5 119-145.
- Barley, Stephen R. 1986. Technology as an Occasion for Structuring: Evidence from Observations of CT Scanners and the Social Order of Radiology Departments. *Administrative Science Quarterly* 31: 78-108.
- Garud, R. & M.A. Rappa. 1994. A socio-cognitive model of technology evolution: The case of cochlear implants. *Organization Science*, 5: 344-362.

Feldman, M.S. and Orlikowski, W.J. Theorizing Practice and Practicing Theory. *Organization Science*, 22, 5, 2011: 1240–1253.

**Extra (optional) reading:**

Orlikowski, W.J. “Knowing in Practice: Enacting a Collective Capability in Distributed Organizing.” *Organization Science*, 13, 4, 2002: 249-273.

---

**Monday February 2<sup>nd</sup>, 09:00 h. – 11:45 h.**

**Session 8. Institutional logics and institutional work**

**Memo question(s):**

1. Under what conditions should we expect to see an institutional logic dominate versus seeing a co-existence of a plurality of logics?
2. Institutional maintenance versus change is a central debate in institutional theory. Compare these articles on where change comes from and how this influences the process and content of an institutional field.
3. (Extra): Include Battilana and Dorado’s contribution when answering the previous questions.

**Required readings:**

- Thornton, P.H. & Ocasio, W. 2008. Institutional logics. In R. Greenwood, C. Oliver, R. Suddaby & K. Sahlin-Andersson (editors), *Handbook of Institutional Theory*: pp. 99-129. London: Sage Publications.
- Dunn, M.B. & Jones, C. 2010. Institutional logics and institutional pluralism: the contestation of care and science logics in medical education, 1967-2005. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 55: 114–149.
- McPherson, C.M. & Sauder, M. 2013. Logics in Action: Managing Institutional Complexity in a Drug Court. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 58: 165-196.
- Thomas B. Lawrence, Roy Suddaby. 2006. Institutions and Institutional Work. *Handbook of Organization Studies 2*: 215–54.
- Maguire, Steve, and Cynthia Hardy. 2009. Discourse and Deinstitutionalization: The Decline of DDT. *The Academy of Management Journal* 52 (1): 148–78.

**Extra (optional) reading:**

Battilana, Julie, and Silvia Dorado. 2010. Building Sustainable Hybrid Organizations: The Case of Commercial Microfinance Organizations. *Academy of Management Journal* 53(6):1419–1440.

---

**Thursday March 5<sup>th</sup>, 09:00 h. – 11:45 h.**

**Session 9. Intra-organizational networks: Brokerage**

**Memo question(s):**

1. Under what conditions should we expect to see an institutional logic dominate versus seeing a co-existence of a plurality of logics?
2. Institutional maintenance versus change is a central debate in institutional theory. Compare these articles on where change comes from and how this influences the process and content of an institutional field.
3. (Extra): Is Burt's secondhand brokerage hypothesis consistent with his prior formulation of the theory?

**Required readings:**

- Granovetter, Mark S. 1973. The Strength of Weak Ties. *American Journal of Sociology* 78: 1360-1380.
- Hansen, Morten T. 1999. The search-transfer problem The role of weak ties in sharing knowledge across organization subunits. *Administrative Science Quarterly* 44: p. 82-
- Burt, Ronald S. 2004. Structural Holes and Good Ideas. *American Journal of Sociology* 110 (2): 349–99.
- Obstfeld, David. 2005. Social Networks, the Tertius Iungens Orientation, and Involvement in Innovation. *Administrative Science Quarterly* 50: 100-130.
- Lingo, L. E. & O'Mahony, S. 2010. Nexus Work: Brokerage on Creative Projects. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 55 (2010): 47–81

**Extra (optional) reading:**

- Burt, Ronald S. 2007. "Secondhand Brokerage: Evidence on the Importance of Local Structure for Managers, Bankers, and Analysts." *Academy of Management Journal* 50: 119 – 148.

**Thursday March 19<sup>th</sup>, 15:00 h. – 17:45 h.**

**Session 10. Organizational identity and categories**

1. How does the concept of "organizational identity" vary across the various readings? Which one do you find most compelling, and why?
2. The concept of "category" is quite popular in organizational theory these days. Given your reading of this week's articles, what is your take on the study of categories and categorization? What do these studies add to previously established theories (e.g. population ecology and neo-institutional theory)?

**Required readings:**

- Hsu, G. & Hannan, M.T. 2005. Identities, Genres, and Organizational Forms, *Organization Science*, 16: 474-490
- Zuckerman, Ezra W. 1999. "The Categorical Imperative: Securities Analysts and the Illegitimacy Discount." *American Journal of Sociology* 104: 1398-1438.
- Tripsas, Mary. 2009. "Technology, Identity, and Inertia Through the Lens of "The Digital Photography Company" *Organization Science* 20: 441-460.

- Dutton, Jane E., and Janet M. Dukerich. 1991. "Keeping an Eye on the Mirror: Image and Identity in Organizational Adaptation." *The Academy of Management Journal* 34 (3): 517–54.
- Kennedy, Mark Thomas. 2008. "Getting Counted: Markets, Media, and Reality." *American Sociological Review* 73 (2): 270–95.
- Jones, Candace, Massimo Maoret, Felipe G. Massa, and Silviya Svejenova. 2011. "Rebels with a Cause: Formation, Contestation, and Expansion of the De Novo Category 'Modern Architecture,' 1870–1975." *Organization Science* 23 (6): 1523–45.

**If you want to know more: Selected readings on class topics (note: asterisk highlights “must read” classic readings)**

### **On the past and future of organizational theory:**

- Shenhav, Yehouda. 2003. The Historical and Epistemological Foundations of Organization Theory: Fusing sociological theory with engineering discourse. in Tsoukas, Haridimos, George D. Mavros and Christian Knudsen (Eds.) The Oxford Handbook of Organization Theory Oxford University Press.
- Fourcade, M. 2007. "Theories of Markets and Theories of Society." *American Behavioral Scientist* 50:1015.
- \*Parsons, Talcott. 1956. "Suggestions for a Sociological Approach to the Theory of Organizations-I." *Administrative Science Quarterly* 1 (1): 63–85. doi:10.2307/2390840.
- \*Parsons, Talcott. 1956. "Suggestions for a Sociological Approach to the Theory of Organizations.II." *Administrative Science Quarterly* 1 (2): 225–39.
- Fligstein, Neil. 2001. "Organizations: Theoretical Debates and the Scope of Organizational Theory" in Calhoun Craig, Chris Rojek, and Bryan Turner (eds.) *International Handbook of Sociology*. Sage Press.
- Pfeffer, J. 1997. *New directions for organization theory problems and prospects*. New York, Oxford University Press. (Chapt. 1)
- Davis, Gerald F. and Christopher Marquis. 2005. "Prospects for Organizational Theory in the Early 21st Century: Institutional Fields and Mechanisms." *Organization Science*, 16: 332-343.

### **On embeddedness and networks**

- \*Coleman, James S. 1988. "Social Capital in the Creation of Human Capital." *American Journal of Sociology* 94: S95-S120.
- \*Jones, C. Hesterly, W.S. & Borgatti, S.P 1997. Network governance: Exchange conditions and social mechanisms. *Academy of Management Review*, 22: 911-945.
- Rowley, Tim, Dean Behrens, and David Krackhardt. 2000. "Redundant Governance Structures: An Analysis of Structural and Relational Embeddedness in the Steel and Semiconductor Industries." *Strategic Management Journal* 21 (3): 369–86.
- Podolny, Joel M. and Karen L. Page. 1998. "Network Forms of Organization." *Annual Review of Sociology* 24: 57-76.
- Diekmann, A., Ben, J., Przepiorka, W. & Wehrli, S. 2013. Reputation Formation and the Evolution of Cooperation in Anonymous Online Markets *American Sociological Review* first published on November 21, 2013 as doi:10.1177/0003122413512316
- Sorenson, Olav and Toby Stuart. 2001. "Syndication Networks and the Spatial Distribution of Venture Capital." *AJS* 106(6): 1546-88.
- Lincoln, James R., Michael L. Gerlach, and Christina L. Ahmadjian. 1996. Keiretsu networks and corporate performance in Japan. *American Sociological Review*, 61: 67-88.
- Powell, Walter W., D. White, K. Koput, and J. Owen-Smith. 2004. "Network Dynamics and Field Evolution: The Growth of Interorganizational Collaboration in the Biotechnology Industry." *American Journal of Sociology*.
- Powell, Walter W., K. Koput, and L. Smith-Doerr. 1996. "Interorganizational Collaboration and the Locus of Innovation." *ASQ* 41(1): 116-45.
- \*Uzzi, Brian. 1999. Embeddedness in the Making of Financial Capital. *ASR* 64: 481-505.

### **Neo-institutional theory: Conformity and diffusion**

- \*Berger, P. & Luckmann. 1967. *The Social Construction of Reality*. pp53-104.[ These pages correspond to: Start in chapter 2 Society as Objective Reality, with 1 b). Origins of Institutionalization, including 1c) sedimentation and tradition, 1d) roles, 1e) scope & modes of institutionalization, include 2. Legitimation a) origins of symbolic universes. STOP at 2b) Conceptual Machineries of Universe Maintenance.]
- \*Zucker, Lynne G. 1977. "The Role of Institutionalization in Cultural Persistence." *American Sociological Review* 42 (5): 726–43.
- Ansari, Shahzad M., Peer C. Fiss, and Edward J. Zajac. 2010. "Made to Fit: How Practices Vary As They Diffuse." *Academy of Management Review* 35 (1): 67–92.
- Colyvas, Jeannette A., and Stefan Jonsson. 2011. "Ubiquity and Legitimacy: Disentangling Diffusion and Institutionalization\*." *Sociological Theory* 29 (1): 27–53. doi:10.1111/j.1467-9558.2010.01386.x.
- Fligstein, Neil 1985. "The Spread of the Multidivisional Form Among Large Firms, 1919-1979," *ASR*, June 1985:377-391.
- \*Suchman, Mark C. 1995. "Managing Legitimacy: Strategic and Institutional Approaches." *Academy of Management Review* 20 (3): 571–610. doi:10.5465/AMR.1995.9508080331.

### **Population ecology of organizations:**

- \*Haveman, Heather A. 1992. "Between a Rock and a Hard Place: Organizational Change and Performance Under Conditions of Fundamental Environmental Transformation." *Administrative Science Quarterly* 37 (1): 48–75. doi:10.2307/2393533.
- \*Stinchcombe, A. 1965. *Social structure and organizations*. In James G. March (Ed.), *Handbook of Organizations*: 142-169. Chicago: Rand McNally.
- \*Carroll, Glenn and Anand Sevaminathan. 2000. "Why the Microbrewery Movement? Organizational Dynamics of Resource Partitioning in the U.S. Brewing Industry." *AJS* 106(3): 715-762.
- 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. doi:10.2307/2094928.
- \*Haveman, H. & Rao, H. 1997. Structuring a theory of moral sentiments: Institutional and organizational coevolution in the early thrift industry. *American Journal of Sociology*, 102:1606-1651.
- Barnett, William P., and Glenn R. Carroll. 1987. Competition and mutualism among early telephone companies. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 32: 400-421.
- Haveman, Heather A. 1992. Between a rock and a hard place: Organizational change and performance under conditions of fundamental environmental transformation. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 37: 48-75.
- Freeman, John and Michael T. Hannan. 1983. "Niche Width and the Dynamics of Organizational Populations." *American Journal of Sociology*, Vol. 88, No. 6. (May, 1983), pp. 1116-1145.
- \*Baum, Joel A. C. and Jitendra V. Singh. 1994. "Organizational Niches and the Dynamics of Organizational Mortality." *American Journal of Sociology*, Vol. 100, No. 2, pp. 346-380.

### **Behavioral theory of the firm:**

- Argote, Linda, and Henrich R. Greve. 2007. "A Behavioral Theory of the Firm": 40 Years and Counting: Introduction and Impact." *Organization Science* 18 (3): 337–49.
- Gavetti, G., D. Levinthal, and W. Ocasio. 2007. "Neo-Carnegie: The Carnegie School's past, present, and reconstructing for the future." *Organization Science* 18:523-536.
- \*Ocasio, William. 1997. "Towards an Attention-Based View of the Firm." *Strategic Management Journal* 18: 187–206.
- \*Tripsas, Mary, and Giovanni Gavetti. 2000. "Capabilities, Cognition, and Inertia: Evidence from Digital Imaging." *Strategic Management Journal* 21 (10-11): 1147–61.
- March, J.G. & Simon, H.A. 1958. *Organizations*, chapter 6—Cognitive limits on rationality pp. 136-171. New York: John Wiley & Sons
- \*Levitt, B. & March, J.G. 1988. *Organization Learning*. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 14: 319-340
- Levitt, B. & Nass, C. 1989. The lid on garbage can: Institutional constraints on decision making in the technical core of college-text publishers. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 34: 190-207.
- \*March, J.G. 1996. Continuity and change in theories of organizational action. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 41: 278-287.
- \*Thompson, James D. 1967. *Organizations in Action*. McGraw-Hill, pp.1-65.
- Bendor, Jonathan, Terry Moe, and Ken Schotts. 2001. "Recycling the Garbage Can: An Assessment of the Research Program." *APSR* 95, 1: 169-190. Reply by Johan Olsen, "Garbage Cans, New Institutionalism, and the Study of Politics." Pp. 191-198.

### **Social construction and sense-making:**

- \*Balogun, Julia, and Gerry Johnson. 2004. "Organizational Restructuring and Middle Manager Sensemaking." *The Academy of Management Journal* 47 (4): 523–49.
- \*Maguire, Steve, Cynthia Hardy, and Thomas B. Lawrence. 2004. "Institutional Entrepreneurship in Emerging Fields: HIV/AIDS Treatment Advocacy in Canada." *The Academy of Management Journal* 47 (5): 657–79.
- Abbolafia, M. & Kilduff, M. 1988. Enacting market crisis: The social construction of a speculative bubble: *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 33: 177-194.
- \*Orlikowski, W.J. "Improvising Organizational Transformation over Time: A Situated Change Perspective," *Information Systems Research*, 7, 1, 1996: 63-92.
- \*Kellogg, K. 2009. *Operating Room: Relational Spaces and Microinstitutional Change in Surgery*. *American Journal of Sociology*, 115: 657–711
- Kaplan, S. and Orlikowski, W.J. "Temporal Work in Strategy Making," *Organization Science*, 24, 4, 2013: 965-995.
- Orlikowski, W.J. "The Duality of Technology: Rethinking the Concept of Technology in Organizations," *Organization Science*, 3, 3, 1992: 398-427.
- Orlikowski, W.J. "Using Technology and Constituting Structures: A Practice Lens for Studying Technology in Organizations." *Organization Science*, 11, 4, 2000: 404–428.
- Tsoukas, H. and Chia, R. "On organizational becoming: Rethinking organizational change." *Organization Science*, 13, 2002: 567-582.

### **Institutional logics and institutional work:**



- \*Seo, Myeong-Gu, and W. E. Douglas Creed. 2002. "Institutional Contradictions, Praxis, and Institutional Change: A Dialectical Perspective." *The Academy of Management Review* 27 (2): 222–47.
- 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, 1958–1990." *American Journal of Sociology* 105 (3): 801–43.
- \*Greenwood, R., Raynard, M., Kodieh, F., Micelotta, E.R. & Lounsbury, M. 2011. *Institutional Complexity and Organizational Responses*. *Academy of Management Annals*, 5: 317-371.(40 pp)
- Briscoe, F., S. Safford. 2008. The Nixon-in-China Effect: Activism, Imitation, and the Institutionalization of Contentious Practices. *Administrative Science Quarterly* 53(3) 460-491.
- Davis, Gerald F., Kristina A. Diekmann, and Catherine H. Tinsley. 1994. The decline and fall of the conglomerate firm in the 1980s: The deinstitutionalization of an organizational form. *American Sociological Review*, 59: 547-570.
- \*Oliver, C. 1992. The antecedents of de-institutionalization. *Organization Studies*, 13/4: 563-588.
- Eisenhardt, K. 1989. Agency theory: An assessment and a review. *Academy of Management Review*, 14(1): 57-74.

### **Intra-organizational networks:**

- Valderes, B. & Stark, D. 2010. Structural folds. *American Journal of Sociology*, 15: 1150–90
- \*Symposium on Structural Holes, including Reagans & Zuckerman, "Why Knowledge Does Not Equal Power: The Network Redundancy Tradeoff"; comments by Burt, Podolny, van de Rijt et al., and reply ("All in the Family") by Reagans and Zuckerman. *Industrial and Corporate Change* 17: 903-999.
- Stovel & Shaw, 2012. Brokerage. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 38:139-158.
- Tortoriello, Marco, Ray Reagans, and Bill McEvily. 2012. "Bridging the Knowledge Gap: The Influence of Strong Ties, Network Cohesion, and Network Range on the Transfer of Knowledge Between Organizational Units." *Organization Science* 23 (4): 1024–39.
- Reagans, Ray, and Bill McEvily. 2003. "Network Structure and Knowledge Transfer: The Effects of Cohesion and Range." *Administrative Science Quarterly* 48 (2): 240–67.
- Reagans, Ray, and Ezra W. Zuckerman. 2001. "Networks, Diversity, and Productivity: The Social Capital of Corporate R&D Teams." *Organization Science* 12 (4): 502–17.
- \*Reagans, Ray, Ezra Zuckerman, and Bill McEvily. 2004. "How to Make the Team: Social Networks Vs. Demography as Criteria for Designing Effective Teams." *Administrative Science Quarterly* 49 (1): 101–33.
- \*Casciaro, Tiziana, and Miguel Sousa Lobo. 2008. "When Competence Is Irrelevant: The Role of Interpersonal Affect in Task-Related Ties." *Administrative Science Quarterly* 53 (4): 655–84.
- Tortoriello, Marco, and David Krackhardt. 2010. "Activating Cross-Boundary Knowledge: The Role of Simmelian Ties in the Generation of Innovations." *Academy of Management Journal* 53 (1): 167–81.
- \*Krackhardt, David. 1990. "Assessing the Political Landscape: Structure, Cognition, and Power in Organizations." *Administrative Science Quarterly* 35 (2): 342–69.
- Kilduff, Martin, and David Krackhardt. 1994. "Bringing the Individual Back in: A Structural Analysis of the Internal Market for Reputation in Organizations." *The Academy of Management Journal* 37 (1): 87–108.

- \*Krackhardt, David, and Daniel J. Brass. 1994. *Intraorganizational Networks*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- \*Krackhardt, David. 1992. "The Strength of Strong Ties: The Importance of Philos in Organizations." *Networks and Organizations: Structure, Form, and Action* 216: 239.
- Borgatti, Stephen P., and Rob Cross. 2003. "A Relational View of Information Seeking and Learning in Social Networks." *Management Science* 49 (4): 432–45.
- Borgatti, Stephen P, and Martin G Everett. 2000. "Models of Core/periphery Structures." *Social Networks* 21 (4): 375–95.

### **Optional readings:**

- King, Brayden G, Elisabeth S. Clemens, and Melissa Fry. 2010. "Identity Realization and Organizational Forms: Differentiation and Consolidation of Identities Among Arizona's Charter Schools." *Organization Science* 22 (3): 554–72. doi:10.1287/orsc.1100.0548.
- \*Rao, H., Monin, P., & Durand, R. 2003. Institutional change in Toque Ville: Nouvelle cuisine as an identity movement in French gastronomy. *American Journal of Sociology*, 108, 795–843.
- \*Zuckerman, Ezra W. 2010. *Speaking with One Voice: A "Stanford School" Approach to Organizational Hierarchy*. *Research in the Sociology of Organizations*, forthcoming.
- \*Zuckerman, Ezra W, Tai-Young Kim, Kalinda Ukanwa, and James von Rittmann. 2003. "Robust Identities or Non-Entities? Typecasting in the Feature Film Labor Market." *American Journal of Sociology* 108: 1018-1075.
- \*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.
- \*Navis, Chad, and Mary Ann Glynn. 2010. "How New Market Categories Emerge: Temporal Dynamics of Legitimacy, Identity, and Entrepreneurship in Satellite Radio, 1990-2005." *Administrative Science Quarterly* 55 (3): 439–71.
- Porac, Joseph F., Howard Thomas, Fiona Wilson, Douglas Paton, and Alaina Kanfer. 1995. "Rivalry and the Industry Model of Scottish Knitwear Producers." *Administrative Science Quarterly* 40 (2): 203–27.

## Selected readings on other topics not covered in this course

### Evolutionary theory

- Campbell, Donald T. 1965. Variation and selective retention in socio-cultural evolution. In H.R. Barringer, G.I. Blanksten, and R.W. Mack, eds., *Social Change in Developing Areas: A Reinterpretation of Evolutionary Theory*, 19-48. Cambridge, MA: Schenkman.
- Nelson, Richard R., and Sidney G. Winter. 1982. *An Evolutionary Theory of Economic Change*. Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.
- Tushman, Michael L., and Elaine Romanelli. 1985. Organizational evolution: A metamorphosis model of convergence and reorientation. In L. Cummings and B. Staw, eds., *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 7: 171-222. Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
- Arthur, W. Brian. 1989. Competing technologies, increasing returns, and lock-in by historical events. *Economic Journal*, 99: 116-131.
- Gersick, Connie J. G. 1991. Revolutionary change theories: A multilevel exploration of the punctuated equilibrium paradigm. *Academy of Management Review*, 1: 10-36.
- Tushman, Michael L., and Philip Anderson. 1986. Technological discontinuities and organizational environments. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 31: 439-465.
- Anderson, Philip, and Michael L. Tushman. 1990. Technological discontinuities and dominant designs: A cyclical model of technological change. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 35: 604-633.
- Carroll, Glenn R., and J. Richard Harrison. 1994. On the historical efficiency of competition between organizational populations. *American Journal of Sociology*, 100: 729-749.
- Aldrich, Howard E. 1999. *Organizations Evolving*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

### Technology

- David, Paul A. 1985. Clio and the economics of QWERTY. *American Economic Review*, 75: 332-337.
- \*Tushman, Michael L., and Philip Anderson. 1986. Technological discontinuities and organizational environments. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 31: 439-465.
- Anderson, Philip, and Michael L. Tushman. 1990. Technological discontinuities and dominant designs: A cyclical model of technological change. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 35: 604-633.
- Nelson, Richard R. 1994. "The Co-Evolution of Technology, Industrial Structure, and Supporting Institutions," *Industrial and Corporate Change* 3: 47-64.
- Van de Ven, Andrew and Garud, Raghu. 1994. "The Coevolution of technical and Institutional Events in the Development of Innovation". Pp. 425-443 in *Evolutionary Dynamics of Organizations*, edited by Joel A.C. Baum and Jitendra Singh. New York, Oxford University Press.

### Organizational Learning and Innovation

- Levitt, Barbara, and James G. March. 1988. Organizational learning. In W. Richard Scott, ed., *Annual Review of Sociology*, 14: 319-340.
- Abrahamson, Eric, and Gregory Fairchild. 1999. Management fashion: Lifecycles, triggers, and collective learning processes. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 44: 708-740.
- Sørensen, Jesper B., and Toby E. Stuart. 2000. Aging, obsolescence, and organizational innovation. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 45: 81-112.

- Benner, Mary J., and Michael L. Tushman. 2002. Process management and technological innovation: A longitudinal study of the photography and paint industries. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 47: 676-706.
- Cyert, Richard M., and James G. March. 1992 [1963]. *A Behavioral Theory of the Firm*, 2nd Ed., (especially chapters 3, 6, and 7). Cambridge, MA: Blackwell.
- Cohen, Michael D., James G. March, and Johan P. Olsen. 1972. A garbage can model of organizational choice. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 17: 1-25.
- Powell, Walter W., Kenneth W. Koput, and Laurel Smith-Doerr. 1996. Interorganizational collaboration and the locus of innovation: Networks of learning in biotechnology. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 41: 116-145.
- Greve, Henrich R. 1998. Performance, aspirations, and risky organizational change. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 43: 58-86.

### **Organizational culture**

- DiMaggio, P., "Culture and Economy," In N. J. Smelser and R. Swedberg, eds., *The Handbook of Economic Sociology*, Princeton, NJ: Princeton U.P., 1994: 27-57
- Swidler, Ann. 1986. Culture in action: Symbols and strategies. *American Sociological Review*, 51: 273-286.
- Kunda, Gideon. 1992. *Engineering Culture: Control and Commitment in a High-Tech Corporation*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Peterson, Richard A., and David G. Berger. 1975. Cycles in symbol production: The case of popular music. *American Sociological Review*, 40: 158-173.
- Carroll, Glenn R., and J. Richard Harrison. 1998. Organizational demography and culture: Insights from a formal model and simulation. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 43: 637-667.

### **Entrepreneurship and organizational founding**

- Stinchcombe, Arthur L. 1965. Social structure and organizations. In J. March, ed., *Handbook of Organizations*: 142-193. Chicago: Rand-McNally.
- Dobbin, Frank R., and Timothy Dowd. 1997. How policy shapes competition: Early railroad foundings in Massachusetts. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 42: 501-529.
- Sorenson, Olav, and Pino G. Audia. 2000. The social structure of entrepreneurial activity: Geographic concentration of footwear production in the United States, 1940-1989. *American Journal of Sociology*, 106: 424-462.
- Burton, M. Diane, Jesper B. Sørensen, and Christine M. Beckman. 2002. Coming from good stock: Career histories and new venture formation. *Research in the Sociology of Organizations*, 19: 229-262. New York: Elsevier Science Ltd.
- Ruef, Martin, Howard E. Aldrich, and Nancy M. Carter. 2003. The structure of founding teams: Homophily, strong ties, and isolation among U.S. entrepreneurs. *American Sociological Review*, 68: 195-222.
- Chinoy, Ely. 1955/1992. *Automobile Workers and the American Dream*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.
- Aldrich, Howard E., and Marlene Fiol. 1994. Fools rush in? The institutional context of industry creation. *Academy of Management Review*, 19: 645-670.
- Aldrich, Howard E. 1999. *Organizations Evolving*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Wiewel, Wim, and Albert Hunter. 1985. The interorganizational network as a resource: A comparative case study of organizational genesis. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 30: 482-496.

- Baum, Joel A.C., and Heather A. Haveman. 1997. Love thy neighbor? Differentiation and agglomeration in the Manhattan hotel industry. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 41: 304-338.
- Zucker, Lynne, Michael Darby, and Marilyn Brewer. 1998. Intellectual capital and the birth of U.S. biotechnology enterprises. *American Economic Review*, 88: 290-305.
- Ruef, Martin. 2000. The emergence of organizational forms: A community ecology approach. *American Journal of Sociology*, 106: 658-714.
- Sorenson, Olav, and Toby Stuart. 2001. Syndication networks and the spatial distribution of venture capital investments. *American Journal of Sociology*, 106: 1546-1588.

### **Organizational Demography**

- Gusfield, Joseph R. 1957. The problem of generations in an organizational structure. *Social Forces*, 35: 323-330.
- Ryder, Norman B. 1964. Notes on the concept of a population. *American Journal of Sociology*, 69: 447-463.
- Ryder, Norman B. 1965. The cohort as a concept in the study of social change. *American Sociological Review*, 30: 843-861.
- Blau, Peter M. 1977. *Inequality and Heterogeneity: A Primitive Theory of Social Structure*, chapters 1-4. New York: Free Press.
- Pfeffer, Jeffrey. 1983. Organizational demography. In L. Cummings and B. Staw, eds., *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 5: 299-357. Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
- Lawrence, Barbara. 1997. The black box of organizational demography. *Organization Science*, 8: 1-22.
- Williams, Katherine Y., and Charles A. O'Reilly. 1998. Demography and diversity in organizations: A review of 40 years of research. In B. Staw and L. Cummings, eds., *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 20: 77-140.
- Reskin, Barbara F., Debra B. McBrier, and Julie A. Kmec. 1999. The determinants and consequences of workplace sex and race composition. In Karen S. Cook., ed., *Annual Review of Sociology*, 25: 235-261.
- Reed, Theodore. 1978. Organizational change in the American Foreign Service, 1925-1965: The utility of cohort analysis. *American Sociological Review*, 43: 404-421.
- McPherson, J. Miller, Pamela A. Popielarz, and Sonia Drobic. 1992. Social networks and organizational dynamics. *American Sociological Review*, 57: 153-170.
- Shenhav, Yehouda, and Yitchak Haberfeld. 1992. Organizational demography and inequality. *Social Forces*, 71: 123-143.
- Cohen, Lisa E., Joseph P. Broschak, and Heather A. Haveman. 1998. And then there were more? The effect of organizational sex composition on the hiring and promotion of managers. *American Sociological Review*, 63: 711-727.
- Sørensen, Jesper B. 1999. The ecology of organizational demography: Managerial tenure distributions and organizational competition. *Industrial and Corporation Change*, 8: 713-744.
- Reagans, Ray, and Ezra W. Zuckerman. 2001. Networks, diversity, and productivity: The social capital of corporate R&D teams. *Organization Science*, 12: 502-517.

### **Jobs and Careers**

- Taylor, Frederick Winslow. 1911. *The Principles of Scientific Management*. New York: W.W. Norton and Co.

- Bendix, Reinhard. 1956. *Work and Authority in Industry: Ideologies of Management in the Course of Industrialization*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Whyte, William H., Jr. 1956. *The Organization Man*. New York: Simon and Schuster.
- Guillén, Mauro F. 1994. *Models of Management: Work, Authority, and Organization in a Comparative Perspective*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Stolzenberg, Ross M. 1978. Bringing the boss back in: Employer size, employee schooling, and socioeconomic achievement. *American Sociological Review*, 43: 813-828.
- Baron, James N., and William T. Bielby. 1980. Bringing the firms back in: Stratification, segmentation, and the organization of work. *American Sociological Review*, 45: 737-765.
- Baron, James N., and William T. Bielby. 1984. The organization of work in a segmented economy. *American Sociological Review*, 49: 454-473.
- Faulkner, Robert R., and Andy B. Anderson. 1987. Short-term projects and emergent careers: Evidence from Hollywood. *American Journal of Sociology*, 92: 879-909.
- Miner, Anne S. 1987. Idiosyncratic jobs in formalized organizations. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 32: 327-351.
- Haveman, Heather A., and Lisa E. Cohen. 1994. The ecological dynamics of careers: The impact of organizational founding, dissolution, and merger on job mobility. *American Journal of Sociology*, 100: 104-152.
- Stovel, Katherine, Michael Savage, and Peter Bearman. 1996. Ascription into achievement: Models of career systems at Lloyds Bank, 1890-1970. *American Journal of Sociology*, 102: 358-399.
- Podolny, Joel M., and James N. Baron. 1997. Resources and relationships: Social networks and mobility in the workplace. *American Sociological Review*, 62: 673-693.
- Fernandez, Roberto M., Emilio J. Castilla, and Paul Moore. 2000. Social capital at work: Networks and employment at a phone center. *American Journal of Sociology*, 105: 1288-1356.
- Petersen, Trond, Ishak Saporta, and Marc-David Seidel. 2000. Offering a job: Meritocracy and social networks. *American Journal of Sociology*, 106: 763-816.
- Kalleberg, Arne L., Barbara F. Reskin, and Ken Hudson. 2000. Bad jobs in America: Standard and non-standard employment relations and job quality in the United States. *American Sociological Review*, 65: 256-278.

## **Professions**

- Wilensky, Harold L. 1965. The professionalization of everyone? *American Journal of Sociology*, 70: 137-158.
- Goldner, Fred H., and R.R. Ritti. 1967. Professionalization as career immobility. *American Journal of Sociology*, 72: 489-502.
- Hall, Richard H. 1968. Professionalization and bureaucratization. *American Sociological Review*, 33: 92-104.
- Freidson, Eliot. 1970. *Profession of Medicine: A Study of the Sociology of Applied Knowledge*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Heinz, John P., and Edward O. Laumann. 1994 [1982]. *Chicago Lawyers: The Social Structure of the Bar*, Rev. Ed. Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press.
- Starr, Paul. 1982. *The Social Transformation of American Medicine*. New York: Basic Books.
- Freidson, Eliot. 1986. *Professional Powers: A Study in the Institutionalization of Formal Knowledge*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

- Abbott, Andrew. 1988. *The System of Professions: An Essay on the Division of Expert Labor*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Galanter, Marc, and Thomas Palay. 1991. *Tournament of Lawyers: The Transformation of the Big Law Firm*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Abbott, Andrew. 2001. *Chaos of Disciplines*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

### **Gender & Organizations**

- Kanter, Rosabeth Moss. 1977. *Men and Women of the Corporation*. New York: Basic Books.
- Jacobs, Jerry. 1989. *Revolving Doors: Sex Segregation and Women's Careers*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- England, Paula. 1992. *Comparable Worth: Theories and Evidence*. New York: Aldine de Gruyter.
- Spain, Daphne, and Suzanne M. Bianchi. 1996. *Balancing Act: Motherhood, Marriage, and Employment among American Women*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Reskin, Barbara F., Debra B. McBrier, and Julie A. Kmec. 1999. The determinants and consequences of workplace sex and race composition. In Karen S. Cook., ed., *Annual Review of Sociology*, 25: 235-261.
- Nelson, Robert L., and William P. Bridges. 1999. *Legalizing Gender Inequality: Courts, Markets, and Unequal Pay for Women in the United States*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bielby, William T., and James N. Baron. 1986. Men and women at work: Sex segregation and statistical discrimination. *American Journal of Sociology*, 91: 759-799.
- Wharton, Amy S., and James N. Baron. 1987. So happy together? The psychological impact of gender segregation on women at work. *American Sociological Review*, 52: 574-587.
- Pfeffer, Jeffrey, and Alison Davis-Blake. 1987. The effect of the proportion of women on salaries: The case of college administrators. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 32: 1-24.
- Bernhardt, Annette, Martina Morris, and Mark S. Handcock. 1995. Women's gains or men's losses? A closer look at the shrinking gender gap in earnings. *American Journal of Sociology*, 101: 302-328.
- Petersen, Trond, and Laurie A. Morgan. 1995. Separate and unequal: Occupation-establishment sex segregation and the gender wage gap. *American Journal of Sociology*, 101: 329-365.
- Reskin, Barbara F., and Debra Branch McBrier. 2000. Why not ascription? Organizations' employment of male and female managers. *American Sociological Review*, 65: 210-233.

### **Labor Process Theory and Critical Perspectives (Marxians, Foucauldian, etc.)**

- Braverman, Harry. 1974. *Labor and Monopoly Capital*, Monthly Review Press.
- Burawoy, Michael. 1979. *Manufacturing Consent*, U. of Chicago Press.
- Edwards, Richard (1979). *Contested Terrain: The Transformation of the Workplace in the Twentieth Century*. New York: Basic Books. Pp. 48-71.
- Burrell, G. (1988). "Modernism, Post-modernism and organizational analysis 2: The contribution of Michel Foucault" *Organization Studies*, 9: 221-235.
- Foucault, Michel (1991). "Governmentality" in Graham Burchell, Colin Gordon and Peter Miller (eds.) *The Foucault Effect: Studies in Governmentality*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press. Pp. 87-104.

- Foucault, Michel (1979). *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*. New York: Vintage Books. Pp. 195-228.
- Vallas, Steven P. 2003. "Why Teamwork Fails: Obstacles to Workplace change in Four Manufacturing Plants." *American Sociological Review* 68: 223-50.

### **Transaction Cost Economics and boundaries of the firm**

- Williamson, Oliver E. 1975. *Markets and Hierarchies: Analysis and Anti-Trust Implications* (especially chapters 1, 2, 5-8). New York: Free Press.
- Williamson, Oliver E. 1991. Comparative economic organization: The analysis of discrete structural alternatives. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 36: 269-296.
- Hart, Oliver. 1995. *Firms, Contracts, and Financial Structure* (especially chapters 1-3). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Holmström, Bengt, and John Roberts. 1998. The boundaries of the firm revisited. *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 12: 73-94.
- Holmström, Bengt. 1999. The firm as a subeconomy. *Journal of Law, Economics, and Organization*, 15: 74-102.
- Baker, George, Robert Gibbons, and Kevin J. Murphy. 2002. Relational contracts and the theory of the firm. *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 117: 39-84.
- Whinston, Michael. 2003. On the transaction cost determinants of vertical integration. *Journal of Law, Economics, and Organization*, 19: 1-23.
- Monteverde, Kirk, and David Teece. 1982. Supplier switching costs and vertical integration in the automobile industry. *Bell Journal of Economics*, 13: 206-13.
- Joskow, Paul. 1987. Contract duration and relationship-specific investment: Empirical evidence from coal markets. *American Economic Review*, 77: 168-85.
- Pisano, Gary P. 1990. The R&D boundaries of the firm: An empirical analysis. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 35: 153-176.
- Mullin, Joseph, and Wallace Mullin. 1997. United States Steel's acquisition of Great Northern Ore Properties: Vertical foreclosure or efficient contractual governance? *Journal of Law, Economics, and Organization*, 13: 74-100.
- Banerjee, Abhijit, and Esther Duflo. 2000. Reputation effects and the limits of contracting: A study of the Indian software industry. *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 115: 989-1017.
- Baker, George, and Thomas Hubbard. 2003. Make versus buy in trucking: Asset ownership, job design, and information. *American Economic Review*, 93: 551-572.
- Azoulay, Pierre. 2003. Acquiring knowledge within and across firm boundaries: Evidence from clinical development. Working paper, Columbia University.
- David, Robert J., and Shin-Kap Han. 2003. A systematic assessment of the empirical support for transaction cost economics. Forthcoming, *Strategic Management Journal*.
- Coase, Ronald. 2000. The acquisition of Fisher Body by General Motors. *Journal of Law and Economics*, 43: 15-31.
- Freeland, Robert. 2000. Creating holdup through vertical integration: Fisher Body revisited. *Journal of Law and Economics*, 43: 33-66.
- Casadesus-Masanell, Ramon, and Daniel Spulber. 2000. The fable of Fisher Body. *Journal of Law and Economics*, 43: 67-104.
- Klein, Benjamin. 2000. Fisher-General Motors and the nature of the firm. *Journal of Law and Economics*, 43: 105-41.

### **Agency Theory and incentives**



- Fama, Eugene F. 1980. Agency problems and the theory of the firm. *Journal of Political Economy*, 88: 288-307.
- Fama, Eugene, and Michael C. Jensen. 1983. Separation of ownership and control. *Journal of Law and Economics*, 26: 301-326.
- Fama, Eugene F., and Michael C. Jensen. 1983. Agency problems and residual claims. *Journal of Law and Economics*, 26: 327-350.
- Gibbons, Robert. 1998. Incentives in organizations. *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 12: 115-132.
- Baker, George, Robert Gibbons, and Kevin J. Murphy. 1994. Subjective performance measures in optimal incentive contracts. *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 109: 1125-56.
- Che, Yeon-Koo, and Seung-Weon Yoo. 2001. Optimal incentives for teams. *American Economic Review*, 91: 525-41.
- Baker, George. 2002. Distortion and risk in optimal incentive contracts. *Journal of Human Resources*, 37: 728-751.
- Rob, Rafael, and Peter Zemsky. 2002. Social capital, corporate culture, and incentive intensity. *Rand Journal of Economics*, 33: 243-57.
- Bénabou, Roland, and Jean Tirole. 2003. Intrinsic and extrinsic motivation. *Review of Economic Studies*, 70: 489-520.
- Murdock, Kevin. 2002. Intrinsic motivation and optimal incentive contracts. *RAND Journal of Economics*, 33: 650-671.
- Lazear, Edward. 2000. Performance, pay and productivity. *American Economic Review*, 90: 1346-61.
- Bertrand, Marianne, and Sendhil Mullainathan. 2001. Do CEOs set their own pay? The ones without principals do. *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 116: 901-32.
- Chevalier, Judith, and Glen Ellison. 1997. Risk taking by mutual funds as a response to incentives. *Journal of Political Economy*, 105: 1167-1200.
- Prendergast, Canice. 2002. The tenuous tradeoff between risk and incentives. *Journal of Political Economy*, 110: 1071-1102.
- Hamilton, Barton H., Jack A. Nickerson, and Hideo Owan. 2003. Team incentives and worker heterogeneity: An empirical analysis of the impact of teams on productivity and dispersion. *Journal of Political Economy*, 111: 465-497.
- Sacerdote, Bruce. 2001. Peer effects with random assignment: Results for Dartmouth roommates. *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 116: 681-704.
- Knez, Marc, and Duncan Simester. 2001. Firm-wide incentives and mutual monitoring at Continental Airlines. *Journal of Labor Economics*, 19: 743-772.
- Frey, Bruno, and F. Oberholzer-Gee. 1997. The cost of price incentives: An empirical analysis of motivation crowding-out. *American Economic Review*, 87: 746-55.

## Professor's Biography



Massimo Maoret is an Assistant Professor in the Strategic Management Department at IESE Business School, and a Marie Curie Fellow of the European Commission. He has received a Ph.D. in Management from Boston College in 2013; he is an active member of the Academy of Management and was also part of the Economic Sociology Work Group at the MIT Sloan School of Management between 2010 and 2013.

Massimo's research focuses on how social networks influence performance both at the individual and organizational level. His work focuses on explaining how informal relationships facilitate the innovativeness of knowledge workers (engineers and architects), and the process through which new organizational members become socialized by developing their networks in their new jobs. He also studies how organizations of the public and private sector exchange knowledge in large technological consortia, and how the stability of task-related interactions boosts organizational competitiveness.

He investigated the impact of social networks on the performance of various small and large firms, but also on no-profit organizations from different institutional sectors (e.g. basketball teams and the military). His work has appeared in multiple prestigious academic journals, including *Organization Science*, the *Strategic Management Journal*, *Advances in Strategic Management* and the *Proceedings of the Academy of Management*.

At IESE Business School, Prof. Maoret teaches in a wide array of programs, including Competitive Strategy, Strategy Execution and Organizational Change in the fulltime MBA, Organizational Theory in the Ph.D. curriculum, and also various modules on “managing your network” and “getting things done” at the Executive level, where he collaborated with organizations such as Henkel, DOW Chemical and UNICEF.