

EMORY UNIVERSITY

Sociology 514

BUREAUCRATIC ORGANIZATIONS

Spring 2001
6:00 - 9:00 (T)
206 Tarbutton Hall

Dr. Tim Dowd
230 Tarbutton Hall
Office Hours 2:00 - 3:30 (T)
x6259; tdowd@emory.edu

This course (1) provides students with a thorough grounding in the organizational literature and (2) prepares students for doing their own organizational research. To facilitate the first objective, the readings are organized historically so as to highlight both intellectual developments in the organizational literature and shifts in emphases that have occurred in this literature. For example, we will see how early work tends to emphasize life *within* organizations (*e.g.*, informal relations among workers, managerial strategies) while later work tends to emphasize the environment *beyond* the confines of the individual organization (*e.g.*, inter-organizational linkages, diffusion of business strategies). To facilitate the second objective, we will have regular discussions concerning various strategies for doing organizational research, and we will discuss the feasibility of applying these strategies to new topics.

COURSE ORGANIZATION

The course is organized as a seminar, which entails the combination of weekly lectures, a fair amount of reading, class discussion, and written assignments. Given this organization, you are expected to attend each class and to participate actively.

A) Attendance

If you must miss a class, please inform me ahead of time so that we can make arrangements. Note that unexcused absences will negatively affect your final grade.

B) Class Participation and Discussion

Active participation requires adequate preparation. You therefore must read the assigned material before class and develop your own assessment of this material. Such careful preparation, in turn, will improve the quality of class discussion. Of course, class discussion should be both informed and respectful; moreover, it should be a forum wherein all can raise questions, explore ideas, and express misgivings. Participation comprises 20% of your final grade.

C) Weekly Memos

You will prepare a 2-3 page memo for each week's readings (typed and double-spaced). You should regard these memos as ideas in progress rather than as finished products. Use them to digest each week's readings (e.g., summaries) and to respond with questions, criticisms, and new ideas. Please bring your memo to class and submit it at the end of class. The weekly memos comprise 25% of your final grade.

D) Class Presentation

On three occasions, you and other seminar participants will lead the class in discussion. Discussion-leaders will develop questions that guide the seminar through an exploration of the week's readings -- including the strengths and weaknesses of the material and the directions that future research should take. Turns as discussion-leader will comprise 20% of your final grade. We will devise the discussion-leader schedule on the first day of class.

E) Final Paper

You will complete a 12-15 page paper (typed and double-spaced). This paper should deal with some aspect of the organizational literature, yet it should also relate to your own research interests. Consequently, this paper may take a variety of forms. It can, for example, be a literature review, a research proposal, a dissertation prospectus, or an empirical project. I ask that you discuss your topic with me prior to March 9th and that you submit an outline by March 27th. During the April 10th meeting, you and your peers will circulate drafts for comments and suggestions. On April 17th, you will present your paper and discuss how you address (or will address) the comments that you received. The final paper is due on May 8th and will comprise 35% of your final grade.

READING MATERIALS

We will read a broad range of material this semester, including well-known works and recent contributions to the organizational literature. To assist you with the building of your personal library, I have ordered a number of books. They are listed below and are available at Druid Hills Bookstore (recommended rather than required purchases). These books are also available at the General Reserve in Woodruff Library. The remaining articles and chapters are available via Euclid's online reserves. Many articles are available online via JSTORE (www.jstor.org/jstor) and ProQuest Databases (e.g., www.galileo.peachnet.edu).

Aldrich, Howard. 1999. *Organizations Evolving*. London: Sage.

Biggart, Nicole Woolsey. 1990. *Charismatic Capitalism: Direct Selling Organizations in America*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

- Burawoy, Michael. 1979. *Manufacturing Consent: Changes in the Labor Process under Monopoly Capitalism*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Chandler, Alfred D., Jr. 1990. *Scale and Scope: The Dynamics of Industrial Capitalism*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Edwards, Richard. 1979. *Contested Terrain: The Transformation of the Workplace in the Twentieth Century*. New York: Basic Books.
- Perrow, Charles. 1986. *Complex Organizations: A Critical Essay*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Scott, W. Richard. 1995. *Institutions and Organizations*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Vaughan, Diane. 1996. *The Challenger Launch Decision: Risky Technology, Culture, and Deviance at NASA*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
-

READING ASSIGNMENTS

(subject to revision)

January 23 : Organizational Matters

January 30 : Welcome to the Wonderful World of Bureaucratic Organization

Weber's writing on bureaucracy is a touchstone for the organizational literature. Consequently, we spend this week exploring his argument. Perrow nicely situates Weber's treatment of bureaucracy, and Biggart expounds on various Weberian issues. Biggart, Rothschild-Whitt, and Stinchcombe cast Weber's ideal type into bold relief by offering counter-types. The supplemental readings provide further clarification. Reskin and McBrier examine the ramifications of impersonal bureaucracy; Hirsch shows how craft administration is relevant for media industries; Martin and colleagues offer a case study that pushes the collectivist type toward a feminist type of organization

Biggart, Nicole Woolsey. 1990. *Charismatic Capitalism*. Chapters 1, 2, 5, and 6.

Perrow, Charles. 1986. *Complex Organizations*, Chapter 1.

Rothschild-Whitt, Joyce. 1979. "The Collectivist Organization: An Alternative to Rational-Bureaucratic Models." *American Sociological Review* 44:509-527.

Stinchcombe, Arthur L. 1959. "Bureaucratic and Craft Administration of Production: A Comparative Study." *Administrative Science Quarterly* 4:168-187.

Weber, Max. 1981 (1947). "Bureaucracy." Pages 7-36 in *The Sociology of Organizations: Basic Studies*, edited by Oscar Grusky and George A. Miller. Second edition. New York: Free Press.

Supplemental Readings:

Hirsch, Paul M. 1972. "Processing Fads and Fashions: An Organization-Set Analysis of Cultural Industry Systems." *American Journal of Sociology* 77:639-659.

Martin, Joanne, Kathleen Knopoff, and Christine Beckman. 1998. "An Alternative to Bureaucratic Impersonality and Emotional Labor: Bounded Emotionality at the Body Shop." *Administrative Science Quarterly* 43:429-469.

Reskin, Barbara F. and Debra Branch McBrier. 2000. "Why Not Ascription? Organizations' Employment of Male and Female Managers." *American Sociological Review* 65:210-223.

February 6 : Worker Control, Routinization, and Bureaucracy

Whereas some laud the technical efficiency of bureaucratic organizations, others view bureaucracy as a tool by which owners and managers control their workers. The latter view is understandable when we consider Taylor's "scientific management" -- a system whereby managers can (supposedly) increase worker productivity. Braverman discusses the control implications of Taylor's system, stressing how worker tasks are de-skilled. Expounding on the control theme, Edwards presents an historical argument in which control via direct supervision gives way to other forms of worker control. Baron and colleagues quantitatively test Edwards' argument by employing a longitudinal data set, with Jennings *et al.* describing the construction and analysis of that data set. Barley and Perlow both examine control (one more explicitly than the other) in contemporary settings, thereby complementing the historical concerns of Edwards and Baron *et al.* while extending the worker control literature. Once again, Perrow offers a nice introduction to the topic.

Barley, Stephen R. 1996. "Technicians in the Workplace: Ethnographic Evidence for Bringing Work into Organization Studies." *Administrative Science Quarterly* 41:404-441.

Baron, James N., Frank R. Dobbin, and P. Devereaux Jennings. 1986. "War and Peace: The Evolution of Modern Personnel Administration in U.S. Industry." *American Journal of Sociology* 92:350-383.

Edwards, Richard. 1979. *Contested Terrain*. Chapters 1, 7, and 8.

Perlow, Leslie A. 1998. "Boundary Control: The Social Ordering of Work and Family Time in a High- Tech Corporation." *Administrative Science Quarterly* 43:328-357.

Perrow, Charles. 1986. *Complex Organizations*, Pages 49-62.

Supplemental Readings:

Braverman, Harry. 1974. *Labor and Monopoly Capital: The Degradation of Work in the Twentieth Century*. New York: Monthly Review Press. Chapter 5.

Jennings, P. Devereaux, Frank Dobbin, and James Baron. 1992. "Making War and Peace." Pages 179-193 in *Doing Exemplary Research*, edited by Peter J. Frost and Ralph Stablein. Beverly Hills: Sage.

Taylor, Frederick W. 1981 (1911). "Scientific Management." Pages 55-66 in *The Sociology of Organizations: Basic Studies*, edited by Oscar Grusky and George A. Miller. Second edition. New York: Free Press.

February 13 : Normative Inducements (and Control): Human Relations and Beyond

Chester Barnard insists that bureaucratic organizations inherently are cooperative (read "normative") systems. In a similar vein, early proponents of the Human Relations model explored the normative side of bureaucratic life (*e.g.*, informal groups, leadership styles) so as to understand what induces productivity and commitment among workers. The readings build on this normative theme. Perrow provides an unflattering overview of the Human Relations model. Roy provides an empirical critique of the Human Relations model and sets the stage for Burawoy's case study. Burawoy and Barker both move beyond the Human Relations model and critically examine the worker control that results from normative inducements, and Ezzamel and Willmott's case study speaks to the works of Burawoy and Barker. The remaining readings provide an important context: Barley and Kunda historically chart managerial concerns with normative control; Dobbin and colleagues demonstrate how policy and managers spurred the historical expansion of internal labor markets.

Barnard, Chester. 1981 (1938). "Cooperation." Pages 84-97 in *The Sociology of Organizations: Basic Studies*, edited by Oscar Grusky and George A. Miller. Second edition. New York: Free Press.

Barker, James R. 1993. "Tightening the Iron Cage: Concretive Control on Self-Management Teams." *Administrative Science Quarterly* 38:408-437.

Burawoy, Michael. 1979. *Manufacturing Consent*. University of Chicago. Preface, Chapters 3-6.

Dobbin, Frank, John R. Sutton, John W. Meyer, and W. Richard Scott. 1993. "Equal Opportunity Law and the Construction of Internal Labor Markets." *American Journal of Sociology* 99:396-427.

Perrow, Charles. 1986. *Complex Organizations*, Pages 62-85.

Supplemental Readings:

Barley, Stephen R. and Gideon Kunda. 1992. "Design and Devotion: Surges of Rational and Normative Ideologies of Control in Managerial Discourse." *Administrative Science Quarterly* 37:363-399.

Ezzamel, Mahmoud and Hugh Willmott. 1998. "Accounting for Teamwork: A Critical Study of Group- Based Systems of Organizational Control." *Administrative Science Quarterly* 43:358-396.

Roy, Donald. 1954. "Efficiency and the Fix: Informal Intergroup Relations in a Piecework Machine Shop." *American Journal of Sociology* 60:255-266.

February 20 : Cliques and Cooptation: The Institutional Approach

From the outside, organizations (especially bureaucracies) may appear tidy and efficient. From the inside, however, they often appear as messy struggles for control. The case studies of the 1940s and 1950s admirably depicted such struggles. These studies were journalistic in style and emphasized both the informal aspects of organizations and the larger environmental context. Perrow offers an overview of the institutional school, and Scott describes how this group of institutionalists compares to other groups. Merton's classic piece calls into question the operational efficiency of bureaucracy, while Zald and Meyer detail the dramatic transformation of a particular organization. Both Blau and Dalton cleverly show the difference between an organization's "official" and "unofficial" chain of command. The remaining case studies bear more than a passing resemblance to the institutional approach, thereby showing its continued relevance for current scholarship.

Dalton, Melville. 1992 (1959). "Men Who Manage." Pages 315-344 in *The Sociology of Economic Life*, edited by Mark Granovetter and Richard Swedberg. Boulder: Westview Press.

Glynn, MaryAnn. 2000. "When Cymbals Become Symbols: Conflict over Organizational Identity within a Symphony Orchestra." *Organization Science* 11:285-298.

Merton, Robert. 1940. "Bureaucratic Structure and Personality." *Social Forces* 17:560-568.

Morrill, Calvin. 1991. "Conflict Management, Honor, and Organizational Change." *American Journal of Sociology* 97:585-621.

Perrow, Charles. 1986. *Complex Organizations*, Pages 157-177.

Zald, Meyer N. and Patricia Denton. 1963. "From Evangelism to General Service: The Transformation of the YMCA." *Administrative Science Quarterly* 8:214-234.

Supplemental Readings:

Blau, Peter M. 1955. *The Dynamics of Bureaucracy: A Study of Interpersonal Relations in Two Government Agencies*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. Chapters 7-8.

Clayman, Steven E. and Ann Reisner. 1998. "Gatekeeping in Action: Editorial Conferences and Assessments of Newsworthiness." *American Sociological Review* 63:178-199.

Scott, W. Richard. 1995. *Institutions and Organizations*. Chapters 1-2.

February 27 : Decisions, Decisions: The Carnegie School

Many of the previous works emphasize the rational efficiency of bureaucratic organization -- be it an efficiency of production or an efficiency of control. Herbert Simon, James March and others explore the complexity of life in bureaucratic organizations and, hence, broach factors that constrain the efficiency and rationality. In particular, Simon and his colleagues emphasize the extent to which organizational decisions are constrained by limited information, by limited effort, and by internal coalitions. Perrow's succinct introduction is particularly helpful. Cyert and March provide a provocative account of how decision making in organizations often relies on limited information. Vaughan's case study chillingly demonstrates the import of decision making routines. Recent studies on technology brokering, broadcasting, and publishing demonstrate the insights of the Carnegie School.

Hargadon, Andrew and Robert I. Sutton. 1997. "Technology Brokering and Innovation in a Product Development Firm." *Administrative Science Quarterly* 42:716-749.

March, James G. and Herbert A. Simon. 1981 (1958). "Decision-Making Theory." Pages 135-150 in *The Sociology of Organizations: Basic Studies*, edited by Oscar Grusky and George A. Miller. Second edition. New York: Free Press.

Perrow, Charles. 1986. *Complex Organizations*, Pages 119-140.

Vaughan, Diane. 1996. *The Challenger Launch Decision*. Preface, Chapters 1-3, 5-6, and 8.

Supplemental Readings:

Cyert, Richard M. and James G. March. 1963. *A Behavioral Theory of the Firm*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall. Chapters 3, 6, and 7.

Greve, Henrich R. and Alva Taylor. 2000. "Innovations as Catalysts for Organizational Change: Shifts in Organizational Cognition and Search." *Administrative Science Quarterly* 45:54-80.

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

March 6 : Beyond the Boundaries: Organizing in an Uncertain and/or Changing Environment

Is there one best way for organizing? Some answer, "No -- it depends on the type of task that the organization is performing and/or the type of environment that it confronts." Burns and Stalker, for example, argue that firms in stable environments should employ a different management style than those in unstable environments; Bradach updates their argument and shows how organizations may simultaneously utilize both management styles. Note that the environmental emphasis of Burns and Stalker pushed scholarly research beyond the confines of an individual organization. Lawrence and Lorsch build on this idea when they develop their contingency theory. Barley and Schoonhoven both offer insightful critiques of contingency theory and empirical studies in health care. Thorton and Ocasio, as well as Baker and Faulkner, make a compelling case for the historically contingent nature of business.

Barley, Stephen R. 1990. "The Alignment of Technology and Structure through Roles and Networks." *Administrative Science Quarterly* 35:61-103.

Bradach, Jeffrey L. 1997. "Using the Plural Form in the Management of Restaurant Chains." *Administrative Science Quarterly* 42:276-303.

Lawrence, Paul R. and Jay W. Lorsch. 1967. *Organizations and Environment: Managing Differentiation and Integration*. Boston: Harvard University. Chapters 2 and 8.

Perrow, Charles. 1986. *Complex Organizations*, Pages 178-192.

Thorton, 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* 105:801-843.

Supplemental Readings:

Baker, Wayne E. and Robert R. Faulkner. 1991. "Role as Resource in the Hollywood Film Industry." *American Journal of Sociology* 97:279-309.

Burns, Tom and G.M. Stalker. 1961. *The Management of Innovation*. London: Tavistock. Chapters 5-6.

Schoonhoven, Claudia Bird. 1981. "Problems with Contingency Theory: Testing Assumptions Hidden within the Language of Contingency Theory." *Administrative Science Quarterly* 26:349-377.

March 13 : NO CLASS - SPRING BREAK

March 20 : Explaining the Expansion of Firms and the Rise of Industrial Capitalism (Part I)

In 1962, Alfred Chandler described how General Motors, DuPont, and other organizations adopted the multidivisional form (MDF). In subsequent research, such as *Scale and Scope*, Chandler historically documented the rise and diffusion of this organizational form and the attendant rise of industrial capitalism. In the wake of Chandler's impressive research, social scientists have theoretically and empirically assessed his causal argument. Two readings assess Chandler's argument in the context of competing and/or complementary arguments; Fligstein and Palmer *et al.* find some support for Chandler's argument, but they also find other factors at play in the diffusion of the MDF. Drawing on a competing argument and turn of the century data, Roy directly challenges the efficiency assumption found in Chandler's argument. The remaining works temper Chandler's argument by demonstrating how culture, policy, and power shape logics of economic activity (including notions of value and efficiency).

Chandler, Alfred D., Jr. 1990. *Scale and Scope*. Introduction, Chapters 1-6.

Dobbin, Frank and Timothy J. Dowd. 2000. "The Market that Antitrust Built: Public Policy, Private Coercion, and Railroad Acquisitions." *American Sociological Review* 65:631-657.

Fligstein, Neil. 1985. "The Spread of the Multidivisional Firm, 1919-79." *American Sociological Review* 50:377-391.

Roy, William G. 1997. *Socializing Capital: The Rise of the Large Industrial Corporation in America*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press. Chapters 1-2.

Supplemental Readings:

Carruthers, Bruce G. and Sarah Babb. 1996. "The Color of Money and the Nature of Value: Greenbacks and Gold in Postbellum America." *American Journal of Sociology* 101:1556-1591.

Palmer, Donald A., P. Devereaux Jennings, and Xueguang Zhou. 1993. "Late Adoption of the Multidivisional Form by Large U.S. Corporations: Institutional, Political, and Economic Accounts." *Administrative Science Quarterly* 38:100-131.

Zelizer, Viviana. 1978. "Human Values and the Market: The Case of Life Insurance and Death in 19th Century America." *American Journal of Sociology* 84:591-610

March 27 : Explaining the Expansion of Firms and the Rise of Industrial Capitalism (Part II)

In the spirit of Chandler's historical research, Williamson offers a general argument regarding, among other things, why firms expand and why they adopt the MDF. He argues, for example, that firms vertically integrate because it is an efficient solution for dealing with opportunistic

suppliers and distributors. Three readings take conceptual issue with Williamson's transaction costs approach. Perrow critiques the efficiency assumption and inattention to power; Granovetter contests the atomistic assumption; Powell unpacks the market-hierarchy dichotomy. Uzzi and Freeland empirically demonstrate why such conceptual issues matter. The remaining readings explore the limits of Williamson's argument via international cases.

Freeland, Robert F. 1996. "The Myth of the M-Form? Governance, Consent, and Organizational Change." *American Journal of Sociology* 102:483-526.

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

Perrow, Charles. 1988. *Complex Organizations*, Pages 219-224, 236-257.

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

Williamson, Oliver. 1981. "The Economics of Organization: The Transaction Cost Approach." *American Journal of Sociology* 87:548-577.

Supplemental Readings:

Hamilton, Gary G. and Nicole Woolsey Biggart. 1988. "Market, Culture, and Authority: A Comparative Analysis of Management and Organization in the Far East." *American Journal of Sociology* 94:S52-S94.

Lazerson, Mark H. 1988. "Organizational Growth of Small Firms: An Outcome of Markets and Hierarchies?" *American Sociological Review* 53:330-342.

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

April 3 : Population Ecology

Population ecology is among the most influential theories in the recent organizational literature. Its proponents posit that the evolution of a given organizational population results from the interplay between its environment and its organizational demography (*e.g.*, foundings, failures). Their position, however, does not denote consensus. One camp, for example, primarily assesses the environment via the total number of organizations in the population (*i.e.*, density), and it posits that organizations rarely adapt to their environment. Hannan and Freeman offer a classic example and Hannan and Carroll (1995) provide a concise summary in their 1995 book. Another camp assesses the environment via a range of measures that includes (but is not limited to) density, and it recognizes organizational adaptation. Aldrich's evolutionary approach leans toward the latter camp, and the exchange between Baum & Powell and Hannan & Carroll

highlights differences between the camps. The remaining articles illustrate developments that have pushed the ecological literature in new directions.

Aldrich, Howard. 1999. *Organizations Evolving*. Chapters 1-3, 9-11.

Dobbin, Frank and Timothy J. Dowd. 1997. "How Policy Shapes Competition: Early Railroad Foundings in Massachusetts." *Administrative Science Quarterly* 42:510-529.

Hannan, Michael T. and John Freeman. 1977. "The Population Ecology of Organizations." *American Journal of Sociology* 82:946-949.

Haveman, Heather A. and Hayagreeva Rao. 1997. "Structuring a Theory of Moral Sentiments: Institutional and Organizational Coevolution in the Early Thrift Industry." *American Journal of Sociology* 102:1606-1651.

Minkoff, Debra C. 1997. "The Sequencing of Social Movements." *American Sociological Review* 62:779- 799.

Supplemental Readings:

Baum, Joel A.C. and Walter W. Powell. 1995. "Cultivating an Institutional Ecology of Organizations: Comment on Hannan, Carroll, Dundon, and Torres." *American Sociological Review* 60:529-538.

Carroll, Glenn R. and Michael T. Hannan. 1995. *Organizations in Industry: Strategy, Structure & Selection*. New York: Oxford University Press. Pages 1-36, 115-120, and 215-221.

Hannan, Michael T. and Glenn R. Carroll. 1995. "Theory Building and Cheap Talk about Legitimation: Reply to Baum and Powell." *American Sociological Review* 60:539-544.

April 10 : Neo-Institutional Theory

Like population ecology, neo-institutional theory is among the most influential theories to emerge in recent years. This theory stresses how legitimate ways of organizing are socially constructed and, then, are diffused to the point of being taken-for-granted. Scott provides a thorough overview and makes clear why this institutional version is "new." DiMaggio & Powell and Meyer & Rowan offer foundational statements. Two readings take issue with neo-institutional research: Mirzuchi and Fein detail how some have incompletely drawn on DiMaggio and Powell's argument; Kraatz and Zajac explore the limits of neo-institutional predictions. The remaining works demonstrate attempts to refine and extend neo-institutional theory. DiMaggio highlights the import of individual actors; Rueff and Scott move beyond proxy measures for legitimacy; Davis and colleagues address the process of deinstitutionalization.

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.

DiMaggio, Paul J. 1991. "Constructing an Organizational Field as a Professional Project: U.S. Art Museums, 1920-1940." Pages 267-292 in *The New Institutionalism in Organizational Analysis*, edited by Walter W. Powell and Paul J. DiMaggio. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

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.

Rueff, Martin and W. Richard Scott. 1998. "A Multidimensional Model of Organizational Legitimacy: Hospital Survival in Changing Institutional Environments." *Administrative Science Quarterly* 43:877-904.

Scott, W. Richard. 1995. *Institutions and Organizations*. Chapters 3, 5-7.

Supplemental Readings:

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* 61:812-836.

Meyer, John W. and Brian Rowan. 1977. "Institutionalized Organizations: Formal Structure as Myth and Ceremony." *American Journal of Sociology* 83:340-363.

Mizruchi, Mark S. and Lisa C. Fein. 1999. "The Social Construction of Organizational Knowledge: A Study of the Uses of Coercive, Mimetic, and Normative Isomorphism." *Administrative Science Quarterly* 1999:653-683.

April 17 : PAPER PRESENTATIONS

May 8 : FINAL PAPER DUE