

MORS520
Cultural and Meaning-Based Theories of Organization

Winter Quarter 2007

Meeting time

Wednesdays, 2-5pm, Jacobs 387

Overview and Objectives

This course introduces doctoral students to major theoretical perspectives and empirical approaches in the cultural analysis of organizing processes. Cultural analysis in organization studies is a broad and vaguely defined area and consequently, coverage is somehow selective. Specifically, the course is (a) anchored on current questions and debates in organization theory and economic sociology; it (b) emphasizes relatively structured qualitative and quantitative approaches to understanding meaning systems and processes; and (c) it is particularly concerned with multi-level mechanisms that connect collective cultural systems with individual and organizational subjectivity and action.

The course draws on insights from organization studies, anthropology, linguistics, psychology, and sociology that we apply to core intra- and interorganizational processes, such as communication, competition, coordination, domination and contestation, exchange, and institutionalization. There is a dual focus on theory and method, so that materials range from some basic metaphysics to questions of research design, data analysis and writing. Some sessions include short tutorials about techniques for data analysis and software support. Readings include some classic statements of major approaches and more current applications and debates. Tracing the history of ideas from the past to the present puts current debates into perspective, but critical discussions of examples and exemplars are the primary vehicle for developing facility with the material and for finding your own voice. I will provide some background and short synopses, but all classes are run as seminars. Come to class prepared, as your discussions carry the day.

By the end of the course, you should have acquired a conceptual vocabulary that allows you to evaluate what makes for a good and useful cultural explanation and should have a good idea how to integrate issues of meaning into your own research. Hopefully, you'll also walk away with a better sense of which questions are susceptible to empirical resolution, which are due to differences in first principles, and which are "merely" semantic. There are no prerequisites for this course. It is designed for students with an interest in organizations and markets but is suitable for any other aspiring social scientists.

Readings and Seminar Sessions

There is a basic tradeoff in a course that seeks relatively wide coverage and that is based on a fundamental analytic perspective rather than a particular literature or well-defined academic field. On the one hand, it needs to introduce and survey the general approaches and foundations. The challenge then is to connect those generic recipes and ideas to specific feasible research. At the same time, the course needs to provide specific examples and exemplars of research that connect to current discourse in the field of organizations, without running the risk of you missing the larger picture that allows you situate this

research and your own interests in the larger landscape of ideas. There is no easy solution to resolving this tension, but at least I can be transparent about the material. If you imagine a continuum from 1 to 10 where 1 = specific and 10 = general, I judge my readings to average out to 7. Some are below and others above, and opinions may vary on those ratings depending where you come from.

The implication of this trend towards generality, though, is worth pointing out. It will be your/our shared responsibility to tip the balance back in class towards specificity. I expect you not to stop at the point of understanding the ideas in the readings. I expect that clarifications of concepts and a discussion of example studies will only take up the first half of each class. The second half is dedicated to collectively unearthing intriguing leads for theory and empirical research, with a special emphasis on relating the course content to other research areas that you know. So the rhythm of a class will go something like this: Warmup on topic – discussion of assigned articles (appreciative; key points, compare and contrast) – discussion of extensions and boundary conditions (more critical) – attractive and inviting leads for research (implications, applications) – summary reflection. Somewhere in-between I am likely to provide some further background, history or systematic coherence to the topic.

For each session, I have also listed a set of additional background readings, which are simply resources for delving deeper into a topic. These background readings are a mix of foundational classics that I (very hesitantly) did not include for the sake of keeping at bay the number of assigned pages, introductions to related literatures that the course does not cover, and further empirical studies.

Assignments and Requirements

This course has two requirements: class participation (50%), and either one of two options (50%): (1) a full length 15 – 20 page research proposal due at the end of the quarter; or (2) a set of 8 one page “research idea” mini-proposals, due at the beginning of classes 2-9, plus a 10pg maximum book review due at the end of the quarter. *Note: You need to tell me by the second class meeting which options you chose.*

Class participation (50%). Because this course is a seminar, most of the action takes place during class discussion. Thus, all participants should show up prepared to discuss the readings, and actually speak up, too! To make sure that you are well-prepared for discussion, I ask that you send me a brief (one page) memo on each week’s readings via e-mail by **10:00 a.m.** on the day of class, starting with the second class meeting. The memo should identify major themes of the readings, draw connections and contrasts between articles, and should end with **2-3 questions** that you would like to see addressed during the discussion. *Note: you are allowed to miss one memo over the course of the quarter without special reason.*

One or two students will also act as discussants each week. The job of a discussant is twofold: first, to “prime the pump” for getting started a constructive discussion of the readings, which can be accomplished, for example, by distilling the main ideas of articles as you see it or by asking smart questions; and second, to launch and direct the discussion around intriguing research leads. You don’t need to present anything, but should have your talking points down. We want discussions to be appreciative and critical at the same time. So it’s best to start with asking yourself, What are the interesting ideas in the paper? How could this be useful for my research? Then, What are the scope conditions--under what circumstances is the argument meant to apply (e.g., only to French chefs, or bicultural individuals in the US)? What modifications and extensions would be necessary to extend the argument? Are there critical differences between this author's arguments and those of others we have read? Can these differences be resolved? What would a study look like that did this? How would those ideas inform other theories (e.g., what would a discursive theory of corporate governance look like)?

Research proposal (50%). This option is most suitable for those who have research interests closely aligned with the literature covered in this course and want to develop papers in this area, and for those that are working on existing projects that can be informed and advanced by ideas and materials from the class. It is acceptable to use research that you have already started, but not one that is already fully developed. In this case you may also chose to focus more on methodological development and data analysis than on theory. I will give you more details on in class and encourage you to consult with me

about this project early on. The research proposal is intended to get you thinking concretely about designing research that advances the discourse in a particular area (and, not incidentally, to give you practice in writing a dissertation proposal). Proposals generally are to resemble the front end of an empirical research paper, with introduction (“why is this interesting and needed?”), theoretical development, hypotheses if applicable, and a reasonably concrete sketch of a methods section. I am willing to give feedback on drafts throughout the quarter.

Mini-proposals plus book review (50%). This option is better suited for those who are either not at a stage to commit to a fully fledged research project or those who prefer to use the course to selectively pick up ideas that apply to their research. One new mini proposal each is due at the beginning of sessions 2 to 9. The page limit is strictly enforced. The idea is that you convert the articles you read into a paper that you might want to write. To do this, the proposal includes the title of the article, a one sentence summary of the point the article will make, followed by a commentary in which you say what led you to the idea, what contribution you feel it might make. If you propose an empirical study, also include one sentence about a suitable setting and methodology. These are short statements, so craft them carefully. Part of the idea is to hone your skill in working with the vocabulary and expressing your ideas in a succinct way. While the mini-proposals address breadth, the book review gives you chance to also practice depth by examining a more complex and comprehensive piece. See it as an opportunity to explore an author, theory or phenomenon that you have become attracted to in detail. The review should include a concise description of the main ideas in the book and a critical review and evaluation in light of the material covered in this class. A list of suitable books are listed below; some are mainly theoretical others empirical in nature, some classics, some recent*. For inspiration how to write the review and for additional books that you’d rather cover, check out the book review section in journals such as ASQ. You can review books not listed below with my approval.

Appadurai, Arjun. 1996. *Modernity at large: cultural dimensions of globalization*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.

Aronowitz, Robert A. 1998. *Making sense of illness*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Bateson, Gergory. 1972. *Steps to an ecology of mind: Collected essays in anthropology, psychiatry, evolution, and epistemology*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Biernacki, Richard. 1995. *The fabrication of labor*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Bourdieu, Pierre. 1984[1979]. *Distinction: a social critique of the judgment of taste*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Bourdieu, Pierre. 2005. *The social structures of the economy*. Malden, MA: Polity Press.

Bowker, Geoffrey C, and Susan Leigh Star. 1999. *Sorting things out: classification and its consequences*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Collins, Randall. 2004. *Interaction ritual chains*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Dobbin, Frank. 1994. *Forging industrial policy: the United States, Britain, and France in the railway age*. London, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Douglas, Mary. 1986. *How institutions think*. Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press.

Duranti, Alessandro. 1997. *Linguistic anthropology*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Foucault, Michel. 1972. *The archeology of knowledge*. London: Routledge.

Garfinkel, Harold. 1967. *Studies in ethnomethodology*. Malden, MA: Polity Press.

Geertz, Clifford. 1973. *The interpretation of cultures*. New York: Basic Books.

- Giddens, Anthony. 1984. *The constitution of society: outline of the theory of structuration*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Goffman, Erving. 1974. *Frame analysis*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Guillén, Mauro F. 1994. *Models of management: work, authority, and organization in a comparative perspective*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Guillén, Mauro F. 2006. *The Taylorized beauty of the mechanical: scientific management and the rise of modernist architecture*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Hannan, Michael T, Laszlo Polos, and Glenn R Carroll. 2007. *The logics of organizational theory: Social codes and ecologies*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Hirschman, Albert O. 1991. *The rhetoric of reaction: perversity, futility, jeopardy*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Hofstede, Geert. 203. *Cultures consequences*. 2nd ed. New York: Sage.
- Jasper, James M. 1997. *The art of moral protest*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Lamont, Michèle, and Laurent Thévenot (Eds.). 2000. *Rethinking comparative cultural sociology*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Levi-Strauss, Claude. 1974. *Structural anthropology*. New York: Basic Books.
- Mead, George H. 1934. *Mind, self, and society*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Nisbett, Richard E. 2003. *The geography of thought*. New York: Free Press.
- Schein, Edgar H. 1992. *Organizational culture and leadership*. San Fransico, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Shore, Bradley. 1996. *Culture in mind: cognition, culture and the problem of meaning*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Schütz, Alfred. 1967[1932]. *The phenomenology of the social world*. Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press.
- Swidler, Ann. 2001. *Talk of love: How culture matters*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Tannen, Deborah. 2005. *Conversational style*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Taylor, J R, and E J Van Every. 2000. *The emergent organization: Communication as its site and surface*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Vygotsky, Lev. 1986. *Thought and language*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Wardhaugh, Ronald. 2002. *An introduction to sociolinguistics*. Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- Zerubavel, Eviatar. 1997. *Social mindscapes: an invitation to cognitive sociology*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

** I am well aware that reviews have already been published for most of these books. Needless to say that yours needs to be entirely original to pass.*

Class Schedule

1 – Introduction: Culture and Meaning in Theories of Organizing

The readings for the first session set the stage for questions of culture and meaning. Smircich provides a useful characterization of different approaches to culture. Weick et al say why and how meaning making is central to organizing processes. Swidler's piece provides a view of culture with great affinity to Weick's ideas but that is missing in Smircich's review. DiMaggio's overview is excellent but can be skimmed for the main points. Ask yourself, what are the key aspects of culture and meaning that these authors subscribe to? Where do they differ? What would be a good working definition of both concepts and how do they relate? Why do these authors claim that culture and meaning matter in organizations?

Readings:

- Smircich, Linda. 1983. "Concepts of culture and organizational analysis." *Administrative Science Quarterly* 28:339-358.
- Weick, Karl E, Kathleen M Sutcliffe, and David Obstfeld. 2005. "Organizing and the process of sensemaking." *Organization Science* 16:409-421.
- Swidler, Ann. 1986. "Culture in action: symbols and strategies." *American Sociological Review* 51:273-286.
- DiMaggio, Paul J. 1994. "Culture and economy." Pp. 27-57 in *The handbook of economic sociology*, edited by Neil J Smelser and Richard Swedberg. Princeton: Princeton University Press. [skim]

Discussant:

Background Resources (other classics in organizations, pointers to other perspectives)

- Kunda, Gideon. 1992. *Engineering culture: Control and commitment in a high-tech corporation*. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.
- Meyerson, Debra, and Joanne Martin. 1987. "Cultural change: an integration of three different views." *Journal of Management Studies* 24:623-647.
- O'Reilly, Charles A, and Jennifer A Chatman. 1996. "Culture as social control: corporations, cults and commitment." *Research in Organizational Behavior* 18:157-200.
- Van Maanen, John, and Gideon Kunda. 1989. "'Real feeling': emotional expression and organizational culture." *Research in Organizational Behavior* 11:43-103.
- Van Maanen, John, and Stephen R Barley. 1984. "Occupational communities: culture and control in organizations." *Research in Organizational Behavior* 6:287-365.
- Markus, H R, and S Kitayama. 1991. "Culture and the self: implications for cognition, emotion, and motivation." *Psychological Review* 98:234-253.
- Keessing, Roger M. 1974. "Theories of culture." *Annual Review of Anthropology* 3:73-97.
- Peterson, Richard A, and N Anand. 2004. "The production of culture perspective." *Annual Review of Sociology* 30:311-334.
- Kaufman, Jason. 2004. "Endogenous explanations in the sociology of culture." *Annual Review of Sociology* 30:335-357.

2 - A Semiotic Framework of Analysis

Signs are the vehicles that encode and transmit meaning and hence are fundamental to understanding small and large scale systems of culture and meaning. Semiotics provides some insights and terminology into the structure, variety and “life” of signs that will help us analyze subsequent questions in a more systematic fashion. Chandler’s online book is an exquisite resource that you should draw on throughout the class. Pierce is probably the toughest read of the quarter, so make sure to read Chandler’s chapters first. A more practical methodological piece and two exemplary empirical studies round out the readings. Try to sort out the basic terminology as much as you can, we’ll clarify the rest in class. What are the different ways in which meaning is being made? What is the respective role of concrete social and abstract linguistic processes in meaning making?

Readings:

- Chandler, Daniel. n.d. *Semiotics for beginners*. Online Book, University of Aberdeen, UK: <http://www.aber.ac.uk/media/Documents/S4B/semiotic.html>. Chap.1&2 (Introduction, Signs)
- Peirce, Charles Sanders. 1955[1898]. "Logic as semiotic: the theory of signs." Pp. 98-119 in *Philosophical writings of Peirce*, edited by Justus Buchler. New York: Dover.
- Feldman, Martha S. 1995. *Strategies for interpreting qualitative data*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage. Chap.2
- Barley, Stephen R. 1983. "Semiotics and the study of occupational and organizational culture." *Administrative Science Quarterly* 28:393-413.
- Fiol, Marlene C. 1989. "A semiotic analysis of corporate language: organizational boundaries and joint venturing." *Administrative Science Quarterly* 34:277-303.

Discussant:

Some “Hardcore” Semiotics Texts (key pieces, not recommended for everyone)

- Barthes, Roland. 1967[1964]. *Elements of semiology*. London: Jonathan Cape.
- Eco, Umberto. 1976. *A theory of semiotics*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.
- Greimas, Algirdas. 1987. *On meaning: selected writings in semiotic theory*. London: Frances Pinter.
- Levi-Strauss, Claude. 1966[1962]. *The savage mind*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Levi-Strauss, Claude. 1974. *Structural anthropology*. New York: Basic Books.
- Saussure, Ferdinand de. 1959[1915]. *Course in general linguistics*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

3- From Signs to Systems: Dimensions and Measurement of Meaning Systems

Cultures and meaning systems are made up of many people using many signs for many purposes. This class focuses on the “content” of culture, rather than its use. The question becomes: What should we analyze when we analyze culture? The choices seem endless: words, binary oppositions, repertoires, concept networks, maps, narratives, frames and logics, discourses, multidimensional meaning systems, root metaphors? What are the pros and cons of these choices? Are these choices simply arbitrary, or are these better and worse options for some purposes? Which research questions can you address with particular forms of analysis? In class we’ll also start discussing some more practical data questions, too.

Readings:

- Jepperson, Ronald L, and Ann Swidler. 1994. "What properties of culture should we measure?" *Poetics* 22:359-371.
- Mohr, John W. 1998. "Measuring meaning structures." *Annual Review of Sociology* 24:345-370.
- Williams, Raymond. 1985. *Keywords: a vocabulary of culture and society*. New York: Oxford University Press. (excerpt)
- Weber, Klaus. 2005. "A toolkit for analyzing corporate cultural toolkits." *Poetics* 33:227-252.
- Carley, Kathleen. 1993. "Coding choices for textual analysis: a comparison of content analysis and map analysis." *Sociological Methodology* 23:75-126.
- Roberts, Carl W. 2000. "A conceptual framework for quantitative text analysis." *Quality & Quantity* 34:259-274.

Discussant:

Background Resources (mainly leads to approaches not covered extensively here)

- Geertz, Clifford. 1973. *The interpretation of cultures*. New York: Basic Books.
- Huff, Anne S. 1990. "Mapping strategic thought." Pp. 11-49 in *Mapping strategic thought*, edited by Anne S Huff. New York: Wiley.
- Czarniawska, Barbara. 1998. *A narrative approach to organizational studies*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Franzosi, Roberto. 1994. "From words to numbers: a set theory framework for the collection, organization, and analysis of narrative data." *Sociological Methodology* 24:105-136.
- Fairclough, Norman. 2003. *Analyzing discourse: textual analysis for social research*. New York: Routledge.
- 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* 105:801-843.
- Morgan, Gareth. 1996. *Images of organization*. 2nd ed. New York: Sage.

4 – Culture as Context: Comparative Analysis

Cultures are usually seen as properties of collectives, such as regions, countries, industries, organizations, or groups. Much cultural analysis is quintessentially comparative. This raises several questions: What is the relevant unit or is it just a matter of taste? Is it enough to establish group differences? How do “cultural effects” of collectives come about in the first place, how do they emerge and how do they influence the thoughts and actions of members? What are the carriers of collective cultures? (When) Is drawing boundaries around “cultural groups” sensible?

Readings:

- Hedström, Peter, and Richard Swedberg. 1998. "Social mechanism: an introductory essay." Pp. 1-31 in *Social mechanisms: an analytical approach to social theory*, edited by Peter Hedstrom and Richard Swedberg. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Nisbett, Richard E, Kaiping Peng, Incheol Choi, and Ara Norenzayan. 2001. "Culture and systems of thought: holistic versus analytic cognition." *Psychological Review* 108:291–310.
- Biggart, Nicole Woolsey, and Mauro F Guillén. 1999. "Developing difference: social organization and the rise of the auto industries of South Korea, Taiwan, Spain, and Argentina." *American Sociological Review* 64: 722-747.
- House, Robert J, and Mansour Javidan. 2004. "Overview of GLOBE." Pp. 9-28 in *Culture, leadership, and organization*, edited by Robert J House, Paul J Hanges, Mansour Javidan, Peter W Dorfman, and Vipin Gupta. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Discussant:

Background Readings (conceptual amendments, alternative groups, blending and change)

- Wiley, Norbert. 1988. "The micro-macro problem in social theory." *Sociological Theory* 6:254-261.
- Lamont, Michèle, and Virág Molnár. 2002. "The study of boundaries in the social sciences." *Annual Review of Sociology* 28:167-195.
- Abrahamson, Eric, and Charles J Fomburn. 1994. "Macrocultures: determinants and consequences." *Academy of Management Review* 19:728-755.
- Van Maanen, John, and Stephen R Barley. 1984. "Occupational communities: culture and control in organizations." *Research in Organizational Behavior* 6:287-365.
- Krackhardt, David, and Martin Kilduff. 1990. "Friendship Patterns and Culture: The Control of Organizational Diversity." *American Anthropologist* 92:142-154.
- Pieterse, Jan Nederveen. 1995. "Globalization as hybridization." Pp. 45-68 in *Global modernities*, edited by Mike Featherstone, Scott Lash, and Roland Robertson. London: Sage.
- Inglehart, Ronald, and Wayne E Baker. 2000. "Modernization, cultural change, and the persistence of traditional values." *American Sociological Review* 65:19-51.
- Boli, John, and George M Thomas (Eds.). 1999. *Constructing world culture: international non-governmental organizations since 1875*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

5 - Linking Mechanisms Between Culture and Individual Behavior I

If cultures are systems of meaning that shared by a collective, why does not everyone in a community think the same and act the same? One answer may lie in the fact that actors occupy different positions, have different social identities and develop dispositions that are reflective of their “locations” in this community. The readings are a mix of conceptual explications of how this may come about and empirical examples of how that may manifest itself in meaning making processes. What is the difference between notions of identity, habitus, position, role and location? What are boundary conditions and sources of variation for these things to matter? How should one think about individual agency in these models?

Readings:

- Barley, Stephen R, and Pamela S Tolbert. 1997. "Institutionalization and structuration: studying the links between action and institution." *Organization Studies* 18:93-117.
- Swidler, Ann. 2002. "Cultural repertoires and cultural logics: can they be reconciled?" *Comparative and Historical Sociology* 14:1-6.
- Douglas, Mary. 1986. *How institutions think*. Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press. (excerpt)
- Bourdieu, Pierre. 1998. *Practical reason. On the theory of action*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press. (excerpt)
- Dutton, Jane E, and Janet M Dukerich. 1991. "Keeping an eye on the mirror: image and identity in organizational adaptation." *Academy of Management Journal* 34:517-554. [skim]
- Weber, Klaus. 2006. "Organizational fields and corporate cultural repertoires." *Working Paper. Kellogg School of Management*.

Discussant:

Background Readings (the structure-agency debate, more Bourdieu, diverse empirical examples)

- Giddens, Anthony. 1984. *The constitution of society: outline of the theory of structuration*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Sewell, William H. 1992. "A theory of structure: duality, agency and transformation." *American Journal of Sociology* 98:1-29.
- Hays, Sharon. 1994. "Structure and agency and the sticky problem of culture." *Sociological Theory* 12:57-72.
- Emirbayer, Mustafa, and Jeff Goodwin. 1996. "Symbols, positions, objects." *History and Theory* 35:358-374.
- Bourdieu, Pierre. 2005. "Principles of an economic anthropology." Pp. 75-89 in *Handbook of economic sociology*, edited by Neil J Smelser and Richard Swedberg. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- DiMaggio, Paul J. 1987. "Classification in art." *American Sociological Review* 52:440-455.
- Pratt, Michael G, and Anat Rafaeli. 1997. "Organizational Dress as a Symbol of Multilayered Social Identities." *Academy of Management Journal* 40:862-898.
- Rao, Hayagreeva, Pierre Monin, and Rudolphe Durand. 2003. "Institutional change in Toque Ville: nouvelle cuisine as an identity movement in French gastronomy." *American Journal of Sociology* 108:795-843.

6 – Linking Mechanisms Between Culture and Individual Behavior II

While identity-like concepts have taken up most of the attention in recent research, meaning and behavior are also conditioned by the social and cultural structure of situations, domains and concrete interactions. People (or firms) do not make sense and act purely based on their identity but also based on their interaction context and partners. But what exactly is a “situation”, how are situations constituted and how do they influence behavior? Do people move in and out freely? Is there skill in doing this? What carries over and what is different from last week’s focus on identities and positions?

Readings:

- Mills, C Wright. 1940. "Situational actions and vocabularies of motive." *American Sociological Review* 5:904-913.
- Goffman, Erving. 1974. *Frame analysis*. New York: Harper & Row. Chap. 1&2
- Eliasoph, Nina, and Paul Lichterman. 2003. "Culture in interaction." *American Journal of Sociology* 108:735-794.
- Weber, Klaus, and Mary Ann Glynn. 2006. "Making sense with institutions: thought and action in Karl Weick's theory." *Organization Studies* 27:1639-1660.

And either one of:

- Orlikowski, Wanda J, and JoAnne Yates. 1994. "Genre repertoire: the structuring of communicative practices in organizations." *Administrative Science Quarterly* 39:541-574.
- Benet-Martínez, Verónica, Janxin Leu, Fiona Lee, and Michael W Morris. 2002. "Negotiating biculturalism: cultural frame switching in biculturals with oppositional versus compatible cultural identities." *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology* 33:492-516.
- Erickson, Bonnie H. 1996. "Culture, class, and connections." *American Journal of Sociology* 102:217-251.

Discussant:

Background Readings (the more basic theories, some informative work by a colleague)

- Goffman, Erving. 1974. *Frame analysis*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Yates, JoAnne, and Wanda J Orlikowski. 1992. "Genres or organizational communication: a structural approach to studying communication and media." *Academy of Management Review* 17:299-326.
- Gumperz, John J, and Stephen C Levinson. 1996. "Introduction: linguistic relativity re-examined." Pp. 1-20 in *Rethinking linguistic relativity*, edited by John J Gumperz and Stephen C Levinson. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Lehman, Darrin R, Chi-yue Chiu, and Mark Schaller. 2004. "Psychology and culture." *Annual Review of Psychology* 55:689-714.
- Bettenhausen, Kenneth, and J Keith Murnighan. 1985. "The emergence of norms in competitive decision-making groups." *Administrative Science Quarterly* 30:350-372.
- Bettenhausen, Kenneth, and J Keith Murnighan. 1991. "The development of an intragroup norm and the effects of interpersonal and structural challenges." *Administrative Science Quarterly* 36:20-35.

7 – The Bottom-up View: Culture and Social Construction

The last sessions focused on “contextual mechanisms.” This one examines bottom-up or “aggregation” mechanisms. Note that in both instances, we start with culture and meaning and look at social behavior as the outcome. So this week is about cultural dynamics in the creation of larger social dynamics and environments. Social construction is the short-hand, and you will want to unpack what exactly that term means. In particular, it is often taken as a reference that imagined realities become real by default or that spin works. How does the process work, though, and when are constructions successful, i.e. “reality”?

Readings:

- Berger, Peter L, and Thomas Luckmann. 1966. *The social construction of reality*. New York: Doubleday. (exerpt)
- Weick, Karl E. 2003. "Enacting an environment: the infrastructure of organizing." Pp. 184-194 in *Debating organization: point-counterpoint in organization studies*, edited by Stewart R Clegg. Cambridge, MA: Blackwell.
- Collins, Randall. 2004. *Interaction ritual chains*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press. (exerpt)
- Abolafia, Mitchel Y, and Martin Kilduff. 1988. "Enacting market crisis: The social construction of a speculative bubble." *Administrative Science Quarterly* 33:177-193.
- Hirsch, Paul M. 1986. "From ambushes to golden parachutes: corporate takeovers as an instance of cultural framing and institutional integration." *American Journal of Sociology* 91:800-837. [skim]

Discussant:

Background Resources (background to B&L, enactment, then applications to different contexts)

- Schütz, Alfred. 1967[1932]. *The phenomenology of the social world*. Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press.
- Nicholson, Nigel. 1995. "Enactment." Pp. 155-156 in *Blackwell encyclopedic dictionary of organizational behavior*, edited by Nigel Nicholson. Cambridge, MA: Blackwell.
- Rindova, Violina P, Manuel Becerra, and Ianna Contardo. 2004. "Enacting competitive wars: competitive activity, language games, and market consequences." *Academy of Management Review* 29:670-673.
- White, Harrison C. 2000. "Modeling discourse in and around markets." *Poetics* 27:117-133.
- Zbaracki, Mark J. 1998. "The rhetoric and reality of Total Quality Management." *Administrative Science Quarterly* 43:602-636.
- Zerubavel, Eviatar. 2003. *Time maps: collective memory and the social shape of the past*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

8 – Cultural Practices: Sensemaking and Coordination

The last three sessions of the quarter focus on three growing streams of research in organization studies in which meaning and culture take center stage. The first is the larger area of research tied to sensemaking perspectives. We've covered the basic perspective before, so these are more concrete examples and some extensions.

Readings:

- Weick, Karl E. 1998. "Improvisation as a mindset for organizational analysis." *Organization Science* 9:543-555.
- Quinn, Ryan W, and Jane E Dutton. 2005. "Coordination as energy-in-conversation." *Academy of Management Review* 30:36-57.
- Feldman, Martha S. 2000. "Organizational routines as a source of continuous change." *Organization Science* 11:611-629.
- Weick, Karl E. 1993. "The collapse of sensemaking in organizations: the Mann Gulch disaster." *Administrative Science Quarterly* 38:628-652.
- Inkpen, A C, and M M Crossan. 1995. "Believing is seeing: joint ventures and organization learning." *Journal of Management Studies* 32:595-618.

Discussant:

Background Resources (the basic text, links to other organizational literatures, empirical studies)

Weick, Karl E. 1995. *Sensemaking in organizations*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.

- Ashforth, Blake E, and Ronald H Humphrey. 1997. "The ubiquity and potency of labeling in organizations." *Organization Science* 8:5-28.
- Crossan, Mary M, Henry M Lane, and Roderick E White. 1999. "An organizational learning framework: from intuition to institution." *Academy of Management Review* 24:522-537.
- Feldman, Martha S, and Brian T Pentland. 2003. "Reconceptualizing organizational routines as a source of flexibility and change." *Administrative Science Quarterly* 48:94-118.
- Laroche, Herve. 1995. "From decision to action in organizations: decision-making as a social representation." *Organization Science* 6:62-75.
- Barr, Pamela S, and Anne S Huff. 1997. "Seeing isn't believing: understanding diversity in the timing of strategic response." *Journal of Management Studies* 34:337-370.
- Brown, Andrew D. 2000. "Making sense of inquiry sensemaking." *Journal of Management Studies* 37:45-75.
- Edelman, Lauren B. 1992. "Legal ambiguity and symbolic structures: organizational mediation of Civil Rights law." *American Journal of Sociology* 97:1531-1576.
- Gioia, Dennis A, and James B Thomas. 1996. "Identity, image, and issue interpretation: sensemaking during strategic change in academia." *Administrative Science Quarterly* 41:370-403.
- Rafaeli, Anat, Jane E Dutton, Celia V Harquail, and Stephanie Mackie-Lewis. 1997. "Navigating by attire: the use of dress by female administrative employees." *Academy of Management Journal* 40:9-45.

9 – Cultural practices: Framing and Authenticity

Sensemaking researchers are accused of neglecting political interest and the use of language and symbols for (self-interested) influence. You want to assess this claim as it applies to the basic perspective and to the practice of research. Framing research takes conflict of interest and strategic use of language seriously, but you'll notice that framing also facilitates coordinating collective action. A central question in this literature is around the notion of de-coupling (public from private beliefs, symbolic communication from action, etc.). How should we understand decoupling from the perspective of earlier readings in this class? Underlying the notion of de-coupling is often a notion "authenticity." Why are we concerned with authenticity in the first place? How is it achieved? What processes and factors should we analyze to assess authenticity empirically?

Readings:

- Benford, Robert D, and David A Snow. 2000. "Framing processes and social movements: An overview and assessment." *Annual Review of Sociology* 26:611-639.
- Alexander, Jeffrey C. 2004. "Cultural pragmatics: social performance between ritual and strategy." *Sociological Theory* 22:527-573.
- Taylor, Charles. 1991. *The ethics of authenticity*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press. (exerpt)

And one of three:

- Suddaby, Roy, and Royston Greenwood. 2005. "Rhetorical strategies of legitimacy." *Administrative Science Quarterly* 50:35-67.
- Elsbach, Kimberley D, and Greg Eloffson. 2000. "How the packaging of decision explanations affects perceptions of trustworthiness." *Academy of Management Journal* 43:80-89.
- Lounsbury, Michael, and Mary Ann Glynn. 2001. "Cultural entrepreneurship: stories, legitimacy, and the acquisition of resources." *Strategic Management Journal* 22:545-564.

Refresh your memory on:

- Meyer, John W, and Brian Rowan. 1977. "Institutional organizations: formal structures as myth and ceremony." *American Journal of Sociology* 83:340-363.

Discussant:

Background Readings (another take on when framing "works", additional empirical pieces)

- Schudson, Michael. 1989. "How culture works: perspectives from media studies on the efficacy of symbols." *Theory and Society* 18:153-180.
- Elsbach, Kimberley D. 1994. "Managing organizational legitimacy in the California cattle industry: the construction and effectiveness of verbal accounts." *Administrative Science Quarterly* 39:57-88.
- Fiss, Peer C, and Paul Hirsch. 2005. "The discourse of globalization: framing and sensemaking of an emerging concept." *American Sociological Review* 70:25-52.
- Staw, Barry M, Pamela I McKechnie, and Sheila M Puffer. 1983. "The justification of organizational performance." *Administrative Science Quarterly* 28:582-600.
- Wade, James B, Joseph F Porac, and Timothy G Pollock. 1997. "Worth, words, and the justification of executive pay." *Journal of Organizational Behavior* 18:641-664.

10 – Cultural Practices: Public Discourse

The final area of research where analysts of meaning and culture find fertile ground in the analysis of public discourse. What is the role of external discourse for organizations? What is the relevant “public” and how does it influence organizations? Do organizations rather manipulate public discourse about them? This is a field that has experienced a resurgence in organization studies over the past years and leaves plenty of work to be done, with more sophisticated theories and methods becoming available.

Readings:

- Phillips, Nelson, Thomas B Lawrence, and Cynthia Hardy. 2004. "Discourse and institutions." *Academy of Management Review* 29:635-652.
- McCombs, Maxwell. 1997. "Building consensus: The news media's agenda-setting roles." *Political Communication* 14:433-443.
- Deephouse, David L. 1996. "Does isomorphism legitimate?" *Academy of Management Journal* 39:1024-1039.
- Abrahamson, Eric, and Gregory Fairchild. 1999. "Management fashion: lifecycles, triggers, and collective learning processes." *Administrative Science Quarterly* 44:708-740.
- Ocasio, William, and John Joseph. 2005. "Cultural adaptation and institutional change: the evolution of vocabularies of corporate governance, 1972-2003." *Poetics* 33:163-178.

Discussant:

Resources (another link to institutionalism, studies of effects and dynamics of public discourse)

- Campbell, John L. 2001. "Institutional analysis and the role of ideas in political economy." Pp. 159-189 in *The rise of neoliberalism and institutional analysis*, edited by John L Campbell and Ove K Pedersen. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- 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.
- Barley, Stephen R, Gordon W Meyer, and Debra C Cash. 1988. "Cultures of culture: academics, practitioners and the pragmatics of normative control." *Administrative Science Quarterly* 33:24-60.
- Deephouse, David L. 2000. "Media reputation as a strategic resource: an integration of mass communication and resource-based theories." *Journal of Management* 26:1091-1112.
- Gamson, William A, and Andre Modigliani. 1989. "Media discourse and public opinion on nuclear power: a constructionist approach." *American Journal of Sociology* 95:1-37.
- Pollock, Timothy G, and Violina Rindova. 2003. "Media legitimation effects in the market for initial public offerings." *Academy of Management Journal* 46:631-642.

Appendix: A Idiosyncratic and Selective Set of Methodological Resources

Also see the more general overviews in the main syllabus

Interpretive Analysis of Field Data

- Feldman, Martha S. 1995. *Strategies for interpreting qualitative data*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Geertz, Clifford. 1973. *The interpretation of cultures*. New York: Basic Books.
- Blee, Kathleen M, and Verta Taylor. 2002. "Semi-structured interviewing in social movement research." Pp. 92-117 in *Methods of social movement research*, edited by Bert Klandermans and Suzanne Staggenborg. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
- Dohan, Daniel, and Martin Sanchez-Jankowski. 1998. "Using computers to analyze ethnographic field data: Theoretical and practical considerations." *Annual Review of Sociology* 24:477-498.

Narrative Analysis

- Czarniawska, Barbara. 1998. *A narrative approach to organizational studies*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Franzosi, Roberto. 1994. "From words to numbers: a set theory framework for the collection, organization, and analysis of narrative data." *Sociological Methodology* 24:105-136.

Qualitative Discourse Analysis

- Fairclough, Norman. 2003. *Analyzing discourse: textual analysis for social research*. New York: Routledge.
- Wetherell, Margaret, Stephanie Taylor, and Simon J Yates (Eds.). 2001. *Discourse as data: a guide for analysis*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Discourse and Frame Analysis More Generally

- Johnston, Hank. 1995. "A methodology for frame analysis: from discourse to cognitive schema." Pp. 217-246 in *Social movements and culture*, edited by Hank Johnston and Bert Klandermans. New York: Routledge.
- Johnston, Hank. 2002. "Verification and proof in frame and discourse analysis." Pp. 62-91 in *Methods of social movement research*, edited by Bert Klandermans and Suzanne Staggenborg. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.

Quantitative Content Analysis

- Krippendorff, Klaus. 2003. *Content analysis: An introduction to its methodology*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Quantitative Semantic Analysis - Maps, Networks, Latices

- Huff, Anne S (Ed.). 1990. *Mapping strategic thought*. New York: Wiley.
- Carley, Kathleen, and Michael Palmquist. 1992. "Extracting, representing, and analyzing mental models." *Social Forces* 70:601-636.
- Carley, Kathleen. 1993. "Coding choices for textual analysis: a comparison of content analysis and map analysis." *Sociological Methodology* 23:75-126.
- Breiger, Ronald L. 2000. "A tool kit for practice theory." *Poetics* 27:91-115.