

Contemporary organizational theory: The demographic, relational, and cultural perspectives

Heather A. Haveman  | Rachel Wetts

Department of Sociology, University of California, Berkeley

Correspondence

Heather A. Haveman, University of California, Berkeley, Department of Sociology, 410 Barrows Hall, Berkeley, CA 94720-1980.
Email: haveman@berkeley.edu

Abstract

We review three perspectives—demographic, relational, and cultural—that have dominated sociological research on organizations during the past four decades. These perspectives arose in reaction to the atomistic and rationalist–adaptationist assumptions of earlier perspectives on organizations. These perspectives have different conceptions of social structure and thus different conceptions of what creates opportunities for and constraints on action. The demographic perspective holds that social structure is constituted by distributions of social actors along salient dimensions of social and physical space; the relational perspective, by webs of social relationships; and the cultural perspective, by widely shared and patterned understandings of reality and possibility. These perspectives also have different conceptions of identity and therefore motivations for action. For demographers, identity derives from position, absolute or relative, along salient dimensions of social life; for relational scholars, from ties among individuals, groups, and organizations; and for cultural scholars, from social interaction. All three perspectives have been applied to explain behavior at five different levels of analysis: the individual, group or organizational subunit, organization, industry or organizational population, and field. Up to the 1990s, these perspectives were generally applied separately, but over the past two decades, studies have increasingly used multiple perspectives.

1 | INTRODUCTION

In this paper, we review research on organizations during the past four decades. Organizational theory evolved from a disparate set of roots in sociology, economics, political science, psychology, and management. In a companion paper (Haveman & Wetts, 2019), we laid out organizational theory's history from classical sociology to the 1970s. By the mid-1970s, organizational theory was dominated by two perspectives: (a) the Carnegie School's decision-making perspective (e.g., Cyert & March, 1963; March & Olsen, 1976; Simon, 1947) and (b) three variants of contingency theory, namely, structural (e.g., Blau & Scott, 1962; Lawrence & Lorsch, 1967; Thompson, 1967), strategic (e.g., Child, 1972; Hickson, Robin Hinings, Lee, Schneck, & Pennings, 1971), and information processing (Galbraith, 1973). Both perspectives were adaptationist and (at least boundedly) rationalist. They assumed organizations sought efficient and effective performance, those in charge of organizations could survey the environment and determine (albeit imperfectly) how to improve organizational performance, and organizations could easily change their strategies and structures to improve performance. Moreover, both perspectives viewed organizations as atomistic actors, so decision makers could make decisions and take action based on internal preferences, constrained only by resources and information.

In the 1970s, three new perspectives on organizations developed in reaction to these assumptions. To reflect their concepts of social structure, we label them demographic, relational, and cultural. A central concern for *demography*—the distribution of individuals, groups, and organizations along salient dimensions of social structure, such as individual age, race and gender, group size and composition, and organizational form and location—characterizes internal organizational demography and organizational ecology (Baron & Bielby, 1980; Blau, 1977; Hannan & Freeman, 1984, 1989; Kanter, 1977; Pfeffer, 1983). A focus on webs of *relationships* among people, groups, and organizations is most noticeable in research on social capital (Bourdieu, 1980; Coleman, 1988; Granovetter, 1973), power in organizations (Emerson, 1962; Pfeffer, 1981), and resource-dependence theory (Aldrich & Pfeffer, 1976; Burt, 1983; Pfeffer & Salancik, 1978). An emphasis on *culture*, meaning widely shared norms, values, expectations, roles, and rituals, is reflected in institutionalist approaches (DiMaggio & Powell, 1983; Meyer & Rowan, 1977; Scott, 2008; Scully & Creed, 1997) and research on organizational culture (Deal & Kennedy, 1982; Pettigrew, 1979).

These perspectives propose divergent conceptions of *social structure*, which provides opportunities for and constraints on action, and *identity*, which provides motivations for action. Demographic analysts view social structure as inhering in multiple cross-cutting distributions (Blau, 1994) and identity and motivation as deriving from position, absolute or relative, along one or more dimensions of social life, such as individual age and gender or organizational location and strategy. Relational analysts view social structure as inhering in social and economic ties between individuals, groups, or entire organizations and identity and motivation as constituted by those ties. Finally, for cultural scholars, social structure consists of shared, patterned understandings of reality and possibility (i.e., beliefs about what is feasible, acceptable, or valued) that actors use to make sense of and evaluate actions, while identity and motivation derive from those shared understandings (Berger & Luckmann, 1967). All three perspectives are used to explain behavior at five levels of analysis: the individual, the group, the organization, populations/industries, and interorganizational fields. Table 1 summarizes these perspectives and explains how they are used at different levels of analysis.

These perspectives have been applied to the study of both formal and informal organizational features. *Formal* features include the configuration of offices and positions, the officially designated linkages between them (the "organization chart"), and written job descriptions, rules, and procedures. *Informal* features include the actual (as opposed to official) communication and influence channels (who really talks to whom, not just who is supposed to talk to whom, who sways decision making), actual behavior (what people do every day, not what job descriptions say they should do), and informal norms and practices (what is expected and valued). The formal and the informal are often only loosely coupled, as informal social relations, practices, and norms often deviate from formal organization charts, job descriptions, rules, and procedures—as sociologists have known since the 1950s (e.g., Blau, 1955; Gouldner, 1954).

TABLE 1 Three contemporary perspectives on organizations

Perspective	Demographic	Relational	Cultural
Basic principle	<i>Position in social and physical space</i> determines patterns of action by defining opportunities for action and constraints on action.	<i>Relationships</i> determine patterns of action by defining opportunities for action and constraints on action.	<i>Shared understandings/ mental models</i> determine patterns of action by defining opportunities for action and constraints on action.
Social structure inheres in the <i>demographic distribution</i> of individuals and collectives—that is, along salient dimensions of social and physical position.	... the <i>relationships</i> between individuals and collectives (organizations, families, and etc.) involving exchanges of valued items (material or symbolic).	... the system of understandings of reality and possibility— <i>culture</i> —meaning norms, values, and expectations of what is and what is not done/ possible/good.
Identity derives from actors' positions, absolute or relative, along dimensions of social life; the relational perspective.	... is constituted by the social and economic ties among individuals, groups, and organizations.	... is a social construction, arising from social interaction.
Central logic at different levels of analysis			
Individual: your social, psychological, and economic experiences as an organizational member depend on <i>internal organizational demography</i> : (a) demographic characteristics (gender, race, age, and etc.) and (b) your demographic characteristics relative to other people in the organization (and in the labor force/population).	... <i>interpersonal relations</i> : (a) a focal individual's relationships with other people—ffective and instrumental, voluntary and involuntary, current and past; and (b) the structure of relationships among people and groups within a focal organization and among other organizations.	... <i>individual sense making and learning</i> ; <i>symbolic interaction</i> : cognitive representations of what is and should be (schemas), which can be tinged with strong emotions, and which develop over time, through real and superstitious learning.
Group/subunit behavior and effectiveness (conflict, innovativeness, creativity, ability to make good or timely decisions, turnover, ...) depend on <i>internal organizational demography</i> : the composition of the group, in terms of demographic characteristics (gender, race/ethnicity, age, time in the organization/ group, education area, and level).	... <i>intraorganizational networks</i> : the structure of relationships among people and groups within and between organizations. Note that the "nodes" in these networks can be individuals or groups (e.g., mapping how work flows through a focal organization).	... <i>social cognition and symbolic interaction</i> : the meanings people have toward other people and things, which are derived from social interaction and modified through interpretation.
Organization: an organization's functioning, behavior, and performance (structural change, growth/shrinkage, economic performance) depend on <i>organizational ecology</i> : the focal organizations' characteristics (e.g., age, size, and technology) and the characteristic of other organizations in the focal organization's environment (e.g., their numbers, variety, and relative size).	... <i>interorganizational networks</i> : (a) relationships between the focal organization and other organizations—ffective and instrumental, voluntary and involuntary, current and past; and (b) the structure of relationships among organizations in the focal organization's	... <i>the social construction of reality</i> : what people in the focal organization have learned about what works and does not, what is right and wrong, what is good and bad about rules, laws, and resources/ power (coercive forces); norms, values, and expectations (cultural

(Continues)

TABLE 1 (Continued)

Perspective	Demographic	Relational	Cultural
Population/industry: the structure and vital rates of populations/industries depend on <i>population ecology</i> : the number of organizations in the focal population, their aggregate size, their distribution in terms of salient characteristics (age, size, technology, and etc.), and their identities (forms as social codes, involving both recognition and imperative standing).	environment. Note that the "nodes" in these networks can be individuals or organizations. ... <i>interorganizational networks</i> : the structure of relationships among organizations within the focal population/industry. Note that the nodes in these networks can be individuals or organizations.	forces); and relative frequency/rareness of role models (mimetic targets). ... <i>the social construction of reality</i> : what people in the organizations in the focal population or industry have learned about what works and does not, what is right and wrong, what is good and bad—not merely dry fact but rather also what they have learned about rules, laws, and resource dependencies (coercive/regulatory forces); norms, values, and expectations (cultural forces); and relative frequency/rareness of role models (mimetic targets).
Field/Sector: the emergence and structure of fields/sectors depend on <i>community ecology</i> : the number of organizations in the multiple populations in the field/sector, their aggregate size, their distribution in terms of salient characteristics (age, size, technology, and etc.), and their identities (forms as social codes, involving both recognition and imperative standing).	... <i>interorganizational networks</i> : the structure of relationships among organizations in a sector or field. Note that the nodes in these networks can be individuals or organizations.	... <i>the social construction of reality</i> : what people in the focal sector or field have learned about what works and does not, what is right and wrong, what is good and bad—not merely dry fact but rather also what they have learned about rules, laws, and resource dependencies (coercive/regulatory forces); norms, values, and expectations (cultural forces); and relative frequency/rareness of role models (mimetic targets).

The assumptions undergirding these perspectives differ from the assumptions of earlier perspectives. The macrodemographic and macrocultural perspectives broke with the assumption that organizations can be adapted to external conditions in a technically rational way. In the macrodemographic perspective, inertial pressures prevent timely adaptation, while for the macrocultural perspective, conforming to institutional rules can prevent efficient operation. In a related vein, the microdemographic and microcultural perspectives broke with the assumption that behavior in organizations is geared toward efficiency and effectiveness. Instead, the microdemographic perspective holds that behavior is driven by differences between people along salient dimensions of social life, which generate inequality in access to many outcomes controlled by organizations. **The microcultural perspective emphasizes how routines, implicit logics, and meaning-making processes drive individual and group behavior.**

For its part, the relational perspective broke with the assumption that individuals, groups, and organizations can be understood as atomistic actors. Instead, all social actors are just that—social—which requires recognizing how

webs of social and economic interactions create opportunities for and constraints on action. At the microlevel, relationships determine what actors can do, as well as what actors are motivated to do because people and groups in organizations are interdependent. At the macrolevel, no organization is an island, entire unto itself; instead, every organization depends on others (e.g., suppliers and customers) to accomplish its goals. This perspective highlights the role that power plays in organizational life, as an attribute of relationships.

The next three sections flesh out Table 1, reviewing major themes in each perspective. Then, we briefly review research that combines perspectives. We conclude with a few speculations on the future of organizational theory.

2 | THE DEMOGRAPHIC PERSPECTIVE

Two research traditions take the demographic perspective. They differ in intellectual origins and units studied. *Internal organizational demography* is microscopic, analyzing individuals and small groups within organizations. It developed along separate lines in sociology and management, but both applied insights from human demography. *Organizational ecology* is macroscopic, analyzing entire organizations, populations, or industries. It adopted models from biological evolution, human ecology, and human demography to explain the dynamics of organizations. Only a few studies probe connections between microlevel and macrolevels (e.g., Ferguson & Koning, 2018; Greve, 1994; Haveman & Cohen, 1994).

2.1 | Micro level research

Internal organizational demography studies the distribution of people within organizations (employees or customers) along salient dimensions of social position (e.g., Baron & Bielby, 1980; Pfeffer, 1983). It has four theoretical foundations. First, sociological theories of group interaction hold that people prefer to interact with similar others (Simmel, 1955; Blau, 1977; Kanter, 1977)—a phenomenon known as homophily (McPherson, Smith-Lovin, & Cook, 2001). Second, demography uses the number of people in different social positions to explain rates of entry into and exit from organizations and rates of social interaction among organizational members (Pfeffer, 1983; Ryder, 1965). Third, social-psychological theories of social identity and categorization hold that we classify people to understand their behavior and that our identity and self-worth derive in part from the groups we belong to (Tajfel, 1982; Tajfel & Turner, 1979, 1986). Together, these processes create in-groups and out-groups, and promote in-group biases. Fourth, sociological expectation-states theory holds that different levels of esteem and competence are attributed to people in different demographic groups, creating interactions in which these expectations become self-fulfilling prophecies—conferring higher status and better outcomes on individuals from higher status groups (Berger, Rosenholtz, & Zelditch, 1980; Ridgeway, 1991; Ridgeway, Boyle, Kuipers, & Robinson, 1998).

The goal of all internal organizational demography is to attend to “any categorical difference that has a significant impact on group interaction and outcomes” (DiTomaso, Post, & Parks-Yancy, 2007; p. 474). Early work focused on tenure, meaning how long people had worked in the focal organization (e.g., O'Reilly, Caldwell, & Barnett, 1989; Pfeffer, 1983), and gender (e.g., Kanter, 1977; Wolf & Fligstein, 1979). Later research widened the focus to age (e.g., Zenger & Lawrence, 1989), race/ethnicity (e.g., Sørensen, 2004; Tomaskovic-Devey, 1993), sexual orientation (e.g., Tilcsik, 2011), social class (e.g., Rivera, 2012), and intersecting identities (e.g., Correll, Benard, & Paik, 2007; Pager, 2003; Pedulla, 2014). Much demographic work studies power and inequality and shows how nominal demographic parameters (unordered categories) are transformed into graded parameters with hierarchical rankings (Ridgeway et al., 1998). Thus, attributes like gender, race/ethnicity, and age become axes of inequality, determining who gets authority, status, and material resources.

At the individual level, the main issues are whether focal individuals are similar to or different from others in their workplace and whether they are members of high- or low-status groups. People in subordinated groups are harmed by stereotypes and so are not heard or valued as much as people in dominant groups (e.g., Kanter, 1977; Konrad, Winter, & Gutek, 1992). Moreover, numerical minorities from subordinated groups become “tokens” (Kanter,

1977), subject to heightened visibility and social isolation. In contrast, numerical minorities from dominant groups benefit from stereotypes (e.g., Williams, 1989, 1995). Finally, "relational demography" (Tsui, Egan, & O'Reilly, 1992), meaning similarities or differences between workers and their supervisors, affects communication, performance assessment, commitment, job satisfaction, and turnover.

At the collective (group or organizational) level, the issue is composition in terms of salient demographic dimensions. As demographic variation among members increases, trust and cohesion decline, conflict escalates, communication worsens, commitment falters, and turnover increases (e.g., O'Reilly et al., 1989; Zenger & Lawrence, 1989). Yet as demographic variation increases, social ties and information sources become broader, fostering creativity and innovation (e.g., Gibson & Gibbs, 2006). Together, these costs and benefits of demographic variation affect groups' and organizations' ability to innovate and adapt to changing environments.

In sum, the demographic distribution of individuals in a group or organization is important because it shapes social interactions, who has power, and how (well) people work together (for reviews, see Williams & O'Reilly, 1998; Reskin, McBrier, & Kmec, 1999; DiTomaso et al., 2007; Stainback, Tomaskovic-Devey, & Skaggs, 2010). Moreover, the effects of demography are nested, with differences between organizational members affecting their interactions in supervisor-subordinate dyads and work groups, and these interactions affecting individual, group, and organizational functioning. Finally, the uneven distribution of economic and status rewards conferred by schools and workplaces contributes to inequality among demographic groups.

2.2 | Macro level research

Organizational ecologists conduct demographic analyses where the units of study are organizations, rather than individuals (Carroll & Hannan, 2000). As in other demographic analyses, the focus is on numbers (of organizations with specific forms) and rates (of organizational founding, failure, and change). This theory first applied ideas from biological evolution (e.g., Levins, 1968; May, 1973) and human ecology (e.g., Hawley, 1950; McKenzie, 1926; Park, 1936) to explain organizational dynamics (rates of organizational founding, failure, and change) in terms of population numbers and environmental characteristics. This theory then applied insights from human demography (e.g., Gompertz, 1825) to explain how organizational features (e.g., age and size) affect rates of growth, change, and failure.

Ecologists study populations of organizations (Hannan & Freeman, 1989), which produce similar outputs using similar inputs. Early work in this tradition treated all organizations in a population as similar and argued that as the number of organizations in a population increased, both legitimacy and competition increased—legitimacy at a decreasing rate, competition at an increasing rate (e.g., Hannan & Freeman, 1989; Olzak & West, 1991). Founding rates increase with legitimacy and decrease with competition, and failure rates decrease with legitimacy and increase with competition. Later work distinguished organizations by form, based on characteristics such as size, market niche (specialist or generalist), technology, or location, and considered both competitive and mutually beneficial interactions within and between organizational forms (e.g., Barnett & Woyvode, 2004; Baum & Singh, 1994; Carroll & Swaminathan, 2000; Ingram & Simons, 2000).

Organizational ecology holds that organizations change slowly because of inertial pressures (Hannan & Freeman, 1984, 1989). Past investments, information limits, vested interests, entry and exit barriers, and legitimacy considerations all favor organizations that perform reliably and account for their actions, which requires highly reproducible (unchanging) organizational structures. When organizations do change, they experience harmful process effects stemming from frictions accompanying change (Barnett & Carroll, 1995). They also experience content effects stemming from changing fit with environments—beneficial if fit improves, harmful if fit worsens. While change can benefit organizations if they are performing poorly (e.g., Greve, 1999; Haveman, 1992) and ties to institutions that provide resources and confer legitimacy can buffer organizations from the harmful process effects of change (e.g., Baum & Oliver, 1991; Minkoff, 1999), most research has shown that change harms organizations. Therefore, populations of organizations change mostly through selection, not adaptation. For example, over 60 years,

California thrifts changed from club-like associations that valued community and mutual aid to impartial bureaucracies that celebrated efficiency and individual rationality (Haveman & Rao, 1997). But most change occurred through the differential founding and failure of different organizational forms; only a little occurred through existing organizations adopting new forms.

When organizations are founded, they imprint on prevailing social conditions (Stinchcombe, 1965; for a review, see Marquis & Tilcsik, 2013). Because of inertia, organizations reflect those conditions throughout their lives. For example, the Paris Opera was conceived as a royal academy, a high-status organizational form devoted to discussion among academy members (Johnson, 2007). But, pushed by the king, whose permission was required to found any organization in that era, it was launched as a hybrid of the royal academy and the commercial theater, a much lower status organizational form. Not only did it incorporate elements of two organizational forms, those elements persisted for centuries. In a more recent example, the organizational “blueprints” of high-tech firms in Silicon Valley reflected founders’ imprints many years after founding (Baron, Burton, & Hannan, 1999).

3 | THE RELATIONAL PERSPECTIVE

Scholars taking the relational perspective hold that social relations are primary and social-unit attributes are secondary. Microrelational research focuses on relationships between individuals or groups, while macrorelational research examines relationships between organizations or industries. Few studies investigate cross-level connections between micro and macro (e.g., Shane & Stuart, 2002).

3.1 | Micro level research

There are two main strands of microrelational research. The first examines *social capital* (Bourdieu, 1980; Coleman, 1988), meaning the resources people derive from their connections, such as ties to schoolmates, current and former coworkers, or people in other organizations. Social capital improves access to information and material resources, which in turn enhances social status, reduces uncertainty, and improves many individual outcomes. For example, applicants referred by employee contacts are 10 times more likely to be offered jobs than applicants without referrals (Fernandez & Galperin, 2014). But social capital also creates mutual obligations, channeling action onto particular pathways and foreclosing others (Lin, 1999; Portes, 1998).

Different types of social ties—strong versus weak—provide individuals and groups with distinct benefits and challenges. Strong ties, which bond group members tightly, improve knowledge transfer within groups and facilitate norm enforcement, increasing trust and improving group functioning (Coleman, 1988; Uzzi & Spiro, 2005). Weak ties can bridge holes in networks, connecting otherwise-unconnected groups, which tend to have different information sources (Burt, 1992, 2000; Granovetter, 1973; Yakubovich, 2005). People whose networks include “bridging” or “brokering” ties can spark innovation and control information flows (Burt, 2000; Perry-Smith, 2006). Brokers can engage in socially beneficial acts like conflict mediation, but also socially undesirable acts like manipulation (Stovel & Shaw, 2012). Because their benefits differ, bridging and bonding ties are complements (Adler & Kwon, 2002; Burt, 2000). For example, groups perform best when members have diverse, nonredundant ties to people outside the group, but also strong ties to other group members (Reagans & Zuckerman, 2001). Bridging ties can foster creativity, while bonding ties facilitate the diffusion and implementation of ideas (Fleming, Mingo, & Chen, 2007). The value of bridging and bonding ties is contingent on goals and context (Adler & Kwon, 2002). For example, bridging ties harm individuals’ career performance in high-tech companies in China, where the collectivistic culture clashes with brokers’ agency (Xiao & Tsui, 2007).

The second main strand of micro relational research focuses on *power* as an attribute of relationships and assumes power is the inverse of dependence (Emerson, 1962). Consider the power-dependence relationship between two individuals, Pat and Chris. Pat’s power over Chris—the amount of pressure Pat can exert on Chris to

do what Pat wants—equals Chris's dependence on Pat. The power Pat can exert is a function of Chris's motivation and alternatives: The more Chris wants what Pat can provide, the more Chris depends on Pat, and the more power Pat has over Chris; and the more alternatives Chris has, the less Chris depends on Pat, and the less power Pat has over Chris.

Within organizations, vertical and horizontal power-dependence relations develop (Pfeffer, 1981). Vertically, people at each level have formally invested power over lower levels; this power resides in the position held, not in the person holding the position (Weber, 1968). Horizontally, power arises because individuals and groups in organizations depend on each other to perform their assigned tasks—they are interdependent (Thompson, 1967). Horizontal power is activated when interdependent actors have different goals or different beliefs about how to achieve their goals, the resources needed to achieve goals are scarce, and actors have different levels of resources. Both vertical and horizontal power-dependence relations influence whose goals and beliefs are acted upon and to what effect. For example, ties between people promoting change and powerful others who are neutral to the proposed change (fence-sitters) allow change promoters to co-opt fence sitters and get the change approved; however, strong ties to powerful others who disapprove of the proposed change reduce the chance of approval (Battilana & Casciaro, 2013).

3.2 | Macro level research

Macro relational studies examine how links to other organizations—oversight agencies, competitors, customers, and suppliers—affect organizational structures, actions, and performance. Work in this tradition is generally labeled *resource dependence* (Aldrich & Pfeffer, 1976; Burt, 1983; Pfeffer & Salancik, 1978).¹ Because organizations rely on other organizations, they are vulnerable to power plays by those organizations and thus face uncertainty. To reduce vulnerability and uncertainty and so stabilize operations and improve performance, organizations integrate vertically, taking over suppliers or distributors; diversify; and create strategic alliances, joint ventures, and director interlocks (Pfeffer & Salancik, 1978; Burt, 1983; for a review, see Davis & Cobb, 2010).

Some macrorelational studies investigate ties between individuals that span organizational boundaries, notably the long tradition of research on interlocking directorates in the United States (e.g., Haunschild & Beckman, 1998; Mizruchi & Stearns, 1988; Yue, 2016). Some macrorelational studies examine ties centered on organizations, rather than individuals, such as strategic alliances and joint ventures, supplier/buyer ties, and knowledge flows through patents (e.g., Baker, 1990; Gulati & Gargiulo, 1999; Uzzi, 1997). Both types of studies investigate a paradox: Interorganizational ties both create opportunities for action and impose constraints on action (Granovetter, 1985). They can make interactions more predictable (e.g., Dore, 1983), facilitate information exchange (e.g., Helper, 1990), and improve organizational performance by providing access to resources (Gulati, Lavie, & Madhavan, 2011). But they can make firms “overembedded” to the point where the costs of managing ties outweigh the benefits. For example, strong ties between organizations can increase trust, information transfer, and coordination, but they also make firms vulnerable to shocks, require time and resources to maintain, and insulate firms from outside information (Uzzi, 1997). And ties to powerful partners create the potential for appropriation and coercion (e.g., Katila, Rosenberger, & Eisenhardt, 2008), so a few large organizations can wield outsize influence. For example, changing power dynamics between large American retailers and their suppliers partly explains why wages have stagnated since the 1970s (Wilmers, 2018).

On a more macro (societal) scale, some scholars view corporations as tools of elite control (e.g., Clawson, 1980; Domhoff, 2014). They argue that in the United States, dense corporate networks created by board interlocks helped maintain an economic elite by socializing newcomers, fostering solidarity, coordinating political action, and facilitating control over public policy (Burris, 2005; Domhoff, 2014; Useem, 1984; Zeitlin, 1974). Although the evidence to support this argument is mixed (for a review, see Mizruchi, 1996), there is evidence that interlocks spread information about strategies, structures, and practices, thus affecting strategic behavior (e.g., Davis, 1991; Haunschild &

Beckman, 1998; for a review of the performance impacts of interorganizational networks in general, see Gulati et al., 2011). Although the interlock network became less connected in the 2000s (Chu & Davis, 2016; Mizruchi, 2013), highly cohesive subgroups remain (Benton, 2016).²

In addition to elite network effects, interorganizational power dynamics have other impacts on society at large. Changes in American antitrust laws and in firms' strategies and structures over the twentieth century altered which functional areas could best solve the problems facing organizations and thus who rose to power: First, executives came from entrepreneurship and manufacturing, then from sales and marketing, and finally from finance (Fligstein, 1987). Pushed by powerful investment bankers and institutional investors, finance-trained executives embraced the logic that corporations should maximize shareholder value (stock price) above all (Davis, 2009; Fligstein, 2001). This logic, in turn, led to reduced employee job security and increased societal income inequality, as corporate executives promoted corporate downsizing in response to stock-price declines (e.g., Jung, 2016).

4 | THE CULTURAL PERSPECTIVE

Research taking this perspective examines shared and patterned understandings of reality and possibility. This perspective is often labeled "institutional" because institutions are central to it. Institutions are social facts, phenomena people perceive to be both external to themselves (shared by others) and coercive (backed by sanctions; Durkheim, 1995). Institutions are also durable phenomena: They persist because they develop routines for reproducing themselves over time, so they do not require recurrent collective mobilization or authoritative intervention to endure (Jepperson, 1991).³ Institutions are embodied in culture (customs, conventions, and normative expectations), regimes (legal systems, professional codes, and technical standards), and organizations. But not everything is an institution: Fads in management practices and resistance to authority are not institutions because they are neither broadly accepted nor enduring. Moreover, not all institutions are broadly accepted: Some, like organized crime, may be enduring but are accepted by few.

We distinguish microcultural research on individuals and groups from macrorelational research on organizations and fields, even though they often overlap.

4.1 | Micro level research

Micro cultural research is built on early microsociology (Cooley, 1902, 1909; Mead, 1934), symbolic interactionism (Blumer, 1969), and theories of interaction order and framing (Goffman, 1959, 1974). These traditions analyzed the meanings that people develop through interactions with others—symbolic systems that guide evaluation and action—and how people (re)interpret these meanings as they continue to interact. But these traditions paid little attention to the larger structures within which groups are embedded, so until recently few studies of organizations were built directly on them. Instead, by informing research on work and the professions, these traditions had at most indirect influence on studies of organizations. For example, a study of flight attendants and bill collectors revealed that "emotional labor" (creating desirable emotional displays) is core to both jobs (positive displays for flight attendants and negative displays for bill collectors); training for both jobs inculcates "feeling rules" that guide interactions with customers (Hochschild, 1983). Then, in the 1990s, scholars began to study "inhabited institutions" (Scully & Creed, 1997), the meanings workers attach to their jobs, the conflicts and consensuses created and recreated through workplace interaction, and the resulting cultures. For example, a reinterpretation of Gouldner's *Patterns of Industrial Bureaucracy* (1954) shows how worker–management interactions infuse bureaucracy with meaning (Hallett & Ventresca, 2006). Similarly, a study of people working in drug courts (probation officers, defense and prosecuting attorneys, and clinicians) shows that they use different logics (criminal punishment, rehabilitation, accountability, and efficiency) to negotiate decisions and achieve their particular goals (McPherson & Sauder, 2013).

4.2 | Macro level research

Macro cultural research focuses on organizations and fields, defined as the organizations that constitute a social arena: suppliers, distributors, consumers, regulators, and competitors (DiMaggio & Powell, 1983; cf. Fligstein & McAdam, 2012). This work emphasizes cognition, unreflective and ritualized activity, and social constructionism; it holds that organizations and the roles individuals play in them are created through social interaction, generating shared knowledge and belief systems (Berger & Luckmann, 1967). People develop recipes for understanding and action through habituation, come to recognize actors and situations as types through typification, and institutionalize typifications by sharing them widely. Institutions stabilize social relations by establishing expectations for behavior—norms, values, and roles. Thus, organizations are confronted with “institutionalized rules” maintained by social interaction; legitimacy, and ultimately survival, stems from demonstrating conformity to these rules, even though such conformity can conflict with efficiency (Meyer & Rowan, 1977). When conformity conflicts with efficiency, organizations decouple what they claim they are and do from what they actually are and actually do, and maintain a logic of confidence or good faith through avoidance of inspection, discretion, and overlooking anomalies (Meyer & Rowan, 1977; Weick, 1976). For example, in hospitals, health care is defined as care provided by medical doctors, not care that alleviates pain or cures disease.

Much macrocultural research seeks to understand why organizations are so similar (DiMaggio & Powell, 1983) by investigating institutional isomorphism (literally, “same shape”). As communities of organizations evolve, interorganizational relations, the state, the professions, and competition promote isomorphism among organizations that are tied directly to each other or play similar roles. (Note this often-overlooked connection between the cultural and relational perspectives.) There are three kinds of isomorphism. Mimetic isomorphism is the achievement of conformity through imitation. It can result from efficient responses to uncertainty (“when in doubt, do what other organizations facing the same environment do”) or from bandwagon effects (“if many organizations adopt a structure or course of action, then follow their lead”). Coercive isomorphism stems from the pressure imposed by state regulations that authorize particular organizational structures and activities and prohibit others. Normative isomorphism involves pressures imposed by collective actors such as professional and trade associations, which create informal expectations (if not formal rules) about what organizations should look like and how they should behave. Organizations facing great uncertainty tend to imitate successful organizations (e.g., Haveman, 1993; Strang & Still, 2004) or similar organizations (e.g., Soule, 1997), while organizations respond to pressures from funding sources and state authorities by adopting practices and structures those actors approve (e.g., Edelman, 1992; Mun & Jung, 2018).

Over time, isomorphic pressures make structures, products, and practices legitimate—comprehensible and taken for granted as natural ways to achieve collective goals, justified on the basis of prevailing cultural models and accounts (Meyer & Rowan, 1977; Zucker, 1983). Alternatives may become literally inconceivable. But change can occur if a new structure, product, or practice meets a technical need; if so, the innovation diffuses rapidly through direct contact between organizations. Early-stage diffusion tends to be “rational,” driven by coercion or technical need, while later-stage diffusion tends to be symbolic, driven by imitation or norms (Edelman, 1992; Fligstein, 1985; Tolbert & Zucker, 1983). As a result of symbolism-driven innovation, the structures, products, and policies that diffuse widely are often ineffective; for example, although organizations develop legally acceptable human-resources policies that spread widely, these policies do not always ameliorate inequalities (e.g., Dobbin, Schrage, & Kalev, 2015).

4.3 | Research bridging macro and micro levels

In the 1990s, research on institutional logics emerged, studying “systems of cultural elements (values, beliefs, and normative expectations) by which people, groups, and organizations make sense of and evaluate their everyday activities, and organize those activities in time and space” (Haveman & Gualtieri, 2017; p. 1). At first, logics were

defined at the societal level, such as the (capitalist) market versus the (democratic) state (Friedland & Alford, 1991), mutual cooperation versus bureaucracy and individual rationality (Haveman & Rao, 1997), or professional versus state authority (Scott, Ruef, Mendel, & Caronna, 2000). Later, logics were seen as due to the agency of individuals and small groups inside a single organization (e.g., Dunn & Jones, 2010; Thornton, Ocasio, & Lounsbury, 2012), and more explicitly informed by symbolic interactionism (e.g., Berman, 2012; Binder, 2007; McPherson & Sauder, 2013). This line of work integrates microcultural and macrocultural research on organizations.

Work on organizational culture—the values, beliefs, and assumptions shared (more or less strongly and uniformly) by members of an organization (e.g., Deal & Kennedy, 1982; Schein, 1996, 2010)—also bridges micro and macro. Organizational cultures arise from efforts by owners, managers, and workers to create shared goals, identities, and meanings for their actions (Pettigrew, 1979; van Maanen & Schein, 1979). Organizational cultures influence behavior: funeral-homes use décor, makeup, and quiet action to calm friends and family by creating the illusion that the dead are merely resting (Barley, 1983), while high-tech manufacturers promote extraordinary work effort through espoused norms and values (Kunda, 1992). Individuals' "fit" with organizational culture affects hiring, performance, and turnover (Goldberg, Srivastava, Govind Manian, Monroe, & Potts, 2016; Rivera, 2012). Strongly held and widely shared organizational cultures promote behavioral consistency and thus improve firm performance (Gordon & DiTomaso, 1992; O'Reilly & Chatman, 1996). But strong organizational cultures can also hinder experimentation and learning, impairing performance in changing environments (Sørensen, 2002; Van den Steen, 2010).

5 | COMBINING PERSPECTIVES

The three perspectives on organizations complement each other, so it is not surprising that scholars have increasingly combined them. Here, we describe some notable examples of such work.

5.1 | Demographic and relational

Some work combining the network and demographic perspectives brings to light network mechanisms for explaining how diversity affects group performance. When diversity undercuts cohesion and trust (thus reducing the number of bonding ties within a group), performance declines, but when diversity exposes group members to nonredundant sources of information (through bridging ties to people outside a work group), performance improves (Reagans & Zuckerman, 2001). In this way, network mechanisms mediate the impact of diversity. Other work reveals how demographically segregated networks alter employment opportunities for members of different demographic groups (for a review, see McDonald & Day, 2010). For example, Black job-seekers' contacts are less likely to refer them to prospective employers than are those of White job-seekers (Royster, 2003; Smith, 2005). Moreover, Black job-seekers are less likely than White job-seekers to have high-status social ties (Lin, 2001; McDonald, 2011), so even when Black job-seekers obtain referrals to employers, they gain fewer advantages from these referrals than do comparable White job-seekers (Silva, 2018). In sum, these lines of work show that network processes can be sources of (dis)advantage for different demographic groups, and demography can condition network processes.

5.2 | Demographic and cultural

Work on organizational forms as identities that observers use to evaluate organizations, and their products combines insights from both the demographic and cultural perspectives (Hannan, Pólos, & Carroll, 2007; for reviews, see Negro, Koçak, & Hsu, 2010; Durand, Grandqvist, & Tyllström, 2017). Organizations are sorted (by themselves or observers) into categories of forms that delimit what organizations should (not) be and do, based on observers' understandings. Being perceived as straddling rather than fitting within such categories generates penalties for organizations (e.g., Hsu, 2006; Zuckerman, 1999), while being perceived as members of high-status categories generates benefits for

organizations (e.g., Sharkey, 2014). Other, more micro, work reveals how the social (e)valuation of the categories individuals are placed in (usually but not always demographic) is shaped by organizational and industry norms. For example, in leveraged buyout firms, gender is a more relevant criterion for social exclusion than race/ethnicity because women do not fit the “ideal worker” profile (Turco, 2010), while in consulting and law, social class is more relevant than race/ethnicity because decision makers sort job applicants on cultural similarity (Rivera, 2012).

5.3 | Relational and cultural

Institutionalist research increasingly attends to the interplay between culture and power. Some work reveals how power-dependence relations affect which novel ideas and practices are adopted. For example, organizations adopt frames of strategic change that reflect the interests of those who control financial resources (Fiss & Zajac, 2006). Other work shows how network ties affect diffusion and isomorphism (Strang & Tuma, 1993). For example, different network ties promote isomorphism through different mechanisms (Guler, Guillén, & Macpherson, 2002), and network ties promote customized adoption of new practices early in the institutionalization process but conformity-driven adoption later on (Westphal, Gulati, & Shortell, 1997). Still other work shows that culture conditions network effects, for instance, by influencing the value of different types of network ties (e.g., Xiao & Tsui, 2007).

6 | CONCLUSION

Our review reveals only a tiny fraction of the breadth and depth of contemporary research on organizations. A search of the Web of Science (<http://webofknowledge.com>), which counts citations in academic journals, reveals the impact these ideas have had—and continue to have. For example, Kanter (1977), foundational for microdemographic research, has been cited 5,000 times since its publication; Granovetter (1973), foundational for microrelational research, has been cited 11,000 times; Pfeffer and Salancik (1978), basic for microrelational and macrorelational research, has been cited 8,000 times; and Meyer and Rowan (1977), germinal for the cultural perspective, has been cited 7,000 times. Across all foundational works, half of their citations have been in articles published 2010 onward, suggesting that the study of organizations remains central to sociology, management, and many other fields.

Yet, over the past four decades the study of organizations has grown fastest in professional (especially business) schools. This has, arguably, made research on organizations increasingly focused on efficiency and effectiveness—a tool of capitalism. Counter to this trend, we can make the study of organizations more central to sociology by explaining organizations' impact on outcomes of interest to many sociological subfields, not just inequality (discussed above) but also race and ethnicity, culture, education, politics, and religion. For inspiration, consider how social-movement organizations, churches, government agencies, and media businesses jointly defined “Hispanic” as an ethnic, not racial, category (Mora, 2014); this work fundamentally reorients the study of race/ethnicity and immigration. Many sociological other subfields await reorientation by organizations scholars.

ENDNOTES

- ¹ Much of this research is labeled “social-network analysis,” referring to the empirical techniques used in data analysis, rather than theory (Kilduff & Tsai, 2003; Salancik, 1995). The theory underpinning most social-network analysis of organizations is resource dependence; theories of information exchange and status are less common.
- ² For studies of corporate interlocks in other countries, see, for example, Berkowitz et al. (1979; Canada); Fennema (1982; Europe); Stokman, van der Knoop, and Wasseur (1988; the Netherlands); Gerlach (1993; Japan); Kentor and Yang (2004; transnational).
- ³ Borrowing from economics, some institutionalists emphasize rationality, rules, and risk (e.g., Brinton & Nee, 1998). Ingram and Clay (2000) review this work. Another group of institutionalists analyzes the entire globe (e.g., Meyer, Boli, Thomas, & Ramirez, 1997). Clemens and Cook (1999) and Schneiberg and Clemens (2006) review this work, as well as the organizational institutionalism we describe here.

ORCID

Heather A. Haveman  <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8945-1112>

REFERENCES

- Adler, P. S., & Kwon, S.-W. (2002). Social capital: Prospects for a new concept. *Academy of Management Review*, 27, 17–40. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.2002.5922314>
- Aldrich, H. E., & Pfeffer, J. (1976). Environments of organizations. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 2, 29–105.
- Baker, W. E. (1990). Market networks and corporate behavior. *American Journal of Sociology*, 96, 589–625. <https://doi.org/10.1086/229573>
- Barley, S. R. (1983). Semiotics and the study of occupational and organizational cultures. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 28, 393–413. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2392249>
- Barnett, W. P., & Carroll, G. R. (1995). Modelling internal organizational change. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 21, 217–236. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.so.21.080195.001245>
- Barnett, W. P., & Woyvode, M. (2004). From Red Vienna to the Anschluss: Ideological competition among Viennese newspapers during the rise of national socialism. *American Journal of Sociology*, 109, 1452–1500. <https://doi.org/10.1086/381774>
- Baron, J. N., & Bielby, W. T. (1980). Bringing the firms back in: Stratification, segmentation, and the organization of work. *American Sociological Review*, 45, 737–765. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2094893>
- Baron, J. N., Burton, D., & Hannan, M. T. (1999). Engineering bureaucracy: The genesis of formal policies, positions, and structures in high-technology firms. *Journal of Law, Economics, and Organization*, 15, 1–41. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jleo/15.1.1>
- Battilana, J., & Casciaro, T. (2013). Overcoming resistance to organizational change: Strong ties and affective cooptation. *Management Science*, 59, 819–836. <https://doi.org/10.1287/mnsc.1120.1583>
- Baum, J. A. C., & Oliver, C. (1991). Institutional linkages and organizational mortality. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 36, 187–218. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2393353>
- Baum, J. A. C., & Singh, J. V. (1994). Organizational niches and the dynamics of organizational mortality. *American Journal of Sociology*, 100, 346–380.
- Benton, R. A. (2016). Corporate governance and nested authority: Cohesive network structure, actor-driven mechanisms, and the balance of power in American corporations. *American Journal of Sociology*, 122(3), 661–713. <https://doi.org/10.1086/689397>
- Berger, J., Rosenholtz, S. J., & Zelditch, M. Jr. (1980). Status organizing processes. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 6, 479–508. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.so.06.080180.002403>
- Berger, P. L., & Luckmann, T. (1967). *The social construction of reality: A treatise in the sociology of knowledge*. Garden City, NY: Doubleday/Anchor Books.
- Berkowitz, S. D., Carrington, P. J., Kotowitz, Y., & Waverman, L. (1979). The determination of enterprise groupings through combined ownership and directorship ties. *Social Networks*, 1, 391–413.
- Berman, E. P. (2012). Explaining the move toward the market in US academic science: How institutional logics can change without institutional entrepreneurs. *Theory and Society*, 41, 261–299. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11186-012-9167-7>
- Binder, A. (2007). For love and money: Organizations' creative responses to multiple environmental logics. *Theory and Society*, 36, 547–571. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11186-007-9045-x>
- Blau, P. M. (1955). *Dynamics of bureaucracy: A study of interpersonal relations in two government agencies* (Revised ed.). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Blau, P. M. (1977). *Inequality and heterogeneity: A primitive theory of social structure*. New York: Free Press.
- Blau, P. M. (1994). *Structural contexts of opportunities*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Blau, P. M., & Scott, W. R. (1962). *Formal organizations: A Comparative Approach*. San Francisco, CA: Chandler Publishing Company. (Republished 2003 by Stanford University Press, Stanford, CA.)
- Blumer, H. (1969). *Symbolic interactionism: Perspective and method*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Bourdieu, P. (1980). Le capital social. *Actes de la Recherche en Sciences Sociales*, 31, 2–3.
- Brinton, M. C., & Nee, V. (Eds.) (1998). *The new institutionalism in sociology*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Burris, V. (2005). Interlocking directorates and political cohesion among corporate elites. *American Journal of Sociology*, 111(1), 249–283. <https://doi.org/10.1086/428817>

- Burt, R. S. (1983). *Corporate profits and co-optation: Networks of market constraints and directorate ties in the American economy*. New York: Academic Press.
- Burt, R. S. (1992). *Structural holes: The social structure of competition*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Burt, R. S. (2000). The network structure of social capital. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 22, 345–423. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0191-3085\(00\)22009-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0191-3085(00)22009-1)
- Carroll, G. R., & Hannan, M. T. (2000). *The demography of corporations and industries*. Princeton NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Carroll, G. R., & Swaminathan, A. (2000). Why the microbrewery movement? Organizational dynamics of resource partitioning in the American brewing industry after Prohibition. *American Journal of Sociology*, 106, 715–762. <https://doi.org/10.1086/318962>
- Child, J. (1972). Organizational structure, environment and performance: The role of strategic choice. *Sociology*, 6, 1–22. <https://doi.org/10.1177/003803857200600101>
- Chu, J. C., & Davis, G. F. (2016). Who killed the inner circle? The decline of the American corporate interlock network. *American Journal of Sociology*, 122(3), 714–754. <https://doi.org/10.1086/688650>
- Clawson, D. (1980). *Bureaucracy and the labor process*. New York: Monthly Review Press.
- Clemens, E. S., & Cook, J. M. (1999). Politics and institutionalism: Explaining durability and change. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 25, 441–466. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.soc.25.1.441>
- Coleman, J. S. (1988). Social capital in the creation of human capital. *American Journal of Sociology*, 94, S95–S120. <https://doi.org/10.1086/228943>
- Cooley, C. H. (1902). *Human nature and the social order*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.
- Cooley, C. H. (1909). *Social organization: A study of the larger mind*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. <https://doi.org/10.1037/14788-000>
- Correll, S. J., Benard, S., & Paik, I. (2007). Getting a job: Is there a motherhood penalty? *American Journal of Sociology*, 112, 1297–1338. <https://doi.org/10.1086/511799>
- Cyert, R. M., & March, J. G. (1963). *A behavioral theory of the firm*. Cambridge, MA: Blackwell.
- Davis, G. F. (1991). Agents without principles? The spread of the poison pill through the intercorporate network. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 36, 583–613. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2393275>
- Davis, G. F. (2009). *Managed by the markets: How finance has re-shaped America*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Davis, G. F., & Cobb, J. A. (2010). Resource dependence theory: Past and future. *Research in the Sociology of Organizations*, 28, 21–42. [https://doi.org/10.1108/S0733-558X\(2010\)0000028006](https://doi.org/10.1108/S0733-558X(2010)0000028006)
- Deal, T., & Kennedy, A. (1982). *Corporate cultures: The rites and rituals of corporate life*. Reading, MA: Addison Wesley.
- DiMaggio, P. J., & Powell, W. W. (1983). The iron cage revisited: Institutional isomorphism and collective rationality in organizational fields. *American Sociological Review*, 48, 147–160. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2095101>
- DiTomaso, N., Post, C., & Parks-Yancy, R. (2007). Workforce diversity and inequality: Power, status, and numbers. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 33, 473–501. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.soc.33.040406.131805>
- Dobbin, F. R., Schrage, D., & Kalev, A. (2015). Rage against the iron cage: The varied effects of bureaucratic personnel reforms on diversity. *American Sociological Review*, 80(5), 1014–1044. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0003122415596416>
- Domhoff, G. W. (2014). *Who rules America?: The triumph of the corporate rich*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Dore, R. (1983). Goodwill and the spirit of market capitalism. *British Journal of Sociology*, 34, 459–482. <https://doi.org/10.2307/590932>
- 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. <https://doi.org/10.2189/asqu.2010.55.1.114>
- Durand, R., Grandqvist, N., & Tyllström, A. (2017). From categories to categorization: A social perspective on market categorization. *Research in the Sociology of Organizations*, 51, 3–30. <https://doi.org/10.1108/S0733-558X20170000051011>
- Durkheim, É. (1995). In S. Lukes (Ed.), translated by W.D. Halls *The rules of sociological method and selected texts on sociology and its method*. New York: Free Press.
- Edelman, L. B. (1992). Legal ambiguity and symbolic structures: Organizational mediation of civil rights law. *American Journal of Sociology*, 97, 1531–1576. <https://doi.org/10.1086/229939>
- Emerson, R. M. (1962). Power-dependence relations. *American Sociological Review*, 27, 31–41. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2089716>

- Fennema, M. (1982). *International networks of banks and industry*. The Hague: Nijhoff. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-009-7523-1>
- Ferguson, J.-P., & Koning, R. (2018). Firm turnover and the return of racial establishment segregation. *American Sociological Review*, 83(3), 445–474. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0003122418767438>
- Fernandez, R. M., & Galperin, R. V. (2014). The causal status of social capital in labor markets. *Research in the Sociology of Organizations*, 40, 445–462. [https://doi.org/10.1108/S0733-558X\(2014\)0000040022](https://doi.org/10.1108/S0733-558X(2014)0000040022)
- Fiss, P. C., & Zajac, E. J. (2006). The symbolic management of strategic change: Sensegiving via framing and decoupling. *Academy of Management Journal*, 49, 1173–1193. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amj.2006.23478255>
- Fleming, L., Mingo, S., & Chen, D. (2007). Collaborative brokerage, generative creativity, and creative success. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 52, 443–475.
- Fligstein, N. (1985). The spread of the multidivisional form among large firms, 1919–1979. *American Sociological Review*, 50, 377–391. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2095547>
- Fligstein, N. (1987). The intraorganizational power struggle: Rise of finance personnel to top leadership in large corporations, 1919–1979. *American Sociological Review*, 52, 44–58. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2095391>
- Fligstein, N. (2001). *The architecture of markets: An economic sociology of twenty-first-century capitalist societies*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Fligstein, N., & McAdam, D. (2012). *A theory of fields*. New York: Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199859948.001.0001>
- Friedland, R., & Alford, R. R. (1991). Bringing society back in: Symbols, practices, and institutional contradictions. In W. W. Powell, & P. J. DiMaggio (Eds.), *The new institutionalism in organizational analysis* (pp. 232–263). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Galbraith, J. R. (1973). *Designing complex organizations*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Gerlach, M. (1993). *Alliance capitalism: The social organization of Japanese business*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Gibson, C. B., & Gibbs, J. L. (2006). Unpacking the concept of virtuality: The effects of geographic dispersion, electronic dependence, dynamic structure, and national diversity on team innovation. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 51, 451–495. <https://doi.org/10.2189/asqu.51.3.451>
- Goffman, E. (1959). *The presentation of self in everyday life*. Garden City, NY: Doubleday Anchor.
- Goffman, E. (1974). *Frame analysis: An essay on the organization of experience*. New York: Harper and Row.
- Goldberg, A., Srivastava, S. B., Govind Manian, V., Monroe, W., & Potts, C. (2016). Fitting in or standing out? The tradeoffs of structural and cultural embeddedness. *American Sociological Review*, 81, 1190–1222. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0003122416671873>
- Gompertz, B. (1825). On the nature of the function expressive of the law of human mortality, and on a new mode of determining the value of life contingents. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society*, 115, 313–380.
- Gordon, G. G., & DiTomaso, N. (1992). Predicting corporate performance from organizational culture. *Journal of Management Studies*, 29, 783–798. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-6486.1992.tb00689.x>
- Gouldner, A. W. (1954). *Patterns of industrial bureaucracy*. New York: Free Press.
- Granovetter, M. (1973). The strength of weak ties. *American Journal of Sociology*, 78, 1360–1380. <https://doi.org/10.1086/225469>
- Granovetter, M. (1985). Economic action and social structure: The problem of embeddedness. *American Journal of Sociology*, 91, 481–510. <https://doi.org/10.1086/228311>
- Greve, H. R. (1994). Industry diversity effects on job mobility. *Acta Sociologica*, 37, 119–139. <https://doi.org/10.1177/000169939403700201>
- Greve, H. R. (1999). The effect of change on performance: Inertia and regression to the mean. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 44, 590–614. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2666963>
- Gulati, R., & Gargiulo, M. (1999). Where do interorganizational networks come from? *American Journal of Sociology*, 104, 1439–1493.
- Gulati, R., Lavie, D., & Madhavan, R. R. (2011). How do networks matter? The performance effects of interorganizational networks. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 31, 207–224. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.riob.2011.09.005>
- Guler, I., Guillén, M. F., & Macpherson, J. M. (2002). Global competition, institutions, and the diffusion of organizational practices: The international spread of ISO 9000 quality certificates. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 47, 207–232. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3094804>
- Hallett, T., & Ventresca, M. (2006). Inhabited institutions. *Theory & Society*, 35, 213–236. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11186-006-9003-z>

- Hannan, M. T., & Freeman, J. (1984). Structural inertia and organizational change. *American Sociological Review*, 49, 149–164. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2095567>
- Hannan, M. T., & Freeman, J. (1989). *Organizational ecology*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Hannan, M. T., Pólos, L., & Carroll, G. R. (2007). *Logics of organizational theory: Audiences, codes, and ecologies* Princeton University Press.
- Haunschild, P. R., & Beckman, C. M. (1998). When do interlocks matter? Alternate sources of information and interlock influence. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 43, 815–844. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2393617>
- Haveman, H. 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. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2393533>
- Haveman, H. A. (1993). Follow the leader: Mimetic isomorphism and entry into new markets. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 38, 593–627. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2393338>
- Haveman, H. A., & Cohen, L. E. (1994). The ecological dynamics of careers: The impact of organizational founding, dissolution, and merger on job mobility. *American Journal of Sociology*, 100, 104–152. <https://doi.org/10.1086/230501>
- Haveman, H. A., & Gualtieri, G. (2017). Institutional logics. In R. Aldag (Ed.), *Oxford research encyclopedia of business and management*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Haveman, H. A., & 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. <https://doi.org/10.1086/231128>
- Haveman, H. A., & Wetts, R. (2019). Organizational theory: From classical sociology to the 1970s. *Sociology Compass*, 13(3), e12627. <https://doi.org/10.1111/soc4.12627>
- Howley, A. H. (1950). *Human ecology: A theory of human structure*. New York: The Ronald Press Co.
- Helper, S. (1990). Comparative supplier relations in the US and Japanese auto industries: An exit/voice approach. *Business and Economic History*, 19, 153–162.
- Hickson, D. J., Robin Hinings, C., Lee, C. A., Schneck, R. E., & Pennings, J. M. (1971). A strategic contingencies' theory of intraorganizational power. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 16, 216–229. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2391831>
- Hochschild, A. R. (1983). *The managed heart: Commercialization of human feeling*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Hsu, G. (2006). Jacks of all trades and masters of none: Audiences' reactions to spanning genres in feature film marketing. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 51, 420–450. <https://doi.org/10.2189/asqu.51.3.420>
- Ingram, P., & Clay, K. (2000). The choice-within-constraints new institutionalism and implications for sociology. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 26, 525–546. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.soc.26.1.525>
- Ingram, P., & Simons, T. (2000). State formation, ideological competition, and the ecology of Israeli workers' cooperatives, 1920–1992. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 45, 25–53. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2666978>
- Jepperson, R. L. (1991). Institutions, institutional effects, and institutionalization. In W. W. Powell, & P. J. DiMaggio (Eds.), *The new institutionalism in organizational analysis* (pp. 143–163). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Johnson, V. (2007). What is organizational imprinting? Cultural entrepreneurship in the founding of the Paris Opera. *American Journal of Sociology*, 113, 97–127. <https://doi.org/10.1086/517899>
- Jung, J. (2016). Through the contested terrain: Implementation of downsizing decisions by large U.S. firms, 1984 to 2005. *American Sociological Review*, 81(2), 347–373.
- Kanter, R. M. (1977). *Men and women of the corporation*. New York: Basic Books.
- Katila, R., Rosenberger, J. D., & Eisenhardt, K. M. (2008). Swimming with sharks: Technology ventures, defense mechanisms and corporate relationships. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 53, 295–332. <https://doi.org/10.2189/asqu.53.2.295>
- Kentor, J., & Yang, Y. S. (2004). Yes, there is a (growing) transnational business community: A study of global interlocking directorates 1983–1998. *International Sociology*, 19(3), 355–368. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0268580904045345>
- Kilduff, M., & Tsai, W. (2003). *Social networks and organizations*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage. <https://doi.org/10.4135/9781849209915>
- Konrad, A. M., Winter, S., & Gutek, B. A. (1992). Diversity in work-group composition: Implications for majority and minority workers. *Research in the Sociology of Organizations*, 10, 115–140.
- Kunda, G. (1992). *Engineering culture: Control and commitment in a high-tech corporation*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Lawrence, P. D., & Lorsch, J. W. (1967). *Organizations and environments: Managing differentiation and integration*. Boston: Harvard Business School Press.
- Levins, R. (1968). *Evolution in changing environments*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

- Lin, N. (1999). Social networks and status attainment. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 25, 467–487. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.soc.25.1.467>
- Lin, N. (2001). *Social capital: A theory of social structure and action*. New York: Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511815447>
- March, J. G., & Olsen, J. P. (1976). *Ambiguity and choice in organizations*. Bergen: Universitetsforlaget.
- Marquis, C., & Tilcsik, A. (2013). Imprinting: Toward a multilevel theory. *Academy of Management Annals*, 7(1), 195–245. <https://doi.org/10.5465/19416520.2013.766076>
- May, R. M. (1973). *Stability and complexity in model ecosystems*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- McDonald, S. (2011). What's in the 'old boys' network? Accessing social capital in gendered and racialized networks. *Social Networks*, 33, 317–330. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socnet.2011.10.002>
- McDonald, S., & Day, J. C. (2010). Race, gender, and the invisible hand of social capital. *Sociology Compass*, 4, 532–543. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1751-9020.2010.00298.x>
- McKenzie, R. D. (1926). The scope of human ecology. Papers and Proceedings of the American Sociological Society, 20th Annual Meeting, 1925: 141–154.
- McPherson, C. M., & Sauder, M. (2013). Logics in action: Managing institutional complexity in a drug court. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 58(2), 165–196. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0001839213486447>
- McPherson, J. M., Smith-Lovin, L., & Cook, J. M. (2001). Birds of a feather: Homophily in social networks. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 27, 415–444. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.soc.27.1.415>
- Mead, G. H. (1934). In C. W. Morris (Ed.), *Mind, self, and society from the standpoint of a social behaviorist*. (Edited and with an Introduction by. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Meyer, J. W., Boli, J., Thomas, G. M., & Ramirez, F. O. (1997). World society and the nation-state. *American Journal of Sociology*, 103, 144–181. <https://doi.org/10.1086/231174>
- Meyer, J. W., & Rowan, B. (1977). Institutionalized organizations: Formal structure as myth and ceremony. *American Journal of Sociology*, 83, 340–363. <https://doi.org/10.1086/226550>
- Minkoff, D. C. (1999). Bending with the wind: Strategic change and adaptation by women's and racial minority organizations. *American Journal of Sociology*, 104, 1666–1703. <https://doi.org/10.1086/210220>
- Mizruchi, M. S. (1996). What do interlocks do? An analysis, critique, and assessment of research on interlocking directorates. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 22, 271–298. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.soc.22.1.271>
- Mizruchi, M. S. (2013). *The fracturing of the American corporate elite*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press. <https://doi.org/10.4159/harvard.9780674075368>
- Mizruchi, M. S., & Stearns, L. B. (1988). A longitudinal study of the formation of interlocking directorates. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 33, 194–210. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2393055>
- Mora, G. C. (2014). *Making Hispanics: How activists, bureaucrats, and media constructed a new American*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. <https://doi.org/10.7208/chicago/9780226033976.001.0001>
- Mun, E., & Jung, J. (2018). Change above the glass ceiling: Corporate social responsibility and gender diversity in Japanese firms. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 63, 409–440. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0001839217712920>
- Negro, G., Koçak, Ö., & Hsu, G. (2010). Research on categories in the sociology of organizations. *Research in the Sociology of Organizations*, 31, 3–35. [https://doi.org/10.1108/S0733-558X\(2010\)0000031003](https://doi.org/10.1108/S0733-558X(2010)0000031003)
- Olzak, S., & West, E. (1991). Ethnic conflict and the rise and fall of ethnic newspapers. *American Sociological Review*, 56, 458–474. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2096268>
- O'Reilly, C. A., Caldwell, D. F., & Barnett, W. P. (1989). Work group demography, social integration, and turnover. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 34, 21–37.
- O'Reilly, C. A., & Chatman, J. A. (1996). Culture as social control: Corporations, culture and commitment. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 18, 157–200.
- Pager, D. (2003). The mark of a criminal record. *American Journal of Sociology*, 108, 937–975. <https://doi.org/10.1086/374403>
- Park, R. E. (1936). Human ecology. *American Journal of Sociology*, 42, 3–49.
- Pedulla, D. S. (2014). The positive consequences of negative stereotypes: Race, sexual orientation, and the job application process. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 77, 75–94. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0190272513506229>
- Perry-Smith, J. E. (2006). Social yet creative: The role of social relationships in facilitating individual creativity. *Academy of Management Journal*, 49, 85–101. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amj.2006.20785503>

- Pettigrew, A. M. (1979). On studying organizational cultures. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 24, 570–581. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2392363>
- Pfeffer, J. (1981). *Power in organizations*. Cambridge, MA: Ballinger.
- Pfeffer, J. (1983). Organizational demography. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 5, 299–357.
- Pfeffer, J., & Salancik, G. R. (1978). *The external control of organizations: A resource dependence perspective*. New York: Harper and Row.
- Portes, A. (1998). Social capital: Its origins and applications in modern sociology. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 24, 1–24. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.soc.24.1.1>
- Reagans, R., & Zuckerman, E. W. (2001). Networks, diversity, and productivity: The social capital of corporate R&D teams. *Organization Science*, 12, 502–517. <https://doi.org/10.1287/orsc.12.4.502.10637>
- Reskin, B. F., McBrier, D. B., & Kmec, J. A. (1999). The determinants and consequences of workplace sex and race composition. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 25, 235–261.
- Ridgeway, C. (1991). The social construction of status value: Gender and other nominal characteristics. *Social Forces*, 70, 367–386. <https://doi.org/10.1093/sf/70.2.367>
- Ridgeway, C., Boyle, E., Kuipers, K., & Robinson, D. (1998). How do status beliefs develop? The role of resources and interaction. *American Sociological Review*, 63, 331–350. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2657553>
- Rivera, L. A. (2012). Hiring as cultural matching: The case of elite professional service firms. *American Sociological Review*, 77(6), 999–1022. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0003122412463213>
- Royster, D. (2003). *Race and the invisible hand: How White networks exclude Black men from blue-collar jobs*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Ryder, N. B. (1965). The cohort as a concept in the study of social change. *American Sociological Review*, 30, 843–861. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2090964>
- Salancik, G. R. (1995). WANTED: A good network theory of organizations. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 40, 345–349. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2393642>
- Schein, E. H. (1996). Culture: The missing concept in organization studies. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 41, 229–240. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2393715>
- Schein, E. H. (2010). *Organizational culture and leadership*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Schneiberg, M., & Clemens, E. S. (2006). The typical tools for the job: Research strategies in institutional analysis. *Sociological Theory*, 24, 195–227. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9558.2006.00288.x>
- Scott, W. R. (2008). *Institutions and organizations* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Scott, W. R., Ruef, M., Mendel, P. J., & Caronna, C. A. (2000). *Institutional change and healthcare organizations: From professional dominance to managed care*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Scully, M., & Creed, W. E. D. (1997). Stealth legitimacy: Employee activism and corporate response during the diffusion of domestic partner benefits. Paper presented at the academy of management meetings, Boston, MA.
- Shane, S., & Stuart, T. (2002). Organizational endowments and the performance of university startups. *Management Science*, 48, 154–170. <https://doi.org/10.1287/mnsc.48.1.154.14280>
- Sharkey, A. 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. <https://doi.org/10.1086/675385>
- Silva, F. (2018). The strength of whites' ties: How employers reward the referrals of black and white jobseekers. *Social Forces*, 97(2), 741–768. <https://doi.org/10.1093/sf/soy051>
- Simmel, G. (1955). *Conflict and the web of group-affiliations*. (Translated by Kurt H. Wolff and Reinhard Bendix.). New York: Free Press.
- Simon, H. A. (1947). *Administrative behavior: A study of decision-making processes in administrative organization* (3rd ed.). New York: Free Press.
- Smith, S. S. (2005). Don't put my name on it: Social capital activation and job-finding assistance among the black urban poor. *American Journal of Sociology*, 111, 1–57. <https://doi.org/10.1086/428814>
- Sørensen, J. B. (2002). The strength of corporate culture and the reliability of firm performance. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 47, 70–91. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3094891>
- Sørensen, J. B. (2004). The organizational demography of racial employment segregation. *American Journal of Sociology*, 110, 626–671. <https://doi.org/10.1086/426464>

- Soule, S. A. (1997). The student divestment movement in the United States and the Shantytown: Diffusion of a protest tactic. *Social Forces*, 75, 855–883. <https://doi.org/10.1093/sf/75.3.855>
- Stainback, K., Tomaskovic-Devey, D., & Skaggs, S. (2010). Organizational approaches to inequality: Inertia, relative power, and environments. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 36, 225–347. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-soc-070308-120014>
- Stinchcombe, A. L. (1965). Social structure and organizations. In J. March (Ed.), *Handbook of organizations* (pp. 142–193). Chicago: Rand-McNally.
- Stokman, F. N., van der Knoop, J., & Wasseur, F. W. (1988). Interlocks in the Netherlands: Stability and careers in the period 1960–1980. *Social Networks*, 10, 183–208. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0378-8733\(88\)90021-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/0378-8733(88)90021-4)
- Stovel, K., & Shaw, L. (2012). Brokerage. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 38, 139–158. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-soc-081309-150054>
- Strang, D., & Still, M. C. (2004). In search of the élite: Revising a model of adaptive emulation with evidence from benchmarking teams. *Industrial and Corporate Change*, 13, 309–333. <https://doi.org/10.1093/icc/dth013>
- Strang, D., & Tuma, N. B. (1993). Spatial and temporal heterogeneity in diffusion. *American Journal of Sociology*, 99, 614–639. <https://doi.org/10.1086/230318>
- Tajfel, H. (1982). Social psychology of intergroup relations. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 33, 1–39. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.ps.33.020182.000245>
- Tajfel, H., & Turner, J. C. (1979). An integrative theory of intergroup conflict. In W. C. Austin, & S. Worchel (Eds.), *The social psychology of intergroup relations* (pp. 33–47). Monterey, CA: Brooks/Cole.
- Tajfel, H., & Turner, J. C. (1986). The social identity theory of intergroup behavior. In S. Worchel, & W. C. Austin (Eds.), *Psychology of intergroup relations* (pp. 7–24). Chicago, IL: Nelson-Hall.
- Thompson, J. D. (1967). *Organizations in action*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Thornton, P. H., Ocasio, W., & Lounsbury, M. (2012). *The institutional logics perspective: A new approach to culture, structure and process*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199601936.001.0001>
- Tilcsik, A. (2011). Pride and prejudice: Employment discrimination against openly gay men in the United States. *American Journal of Sociology*, 117(2), 586–626. <https://doi.org/10.1086/661653>
- Tolbert, P. S., & Zucker, L. G. (1983). Institutional sources of change in the formal structure of organizations: The diffusion of civil service reform, 1880–1935. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 28, 22–39. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2392383>
- Tomaskovic-Devey, D. (1993). *Gender and racial inequality at work: The sources and consequences of job segregation*. Ithaca, NY: ILR Press.
- Tsui, A. S., Egan, T. D., & O'Reilly, C. A. III (1992). Being different: Relational demography and organizational attachment. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 37, 549–579. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2393472>
- Turco, C. J. (2010). Cultural foundations of tokenism: Evidence from the leveraged buyout industry. *American Sociological Review*, 75, 894–913. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0003122410388491>
- Useem, M. (1984). *The inner circle: Large corporations and the rise of business political activity in the U.S. and U.K.* New York: Oxford University Press.
- Uzzi, B. (1997). Social structure and competition in interfirm networks: The paradox of embeddedness. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 42, 35–67. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2393808>
- Uzzi, B., & Spiro, J. (2005). Collaboration and creativity: The small world problem. *American Journal of Sociology*, 111, 447–504. <https://doi.org/10.1086/432782>
- Van den Steen, E. (2010). Culture clash: The costs and benefits of homogeneity. *Management Science*, 56, 1718–1738. <https://doi.org/10.1287/mnsc.1100.1214>
- van Maanen, J., & Schein, E. H. (1979). Toward a theory of organizational socialization. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 1, 209–264.
- Weber, M. (1968). *Economy and society: An outline of interpretive sociology*. (Translated and edited by Guenther Roth and Claus Wittich.). Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Weick, K. E. (1976). Educational organizations as loosely coupled systems. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 21, 1–19. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2391875>
- Westphal, J. D., Gulati, R., & Shortell, S. M. (1997). Customization or conformity: An institutional and network perspective on the content and consequences of TQM adoption. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 42, 366–394. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2393924>

- Williams, C. L. (1989). *Gender differences at work: Women and men in nontraditional occupations*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Williams, C. L. (1995). *Still a Man's world: Men who do Women's work*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Williams, K. Y., & O'Reilly, C. A. (1998). Demography and diversity in organizations: A review of 40 years of research. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 20, 77–140.
- Wilmers, N. (2018). Wage stagnation and buyer power: How buyer-supplier relations affect US workers' wages, 1978 to 2014. *American Sociological Review*, 83, 213–242. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0003122418762441>
- Wolf, W. C., & Fligstein, N. D. (1979). Sex and authority in the workplace: The causes of sexual inequality. *American Sociological Review*, 44, 235–252. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2094507>
- Xiao, Z., & Tsui, A. S. (2007). When brokers may not work: The cultural contingency of social capital in Chinese high-tech firms. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 52, 1–31. <https://doi.org/10.2189/asqu.52.1.1>
- Yakubovich, V. (2005). Weak ties, information, and influence: How workers find jobs in a local Russian labor market. *American Sociological Review*, 70, 408–421. <https://doi.org/10.1177/000312240507000303>
- Yue, L. Q. (2016). The great and the small: The impact of collective action on the evolution of board interlocks after the Panic of 1907. *American Sociological Review*, 81(2), 374–395. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0003122416631989>
- Zeitlin, M. (1974). Corporate ownership and control: The large corporation and the capitalist class. *American Journal of Sociology*, 79, 1073–1119. <https://doi.org/10.1086/225672>
- Zenger, T. R., & Lawrence, B. S. (1989). Organizational demography: The differential effects of age and tenure distributions on technical communication. *Academy of Management Journal*, 32, 353–376.
- Zucker, L. G. (1983). Organizations as institutions. *Research in the Sociology of Organizations*, 2, 1–47.
- Zuckerman, E. W. (1999). The categorical imperative: Securities analysts and the legitimacy discount. *American Journal of Sociology*, 104(5), 1398–1438. <https://doi.org/10.1086/210178>

AUTHOR BIOGRAPHIES

Heather A. Haveman is Professor of Sociology and Business at the University of California, Berkeley. She received a BA and MBA from the University of Toronto and a PhD from UC Berkeley. Before coming to Berkeley in 2006, she taught at Duke (1990–1994), Cornell (1994–1999), and Columbia (1998–2007). She studies how organizations, industries, and employees' careers evolve and the impact of organizations on their employees and society at large. Her work combines insights from institutionalism, organizational demography, social movements, economic geography, microeconomics, and social history. It has appeared in many journals, including the *Academy of 1741–1860*, was published by Princeton University Press in 2015.

Rachel Wetts is a PhD candidate in sociology at the University of California, Berkeley. Her research interests include social psychology, American political culture, and organizational sociology. Ongoing projects use experimental methods and computational text analysis to investigate how perceptions of racial status threat shape white Americans' political attitudes, and how cultural and organizational processes affect which conceptions of climate change become dominant in mainstream media. Some of her research is forthcoming in *Social Forces* and *Sociology Compass*.

How to cite this article: Haveman HA, Wetts R. Contemporary organizational theory: The demographic, relational, and cultural perspectives. *Sociology Compass*. 2019;13:e12664. <https://doi.org/10.1111/soc4.12664>