

Course Number: 26:620:556

Fall, 2018

1 WP 402

Wednesday 9-11:50

Professor Jerry W. Kim

1 WP Room 1012

973-353-1647

jerry.kim@business.rutgers.edu

Office Hours by appointment

COURSE DESCRIPTION

This Ph.D. seminar is intended to introduce students to the foundational questions and perspectives in research on organizational theory. We will examine organizational research from multiple disciplinary viewpoints (e.g., sociology, economics, political science, etc.), and cover canonical pieces to more contemporary research. Students will be exposed to a set of methodologically diverse approaches, which they will be asked to interrogate and compare. The course will be organized as a doctoral seminar. Our primary activities will include critical discussion of assigned articles and how these relate to our own nascent and ongoing research activities.

COURSE MATERIALS

1. Scott, W.R. & Davis, G.F. 2006. *Organizations & Organizing: Rational, Natural and Open Systems*, 1st Edition. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Prentice Hall.
2. Articles and book selections that I will provide you, or that are readily available to you online. Please check Blackboard (blackboard.rutgers.edu) and your official Rutgers email account regularly.

PLEASE NOTE: I will adjust the required readings and topics from time to time during the term. Other than the one required book, which we will use for sure, please consider the rest of the reading assignments as “draft.”

LEARNING GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

This seminar is targeted to participants who are pursuing research-based academic careers. The primary objective is to survey some of the major theoretical perspectives and issues studied in organization theory research, including both classic and contemporary scholarship and both theoretical and empirical contributions.

One goal is to provide you with the opportunity to gain a solid background in the field, such that it will inform and enrich their own research, whether or not you become an organization theorist.

A second goal is to support you in drafting a paper that incorporates one or more of the topics covered in class with your own research interests and to help you learn in a hands-on manner about review and revision processes.

PREREQUISITES

PhD student in Rutgers Business School or permission of instructor (for PhD students from other disciplines).

ACADEMIC INTEGRITY

Students are responsible for understanding the RU Academic Integrity Policy (http://academicintegrity.rutgers.edu/files/documents/AI_Policy_2013.pdf). I will strongly enforce this Policy and pursue all violations. By remaining in this course, you are agreeing to adhere to the RU Honor Policy: "On my honor, I have neither received nor given any unauthorized assistance on this examination or assignment." Plagiarism is a serious violation of academic integrity. See business.rutgers.edu/ai for more details.

ACCOMMODATIONS AND SUPPORT SERVICES

Rutgers University welcomes students with disabilities into all of the University's educational programs. In order to receive consideration for reasonable accommodations, a student with a disability must contact the appropriate disability services office at the campus where you are officially enrolled, participate in an intake interview, and provide documentation: <https://ods.rutgers.edu/students/documentation-guidelines>. If the documentation supports your request for reasonable accommodations, your campus's disability services office will provide you with a Letter of Accommodations. Please share this letter with your instructors and discuss the accommodations with them as early in your courses as possible. To begin this process, please complete the Registration form on the ODS web site at: <https://ods.rutgers.edu/students/registration-form>. For more information please contact Kate Torres at (973)353-5375 or in the Office of Disability Services in the Paul Robeson Campus Center, in suite 219 or by contacting odsnewark@rutgers.edu.

If you are a military veteran or are on active military duty, you can obtain support through the Office of Veteran and Military Programs and Services: <http://veterans.rutgers.edu/>

If you are in need of mental health services, please use our readily available services:
Rutgers University-Newark Counseling Center: <http://counseling.newark.rutgers.edu/>

If you are in need of physical health services, please use our readily available services:
[Rutgers Health Services – Newark: <http://health.newark.rutgers.edu/>

If you are in need of legal services, please use our readily available services: <http://rusls.rutgers.edu/>

GRADING

Grading will be based primarily on student performance in class participation (50%), final paper (40%), and peer review (10%).

- **Class Participation (50% of grade):** Each participant is required to come prepared to class. Since class discussion is an integral part of the course, absences and lack of preparedness are unacceptable. Preparation will always involve reading and working with all the weekly assignments.

In addition to being prepared to engage in discussion every class, you will also be asked to prepare as discussion initiators for two sessions of the seminar. I will lead the discussions in the first two seminar sessions while everyone else is getting settled; the session assignments will be made during the first class (September 5).

- Final Paper and Response Letter (40% of grade):** An important part of this course will be your socialization into the journal review process. Therefore, about two-thirds of the way through the semester, your (first draft of a) research paper for this class will be submitted for (not really) double-blind peer review, and you will serve as a reviewer for a classmate's paper. Participants will write a research paper that relates one or more of the topics covered in class to their own research interests. I am flexible as to the format of the paper, because I want it to meet your needs. But it has to be about Organization Theory in some non-trivial way. One option is the "front end" of a research paper that defines a research question, reviews and critiques the extant literature, develops a few testable hypotheses, and proposes a method for testing the proposed hypotheses. If you have data and want to do a full paper with analysis and results that's okay, but you are still subject to the page limit. A pure theory paper is also acceptable, as is the development of a dissertation proposal. The body of the manuscript (excluding title page, references, figures, etc.) should not exceed 25 PAGES, double spaced with one inch margins and 12 point times new roman font. Each paper will undergo a "journal review process." Your final grade will reflect your original and revised paper (incorporating your response to the reviewer's comments) and your written responses to the reviewer explaining how you responded to each comment, including why you may have elected not to adopt a particular suggestion.
- Review (10% of grade):** You are responsible for providing a quality review of a manuscript submitted to the blind review process. Please keep your review to two, single-spaced pages.

COURSE SCHEDULE

Session	Date	Topic	Deliverables
1	9/5	Introduction and overview	
2	9/12	Bureaucracy and other classical theories	
3	9/19	Carnegie School and organizational learning	
4	9/26	Contingency theory and organizational design	
5	10/3	Resource dependence and power	
6	10/10	Institutional theory I	
7	10/17	Organizational ecology	
8	10/24	Networks and social capital	
9	10/31	Organizational economics	
10	11/7	Institutional theory II	First draft of paper
11	11/14	Culture	Review
	11/21	Thanksgiving (no class)	
12	11/28	Status and reputation	
13	12/5	Social movements	
14	12/12	Professions and work	Final paper

READING LIST

For students who have a particular interest in any topic, I am happy to provide further reading recommendations.

Session 1 Introduction and Overview of Organization Theory

1. Scott. & Davis Chapter 1
2. Pfeffer, J. 1993. Barriers to the advance of organizational science: Paradigm development as a dependent variable. Academy of Management Review, 18: 599-620.
3. Barley, S. 2016. 60th Anniversary Essay: Ruminations on how we became a mystery house and how we might get out. Administrative Science Quarterly, 61(1) 1-8.
4. Lounsbury, M., & Beckman, C. M. 2015. Celebrating organization theory. Journal of Management Studies, 52(2): 288-308.

Further Reading

- Suddaby, R., Hardy, C. & Huy, Q.N. 2011. Where are the new theories of organization? Academy of Management Review, 36(2): 236-246.
- Davis, G. F., & Marquis, C. 2005. Prospects for organization theory in the early twenty-first century: Institutional fields and mechanisms. Organization Science, 16(4), 332-343.
- Pfeffer, J. 1997. New directions for organization theory: Problems and prospects. Oxford University Press. Chapters 1 and 9.
- Hambrick, D. C. 2007. The field of management's devotion to theory: Too much of a good thing?. Academy of Management Journal, 50(6), 1346-1352.

Session 2 Bureaucracy and Other Classical Theories

1. Scott & Davis Chapter 2, 3
2. Weber, M.1978. Economy and Society, pp.212-223 (legal authority); 226-231 (traditional authority); 241-249 (charismatic authority); 956-963 (bureaucracy) (Other than section on bureaucracy, read quickly).
3. Taylor, F.W. 1916. Principles of Scientific Management, 30-49; 58-97; 118-144 (Note: Read quickly; do not get mired down in details; the idea is to familiarize yourself with Taylor's main approach and arguments)
4. Roethlisberger, F.J. & Dickson, W.J. 1939. Management and the Worker. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press. Selections from Chapters 1, 17, pp. 21-25
5. Barnard, C.I. 1938. The Functions of the Executive. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press. pp. 82-123, 139-184.

Further Reading

- Edwards, R. 1979. Contested Terrain. Chapters 1-6
- Perrow,, C. 1986. Complex Organizations: A critical essay. New York: Random House. Chapter 3.
- Blau, P. 1972. Interdependence and Hierarchy in Organizations. Social Science Research 1: 1-24

Session 3 Carnegie School and Organizational Learning

1. March, J.G., & Simon, H.A. 1958. Organizations, Chapter 6
2. Cyert, R.M., & March, J.G. 1963. Chapter 7: A summary of basic concepts. From: A behavioral theory of the firm.
3. Levitt, B. & March, J. G. 1988. Organizational Learning. Annual Review of Sociology, 14:319-340.
4. Greve, H. 1998. Performance, Aspirations, and Risky Organizational Change. Administrative Science Quarterly, Vol. 43 (1): 58-86.
5. Eggers, J. & Kaplan, S. 2009. Cognition and Renewal: Comparing CEO and Organizational Effects on Incumbent Adaptation to Technical Change. Organization Science 20 (2):461–477.

Further Reading

- Levinthal, D. A. 1997. Adaptation on rugged landscapes. Management science, 43(7), 934-950
- Gavetti, G. 2005. Cognition and Hierarchy: Rethinking the Microfoundations of Capabilities' Development. Organization Science 16 (6):599–617.
- Cohen, M.D., March, J.G. & Olsen, J.P. 1972. A garbage can model of organizational choice". Administrative Science Quarterly, 17: 1-25.

Session 4 Contingency Theory and Organizational Design

1. Thompson, J.D. 1967. Organizations in Action. 1-65.
2. Lawrence, P and Lorsch, J. 1969. Organization and Environment: Managing Differentiation and Integration. Intro, Ch. 1 and Ch. 6.
3. Schoonhoven, C.B. 1981. Problems with contingency theory: Testing assumptions hidden within the language of contingency theory. Administrative Science Quarterly, 349-377.
4. Tushman, M. L., & Nadler, D. A. 1978. Information processing as an integrating concept in organizational design. Academy of Management Review, 3(3), 613-624.
5. Kretschmer, T., & Puranam, P. (2008). Integration through incentives within differentiated organizations. Organization Science, 19(6), 860-875.

Further Reading

- Burns, T. & G.M. Stalker. 1961. The Management of Innovation. Tavistock Publications. Chapter 1
- Chandler, A.D. 1962. Strategy and Structure: Chapters in the History of the Industrial Enterprise. Chapter 1.
- Donaldson, L. 1987. Strategy and Structural Adjustment to Regain Fit: In Defense of Contingency Theory. Journal of Management Studies, (24:1-24)
- Sine, W.D., Mitsuhashi, H. & Kirsch, D.A. 2006. Revisiting Burns and Stalker: Formal structure and new venture performance in emerging economic sectors. Academy of Management Journal, 49: 121-132.

Session 5 Resource Dependence Theory and Power

1. Emerson, R.M. 1962. "Power-dependence relations." American Sociological Review, 27: 31-41.
2. Pfeffer, J., & Salancik, G.R. 1978. The external control of organizations. New York: Harper & Row. Chapters 1 & 3
3. Casciaro, T. & Piskorski, M.J. 2005. "Power imbalance, mutual dependence and constraint absorption: A closer look at resource dependence theory." Administrative Science Quarterly, 50: 167-199.

4. Santos, F.M., Eisenhardt, K.M. 2009. Constructing markets and shaping boundaries: entrepreneurial agency in nascent fields. Academy of Management Journal, 52: 643-671.
5. Wry, T., Cobb, J.A. & Aldrich, H.E. 2013. More than a metaphor: Assessing the historical legacy of resource dependence and its contemporary promise as a theory of environmental complexity. The Academy of Management Annals, 7: 439-486.

Further Reading

- M. Gargiulo. 1993. Two-step leverage: Managing constraint in organizational politics. Administrative Science Quarterly. 38 (1): 1-19.
- Chandler, A.D. 1977. The Visible Hand. Ch. 14 and Conclusion.
- Davis, G. and H. Greve. 1997. "Corporate Elite Networks and Governance Changes in the 1980s." American Journal of Sociology 103 (1): 1-37.

Session 6 Institutional theory I

1. Selznick, P. 1957. Leadership in Administration. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press. - Chapters 1 and 5
2. Stinchcombe, A. 1965. "Social Structure and Organizations" in James G. March (ed.) Handbook of Organizations. Chicago, IL: Rand McNally. 142-193.
3. Meyer and Rowan, 1977. "Institutionalized organizations: Formal structure as myth and ceremony" AJS 83: 340-63
4. DiMaggio, P.J. and W.W. Powell. 1983. The iron cage revisited: Institutional isomorphism and collective rationality in organizational fields. American Sociological Review, 48(2), 147-160.

Further Reading

- Scott, R. 2001. Institutions and Organizations. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications. Chapters 3-5.
- Zucker, Lynne G. 1977. "The Role of Institutionalization in Cultural Persistence." American Sociological Review 42: 726-743
- Selznick, P. 1996. "Institutionalism" old" and" new". Administrative Science Quarterly, 270-277.
- DiMaggio, P.J. and W.W. Powell. 1991. The New Institutionalism in Organizational Analysis. Chicago University Press.
- Fligstein, N. 1985. "The spread of the multidivisional form among large firms, 1919-1979" American Sociological Review 50 (3): 377-391.

Session 7 Organizational Ecology

1. Hannan, M.T., & Freeman, J. 1977. The population ecology of organizations. American Journal of Sociology, 82: 929-964.
2. Hannan, M.T., & Freeman, J. 1984. Structural inertia and organizational change. American Sociological Review, 49: 149-164.
3. Carroll, G. and Swaminathan, A. 2000. "Why the Microbrewery Movement? Organizational Dynamics of Resource Partitioning in the US Brewing Industry." American Journal of Sociology, 106:715-762.
4. Young, R. 1988. "Is population ecology a useful paradigm for the study of organizations?" American Journal of Sociology 94: 1-24; Freeman, J., & Hannan, M.T. 1989. Setting the record straight on organizational ecology: Rebuttal to Young. American Journal of Sociology, 95: 425-439

5. Hsu, G., & Hannan, M. T. 2005. Identities, genres, and organizational forms. Organization Science, 16(5): 474-490.

Further Reading

- Baum, J.A.C. & J. V. Singh. 1994. Organizational niches and the dynamics of organizational mortality. American Journal of Sociology 100(2): 346-380.
- Podolny, J., T. E. Stuart, & M.T. Hannan. 1996. Networks, Knowledge, and Niches: Competition in the worldwide semiconductor industry, 1984-1991. American Journal of Sociology 102 (3) 659-689.
- Sørensen, J. B., and T.E. Stuart. 2000. Aging, Obsolescence, and Organizational Innovation. Administrative Science Quarterly 45 (1): 81-112.
- Dobrev, SD, TY Kim, and MT Hannan. 2000. Dynamics of Niche Width and Resource Partitioning. American Journal of Sociology, 106(5): 1299-1337

Session 8 Networks and Social Capital

1. Granovetter, M.S. 1985. Economic action and social structure: The problem of embeddedness. American Journal of Sociology 91: 481-510.
2. Burt, R.S. 1992. The Social Structure of Competition. Chapter 2.
3. Uzzi, B. 1997. Social structure and competition in interfirm networks: The paradox of embeddedness, Administrative Science Quarterly: 35-67.
4. Adler, P.S., & Kwon, S. 2002. Social capital: Prospects for a new concept. Academy of Management Review, 27: 17-40.
5. Aral, S., & Walker, D. (2014). Tie strength, embeddedness, and social influence: A large-scale networked experiment. Management Science, 60(6), 1352-1370.

Further Reading

- Granovetter, M.S. 1978. The strength of weak ties. American Journal of Sociology, 78 (6): 1360-1380.
- Podolny, J. 2001. Networks as the Pipes and Prisms of the Market. American Journal of Sociology 107 (1): 33-60.
- Powell, W.W. 1990. Neither market nor hierarchy: Network forms of organization. Research in Organizational Behavior, 12, 295-336..
- Watts, D.J. & S. Strogatz. 1999. Collective dynamics of small world networks. Nature 393(6684), 440
- Padgett, J.F. and P. MacLean. 2006. Organizational Invention and Elite Transformation: The Birth of Partnership Systems in Renaissance Florence. American Journal of Sociology, 111(5), 1463-1568.
- Fleming, L., S. Mingo, & D. Chen. 2007. Collaborative Brokerage, Generative Creativity, and Creative Success. Administrative Science Quarterly, 52(3), 443-475.

Session 9 Organizational Economics

1. Coase, R.H. 1937. The nature of the firm. Economica. 4(16): 386-405.
2. Williamson, O. 1981. The Economics of Organization: The Transaction Cost Approach. American Journal of Sociology, 87: 548-577
3. Jensen, M. & Meckling, W.H. 1976. Theory of the firm: managerial behavior, agency costs, and ownership structure. Journal of Financial Economics 3: 305-360.

4. David, R.J. & Han, S.K. 2004. A systematic assessment of the empirical support for transaction cost economics. Strategic Management Journal, 25: 39-58.
5. Rawley, E. 2010. Diversification, coordination costs, and organizational rigidity: Evidence from microdata. Strategic Management Journal, 31(8), 873-891

Further Reading

- Pisano, G.P. 1990. The R&D boundaries of the firm: An empirical analysis. Administrative Science Quarterly, 35: 153-176.
- Hart, Oliver. 1995. Firms, Contracts, and Financial Structure (especially chapters 1-3). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Holmström, Bengt, and John Roberts. 1998. The boundaries of the firm revisited. Journal of Economic Perspectives, 12: 73-94.
- Kapoor, R. & R. Adner. 2012. What firms make vs. what they know: how firms' production and knowledge boundaries affect competitive advantage in the face of technological change. Organization Science 23 (5): 1227-1248.

Session 10 Institutional Theory II

1. Zuckerman, E. 1999. The categorical imperative: Securities analysts and the legitimacy discount. American Journal of Sociology, 104(5), 1398-1438.
2. Thornton, P.H. & Ocasio, W. 2008, Institutional logics. The Sage handbook of organizational institutionalism.
3. Greenwood, R. & Suddaby, R. 2006. Institutional Entrepreneurship in Mature Fields: The Big Five Accounting Firms. Academy of Management Journal 49 (1):27–48.
4. Battilana, J., & Dorado, S. 2010. Building sustainable hybrid organizations: The case of commercial microfinance organizations. Academy of Management Journal, 53(6): 1419-1440.
5. Hallett, T. 2010. The myth incarnate: Recoupling processes, turmoil, and inhabited institutions in an urban elementary school. American Sociological Review, 75(1), 52-74.

Further Reading

- DiMaggio, P. 1988. Interest and agency in institutional theory. Pp 3-21 in L.G. Zucker (ed) Institutional Patterns and Organizations: Culture and Environment. Cambridge, MA: Ballinger
- Lounsbury, M. 2007. A Tale of Two Cities: Competing Logics and Practice Variation in the Professionalizing of Mutual Funds. Academy of Management Journal 50 (2):289– 307.

Session 11 Culture

1. DiMaggio, P. 1997. Culture and cognition. Annual Review of Sociology, 23(1), 263-287.
2. Sørensen, J. B. 2002. The strength of corporate culture and the reliability of firm performance. Administrative Science Quarterly 47(1), 70-91.
3. Rivera, L. A. 2012. Hiring as cultural matching: The case of elite professional service firms. American Sociological Review, 77(6), 999-1022.
4. Goldberg, A., Srivastava, S. B., Manian, V. G., Monroe, W., & Potts, C. 2016. Fitting in or standing out? The tradeoffs of structural and cultural embeddedness. American Sociological Review, 81(6), 1190-1222.
5. Giorgi, S., Lockwood, C., & Glynn, M. A. 2015. The many faces of culture: Making sense of 30 years of research on culture in organization studies. Academy of Management Annals, 9(1), 1-54.

Further Reading

- Kunda, G. 1992. Engineering Culture: Control and Commitment in a High-Tech Corporation. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Lizardo, O. 2006. How Cultural Tastes Shape Personal Networks. American Sociological Review. 71: 778-807.
- Srivastava, S.B. & Banaji, M.R. . 2011. "Culture, Cognition, and Collaborative Networks in Organizations." American Sociological Review. 76: 207-233.

Session 12 Status and Reputation

1. Podolny, J. M. 1993. A status-based model of market competition. American Journal of Sociology, 98(4), 829-872.
2. Phillips, D. J., & Zuckerman, E. W. 2001. Middle-status conformity: Theoretical restatement and empirical demonstration in two markets. American Journal of Sociology, 107(2), 379-429.
3. Rindova, V. P., Williamson, I. O., Petkova, A. P., & Sever, J. M. (2005). Being good or being known: An empirical examination of the dimensions, antecedents, and consequences of organizational reputation. Academy of Management Journal, 48(6), 1033-1049.
4. Kovács, B., & Sharkey, A. J. 2014. The paradox of publicity: How awards can negatively affect the evaluation of quality. Administrative Science Quarterly, 59(1), 1-33.
5. Kim, J. W., & King, B. G. 2014. Seeing stars: Matthew effects and status bias in major league baseball umpiring. Management Science, 60(11), 2619-2644.

Further Reading

- Sauder, M., Lynn, F., & Podolny, J. M. 2012. Status: Insights from organizational sociology. Annual Review of Sociology, 38, 267-283.
- Gould, R. V. 2002. The origins of status hierarchies: A formal theory and empirical test. American Journal of Sociology, 107(5), 1143-1178.
- Pfarrer, M. D., Pollock, T. G., & Rindova, V. P. 2010. A tale of two assets: The effects of firm reputation and celebrity on earnings surprises and investors' reactions. Academy of Management Journal, 53(5), 1131-1152.
- Graffin, S. D., Bundy, J., Porac, J. F., Wade, J. B., & Quinn, D. P. 2013. Falls from grace and the hazards of high status: The 2009 British MP expense scandal and its impact on parliamentary elites. Administrative Science Quarterly, 58(3), 313-345.

Session 13 Social Movements

1. McAdam, D., & Scott, W. R. 2005. Organizations and movements. In Davis, G. F., McAdam, D., Scott, W. R., & Zald, M. N. (Eds.). Social Movements and Organization Theory. Cambridge University Press.
2. King, B. G., & Soule, S. A. 2007. Social movements as extra-institutional entrepreneurs: The effect of protests on stock price returns. Administrative Science Quarterly, 52(3), 413-442.
3. McDonnell, M. H., & King, B. 2013. Keeping up appearances: Reputational threat and impression management after social movement boycotts. Administrative Science Quarterly, 58(3), 387-419.
4. Ingram, P., Yue, L. Q., & Rao, H. 2010. Trouble in store: Probes, protests, and store openings by Wal-Mart, 1998–2007. American Journal of Sociology, 116(1), 53-92.

5. Wang, D. J., & Soule, S. A. 2012. Social movement organizational collaboration: Networks of learning and the diffusion of protest tactics, 1960–1995. American Journal of Sociology, 117(6), 1674-1722.

Further Reading

- Zald, M.N & Berger, M.A. 1978. Social movements in organizations - Coup detat, insurgency and mass movements. American Journal of Sociology, 83(4): 823-861.
- Rao, H., Monin, P., & Durand, R. 2003. Institutional change in Toque Ville: Nouvelle cuisine as an identity movement in French gastronomy. American Journal of Sociology, 108(4): 795-843.
- Weber, K., Rao, H., & Thomas, L. G. 2009. From streets to suites: How the anti-biotech movement affected German pharmaceutical firms. American Sociological Review, 74(1), 106-127.
- Haveman, H. A., Rao, H., & Paruchuri, S. 2007. The winds of change: The progressive movement and the bureaucratization of thrift. American Sociological Review, 72(1), 117-142.
- Sine, W. D., & Lee, B. H. 2009. Tilting at windmills? The environmental movement and the emergence of the US wind energy sector. Administrative Science Quarterly, 54(1), 123-155.
- King, B. G., & Pearce, N. A. 2010. The contentiousness of markets: Politics, social movements, and institutional change in markets. Annual Review of Sociology, 36, 249-267.

Session 14 Professions and Work

1. Abbott, Andrew. 1988. The System of Professions: An Essay on the Division of Expert Labor. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. Chapter 1 & 2.
2. Bechky, B. A. 2003. Object lessons: Workplace artifacts as representations of occupational jurisdiction. American Journal of Sociology, 109(3), 720-752.
3. Pager, D., & Quillian, L. 2005. Walking the talk? What employers say versus what they do. American Sociological Review, 70(3), 355-380.
4. Ramarajan, L., & Reid, E. 2013. Shattering the myth of separate worlds: Negotiating nonwork identities at work. Academy of Management Review, 38(4), 621-644.
5. Chan, C. K., & Anteby, M. 2016. Task segregation as a mechanism for within-job inequality: Women and men of the Transportation Security Administration. Administrative Science Quarterly, 61(2), 184-216.

Further Reading

- Baron, J. N. & W.T. Bielby. 1980. Bringing the firms back in: Stratification, segmentation, and the organization of work. American Sociological Review, 45: 737- 765
- Kalleberg, A. L., B. F. Reskin, & K. Hudson. 2000. Bad jobs in America: Standard and non-standard employment relations and job quality in the United States. American Sociological Review, 65: 256-278
- Freidson, E. 1970. Profession of Medicine: A Study of the Sociology of Applied Knowledge. Chicago: University of Chicago Press
- Kanter, R. M. 1977. Men and Women of the Corporation. New York: Basic Books.