Organization

Raimund Hasse

Abstract: German-language organizational sociology is diverse and closely related to international debates. Nonetheless, it has specific features. This article provides an overview over current contributions by identifying five main research areas: (1) formal structures, boundary work, and effects of best-management practices; (2) influences of the technological and institutional environment; (3) theoretical issues and organizational types; (4) new forms of organizing work; and (5) technology and innovation. It subsequently discusses important publications on each of these research areas and illustrates typical research approaches. Finally, it highlights two assets of German-language organizational sociology: first, its ambitious theoretical aspirations, as expressed in particular its combination of organizational and social theories; and second, its thematic interest in (new) technologies as well as in issues related to economic sociology.

Keywords: Organizations, formal structure, standards, organizational types, professionalization

Introduction

The subject of this article is developments in German-language organizational sociology over the last ten years. Its strict focus on organizational *sociology* comes with a rather severe limitation, as it excludes not only publications that are not scientific in the narrower sense—which in light of the proliferation of how-to books and best practices on organizational and management topics is indeed rather restrictive—but also organizational studies from the field of management and business studies. Although some contributions from this field are prescriptive in nature, stating how organizations *should* function and be designed (rather than examining how organizations *actually do* function and *are* designed), many of them do satisfy the quality standards of social-scientific research and feature careful theoretical work, sophisticated methods, and robust empirical results.

But what is organizational sociology? Drawing on insights from science theory, one could argue that organizational sociology is what is produced by those who are recognized as organizational sociologists. If we start from just such a perspective, a good way to begin this overview might be to identify current topics by looking at the events of the organizational sociology section of the German Sociological Association (Deutsche Gesellschaft für Soziologie (DGS)). Between 2011 and its 2018 spring conference, this section held nearly 20 events. Their agendas and calls for papers are

Note: Translation from German by Cathleen Porter for *SocioTrans—Social Science Translation & Editing*.

easily accessible on the section's website or by consulting the DGS conference schedules. The topics of these conferences can be clustered as follows: (1) formal structures, boundary work, and effects of best-management practices; (2) impacts of technological and institutional environments; (3) theoretical issues and organizational types; (4) new forms of organizing work; and (5) technology and innovation.¹ In what follows, I will discuss these topics by mainly focusing on journal articles and monographs—and only marginally on textbooks and anthologies—that have made a contribution to these topics.

1 Formal Structures, Boundary Work, and Effects of Best-Management Practices

This cluster spans a very broad spectrum of contributions that all deal with individual organizations rather than organizational groups (such as fields, populations, or networks). One focus is on formal structures, which are a constitutive feature of all organizations. The fact that organizations cannot be reduced to formal structures, opens up opportunities to relate formal structures to core activities (in the sense of Meyer and Rowan, 1977), to facades and showcasing (“talk” in the sense of Brunsson, 1989), and to informality by and within organizations, as discussed by Victoria von Groddeck and Sylvia Wilz (2015). The focus on individual organizations also includes thematizing organizations’ dealing with uncertainty and corresponding absorptive capacities (Apelt and Senge, 2015; Pongratz et al., 2014) as well as the question of how organi-

¹ The events were as follows for each cluster respectively: (1) *Organisationen im Chaos? (Organizations in Chaos?)* 2011; *Formalität und Informalität in Organisationen (Formality and Informality in Organizations)* 2012; *Grenzen der Organisation (Limits of Organization)* 2014; (2) *Einheit trotz Vielfalt? Identität und Kulturimporte in Organisationen (Unity Despite Diversity? Identity and Cultural Imports in Organizations)* 2012; *Auf dem Weg zur Standardorganisation? (On a Path towards a Standard Organization?)* 2014; *Organisation und Bewertung (Organization and Assessment)* 2018; (3) *Hochschule als Organisation (Institutions of Higher Education as Organizations)* 2011; *Quo vadis Organisationssoziologie? (Where is Organizational Sociology Headed?)* 2013; *Soziologie der Finanzmärkte (The Sociology of Financial Markets)* 2013; *Nonprofitorganisationen (Non-Profit Organizations)* 2015; *Praxistheorie in der Organisationssoziologie (Practice Theory in Organizational Sociology)* 2016; *Perspektiven des Neo-Institutionalismus (Perspectives of Neo-Institutionalism)* 2017; (4) *Vielfalt grenzüberschreitender Arbeitszusammenhänge (Diversity of Cross-Border Contexts of Work)* 2012; *Neue Bindung oder prekarisierende Kommodifizierung? (New Bond or Commodification toward Precarity?)* 2012; *Kreativ aus der Krise – Neue Formen des Organisierens (Creative Ways of Overcoming Crisis – New Forms of Organizing)* 2014; *Arbeit und Organisation 4.0? (Work and Organization 4.0?)* 2016; (5) *Innovationen ohne Ende? Organisationen in der Innovationsgesellschaft (Endless Innovation? Organizations in the Innovation Society)* 2015; *Wissen und Organisation im Spannungsfeld von Öffentlichkeit, Steuerung und Digitalisierung (Knowledge and Organization in a Field of Tension between the Public Sphere, Control, and Digitization)* 2016; *Digitalisierung und Reorganisation (Digitization and Reorganization)* 2017.

zations succeed in developing and maintaining an identity vis-à-vis their social environment (Herkle, 2011; Kirchner, 2012; Achermann, 2016).

A more specific question is how the application of best-management practices impacts the formal structure of organizations in light of the fact that it is not always clear whether these concepts are applied more for the aforementioned purpose of showcasing than as an attempt to structure internal processes. One may assume that the focus of best-management practices makes a difference here. In the case of socially desirable concerns, as in diversity management or compliance management, management concepts can have a comparatively strong external point of reference, as their application primarily serves the purpose of signaling conformity with social values or compliance with legal requirements. However, in cases of more technical and formalized procedures, such as the management of shareholder value or accounting in general, their application might mainly serve internal objectives of organizing work processes. But this is an open empirical question.

The study by Stephanie Bücherl (2014) is noteworthy in this context since it is interested in *controlling* as a form of organizational monitoring and design. Bücherl's case study begins by distinguishing between controlling as a rationalist paradigm in business administration and controlling as a sociological research object that has attracted attention since the end of the 1970s, both in empirical research and in critical reflections. Her empirical analysis distinguishes between functions, consequences, and the handling of these consequences—both purported and factual—as the three knowledge objectives of the study. Whereas her analysis of the discrepancy between purported and factual functions essentially derives from a neo-institutionalist pattern of interpretation, her treatment of the consequences draws on classical topics of organizational sociology such as dealing with uncertainty, information overload, micro-political maneuvers, and management's self-perception. When discussing how consequences are handled, Bücherl describes the ways in which controlling is amended and adapted to organizational reality. In sum, her study can serve as an example of how a concept that holds sway in business administration and management can become an object of a genuinely sociological investigation. Bücherl's study also clearly brings to the fore the specific characteristics and strengths of German-language organizational sociology: a rigorous scientific focus (as opposed to a solution-oriented perspective or the opposing perspective of so-called critical management studies) and an ambitious utilization of organizational theories. As result of such an approach, she adds scientific value beyond the specifics of the case analyzed.

2 Technological and Institutional Environments

This cluster considers studies on an organization's capacity for responsiveness to external conditions on the one hand, which in essence explains how an organization adapts to its technological or institutional environment and, particularly, to other organizations in a given field. On the other hand, it also deals with the specific con-

ditions of individual organizations that result from their active search for niches, which can be best explained along ecological lines of thinking. Such investigations often shed light on social developments that have increased the readiness to accept (comparative) assessments, conducted by external entities, in the form of evaluations, ratings, and rankings (Meier et al., 2016). Likewise, organizations are increasingly seeking external consultation, which has been the subject of numerous studies. Conceptually, two novelties characterize these investigations. First, they engage less in fundamental theoretical reflection on the functions and consequences of external consultation and focus more on empirical analyses of the consulting process itself. Second, these analyses have as their subject not necessarily business consultancy, a field that has been prospering since the 1990s, but consultancy services for organizations other than businesses, not least universities, for instance (Krücken and Serrano-Velarde, 2016; Seidenschnur et al., 2018).

In the context of a sociology that is generally reviving its interest in social values (and, to some degree, in positioning itself accordingly), the discussion about organizations' capacity for responsiveness towards normative expectations has likewise witnessed a tremendous boost (see also von Groddeck, 2011; Münch, 2016). In principle, organizations can be expected to rationalize how they make references to values—for example, by way of documentation and certification of usefulness—as can be observed in corporate social responsibility (CSR) practices (on the value of transparency specifically, see Ringel, 2017). Moreover, organizations seem to be particularly responsive to values that their social environment has cast in technical form (however, concerning the communicative processing of morality, see Besio, 2018).

Nadine Arnold (2017), in her empirical study on the historical development of the idea of fair trade in Switzerland, examines which organizations are involved in translating social values into a technical form and how this is done. Arnold details the differentiation of a highly complex field that consists of standard-setters, certifiers, and accreditation bodies that are able to send credible signals of an organization's commitment to social values and translate such references to values into added economic value. She describes how a new sector has emerged on this basis that—with all its pros and cons—has contributed significantly to the mainstreaming of fair trade as a social value. Decisive master trends, such as professionalization, formalization, the emergence of new organizations (or types thereof), as well as standardization processes form the institutional basis of this development (see also Arnold and Hasse, 2017, and, especially on the translation and interface functions of organizations, Nessel, 2016). Regardless of the fact that Arnold's empirical case concerns the specific conditions in Switzerland (including the duopolistic nature of the Swiss retail business), her study raises fundamental questions, which are also of significance to the debate on governance. Her study illustrates quite well how different coordination principles such as market, organization, and network are not so much alternatives to one another but exist in a mutually reinforcing relationship. Overall, Arnold makes it clear that standardization is a master trend of contemporary society that shapes (or

organizes, if you will) existing organizations and leads to the establishment of new organizations and types of organizations.

3 Theoretical Issues and Organizational Types

In more recent publications, theoretical contributions have served primarily to indicate one's standpoint (Apelt and Wilkesmann, 2015) or as introductions to the subject matter (Kühl, 2011; Tacke and Drepper, 2018). In addition, there have been remarkable attempts to contribute to the advancement of general theories of organization. One example is Thomas Matys' study (2011) in the vein of the sociology of domination, which makes explicit reference to classics such as Karl Marx and Max Weber. His historical study, on the United States, deals with a central theme of James Coleman, namely, the debate over the legal status of organizations.

Another example of theoretically oriented work is "*Operativität und Typik*" (*Operativity and Typology*) by Thomas Drepper (2017). Drawing on systems-theoretical and neo-institutionalist approaches, the author's main intention is to focus on organizations as entities that process meaning and to use this focus to explore issues concerning the typification of behavior, participants, and situations. The important aspect here is that, according to Drepper, typifications emerge from organizational sense-making and cannot be imposed from the outside. The primary starting point of his theoretical discussion is what he refers to as the post-rationalist "meta-narrative of recent organizational research" (2017: 5), which he draws on by reference to basic concepts such as cognition, semantics, diffusion, and translation. Drepper's most important achievement is that he succeeds in linking his extremely stringent concept of organization to current theoretical debates in organizational research; this extends to the debate around the materiality of organizations, which the author discusses under the rubric of "(self-)embodiments." In building his argument, he vividly draws on "the world out there"—which is the ultimate object of social-scientific research. That is to say, he always finds illustrative examples to underpin his reasoning, but this does not (yet) amount to turning organizational sense-making into an object of systematic and methodically controlled research, on the basis of which his propositions could be verified or falsified.

Drepper's focus on organizational sense-making and typification of organizations is important not least given the predictable tendency, owing to the growth of organizational sociology, toward differentiating between different types of organizations (see also Apelt and Tacke, 2012). In contrast to Drepper (2017), this trend is characterized by apodictic distinctions based on which attention is directed to problems that are unique to certain organizations, such as volunteer work in the case of non-profit organizations, and are absent in other types of organizations. Similar applies to universities, which, as professionally dominated organizations, combine research and educational tasks. Other organizations—such as associations or political parties—or those that represent more hybrid forms of different types of organizations are likewise

characterized by special features (Laux, 2016; Bohmann and Laux, 2017). Often, the approach of these studies is to work out the specifics of the type of organization in question and to identify differences to what is presumed to represent the standard model, with companies mostly being regarded as the norm in this day and age. Against this background, a study by Sven Kette deserves particular attention, as it aims to describe companies as a specific type of organization as well (Kette, 2018). The most important implication of this perspective is that there is no standard model or prototype of organization; companies, too, are a special kind of organization.

In addition to universities (von Wissel, 2015; Ruppert, 2017; Kleimann, 2016), hospitals have served as a preferred subject of an organizational sociology focused on individual types. The most important topics addressed here involve profession-related issues and the role of certain occupational groups (Wilkesmann et al., 2015; Bär and Starystach, 2017) as well as the impact of reforms, particularly with regard to the creation of new market situations and competitive conditions (Vogd, 2017; Messer and Reilley, 2015; Bode and Märker, 2012). German-language organizational research is furthermore interested in non-profit organizations and their associations (Kaegi, 2012). These include clubs and societies (Franzen and Botzen, 2011; Gibel, 2020), cultural organizations (Zschesche, 2015), and those committed to a social and/or environmental mission (Guggenheim, 2015). Social services represent yet another area of organization that has received special attention. This applies in particular to matters of organizational change (Evers, 2018) and to innovative professional concepts (Mayrhofer, 2012; 2014). Last but not least, highly informative empirical studies on (changed) forms of organization in a specific field—namely, child and youth protection—have also been put up for discussion by Ingo Bode and Hanno Turba (Bode and Turba, 2014) and Stefanie Büchner (2018).

4 New Forms of Organizing Work

Since organizational sociology in Germany was initially closely linked to the sociology of work and industrial sociology, from which it originated, a specific feature of German-language organizational sociology's approach has been its strong interest in issues of work and employment (Aulenbacher/Grubner, *WORK AND LABOR*, this volume). More recently, this interest has been extended to the occupational group of managers. Some studies have, for example, investigated the prevalence of part-time work among management (Hipp and Stuth, 2013), while others have analyzed management—understood as a social elite—from the angle of social stratification (Pohlmann et al., 2018). Yet a crucial question from an organizational-sociology point of view has only been touched upon in passing, namely, whether it makes a difference—for instance, with regard to management's readiness to adopt new best practices (e.g., shareholder value orientation)—if management positions are filled with technical experts such as engineers or rather with organizational experts such as those who hold a degree in business administration, or whether businesses are

managed by owners and, if so, of which generation (however, see Fiss and Zajac, 2004).

A remarkable study on the subject of work and organization has been provided by Yannick Kalff (2018). In focusing on *projects*, he zeros in on a current form of organization that is just as fundamental to science and research as it is to the realization of innovative endeavors and to much of the creative industries (for the latter, see also Nyfeler, 2019). According to Kalff, projects are a form of self-organization that requires the participants to shoulder the major burden of necessary organizational tasks. Under the title *Organisierendes Arbeiten (Working as Organizing)*, his study looks into what happens in projects, how participants coordinate with one another, and how they represent themselves to the outside world. While approaching projects from the perspectives of labor and organizational studies and incorporating issues of power and domination, Kalff also engages in conceptual work that intends to contribute to a post-Weberian organizational sociology (see also Hartz and Rätzer, 2013, who make special reference to critical management studies). His approach sensitizes us to the need for questioning established concepts of organizational sociology, the significance of which for organizational reality in the 21st century is undeniably not always clear. What is striking, however, is that, in this context, Kalff revisits work as a basic theoretical concept without reference to any current debates in organizational studies.

5 Technology and Innovation

Questions about possible applications and consequences of new technologies have been a key topic since the beginning of organizational research—initially with regard to the mechanization and automation of industrial production but for some time now primarily with regard to information and communication technologies and the challenges of digitization. New technologies not only open up possibilities for rationalization but also for surveillance and bureaucratization. At the same time, they create opportunities for companies to stage themselves as being modern and open-minded toward new technologies (Hertwig, 2014). Whereas the debate on innovation initially revolved around individual organizations and their readiness to explore or at least adopt innovations, today it centers more on issues of network-like associations between organizations, as can be observed in joint ventures and strategic alliances or in R&D collaborations (Rammert, TECHNOLOGY AND INNOVATION, this volume). One aspect at the core of the debate has been best-management practices that derive from the Silicon Valley model and whose transferability to other sectors (low tech) or other regions (continental Europe) is being critically discussed (Hasse and Passarge, 2015). Attention has accordingly been directed to deviations from the model and specifically to matters of cooperation—which is often in the form of projects or organized via networks. After collaborations between the economy and science had been at the center of attention for a long time, there has for some time now been a shift away from examining collaboration between industry and science and more toward also con-

sidering the role of financial service providers and investors, as innovations require considerable capital while offering the prospect of risky but highly lucrative profits (Hirsch-Kreinsen, 2011; for Switzerland, see also Passarge and Hasse, 2013).

In many cases, the organizational sociology approach to innovation has drawn rather strongly on studies of technology, such as the more micro-sociological analyses of the processes of dealing with or producing innovations (Conrad, 2017; Staples, 2017). A second focal point in the area where technology research and organizational sociology overlap is in considering the extraordinary importance of innovations from a societal perspective (Rammert et al., 2016). Here, organizations are (co-)affected and (co-)causers in equal measure. The strong influence of technology studies and innovation research also manifests itself in the fundamental concept of path dependency. The basic idea here is that innovation trajectories and the further development of new technologies are shaped by their own history. Their respective history limits the realm of opportunity for innovations while at the same time offering starting points for their further, more or less incremental development (Meyer, 2016).

Hannah Mormann has adopted a different focus. Her topic is the consequences of the dissemination of technological innovations that are implemented to improve organizational processes (Mormann, 2016). Choosing the widespread use of SAP software as her empirical case, her study begins by reconstructing the emergence of SAP as the factual standard software and offers an essentially neo-institutionalist description of its spread. In particular, she is interested in issues concerning the implementation of the software in individual organizations. Mormann draws on an understanding of organizations strongly inspired by systems theory to examine the significance of the decision to use SAP as well as matters concerning the absorption of uncertainty. She further shows that the software is based on applying standardized conceptions of organizational processes to organizations of practically any kind and that these conceptions have repercussions on organizations that use SAP software since the technology under study not only depicts organizational processes, as the developers would have us believe, but also contributes to shaping them. What we see here is hence a type of development that has effects “behind the backs of the actors.”

6 Critique and Acknowledgment

Before highlighting the specific achievements in German-language organizational sociology, I would like to draw attention to subject areas that, at least in the recent past, have not received much attention. First, the nexus of organization and the individual plays only a marginal role. As a result, German-language organizational sociology is at risk of failing to keep up with major topics relevant to professional practice, such as human resources management, or important issues, such as burnout or work–life balance. One of the consequences is that strictly psychological perspectives are increasingly dominating the professional and social discourse (however, see Bröckling, 2007, for a notable exception).

Second, inequality research is comparatively rare. Of course, there is the important exception of gender discrimination (Hericks, 2011; Gruhlich, 2016; Ochsenfeld, 2012; Müller et al., 2013) and the related topic of diversity management (Frohn, 2015; Schiederig, 2013). But apart from these, questions of social inequality and problems of discrimination according to ascriptive categories such as class background, age, and race (or, in German-speaking countries, ethnicity or simply citizenship or migration background) have not attracted much attention (however, see Lengfeld, 2007, and Wienold and Petzold, 2014; and for a systems-theoretical discussion, see Itschert, 2013).²

Third, there seems to be only little interest in new methodological challenges and opportunities, such as those that have emerged in connection with the debate on big-data analyses or in relation to questions of visualization. Although there are some German-speaking authors who have addressed these issues, their publications are, interestingly enough, largely aimed at an international audience (see Oberg et al., 2017; Höllerer et al., 2017; Mützel, 2015). German-language organizational sociology has thus chiefly turned to the arsenal of established social-scientific methodology—and has documented this in the pertinent reference books (see Liebig et al., 2017; Kühl et al., 2009).

Fourth, almost completely absent are *theoretically* oriented research foci that build upon organizational variables and distinguish, for example, between organizations that are old (or new), large (or small), highly (or little) professionalized, or market- (or subsidy-) dependent, although this would offer excellent opportunities for making comparisons. On the one hand, this is an expression of high ambitions in terms of generalization when it comes to theory building. On the other, however, these theoretical ambitions correspond with a likewise observable specialization according to types of organizations, such as business organizations (companies) or research and educational organizations (universities).³ From the viewpoint of organizational sociology, this could be a problematic development because it suggests that differences in the functions or expected performance, on which the distinction between universities, hospitals, political parties, and companies is based, are more important than differences that derive from organizational characteristics (e.g., age, size, degree of pro-

² For a remarkable exception in organizational sociology, see Gomolla and Radtke (2002). Drawing on a broad spectrum of organizational theories, the authors argue that decision-making in schools systematically discriminates against students with a migration background—not on the basis of psychologically rooted prejudices and stereotypes but because selection decisions are geared toward organizational interests and environmental expectations, the consideration of which leads to institutional discrimination as an unintended side effect. Their research interest thus lies in showing how discrimination is embedded in organizations' everyday culture and in the professional culture of those working there (on the concept of institutional discrimination, see also Hasse and Schmidt, 2012).

³ Differentiation according to other context factors would be conceivable as well, for example, in terms of different social spaces in urban and rural areas or with regard to national arrangements, as have been highlighted in the diversity-of-capitalisms debate, but such differentiation is rare.

fessionalization). Additionally, this development could encourage a fragmentation of organizational sociology (e.g., between research on universities, hospitals, and associations), in which case the research field can be expected to lose sight of its common research object.

Against the backdrop of this critical account, I would like to wrap things up by turning to characteristic strengths of German-language organizational sociology. What stands out in particular is its theoretical aspirations, which have become manifest in two ways. For one, German-language organizational sociology is very strongly oriented toward theories of organization, primarily referring to the classic theories of organization from the 1960s to the 1980s. For another, German-language organizational sociology reliably draws on contemporary discussions in social theory, as currently witnessed not least in its reflections on variants of practice theory, actor–network theory, or the theory of Michel Foucault.

This twofold theoretical orientation presumably explains why German-language organizational sociology is particularly committed to systems-theoretical and neo-institutionalist approaches. Both approaches provide theories of society in which organizations are regarded as crucial drivers of social development, and both employ organizational theories that draw heavily on social conditions such as functional differentiation (systems theory) or rationalization (neo-institutionalism). Most studies highlighted in this article are committed to one of these two strands of theory, with some even operating in very ambitious and sophisticated ways at the intersection of both—which is arguably a unique selling point of German-language organizational sociology. We might therefore summarize that those who are interested in theoretically ambitious organizational sociology will find an extremely rich selection to choose from in the German-speaking scene.

Finally, among German-speaking organizational sociologists, we can identify a strong interest in new technologies and in topics closely related to economic sociology (Maurer, *ECONOMIC SOCIOLOGY*, this volume). The latter is remarkable considering that new economic sociology, which enjoys considerable international prestige, had initially conspicuously neglected the topic of organizations in favor of more micro- or decidedly macro-sociological foci. That said, German-speaking organizational sociology also offers excellent starting points for embarking on the endeavor of more closely integrating economic sociology and organizational sociology—and perhaps even micro- and macro-sociological explanations.

References

- Achermann, D. *Institutionelle Identität im Wandel*; transcript: Bielefeld, 2016.
 Apelt, M.; Senge, K., Eds. *Organisation und Unsicherheit*; Springer VS: Wiesbaden, 2015.
 Apelt, M.; Tacke, V., Eds. *Handbuch Organisationstypen*; Springer VS: Wiesbaden, 2012.
 Apelt, M.; Wilkesmann, U., Eds. *Zur Zukunft der Organisationssoziologie*; Springer VS: Wiesbaden, 2015.

- Arnold, N. *Standardisierungsdynamiken im Fairen Handel*; Springer VS: Wiesbaden, 2017.
- Arnold, N.; Hasse, R. Die Organisation von Wertzuschreibungen: Zur Bedeutung von Drittparteien für die Signalisierung moralischer Qualitäten in Märkten. *Berliner Journal für Soziologie* **2017**, *26*, 329–351.
- Bär, S.; Starystach, S. Arbeitsbedingungen in der Krankenhauspflege. *Soziale Welt* **2017**, *68*, 385–404.
- Besio, C. *Moral und Innovation in Organisationen*; Springer VS: Wiesbaden, 2018.
- Bode, I.; Märker, M. Wettbewerb mit Vorbehalten: Vielfalt und Ambivalenz in der neuen Marktkultur des Krankenhauswesens. *Soziale Welt* **2012**, *63*, 253–271.
- Bode, I.; Turba, H. *Organisierter Kinderschutz in Deutschland*; Springer VS: Wiesbaden, 2014.
- Bohmann, U.; Laux, H. Finanzmarktwächter: Über die Synchronisation von Politik und Ökonomie. *Berliner Journal für Soziologie* **2017**, *27*, 35–63.
- Bröckling, U. *Das unternehmerische Selbst. Soziologie einer Subjektivierungsform*; Suhrkamp: Frankfurt a.M., 2007.
- Brunsson, N. *The Organization of Hypocrisy. Talk, Decisions, and Actions in Organizations*; Wiley: Chichester, 1989.
- Buche, A.; Jungbauer-Gans, M.; Niehbur, A.; Peters, C. Diversität und Erfolg von Organisationen. *Zeitschrift für Soziologie* **2013**, *42*, 483–501.
- Bücherl, S. *Anspruch und Wirklichkeit des Controlling*. Springer VS: Wiesbaden, 2014.
- Büchner, S. *Der organisierte Fall. Zur Strukturierung von Fallbearbeitung durch Organisation*; Springer VS: Wiesbaden, 2018.
- Conrad, L. *Organisation im soziotechnischen Gemenge*; transcript: Bielefeld, 2017.
- Drepper, T. *Operativität und Typik*; Springer VS: Wiesbaden, 2017.
- Evers, J. *Vertrauen und Wandel sozialer Dienstleistungsorganisationen*; Springer VS: Wiesbaden, 2018.
- Fiss, P. C.; Zajac, E. The Diffusion of Ideas over Contested Terrain: The (Non)adoption of Shareholder Value Orientation among German Firms. *Administrative Science Quarterly* **2004**, *49*, 501–534.
- Franzen, A.; Botzen, K., Vereine in Deutschland und ihr Beitrag zum Wohlstand der Regionen. *Soziale Welt* **2011**, *62*, 391–413.
- Frohen, A. *Diversity in Action*; transcript: Bielefeld, 2015.
- Gibel, R. *Obskure Organisationen. Logen, Clubs und Männerbünde als organisationssoziologische Sonderfälle*; transcript: Bielefeld, 2020.
- Gomolla, M.; Radtke, F.-O. *Institutionelle Diskriminierung. Die Herstellung ethnischer Differenz in der Schule*; Leske + Budrich: Opladen, 2002.
- Gruhlich, J. *Transnationale Unternehmen und Geschlecht*; Springer VS: Wiesbaden, 2016.
- Guggenheim, M. *Organisierte Umwelt*; transcript: Bielefeld, 2015.
- Hartz, R.; Rätzer, M. Eds. *Organisationsforschung nach Foucault*; transcript: Bielefeld, 2013.
- Hasse, R.; Passarge, E. Silicon Valley und sonst nichts Neues? Biotechnologie in der Schweiz als Beispiel für neue Organisationsformen und deren Legitimierung. *Zeitschrift für Soziologie* **2015**, *44*, 6–21.
- Hasse, R.; Schmidt, L. Institutionelle Diskriminierung. In *Handbuch Bildungs- und Erziehungssoziologie*; Bauer, U.; Bittlingmayer, U. H.; Scherr, A., Eds.; VS: Wiesbaden, 2012; pp 881–900.
- Hericks, K. *Entkoppelt und institutionalisiert. Gleichstellungspolitik in einem deutschen Konzern*; VS: Wiesbaden, 2011.
- Herkle, H. *Die Identität der Organisation und die Organisation der Identität*; VS: Wiesbaden, 2011.
- Hertwig, M. Technikfassaden in hoch-technisierten Unternehmen? Entkopplung bei der Einführung von E-Business in Unternehmen der Automobilzulieferindustrie. *Berliner Journal für Soziologie* **2014**, *24*, 31–57.

- Hipp, L.; Stuth, S. Management und Teilzeit? – Eine empirische Analyse zur Verbreitung von Teilzeitarbeit unter Managerinnen und Managern in Europa. *Kölner Zeitschrift für Soziologie und Sozialpsychologie* **2013**, *65*, 101–128.
- Hirsch-Kreinsen, H. Finanzmarktkapitalismus und technologische Innovationen. *Zeitschrift für Soziologie* **2011**, *40*, 356–370.
- Höllerer, M.; Daudigeos, T.; Jancsary, D., Eds. *Multimodality, Meaning, and Institutions*; Emerald: Bingley, 2017.
- Itschert, A. *Jenseits der Leistungsgesellschaft. Soziale Ungleichheit in der funktional differenzierten Gesellschaft*; transcript: Bielefeld, 2013.
- Kaegi, U. *Organisationale Zusammenschlüsse im Nonprofit-Bereich*; VS: Wiesbaden, 2012.
- Kalff, Y. *Organisierendes Arbeiten*; transcript: Bielefeld, 2018.
- Kette, S. *Unternehmen. Eine sehr kurze Einführung*; Springer VS: Wiesbaden, 2018.
- Kirchner, S. *Wer sind wir als Organisation?*; Campus: Frankfurt a.M./New York, 2012.
- Kleimann, B. *Universitätsorganisation und präsidiale Leitung*; Springer VS: Wiesbaden, 2016.
- Krücken, G.; Serrano-Velarde, K. Der Berater als Fremder. Eine soziologische Studie zur Managementberatung in Universitäten. *Kölner Zeitschrift für Soziologie und Sozialpsychologie* **2016**, *68*, 29–51.
- Kühl, S. *Organisationen. Eine sehr kurze Einführung*; Springer VS: Wiesbaden, 2011.
- Kühl, S.; Stadtholz, P.; Taffertshofer, A. *Handbuch Methoden der Organisationsforschung*; VS: Wiesbaden, 2009.
- Laux, H. Hybridorganisationen. *Soziale Welt* **2016**, *67*, 313–332.
- Lengfeld, H. *Organisierte Ungleichheit. Wie Organisationen Lebenschancen beeinflussen*; VS: Wiesbaden, 2007.
- Liebig, S.; Matiaske, W.; Rosenbohm, S. *Handbuch empirische Organisationsforschung. Quantitative und Qualitative Methoden*; Springer Gabler: Wiesbaden, 2017.
- Matys, T. *Legal Persons – “Kämpfe” und die organisationale Form*; VS: Wiesbaden, 2011.
- Mayrhofer, H. *Niederschwelligkeit in der Sozialen Arbeit*; VS: Wiesbaden, 2012.
- Mayrhofer, H. Widerspruchsmanagements – Wirkungsorientierung in der Sozialen Arbeit aus neoinstitutionalistischer Theorieperspektive. *Österreichische Zeitschrift für Soziologie* **2014**, *39*, 281–305.
- Meier, F.; Peetz, T.; Waibel, D. Bewertungskonstellationen. Theoretische Überlegungen zur Soziologie der Bewertung. *Berliner Journal für Soziologie* **2016**, *26*, 307–328.
- Messer, M.; Reilley, J. Qualitätsberichte als Vermittlungsinstanz im Wettbewerb zwischen Krankenhäusern: Patienten als rationale Akteure. *Berliner Journal für Soziologie* **2015**, *25*, 61–81.
- Meyer, U. *Innovationspfade. Evolution und Institutionalisierung komplexer Technologie*; Springer VS: Wiesbaden, 2016.
- Meyer, J.; Rowan, B. Institutionalized Organizations: Formal Structure as Myth and Ceremony. *American Journal of Sociology* **1977**, *83*, 340–363.
- Mormann, H. *Das Projekt SAP*; transcript: Bielefeld, 2016.
- Müller, U.; Riegraf, B.; Wilz, S. M. Eds. *Geschlecht und Organisation*; Springer VS: Wiesbaden, 2013.
- Münch, T. *Die Wirkmächtigkeit unternehmensethischer Managementkonzepte*; Springer VS: Wiesbaden, 2016.
- Mützel, S. Facing Big Data: Making Sociology Relevant. *Big Data and Society* **2015**, *2*. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1177/2053951715599179>
- Nessel, S. Verbraucherorganisationen und Verbraucherpolitik als Intermediäre der Nachhaltigkeit. Eine Analyse der institutionellen und organisationalen Einbettung nachhaltigen Konsums. *Berliner Journal für Soziologie* **2016**, *26*, 227–248.

- Nyfelers, J. *Die Fabrikation von Kreativität. Organisation und Kommunikation in der Mode*; Bielefeld: transcript, 2019.
- Oberg, A.; Korff, V.; Powell, W. Culture and Connectivity Intertwined: Visualizing Organizational Fields as Relational Structures and Meaning Systems. *Research in the Sociology of Organizations* **2017**, 53, 17–47.
- Ochsenfeld, F. Gläserne Decke oder goldener Käfig: Scheitert der Aufstieg von Frauen in erste Managementpositionen an betrieblicher Diskriminierung oder an familiären Pflichten? *Kölner Zeitschrift für Soziologie und Sozialpsychologie* **2012**, 64, 507–534.
- Passarge, E.; Hasse, R. Risk Capital in Switzerland – an Institutional Analysis. *Swiss Journal of Sociology* **2013**, 39, 465–491.
- Pohlmann, M.; Liebold, R.; Bär, S.; Schanne, S.; Schmidt, G. *Anatomie einer Elite – Top-Manager in Deutschland*; Springer VS: Wiesbaden, 2018.
- Pongratz, H.; Bernhard, S.; Abbenhardt, L. Fiktion und Substanz. Praktiken der Bewältigung zukunftsbezogener Ungewissheit wirtschaftlichen Handelns am Beispiel der Gründungsförderung. *Berliner Journal für Soziologie* **2014**, 24, 397–423.
- Rammert, W.; Windeler, A.; Knoblauch, H.; Hutter, M., Eds. *Innovationsgesellschaft heute*; Springer VS: Wiesbaden, 2016.
- Ringel, L. *Transparenz als Ideal und Organisationsproblem*; Springer VS: Wiesbaden, 2017.
- Ruppert, A. *Vermessung und Quantifizierung im Hochschulsektor*; Springer VS: Wiesbaden, 2017.
- Schiederig, K. *Mythos Diversity: Personalpolitiken in transnationalen Unternehmen*; Campus: Frankfurt a.M./New York, 2013.
- Seidenschnur, T.; Krücken, G.; Galwa, J.; Vogel, R. Berater im Spiegel des Feldes. Eine professionssoziologische Rekonstruktion ihrer Legitimierung in Verwaltungen und Universitäten. *Soziale Welt* **2018**, 69, 6–32.
- Staples, R. *Doing Innovation*; Springer VS: Wiesbaden, 2017.
- Tacke, V.; Drepper, T. *Soziologie der Organisation*; Springer VS: Wiesbaden, 2018.
- Vogd, W. Management im Krankenhaus – Eine Fallstudie zur Bearbeitung der Innen- und Außenspannungen unter den Bedingungen des deutschen DRG-Systems. *Berliner Journal für Soziologie* **2017**, 27, 93–121.
- von Groddeck, V. *Organisation und Werte*; Springer VS: Wiesbaden, 2011.
- von Groddeck, V.; Wilz, S. M., Eds. *Formalität und Informalität in Organisationen*; Springer VS: Wiesbaden, 2015.
- von Wissel, C. *Hochschule als Organisationsproblem*; transcript: Bielefeld, 2015.
- Wienold, M.; Petzold, K. Fairnessnormen, Sanktionsmacht und soziale Kontrolle bei Bonuszahlungen in Unternehmen. *Soziale Welt* **2014**, 64, 345–367.
- Wilkesmann, M.; Apitzsch, B.; Ruiner, C. Von der Deprofessionalisierung zur Reprofessionalisierung im Krankenhaus? *Soziale Welt* **2015**, 66, 327–346.
- Zschiesche, S. M. *Kulturorganisationen und Corporate Cultural Responsibility*; Springer VS: Wiesbaden, 2015.