Erhard Friedberg's *Multimedia Encyclopedia in Organization Theory* is unique. Its 240 video clips offer a structured encounter with those who made organization theory. 31 of the most eminent organization theorists recount their explorations and findings, and illustrate their reasoning in interpreting the unexpected results of their seminal field-studies. Some 300 articles by 59 American and European authors document the chronology of 17 approaches to the study of organization, providing an overview of the state of the art in the discipline. Together, these materials paint a concrete and lively picture of the progressive construction of this body of knowledge from Taylor to today.

The academic community will find in this encyclopedia new, exciting material for teaching and learning, making organization theory a human encounter as well as an intellectual adventure. The practitioners of organizations will find evidence of the underlying pragmatism of much organizational analysis and gain insights on many of its implications for the current practice of organization and management.


DVD-Rom MAC/PC

With the support of the French Ministry of National Education, LEGO SA and IDRH.

*Paris, October 2011*
A unique teaching and learning device

This Encyclopedia of organization theory grew out of a project called “The Living Archives of Organization Theory”. Started in 1998, this project aims at videotaping extensive interviews with the founding fathers and dominant organizational theorists still alive on their contribution to, and their participation in the development of organization theory. Still ongoing, it now has a database of some 250 hours of professional videotapes with 33 of the most eminent organizational theorists, some of whom have since died.

The Multimedia Encyclopedia of Organization Theory proposes 288 entries (biographies, book-presentations and conceptual articles structured around 17 different approaches to organizational analysis). They present a complete panorama and documentation of the history and the conceptual development of this interdisciplinary field from the end of the nineteenth century on. On this ground alone, it would already be a useful resource for teachers and students of organization theory.

What turns this DVDROM into a unique teaching and learning device, however, is the use it makes of the resources accumulated in the interviews of Chris Argyris, Peter Blau, Nils Brunsson, Ronald Burt, Michel Crozier, Peter Drucker, Mark Granovetter, Michael Hannan, David Hickson, Jay Lorsch, Michael Maccoby, James G. March, Marc Maurice, John Meyer, Douglass North, Johan P. Olsen, Jeffrey Pfeffer, Charles Perrow, Walter W. Powell, Jean-Daniel Reynaud, W. Richard Scott, Thomas C. Schelling, Philip Selznick, Herbert A. Simon, Arthur Stinchcombe, Alain Touraine, Harrison White, William Foote Whyte, and Oliver Williamson.

The DVDROM includes 8 hours of interview excerpts. In them, those who made the history of organization theory comment on the different approaches and contributions (including their own) presented in the DVDROM; they describe and reflect on some of the seminal studies and main concepts which have advanced organization theory and appraise the scope and relevance of present trends of organizational thinking. The DVDROM thus makes the teaching and learning experience into an encounter with the very people whose work is being taught. Beyond its intrinsic interest, this encounter changes the pedagogical situation. It brings a “third person” into the classroom, providing the teacher with a much welcome distance to create interaction and lead the discussion with the class.

In this folder the list of the content of the DVDROM.
1. Presentation

Contents

281 entries to:
- 17 approaches to the study of organization from Taylor to today.
- 14 seminal studies,
- 78 general articles,
- 92 book-presentations,
- 80 biographies.

The bibliography (+1100 titles)

A quiz of some 350 questions.

A search engine allowing to launch a search by theme or by author within the 281 texts as well as within the bibliography (+1100 titles).

233 video clips
8 hours with 31 leading figures in organization theory. All interviews have been taped within the larger project of "The Living Archives of Organization Theory" directed by Professor Erhard Friedberg.

Archive pictures

Something on the chronology: The DVDROM opens with a chronology tracing the emergence and mutual influences over time of seventeen approaches to the study of organizations.

List of contributors:

List of the Interviewees (since 1998 to 2011)

Chris ARGYRIS, American sociologist. One of the historical figures of the psychological approach to organizations and its projection into organizational development and organizational learning.

Peter BLAU, Austrian-American sociologist, Student of R. K. Merton. Known for his studies of bureaucracy, of power and social exchange and for his leading role in the emergence of structural contingency theory.

Paul LAWRENCE, American sociologist at HBS. Studied in particular the relations between organizational performance and the structure of the environment. Together with Jay Lorsch, one of the founders of structural contingency theory.

Charles E. LINDBLOM, American. An economist best known for his criticism of rational planning and decision-making as well as of the myopia of the markets and market economies.

Nils BRUNSSON, Swedish sociologist. A representative of the neo-institutional approach to organizations, known for his study of action irrationality and of organizational hypocrisy.

Ronald BURT, American sociologist. One of the founders and leading theorists of the social network analysis.

Jay LORSCH, American sociologist at HBS. Studied in particular the relations between organizational performance and the structure of the environment. Together with Paul Lawrence, one of the founders of structural contingency theory.

Michael MACCOBY, American psychosociologist. Former student of Eric Fromm, Maccoby is a leading theorist of action research, of leadership and of the management of change.

Michel CROZIER, French sociologist known for his study of the bureaucratic phenomenon, founder of the French School of organizational analysis. Also known for his analyses in favor of the reform of the French state.

James G. MARCH, American political scientist. One of the members of the Carnegie group around H. Simon. Best known for his countless contributions to the study of rationality and decisionmaking. Together with J. Olsen, one of the initiators of a neo-institutionalist approach to organizations.

Peter DRUCKER, Austrian-American. An expert and an international consultant, who was called the "pope" of management. Also known for his study of a private bureaucracy, General Motors.

Marc MAURICE, French sociologist, best known for his analysis, together with J.-J Sylvestre and F. Sellier, of the "societal effect" on organizations. A neo-institutionalist "à la française".

Mark GRANOVETTER, American sociologist. One of the founders of social networks analysis, and initiator and leading theorist of the new economic sociology in the USA.

John MEYER, American sociologist. One of the founders and leading theoretician of a neo-institutionalist approach to the study of organizations and societal modernization.

Michael HANNAN, American sociologist. Founder, with John Freeman, of the approach called the "population ecology of organizations."

Douglass NORTH American economist (Nobel Prize 1993). Founder of cliometrics (quantitative economic history). North is one of the most articulate and radical representatives of neo-institutional economics.

David HICKSON, English sociologist. The initiator, together with Derek Pugh, of the Aston group. An important representative of structural contingency theory.

Jeffrey PFEFFER (American) Sociologist, known for his “resource-dependence perspective” on organizations, developed together with G. Salancik. Also known for his theory of power in organizations.

Charles PERROW, (American) Sociologist, one of the founding fathers of structural contingency theory. Also well known for his work on industrial risk and the role of large organizations in American society.

Walter W. POWELL (American) Sociologist, one of the founding fathers (with P. DiMaggio) and leading theorists of the neo-institutionalist approach in organization theory. Also known for his contribution to social network analysis.

Jean-Daniel REYNAUD, French sociologist, one of the founders of French sociology of work. Best known for his seminal contributions to a theory of bargaining, industrial conflict, and collective action.

W. Richard SCOTT, American sociologist, one of the founding fathers (with J. Meyer) of the neo-institutionalist approach in organization theory.


Philip SELZNICK, American sociologist. Student of R. K. Merton, Best known for his institutional theory of bureaucracy and leadership in organizations. Initiator of an interdisciplinary field of study on “Law and Society”.


Arthur Stinchcombe, American sociologist of organizations, precursor both of structural contingency theory and of the “population ecology of organizations.”

Alain Touraine, French sociologist, one of the founders of the French sociology of work, best known for his theory of social movements and his theory of “social intervention”.

Harrison WHITE, (American), Sociologist, one of the founding fathers of social network analysis. Best known for his sociological theory of markets as well as for his highly influential theoretical essay in general sociology *Identity and Control*.


Oliver E. WILLIAMSON, American economist. Nobel Prize 2009). Best known for his seminal contributions to the development of a transaction cost approach to the study of organizations, as well as to neo-institutional economics.
### 3. Detailed contents

#### Approaches

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Beginning of the 20th century</th>
<th><img src="image1.jpg" alt="Image" /></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Scientific Management</strong></td>
<td>At the turn of the 19th to the 20th century, engineers interested in organization tried to scientifically measure the activities in factories and offices in order to ground the functioning of organizations in universal principles based on science.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1920’s</th>
<th><img src="image2.jpg" alt="Image" /></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>The Human Relations Movement</strong></td>
<td>Seven years of empirical studies conducted in the Hawthorne plant near Chicago produce a series of convergent results underscoring the importance, for an organization’s mode of functioning, of “human relations”: the informal structure of relations among the members of the organization.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1930’s - 1940’s</th>
<th><img src="image3.jpg" alt="Image" /></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>The Participatory Approach</strong></td>
<td>Experiments conducted with groups of children demonstrate that in order to obtain good results, it is better to have the members of the group participate. However, adopting a participative leadership style turns out not to be the ideal solution for all organizations.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1930’s - 1940’s</th>
<th><img src="image4.jpg" alt="Image" /></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>The Interactionist Approach</strong></td>
<td>If one wants to understand the functioning of an organization, one has to know it from the inside. One has to become a social anthropologist in order to observe, measure, and interpret the sentiments as well as the interactions of the members of the organization.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1940’s - 1950’s</th>
<th><img src="image5.jpg" alt="Image" /></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>The Carnegie Group</strong></td>
<td>Studying interdepartmental cooperation in the management of children’s playgrounds in his native city of Milwaukee, Herbert S. Simon is amazed to discover that the public officials of the city do not make budgetary decisions according to the canons of micro-economic theory. He proposes an explanation with his concept of “bounded rationality.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1940’s - 1950’s</th>
<th><img src="image6.jpg" alt="Image" /></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>The Dysfunctions of Bureaucracy</strong></td>
<td>In the years before and after the Second World War, the apparently inexorable growth of big bureaucratized organizations in both the private and the public sector generate both fascination and anguish. Bureaucracy thus becomes a privileged field of empirical research on organizations.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1950’s - 1960’s</th>
<th><img src="image7.jpg" alt="Image" /></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Industrial Sociology in France and Germany</strong></td>
<td>Work and the industrial world become central fields of inquiry for the empirical behavioral sciences that re-emerge in post-Second World War Europe. The empirical exploration of the world of factories and offices provides a first description of the functioning of organizations.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1950’s - 1960’s</th>
<th><img src="image8.jpg" alt="Image" /></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>The Socio-technical Approach</strong></td>
<td>In contrast to the well-known research of Elton Mayo at Western Electric, which had exclusively explored the social system of the firm, socio-technical analysis pays as much attention to the technical system of production as to the social system of the organization, analyzing the interdependence between the two</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Industrial Democracy
The notion of “industrial democracy” was born in Norway at the end of the 1950s. In 1959, the Norwegian Minister of Work, Olav Bruvick, financed a series of social experiments and action research to explore this notion further.

### Organizational psychology
Motivational theories suggest that tensions exist between the psychological needs of the individuals and the Taylorist mode of functioning of organizations. How can the two be better adjusted in order to mitigate these tensions?

### 1960’s - 1970’s

#### The Economics of Organization
Neo-classical economic theory traditionally ignored the existence of organizations. However, the discovery of information asymmetries and of the costs generated by the transactions between economic actors completely changes the picture in the second half of the 1960s.

#### Structural Contingency Theory
Organizations are not only made of people. They are entities that have structures, that use technologies, and that have to deal with their environments. Therefore, it is necessary to analyze an organization in its entirety, considering it as an entity structured by, and dependent on, its context.

#### The Movement for the Improvement of the Quality of Working Life
The “Movement for the Improvement of the Quality of Working Life” emerges in the mid-Sixties in all of the highly developed industrial countries of Continental Europe as well as in Great Britain and the United States.

### 1970’s - 1980’s

#### The French School of Organizational Sociology
While he finishes writing his book *The Bureaucratic Phenomenon*, Michel Crozier decides to launch a new research program on “French Public Administration Confronting Change.” Out of this program will come the development of a new approach to organizations and organized action.

#### Neo-institutionalism
How is it possible that a series of pedagogical reforms in the Bay Area of San Francisco seem to have no impact on the structure and the functioning of the schools? In order to provide an explanation, John Meyer and W. Richard Scott draw attention to the institutional environment of these organizations.

#### Network Analysis and the Study of Organizations
Two premises, a theoretical and a methodological one, are at the heart of social network analysis. First, to explain a person’s behavior, one should not look at the person’s attributes (asking questions such as, “Is he or she rich or poor? Skilled or unskilled? Fat or skinny?”) but at the relations that link him or her to other people. Second, to describe these relations, quantification is necessary.

#### The Population Ecology of Organizations
In 1977, Michael T. Hannan and John H. Freeman publish a theoretical article based on the following question: “Why are there so many forms of organizations?” This question and the general approach that the authors sketch out in this article will give birth to a new orientation in the research on organizations known as the “population ecology of organizations.”
### List of the field studies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Study Title</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1930’s</td>
<td>The Importance of Sentiments: Elton Mayo and Fritz Roethlisberger at the Hawthorne Plant (1924—1932)</td>
<td>In the time between the two World Wars, scientific management, advocated particularly by Frederic W. Taylor, was at its apogee. [...] The Hawthorne experiment, which began in 1924 and continued until 1932, represented the first break away from scientific management. For the first time, this model was going to be called into question by a set of systematic experiments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1930’s</td>
<td>The Impact of the Group on the Individual: William Foote Whyte in Cornerville</td>
<td>In 1936, William Foote Whyte found himself the recipient of a three-year scholarship from the Harvard Society of Fellows and decided to conduct an empirical study on a poor neighborhood in Boston, Massachusetts, called the North End. He would later call this neighborhood “Cornerville” in his now-famous book <em>Street Corner Society</em>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1940’s</td>
<td>Cooptation and Boundary Transactions: Philip Selznick at the Tennessee Valley Authority</td>
<td>The Tennessee Valley Authority is a public agency created in 1933 by the Federal Government of the United States to develop the Tennessee Valley both economically and socially. [...] By the time Philip Selznick began his empirical study in 1942, the TVA had become a huge success. The atypical, innovative and voluntaristic nature of this federal intervention was very appealing, as was the doctrine of participatory democracy advocated by its directors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950’s</td>
<td>Socio-technical Systems: Eric Trist in the Coal Mines of Durham</td>
<td>Shortly after the end of the Second World War, the British coal industry was nationalized. As with all nationalization programs, the intended effect was to improve social relations within nationalized companies and to increase productivity. [...] After nationalization, Britain's coal mines continued to be blighted by a shortage of workers, a high rate of accidents and work-related illnesses and poor productivity. New coal cutting and extraction machines were subsequently introduced and new forms of workplace organization put in place to improve output. These innovative new measures, however, were to cause major social tensions within the mines.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1940’s</td>
<td>Vicious Circles and Latent Functions: Alvin Gouldner at the General Gypsum Company</td>
<td>In 1948, Alvin Gouldner and his team carried out a survey at Oscar Center, a mine belonging to a major gypsum mining company. At the time, bureaucracy was a central theme of American research. [...] One such study was carried out between 1948 and 1951, looking at the way in which an industrial organization becomes “bureaucratic.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950’s</td>
<td>Information and Systems Effects: Michel Crozier at the Postal Bank</td>
<td>In 1952 Michel Crozier, then a new recruit at the CNRS, was attempting to understand the reasons behind the lack of class consciousness among office workers. To help him with his research, he decided to carry out an initial study into this issue. As the subject of his study, he chose a large administrative organization with a high number of office workers: the Paris offices of the French Postal Bank.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950’s</td>
<td>Worker Attitudes toward Technical Change: Jean-Daniel Reynaud and Alain Touraine at the Mont-Saint-Martin Steelworks</td>
<td>At the end of WWII, a new brand of sociology emerges in France. Breaking away from what is considered the « over-theorization » of the Durkheimian school, its main tool is the empirical field study. The sociology of work is at the forefront of this movement, in good part due to the pioneering role of Georges Friedmann. Director, since 1949, of the Center for Sociological Studies, he encourages young intellectuals interested in sociology after having discovered his book on <em>The Human Problems of Industrial Mecanization</em> published in 1946, to go out into the field and see for themselves.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950’s</td>
<td>Uncertainty and Power: Michel Crozier at the French Tobacco Monopoly (Seita)</td>
<td>At the time of the Seita study, Michel Crozier was a young researcher at the recently-founded Institut des Sciences Sociales et du Travail (ISST). At the end of WWII, having spent some time studying American trade unions, he began to take an interest in office workers. He conducted his first study in a department of the French postal bank. The results of this study demonstrated the importance of &quot;organization&quot; in the structuring of interpersonal relationships. This discovery raised new questions and demanded further in-depth research in other areas. Therefore, Michel Crozier seized the opportunity put forward by Yves Delamotte, then the Director of the ISST, who had been approached by the chief executive of Seita to look into ways of reorganizing the</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A study on the impact of automation was conducted in the late 1950s, shortly after the study on workers’ attitudes towards “technical progress” at the Mont-Saint-Martin steelworks. The research method used differs substantially from early French industrial sociology studies. It is hardly mentioned by historians of this discipline, yet it is one of the major studies in French industrial sociology.

1960's — Differentiation and Integration as a Response to Environmental Pressures: Paul Lawrence, Jay Lorsch, and Structural Contingency
In the late 1950s and early 1960s, there occurred a shift in the intellectual climate in the field of organizational studies. The traditional approach, with its universal rules of “good” organization, became increasingly difficult to defend, despite remaining the backbone of organizational thinking. The human relations movement lost much of its novelty value and was increasingly criticized. The inconclusive results of studies into the supposed link between job satisfaction and employee productivity highlighted the excessive simplicity of the conceptual framework, and in particular the lack of attention to the “structural” aspect of organizations (formal structure, goals, tasks, technology, etc.). This context convinced Lawrence of the need to move beyond research into group phenomena and to widen the scope of study to encompass organizations as a whole.

1960's — Dimensions of Bureaucracy: Derek Pugh, David Hickson and the Aston Group
In the second half of the 1950s, three researchers—Derek Pugh, psychologist; Bob Hinings, sociologist; and David Hickson, research assistant—convened in their basement office at North Birmingham Technical College. Thanks to Tom Lupton, a department head at the institution, they had money to finance a study on employee behavior, and in their attempt to develop their research project, they began listing the sets of variables that, in their minds, could influence employee behavior. In the process, the idea came to them of linking this behavior to “management.”

1970's — The Force of Weak Ties: Mark Granovetter’s Network Analysis
In the second half of the 1960s at Harvard University, Harrison C. White gathered together a group of doctoral candidates and began developing what would come to be called “social network analysis.” Mark Granovetter, who was interested in network analysis, joined the group and decided to prepare this thesis under the supervision of Harrison White. He wished to empirically study the role that social networks played in the lives of individuals by attempting to understand in what way and by which mechanisms this occurred. After some hesitation, he decided to study the processes that individuals went through to get a job.

The Studies of John W. Meyer, W. Richard Scott, Elisabeth Cohen, and Terrence Deal of the impact of school reforms in a sample of schools in the Bay Area accumulated a vast amount of material. Its analysis, however, proved disappointing. Indeed, the outcome of the study fell far short of initial expectations. The correlations between what the teachers, principals and superintendents said were limited and largely meaningless, reforms seemed to have very little practical impact and the organizations themselves appeared to be strangely disjointed and disconnected in the sense that actual practices did not reflect policy announcements from senior levels.

By the beginning of the 1980s, five years had already gone by since organizational theory had witnessed the first awakenings of the movement that would undermine the reign of structural contingency theory, a paradigm that up to then had no rival.[…] Two young professors of the sociology of culture and organizations from Yale University set out to conduct empirical studies on how nonprofit organizations in New York functioned.
## List of articles

### Concepts
- Agency Theory
- Agency Theory: Its Contributions and Limitations
- Authority (Hierarchical)
- Bounded Rationality
- Bureaucracy "à la française" (the French way)
- Bureaucracy (The Economic Analysis of)
- Cognitive Dissonance (The Theory of)
- Cooperation
- Co opting
- Convention
- Decision and Organization
- Discretion in Organizations
- Dominant Coalition
- Dynamics of Change
- Economic Sociology
- Formal and Informal Structure
- *Homo economicus*
- Game Theory
- Garbage Can Model (The)
- Ideal Type
- Iron Law (The)
- Institution
- Latent Functions
- Leadership
- Management and the Sociology of Organizations
- Management: A Sociological Perspective
- Methodological Individualism
- Mission (The Changing Mission of the Corporation)
- Negotiation
- Negotiation (Theories of)
- Network Analysis in Organizations
- Organizational Boundary
- Organizational Culture
- Organizational Identity
- Organizational Learning (Theories of)
- Organizational Relay
- Power: Some Notes on a Controversial Concept
- Preference
- Property Rights and Investment in Forms
- Resistance to Change or Change Strategy?
- Rules of the Game
- Rules of Satisfaction according to F. Herzberg
- Source (or Zone) of Organizational Uncertainty
- Strategy
- Structural Contingency Theory
- Tacit Coordination
- The Mechanical Model and the Organic Model
- The Structural Theory of Organizations
- Theory X and Theory Y (D. McGregor)
- Transaction Cost Economics
- Transaction Costs (The Theory of)
- Trust
- Vicious Circles, Perverse Effects, and Emergent Effects

### Complements
- Belot (Émile) and the Principle of Continuity
- Charles Perrow: Looking at Institutions for Juvenile Delinquents
- Committee on Human Relations in Industry
- Drucker (Peter) in a Private Bureaucracy
- From Organizations to A Behavioral Theory of the Firms
- Industrial Sociology in France
- Industrial Sociology in Germany (since 1945)
- Intellectual Foundations and Sources of Neo-institutional Sociology
- Kurt Lewin’s Experiments with Leadership
- Limits of the Human Relations Approach
- Limits of a Psychological Approach to Organization
- Organizational Development
- Overcoming resistance to change (around and about Kurt Lewin)
- Stinchcombe (A.), A Precursor of the Ecology of Organizations
- Tavistock Institute
- Taylor in Japan
- The Bureaucratic Phenomenon in Perspective
- The Carnegie School
- The Chicago School
- the Contribution of Douglass North
- The Contribution of Ronald Coase
- The Movement for the Quality of Work Life (Context)
- the Science of Work at the Dawn of Taylorism
- The Sociology of Everett C. Hughes
- Training Groups or T Groups
Presentations of books and articles

| Micromotives and Macrobehavior (T. Schelling) | Money and Motivation (W. Foote Whyte) |
| Organization and Environment (Lawrence et Lorsch) | Motivation and Personality (A. Maslow) |
| Organizational Choice (E. Trist) | Organizational Ecology (Freeman et Hannan) |
| Organizational Learning (C. Argyris et D. Schön) | Organizational Psychology (E. Schein) |
| Organizations (J. March et H. Simon) | Organizations in Action (J. Thompson) |
| Où va l’administration française ? (M. Crozier et alii) | Patterns of Industrial Bureaucracy (A. Gouldner) |
| The Social Foundations of Industrial Power: A comparison of France and Germany (M. Maurice et alii) | Power in and around Organizations (H. Minzberg) |
| Problèmes humains du machinisme industriel (G. Friedman) | Rediscovering Institutions (J. Thomsen) |
| Social Behavior: Its Elementary Forms (G. Homans) | Street Corner Society (W. Foote Whyte) |
| Structural Holes R. Burt) | Technik und Industriearbeit (Popitz et alii) |
| The Bureaucratic Phenomenon (M. Crozier) | The Dynamics of Bureaucracy (P. Blau) |
| The Dynamics of Rules (J. March et alii) | The Economic Institutions of Capitalism (O. Williamson) |
| The Evolution of Organization (A. Gouldner) | The Human Side of Enterprise (D. MacGregor) |
| The Irrational Organization (N. Brunsson) | The Limits of Organization (K. Arrow) |
| The Logic of Collective Action (M. Olson) | The Management of Innovation (Burns et Stalker) |
| The New Institutionalism in Organizational Analysis (Dimaggio et Powell) | The Organization of Hypocrisy (N. Brunsson) |
| The Reforming Organization (Brunsson et Olsen) | The Social Construction of Reality (Berger et Luckmann) |
| The Structuring of Organizations (H. Minzberg) | The Strategy of Conflict (T. Schelling) |
| Theory of Games and Economic Behavior (Von Neumann) | Toyota Production System (T. Ohno) |
| TVA and the Grass Roots (P. Selznick) | Understanding Organizational Behavior (C. Argyris |
| Union Democracy (S. Lipset) | When Prophecy Fails (L. Festinger et alii) |
| Work and Authority in Industry (R. Bendix) |  |
4. Erhard Friedberg - some informations

Professor Friedberg's major contribution to the study of organizations lies in the systematic development of a theoretical and methodological framework for the analysis of organized action. In *Actors and Systems* co-authored with Michel Crozier, and more recently in *Local Orders*. *The Dynamics of Organized Action*, he has developed a general theoretical model of organization understood as the process (always political in nature) of constructing and maintaining "local or partial orders", i.e. orderly patterns of interaction among a set of individual and collective actors linked by strategic interdependence.

Formal organizations are only one subset on a continuum of such "local orders", and the theoretical and analytical framework designed for their analysis can therefore be transposed for the study of apparently less structured and formalized fields of action as for instance social and political mobilizations, public policy arenas, economic markets and other forms of collective action.

Professor Friedberg is Austrian by birth and education. His career has been conducted largely in France where he has completed numerous empirical studies in a variety of settings both in private firms, and especially the French automotive industry, and public policy arenas such as the implementation of industrial and cultural policy in France, or the comparison between the French and the German university systems. Erhard Friedberg is both a researcher and a teacher. He presently directs the Master of Public Affairs at Sciences Po. He is a frequent consultant to Renault and other French or European Firms, as well as the author of numerous articles on the theory and practice of organized action.

E. Friedberg is currently at work on a major project called "The Living Archives of Organization Theory". The idea behind the project is twofold: on the one hand to conduct and assemble videotaped interviews with the founding fathers of organization theory in Europe and the United States; on the other hand to use the material of these interviews to document the history of organization theory in a series of multi-media productions and documentaries.

**Last publications (since 2000)**


Gisquet E., Friedberg E. End of Life decisions; Tragic Choices in Neonatology, to be published in ALTER, European Journal for Disability Research, 2011.


Friedberg E. "La culture "nationale" n'est pas tout le social", *Revue Française de Sociologie*, Mars 2005, Réponse à Philippe d'Iribarne. 46-1, pp. 177-193.


Friedberg E. "Comment lire les décisions", *Culture et conflit*, 2000.