

SOCIOLOGY IN ORGANIZATIONS
SPRING 2019

COURSE OUTLINE

A. DESIGNATION:	Department and Number	SPM 6905
	Credits	3
	Day/Time	Wed 10:00am-12:30pm
	Location	TBD

B. COURSE DESCRIPTION:

This course is designed to study the role of sociology in management research, and apply lessons learned to the sport management field. Specifically, this class will review several major sociological theories, and examine studies in the management/organizational theory literature that have been framed through sociological perspectives. You will then use ideas and techniques gathered from these studies in sport management research, identifying gaps in your own area of interest where you can use sociological theory to answer specific questions, whether for theory or practice.

Given the breadth of modern sociological theory and its applications, it is not the intent to study every theory or theorist, but rather to expose you to some of the main sociological frameworks currently in use, and give you the tools to be able to apply them, as well as other theories, in a research agenda that seeks to create theoretical and practical contributions to our field.

C. CONTACT INFO:	Dr. Christine Wegner, Ph.D.
	Florida Gym, Room 304
	Phone: 352-294-2821
	Email: christinewegner@ufl.edu
	Office Hours: Mon/Tues 10:00am – 12:00pm or by appt.

D. COURSE OBJECTIVES:

Upon completion of this course students are expected to successfully:

1. Synthesize several major theories currently used in sociology
2. Understand the role of sociological theories in organizational and management research
3. Apply the approach of sociology in organizational research to sport management research
4. Complete a proposal for a study that utilizes sociological theory to analyze a question within sport management

E. COURSE POLICIES

Absences

Students with prior knowledge of an excused absence must make arrangements to submit assignments prior to the designated due date. Documentation is required for an absence to be excused. Excused absences include, but are not limited to, personal illness, family illness or death, call to jury duty, religious holy days, and official University activity. Absences will be excused at instructor's discretion.

Academic Integrity

Any individual who becomes aware of an honor code violation is committed to take corrective action. Academic honesty and integrity are fundamental values of the University community. Students should be sure that they understand the UF Student Honor Code at <https://www.dso.ufl.edu/students.php>.

Students with Disabilities

Any student who feels she or he may need an accommodation based on the Impact of a disability should contact me privately to discuss your specific needs. Students requesting classroom accommodation must first register with the Dean of Students Office. The Dean of Students Office will provide documentation to the student who must then provide this documentation when requesting accommodation. For more information, refer to:

Online: <http://www.dso.ufl.edu/drc>

Phone: (352) 392-8565 (V) or (800) 955-8771 (Relay)

Office: Reid Hall Room 001

This syllabus and other class materials are available in alternative formats upon request.

U Matter, We Care

Your well-being is important to the University of Florida. The U Matter, We Care initiative is committed to creating a culture of care on our campus by encouraging members of our community to look out for one another and to reach out for help if a member of our community is in need. If you or a friend is in distress, please contact umatter@ufl.edu so that the U Matter, We Care Team can reach out to the student in distress. A nighttime and weekend crisis counselor is available by phone at 352-392-1575. The U Matter, We Care Team can help connect students to the many other helping resources available including, but not limited to, Victim Advocates, Housing staff, and the Counseling and Wellness Center. Please remember that asking for help is a sign of strength. In case of emergency, call 9-1-1.

Course Evaluations

Students are expected to provide feedback on the quality of instruction in this course based on 10 criteria. These evaluations are conducted online at <http://evaluations.ufl.edu>. Evaluations are typically open during the last two or three weeks of the semester, but students will be given specific times when they are open. Summary results of these assessments are available to students at <https://evaluations.ufl.edu/results>

F. EXPECTATIONS FOR CREATING AN EFFECTIVE LEARNING LAB

As with any doctoral seminar, you need to attend class regularly (and promptly), read the articles, and be prepared to discuss the articles in class. In weeks that you must write your own responses, you also need to be able to share your idea with others and engage in discussion and critique. But that's just the foundation. Our goal is to transform the classroom into a learning lab through interaction, engagement and participation. Participation reflects not only the presentation of your own ideas and insights, but also the degree to which you *listen* and thoughtfully build on your colleague's comments and ideas. It is expected everyone will be in class and ready to begin class on time, each class period. Phones will be expected to be turned off and stowed away and out of sight, so that we can give one another full attention and respect during discussions.

Moreover, another key goal of this course is to generate future research collaborations among the colleagues in the class, so offering ideas in a constructive, respectful and helpful way is critical towards creating a thriving intellectual climate within and outside of the classroom.

Effective class participation may include offering new and unique insights, clarifying issues and complexities, reframing and extending ideas in meaningful ways, and offering a perspective that helps the group integrate and synthesize readings, ideas, and topics. Debate and dialogue are part of the process, but always within the realm of respect and appreciation for the thoughts and feelings of others.

In order to create a true learning laboratory, we need to engage in processes involving mutual learning and discovery. There are no stupid questions (or answers). Every idea has merit and the capacity to create something bigger.

G. EVALUATION CRITERIA

Class preparation and contributions (25%):

1. First, I expect you to be an active and constructive participant during each session. This requires reading and often re-reading the assigned articles and chapters. In general, you should seek a firm understating of the purpose and logic for a given paper. More importantly, you should strive to reach beyond basic reactions to the readings and instead consider:

- What is good about this paper?
- What is the basic formulation of the theory (constructs and relationships among them), and what drives the theory? What are the theoretical foundations of the research?
- What assumptions do different perspectives make about people? About organizations? How tenable are the assumptions?
- What is the main contribution of this paper? What are the interesting ideas?
- What could have been improved in the paper?
- Do you believe the arguments (about the theory and the conclusions drawn from the data)? What would it take to convince you?
- What are the boundary conditions of the argument? In other words, for whom and under what circumstances does the argument apply and not apply?
- What are the critical differences between this author's argument and others you have read? Can these differences be resolved through an empirical test? What would that study look like?

Overall, expect to spend long hours dissecting the assigned readings. Go over a reading until you are certain you understand its basic premises and arguments and are comfortable discussing them.

****It is expected that you will thoroughly read each paper, provide substantive discussion questions/comments in advance, and be prepared to discuss readings during each class period. If it becomes clear that students are not fulfilling their reading obligations, I reserve the right to institute mandatory weekly write-ups on assigned readings.**

2. Second, all **PhD seminar participants** are responsible for serving as **discussion leader for one article every week**. Though you are expected to deeply reach every assigned article, each week you will each identify one article that you will read in greater depth and for which you will prepare detailed discussion notes/summaries.

During the first class, we will decide who will be the discussion leaders for subsequent weeks.

As the article discussion leader(s), you are responsible for coming up with 1) a comprehensive summary to share with your classmates, 2) a constructive critique of the article (strengths, areas for improvement), 3) critical questions that struck you as you read the article, and 4) a discussion of how this article fits in with the topic for the week, as well as prior readings.

As the article leader(s), you are responsible for getting the group to engage in a critically constructive dialogue of the issues, challenges and dilemmas raised in the readings. To start, the article leader will provide a summary about the key issues. From there, you can be creative in designing a session that will stimulate dialogue, interactions and perhaps the creation of knowledge. You may want to have the group craft integrative models or identify key gaps or debates in the literature. It is critical that you not only have an absolutely firm grasp of the reading that week, but also that you have given significant thought to the type of questions that engender integration, debate and dialogue. Some ideas include an assessment of the similarities and differences in the approaches, assumptions, methods and conclusions of the articles. How does this article build upon the others? What puzzles or complexities do they raise? What should be the next steps in research in this area? It's always a nice idea to try to ask questions that you don't know the answer to; this encourages mutual discovery rather than a "guess what I'm thinking" approach.

It is recommended that article leaders help the group make cross-topic connections between readings of the current session and past sessions. The integration of topics will enable us to see the big picture of how various topics relate. You might ask and look into whether there are unifying frameworks that will allow us to integrate topics. Is there a way to model relationships? What challenges arise when integrating across topics? What research has not been conducted, but should be that better integrates both within topic and across topics? Other questions???

****Article Leader Deliverables.** As article discussion leader, you need to provide the class with summaries of the required articles for your session. Summaries should include the complete title and citation of the article, the core research question or issues addressed and the central objective of the article, and the significant theories, concepts, methods, results and conclusions of the article. Each article summary should be a concise one-page, single-spaced, typed document. The use of headings in your summary is helpful.

The summary will be uploaded to the Weekly Discussion Board on canvas the morning of class so that others can look at/print them out as they see fit.

Bi-weekly Response Ideas (4 x 10% each):

Every other week, you will be offered the opportunity to explore the topics we have covered the previous week, and uncover gaps in sport management where these topics might make a contribution to an ongoing conversation, or start a new one. These responses, or “mini-proposals,” should include three components:

Masters Students:

1. Identify the area in our industry where you see a problem or gap, and review any literature or think-pieces that do exist on the topic, whether it takes a sociological perspective or otherwise (can be academic literature, trade journals, ted talks, other videos, etc).
2. Propose a way to address this problem using what you have learned, as well as other examples you see in the literature and/or the real world
3. Convince your audience about the contribution that this solution will make to industry—either a specific organization or a part of the industry as a whole

PhD Students

1. Identify the area of sport management where you see the gap, and review any relevant literature that does exist on the topic, whether from a sociological perspective or otherwise. (Note that it does not need to be comprehensive, explaining every single study. Rather, you need to demonstrate the lack of depth in this area, and show that you have done enough research in the topic to take this stance).
2. Propose a research question to help fill this gap, and outline how you would use the studied sociological theory to answer it. This should include a brief possible methodology.
3. Highlight the contribution that this will make to the topic, not only in terms of the gap it will fill, but why this is an important gap that needs to be filled within this topic. Discuss potential theoretical and practical contributions.

The page limit for each bi-weekly response is three (3) pages (not including references). It should include a minimum of 8 references that relate to the current literature on your idea or the gap/problem that it exposes. While this might not seem like enough space to incorporate all three components, this assignment is also meant as a practice in brevity, and conciseness. As academics, we often over-explain (see this syllabus as an example). But in our research AND in industry, it is important to understand how to synthesize the literature clearly and directly state our conclusions.

You will need to upload your 3-page summary by the morning of class to the discussion board created for that particular week.

You will also be giving a 5-minute ignite-style presentation on your idea. The ignite style allows you to introduce your idea, and facilitate discussion about your idea, its strengths, and weaknesses. It has become a popular presentation form recently, as it allows for the dissemination of new ideas more quickly. For more information on the ignite-style:

- <http://www.speakerconfessions.com/2009/06/how-to-give-a-great-ignite-talk/>
- Ignite Wiki [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/ignite_\(event\)](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/ignite_(event))
- Here is a great example of an exceptional Ignite Talk:
 - The Illusion of speed <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=bGYgFYG2Ccw>

Proposal (30%):

For Masters Students: This proposal is intended as a way for you to think more deeply about an sociological issue/problem that you see in the sport management industry, and come up with innovative, specific solution for sport organizations. This solution may be for a single organization (e.g. ESPN), or for an entire industry within sport (e.g. community sport organizations). The goal of the paper is to sell your solution to these organization(s). Therefore, you want to use literature we have read as well as outside sources to make your argument.

For PhD Students: This course is intended to give you an opportunity to begin one empirical research project. Specifically, it is the goal that you find a research question within your broad area of interest that has been under-examined in sport management through a sociological lens. This project will involve the design of the research, from initial conceptualization to the development of data gathering instruments. The end result should be a paper that looks like the front section of some of the key sport management or mainstream management journals, along with a section labeled “Potential Contributions.”

For everyone: Your final research paper should be approximately 15-20 double-spaced, typed document (consistent with the hypothesis development and methods section of a typical research paper). A hard copy of your paper is due the day of your presentation. Late papers will be penalized. Papers must be written explicitly for this course. Papers that are revised or modified from other courses will not be accepted. If you have any questions about plagiarism, use of citations, etc – please see me immediately.

I need to approve your paper topics to be sure you are on the right track. I am happy to speak to you about your progress throughout the semester and look at drafts. However, I will not look at drafts up to three weeks before the paper is due.

Key Dates for Proposal:

- *Week 11:* “Research Problems Session” - Bring questions / concerns you are having as you write your proposal
- *Exam Week:* Final Papers Due**

Research Presentation (10%):

You will prepare a 15-minute power-point presentation of your paper to the group. Depending on availability, other faculty and students may be invited to attend to provide feedback and ask questions as if this were an actual conference presentation. The goal of this presentation is to give you practice presenting your work. A few tips that may be helpful include limiting the number of your slides, making sure your slides are readable (larger font), not putting too much information in the slides, and tailoring the talk to your audience. Make sure to have an introduction and conclusion – with “take aways” that are “user-friendly.” It’s better to take your time and make sure that you

don't lose the audience than try to cover too much information in too short a period of time; you don't want to speed through your talk while leaving your audience in the dust. Practice is key. Last, make sure that you time your talk so you don't run over. To simulate an actual conference presentation, you will be kept to time limits. Please be sure you practice to ensure your presentation conforms to time limits. You will be asked to stop when your time limit is up. Evaluation criteria will be made available in advance of the presentations.

G. COURSE OUTLINE

(***highlighted text denotes articles for PhD students only)

Week 2: Creating Contribution in and through Sport Management Research (Jan 16)

Bartunek, J. M., Rynes, S. L., & Ireland, R. D. (2006). What makes management research interesting, and why does it matter?. *Academy of management Journal*, 49(1), 9-15.

Van de Ven, A. H. (1989). Nothing is quite so practical as a good theory. *Academy of management Review*, 14(4), 486-489.

Chalip, L. (2006) Toward a Distinctive Sport Management Discipline. *Journal of Sport Management*, 20, 1-21.

Corley, K. G., & Gioia, D. A. (2011). Building theory about theory building: what constitutes a theoretical contribution?. *Academy of management review*, 36(1), 12-32.

Bacharach, S. B. (1989). Organizational theories: Some criteria for evaluation. *Academy of management review*, 14(4), 496-515

Questions to consider for Week 2:

- What is theory?
- What constitutes a theoretical contribution?
- What is the importance of a theoretical contribution in research?
- Do you think it is possible for sport management to contribute to theory? Is it necessary for it to do so?
- What new ways of thinking can create contributions in sport management?
- What are the ways we can use theoretical contributions to make practical contributions?

Week 3: Epistemologies and Research Design I (Jan 23)

Bechara & Van De Ven (2007) Philosophy of Science Underlying Engaged Scholarship. In Van De Ven, Ed. *Engaged Scholarship: A Guide for Organizational and Social Practice*.

Morgan, G. (1980). Paradigms, metaphors, and puzzle solving in organization theory. *Administrative science quarterly*, 605-622.

Astley, W. G., & Van de Ven, A. H. (1983). Central perspectives and debates in organization theory. *Administrative science quarterly*, 245-273.

Ryan, A. B. (2006). Post-positivist approaches to research. *Researching and Writing your Thesis: a guide for postgraduate students*, 12-26

McKelvey, B. (1997). Perspective-quasi-natural organization science. *Organization science*, 8(4), 351-380.

Fairclough, N. (2005). Peripheral vision discourse analysis in organization studies: The case for critical realism. *Organization studies*, 26(6), 915-939.

Week 4: Epistemologies and Research Design II (Jan 30)

Parker, M. (1995). Critique in the name of what? Postmodernism and critical approaches to organization. *Organization studies*, 16(4), 553-564.

Calas, M. B., & Smircich, L. (1999). Past postmodernism? Reflections and tentative directions. *Academy of management review*, 24(4), 649-672.

Pentland, B. T. (1999). Building process theory with narrative: From description to explanation. *Academy of management Review*, 24(4), 711-724

Maines, David R. (1993) Narrative's Moment and Sociology's Phenomena: Toward Narrative Sociology." *The Sociological Quarterly* 34 (1), 17-38.

Ticineto Clough, Patricia (2009). The New Empiricism: Affect and Sociological Method. *European Journal of Social Theory* 12 (1), 43-61.

Week 5: Identity Theories (Feb 6)

Sveningsson, S., & Alvesson, M. (2003). Managing managerial identities: Organizational fragmentation, discourse and identity struggle. *Human relations*, 56(10), 1163-1193.

Collinson, D. L. (2003). Identities and insecurities: Selves at work. *Organization*, 10(3), 527-547

Brown, A. D. (2015). Identities and identity work in organizations. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, 17 (1), 20-40.

Brown, A. D., & Coupland, C. (2015). Identity Threats, Identity Work and Elite Professionals. *Organization Studies*, 36 (10), 1315-1336.

Petriglieri, J. L. (2011). Under threat: Responses to and the consequences of threats to individuals' identities. *Academy of Management Review*, 36(4), 641-662

Humphreys, M., & Brown, A. D. (2002). Narratives of organizational identity and identification: A case study of hegemony and resistance. *Organization Studies*, 23(3), 421-447.

Clegg, S. R., Rhodes, C., & Kornberger, M. (2007). Desperately seeking legitimacy: Organizational identity and emerging industries. *Organization Studies*, 28(4), 495-513.

Week 6: Applying Identity Theories to Sport Management (Feb 13)

Week 7: Gender, Race, and Intersectionality (Feb 20)

Shaw, S., & Frisby, W. (2006). Can gender equity be more equitable? Promoting an alternative frame for sport management research, education, and practice. *Journal of Sport Management*, 20(4), 483.

Nkomo, S. M. (1992). The emperor has no clothes: Rewriting "race in organizations". *Academy of Management Review*, 17(3), 487-513.

Crenshaw, K. (1991). Mapping the margins: Intersectionality, identity politics, and violence against women of color. *Stanford law review*, 1241-1299

Holvino, E. (2010). Intersections: The simultaneity of race, gender and class in organization studies. *Gender, Work & Organization*, 17(3), 248-277

Essers, C., & Benschop, Y. (2009). Muslim businesswomen doing boundary work: The negotiation of Islam, gender and ethnicity within entrepreneurial contexts. *Human Relations*, 62(3), 403-423.

Harding, N., Ford, J., & Fotaki, M. (2013). Is the 'F'-word still dirty? A past, present and future of/for feminist and gender studies in Organization. *Organization*, 20(1), 51-65.

Tatli, A., & Özbilgin, M. F. (2012). An emic approach to intersectional study of diversity at work: a Bourdieuan framing. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, 14(2), 180-200.

Week 8: Applying Gender, Race, and Intersectionality to Sport Management (Feb 27)

Week 9: Institutional Theory (Mar 13)

Meyer, J. W. and B. Rowan (1977). "Institutionalized Organizations: Formal Structure as Myth and Ceremony." *The American Journal of Sociology* 83(2): 340-363.

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): 147160.

Suchman, M. C. (1995). "Managing Legitimacy: Strategic and Institutional Approaches." *The Academy of Management Review* 20(3): 571-610.

Hargadon, A. B. and Y. Douglas (2001). "When Innovations Meet Institutions: Edison and the Design of the Electric Light." *Administrative Science Quarterly* 46(3): 476-501.

Washington, M., & Patterson, K. D. (2011). Hostile takeover or joint venture: Connections between institutional theory and sport management research. *Sport Management Review*, 14(1), 1-12.

Week 10: Applying Institutional Theory to Sport Management (Mar 20)

Week 11: Evolutionary, Ecological Theories, and Organizational Learning (Mar 27)

Astley, W. G. (1985). "The Two Ecologies: Population and Community Perspectives on Organizational Evolution." *Administrative Science Quarterly* 30(2): 224-241.

Barnett, W. P. and R. A. Burgelman (1996). "Evolutionary Perspectives on Strategy." *Strategic Management Journal* 17: 5-19.

Van de Ven, A. H. and M. S. Poole (1995). "Explaining Development and Change in Organizations." *The Academy of Management Review* 20(3): 510-540.

Weick, K. E. (1993). "The Collapse of Sensemaking in Organizations: The Mann Gulch Disaster." *Administrative Science Quarterly* 38(4): 628-652.

Weick, K. E., K. M. Sutcliffe, et al. (2005). "Organizing and the Process of Sensemaking." *Organization Science* 16(4): 409-421.

Baum, J.A.C. and Shipilov, A.V. (2006). "Ecological approaches to organizations". In Clegg, S.R., Hardy, C., Lawrence, T.B. and Nord, W.R. (eds.) *The SAGE Handbook of Organization Studies*, Second Edition, SAGE Publications, London, UK: 55-110.

Dobrev, S. D., T.-Y. Kim, et al. (2002). "The Evolution of Organizational Niches: U.S. Automobile Manufacturers, 1885-1981." *Administrative Science Quarterly* 47(2): 233-264

Lewin, A. Y., C. P. Long, et al. (1999). "The Coevolution of New Organizational Forms." *Organization Science* 10(5): 535-550.

Week 12: Applying E & E to Sport Management (Apr 3)

Week 13: A Day of Foucault (Apr 17)

Foucault, M. (1982). The subject and power. *Critical inquiry*, 8(4), 777-795

Shogan, D. (2002). Characterizing constraints of leisure: A Foucaultian analysis of leisure constraints. *Leisure Studies*, 21(1), 27-38.

Thomas, R., & Davies, A. (2005). Theorizing the micro-politics of resistance: New public management and managerial identities in the UK public services. *Organization studies*, 26(5), 683-706.

Oswick, C., Fleming, P., & Hanlon, G. (2011). From borrowing to blending: Rethinking the processes of organizational theory building. *Academy of Management Review*, 36(2), 318-337.

Pullen, A. (2006). Gendering the research self: Social practice and corporeal multiplicity in the writing of organizational research. *Gender, Work & Organization*, 13(3), 277-298.

Week 14 (Apr 24): Final Presentations

Final Exam Week: Proposals Due (May 1)**

H. METHODS OF EVALUATION:

Assignment	Percentage	Points Earned
In-class contribution	20%	
Bi-weekly responses (4 total)	40%	
Final proposal	30%	
Presentation	10%	
Total	100%	

Grading Standards

A = 100% - 93%	A- = 92% - 90%	B+ = 89% - 87%
B = 86% - 83%	B- = 82% - 80%	C+ = 79% - 77%
C = 76% - 73%	C- = 72% - 70%	D+ = 69% - 67%
D = 66% - 63%	D- = 62% - 60%	E = 59% and below (failing)

I. DATE OF SYLLABUS: January 7, 2019