

***IS STANDARDIZATION SILENCING SOCIOLOGY?***

By

***Taj Mahon-Haft***

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of  
the requirements for the degree of

MASTERS OF ARTS IN SOCIOLOGY

WASHINGTON STATE UNIVERSITY  
Department of Sociology

MAY 2007

To the Faculty of Washington State University:

The members of the Committee appointed to examine the thesis of  
TAJ ALEXANDER MAHON-HAFT find it satisfactory and recommend that it be  
accepted.

---

Chair

---

---

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to provide my most sincere appreciation for the dedicated attention to this project provided by Louis Gray, Lisa McIntyre, and Ray Jussaume, the members of my committee who offered quick and thoughtful feedback at each stage in the development of this paper. Additionally, they exhibited more patience than could ever be expected.

I would further like to thank Don Dillman for his steady guidance and useful advice, as he offered an immense amount of assistance without ever being on my committee. Nor does the worth of that direct assistance even begin to represent the importance of his constant support and general guidance as a personal and professional mentor and teacher.

Finally, I would like to acknowledge Mike Stern, Nick Parsons, Bryan Rookey, Philip Vanini, and Amati Bague, fellow sociologists-in-training with whom so many hours of theoretical discussion about the field initially lit and continuously rekindled my inspiration for asking meaningful questions about the discipline. From those pensive and less-than-pensive musings sprung the conceptual skeleton of this paper.

# IS STANDARDIZATION SILENCING SOCIOLOGY?

## Abstract

By Taj Alexander Mahon-Haft, M.A.  
Washington State University  
May 2007

Chair: Louis N. Gray

The field of sociology has changed considerably in recent decades, exhibiting a steady trend towards the production of continuously more quantitative, objective, technical literature. This study seeks to determine if these developments are the result of suitable adaptation and contagion processes, whereby organizations adopt the effective, beneficial practices of others, or if they are the product of *institutional isomorphism*, whereby organizations in a field are pressured to conformity that is ultimately detrimental to the field (DiMaggio and Powell, 1983).

To do so, the amount of isomorphic pressure within the field of sociology was measured at 15-year intervals in an effort to determine if it has been steadily increasing as the standardization of sociological texts has been observed. The amount of isomorphic pressure from each of the three mechanisms (mimetic, coercive, and normative) was measured through network analysis of the organizational interactions contributing to the publication of two highly influential journal publications, the *American Sociological Review* and the *American Journal of Sociology*.

Based on these measurements, the amount of coercive and mimetic isomorphic pressure has been steadily increasing, while normative pressures have fluctuated. These

findings suggest that coercive and mimetic isomorphism have been influential in shaping sociological practices.

In seeking further evidence, this study sought to determine if the standardization of sociology has been detrimental for the field, as that is a defining characteristic of institutional isomorphism. To do so, the amount of mainstream media attention paid to sociology and its texts was measured over time through examination of the New York Times historic database of articles and book reviews.

It was found that since the mid-1970s, the increasing standardization of sociological writing has been met by a steady decrease in the amount of mainstream media attention. This suggests that the developing standardization of sociological literature has negatively affected its cultural potency.

Combined with earlier evidence that the amount of coercive and mimetic pressure has increased with increasing standardization, these results strongly suggest that institutional isomorphism was instrumental in shaping sociology's recent developments. The negative result witnessed here further suggests that the changes are not as benevolent as has been assumed before, suggesting that they were less the product of suitable adaptation and contagion processes, and that their effects should be considered and monitored.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	iii
ABSTRACT.....	iv
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	vi
LIST OF TABLES.....	viii
LIST OF APPENDICES.....	ix
DEDICATION.....	x
CHAPTER	
1. INTRODUCTION.....	1
2. WHY INSTITUTIONAL ISOMORPHISM APPEARS TO BE STANDARDIZING SOCIOLOGY.....	7
a. Isomorphism Stems from Structuration.....	8
b. The Mechanisms of Institutional Isomorphism.....	9
i. Mimetic Isomorphism in Sociology.....	10
ii. Coercive Isomorphism in Sociology.....	13
iii. Normative Isomorphism in Sociology.....	16
c. The Homogenizing Impact of Isomorphism in Sociology.....	19
d. Other Possible Explanation for Sociology's Standardization.....	21
e. The detrimental Effects of Isomorphism.....	23
f. Examining Sociology for Isomorphic Symptoms.....	26
g. The Possible Loss of Cultural Potency for Sociology.....	27
3. LOOKING FOR INSTITUTIONAL ISOMORPHISM IN SOCIOLOGY.....	30
a. Testing for Increased Isomorphism in Sociology.....	30
i. Sociology through the Lens of AJS and ASR.....	31
ii. Longitudinal Analysis of Institutional Isomorphism.....	33
b. Structural Analysis with Affiliation Networks.....	34
c. Testing for Mimetic Isomorphism.....	38
i. Diversity of types of Research Institution.....	39
ii. Visibility of Grant-Driven Research Approach.....	42
d. Testing for Coercive Isomorphism.....	44
i. Coercive Pressure from Government Organizations.....	44
ii. Coercive Pressure from Centralized Research Dependency.....	47
e. Testing for Normative Isomorphism.....	51
f. Measuring the Cultural Potency of the Voice of Sociology.....	56
i. Mainstream Media Focus on Sociology.....	57
ii. Mainstream Reviews of Sociology's Top Books.....	59
4. FOUND: INCREASING ISOMORPHISM AND REDUCED CULTURAL POTENCY.....	62
a. Trends in the Level of Mimetic Isomorphism.....	62
i. Greater Visibility of the Academic Research Model.....	63
ii. Increased Visibility of Grant-Driven Research.....	64

b.	Trends in the Level of Coercive Isomorphism.....	66
i.	Coercive Pressure from Dependency on Government Agencies.....	66
ii.	Increased Coercive Pressure from Centralized Resource Dependency..	68
c.	Trends in the Level of Normative Isomorphism.....	71
d.	Trends in Mainstream Media Attention for Sociology.....	74
i.	Recent Declines in Focal Attention to Mainstream Articles.....	74
ii.	Diminished Mainstream Review Attention for Sociology Books.....	75
5.	WHAT DOES INSTITUTIONAL ISOMORPHISM MEAN TO SOCIOLOGY?.....	79
a.	Meaning of Increasing Mimetic Isomorphism.....	81
b.	Meaning of Increasing Coercive Isomorphism.....	83
c.	Meaning of Existing, but not Increasing, Normative Isomorphism.....	86
d.	Meaning of Reduced Mainstream Media Attention.....	89
e.	Impacts of Institutional Isomorphism Being Found in Sociology.....	90
f.	What Can Be Done?.....	95
g.	What Future Research Should be Conducted?.....	97
APPENDICES	.....	101
WORKS CITED	.....	104

## LIST OF TABLES

	Page
4.1. Total strength of ties and rate of institutional involvement of various types of research institution, by year.....	64
4.2. Strengths and rates of grant-driven research, by year.....	65
4.3. Rate of resource dependency upon external support organizations, by type and year.....	67
4.4. Support organizations with highest raw strength of support, by year.....	69
4.5. Most relied upon support organization, for all years.....	70
4.6. Measures of sociology's relative dependency upon most relied upon support organizations, by year.....	71
4.7. Total and proportional strength of ties of core research organizations, by year.....	73
4.8. Normalized eigenvector centrality scores for core research organizations, by year.....	74
4.9. Proportional focus on sociology in NY Times articles, by 5-year period.....	75
4.10. Various measures of reviewership attention in NY Times to AJS-reviewed sociology books, by year of review in AJS.....	76

## LIST OF APPENDICES

	Page
A. 2000 Research Site Matrix.....	101
B. 2000 Support Organization Matrix.....	103

## DEDICATION

This thesis is dedicated to my wonderful wife, Colleen, who has provided years of support as I pursued my idealistic, academic goals.

It is also dedicated to my inspiring sons, Matthew and Dmitrius Karma, along with my brood of younger siblings, Marigot, Rose, Slade, Dylan, Kane, Keegan, Mark, Sadie, and Victoria, all of whom will be occupying the world we leave them for years after we're gone. It is you who daily provide me with the inspiration to continue pushing for a better way and a better world.

Finally, this thesis is dedicated to all four of my parents, Kathi Jane, Howard, Beckey, and Luis, and the most enlightening, supportive friends anyone has ever been blessed with, especially Steve, Sam, Dylan, Nick, Bryan, Paul, Mike, Seth, Amanda, and Shyama. You have collectively provided me with the skills, confidence, and breadth of perspective necessary to begin to see how things are, how that depends on where we stand, and how they might be different.

## ***Chapter 1: Introduction***

In the last 50 years, sociological literature has changed greatly, becoming much more technical and quantitatively oriented. This includes the increased use of the experimental (IRMAD) format and the objective tone in the most prestigious journals (Clemens et al., 1996; Turner and Turner, 1990). There has also been a well-documented rise in the use of quantitative methods and statistical analysis (Camic and Xie 1994; Clemens et al., 1996; Pontille, 2003; Turner and Turner, 1990).

These changes have been widely lauded as the product of the scientific advancement of the field. The overall trend in last 50 years towards more "rigorous formulation of hypotheses, larger and more detailed data sets, statistical models growing in complexity to match the data, and a higher level of statistical analysis in the major sociological journals" has reportedly been "contributing to a greatly improved standard of scientific rigor in the discipline" (Raftery, 2001, p.3). The growing use of a particular set of research tools and practices can be seen as consensus building, a crucial step in the development of scientific norms to guide research (Kuhn, 1970). As these standards have developed, the selection process for publication in the field's journals has become standardized with more attention to rigorous methods and technical writing (Hargens 1991; Turner and Turner, 1990). As a result, sociology began to receive the large grants and recognition that had previously been given only to the "hard sciences" (Turner and Turner 1990; Ross 1991).

This interpretation of the changes sees their diffusion as the result of functional social learning. From this perspective, the developing standards in sociological writing are

the product of suitable adaptation and contagion processes, whereby organizations adopt the effective, beneficial practices of others, thereby propagating their use by serving as a model for others.

However, the incorporation of such methods and tools into sociological publications has grown so steadily and become so widespread that it can also be seen as an overarching trend towards homogenization of the field's practices and products. Now, many of those practices have become so common that they have become nearly uniform standards for inclusion in the discourse of the field. For instance, the use of quantitative analysis and statistical significance testing have steadily increased since the middle of the 20<sup>th</sup> century. In 1998, 72% of articles in the most prestigious journals in sociology (*American Sociological Review* and *American Journal of Sociology*) involved quantitative analysis (Clemens, et al. 1996). The use of statistical significance testing has risen in prevalence from 31% of the articles in 1940, to 91% in 1995 (Leahey, 2005). Additionally, those same journals have become nearly singularly comprised of articles organized in the IRMAD format and written in an objective tone (Pontille, 2003; Clemens, et al., 1996). The changes can be broadly described as a movement towards publication of a narrowing range of styles, methods, and analysis (Clemens, et al., 1996; Pontille, 2003; Ross, 1991; Turner and Turner, 1990). The steadily growing prominence of those organizational approaches also means that there is less variety in the field.

Such homogenization can also be seen as the theoretical result of the process of "institutional isomorphism" (DiMaggio and Powell, 1983), whereby structural pressures drive a field towards conformity in its organizational practices. According to Paul

DiMaggio and Walter Powell (1983), when rationality (like that promoted in these practices) dominates the world system, structuration occurs (Giddens, 1979: 19), and organizations are pressured into uniformity.

Thus, the developing standards could be the result of functional adaptation and contagion processes or isomorphic pressure towards conformity. The primary difference between the two is that the standardization derived from institutional isomorphism is inherently not functional; rather, it leads to a lack of diversity that is actually counterproductive to a field's development (DiMaggio and Powell, 1983). If institutional isomorphism has driven the trend towards standardization, then, the resulting conformity is theoretically expected to be detrimental to the field.

As a discourse-based cultural field, sociology is shaped and defined by the literature published, making it the collective Voice of Sociology (Bourdieu, 1993; Steinberg, 1998). As a result, the trend towards a singular form of writing has reflexively altered the sound of that voice. If institutional isomorphism has driven the field towards damaging conformity, the changes may have detrimentally affected the broad cultural impact of that voice.

The increasingly standardized form that sociological writing now takes is generally more technical and quantitatively oriented than ever before. This growing incorporation of advanced statistical methods and methodological focus in the writing style mean that sociology is increasingly producing literature that is complex and stratified. These are characteristics of what Shrum (1991) called "high-brow" cultural products, which are

accessible to only those in the field that have been trained to appreciate and understand them.

In addition to being less accessible to those outside of sociology, the changes observed may have also led to a loss in cultural potency for the literature, as the developing high-brow style lacks some of the keys to cultural impact described by Schudson (1989). According to Schudson (1989, p.153), there are five dimensions to the potency of a cultural object that determine if it "works", or what "influence particular symbols have on what people think and how they act". Based on those dimensions, the resonance, retrievability, and rhetorical force of the Voice of Sociology appear to have been diminished by the trends towards increased use of the objective tone, scientific jargon, complex statistical analysis, and stylistic conformity. By placing those now dominant discourse characteristics on the scale of Schudson's cultural potency (1989), the potential application of the knowledge produced seems limited by its presentation.

A monotone, high-brow sociological voice with reduced cultural potency is one that is not heard as well. The complexity, standardization, and blandness of the current isomorphism of sociology's discursive field appear to present potential problems for the diffusion and application of the texts beyond the field. If the literature's cultural potency has been reduced, it would be expected to result in a loss of mainstream attention. Therefore, the field might be losing the attention of the general public as a result of the increasingly narrow voice. Without dissemination, knowledge is not created. Thus, the trend towards standardization evident in sociological literature may have detrimentally impacted the power of the field's voice.

Thus, if institutional isomorphism has indeed been occurring within the field of sociology, pushing it towards homogeneity in its organizational practices and products, the potential ramifications may be quite consequential. Therefore, it is valuable to determine if these changes have been the result of isomorphic pressures or if they are the product of functional adaptation and contagion processes.

Here, I will attempt to determine if sociology has been indeed been undergoing institutional isomorphism, with damaging effects on the impact of the field's voice. This will be a two step process. First, it will be determined if there is evidence that increasing pressures of institutional isomorphism have driven a homogenization of sociological writing. Then, I will determine whether the standardization of the literature has hindered the cultural impact of those texts, as evident in the amount of media attention given to sociological works.

To determine if the previously noted trends may have resulted from institutional isomorphism, the level of isomorphism in the field will be gauged to determine if it demonstrates trends similar to the trends towards literary standardization. If isomorphism is the driving force, the steadily increasing standardization should be mirrored by similar trends in the amount of isomorphic pressure in the field. If they are the result of functional adaptation and contagion processes, the amount of isomorphic pressure in the field will not parallel the changes.

This will involve applying DiMaggio and Powell's (1983) hypotheses for empirically measuring the amount of isomorphic pressure in sociology at various times. Institutional isomorphism is a structural force, so determining the extent to which it has been evident

in sociology involves analysis of the field's structure. The structure of the field will be represented by the interactions involved in production of the two most prestigious journals, the *American Journal of Sociology* and the *American Sociological Review*, which provide insight into the "disciplinary standards and ideals" of the field (Platt 1996:126). Network analysis will be applied to measure the amount of isomorphic pressure produced by the structure of those relationships.

To then determine if the changes in the literature have been detrimental to the field, standardization's impact on the cultural potency of the Voice of Sociology will be examined. To measure the field's cultural potency, the amount of attention paid to sociology in the mainstream media across time will be examined. The degree of mainstream attention afforded the research published in sociology will be measured by recording the number of times that sociology is mentioned in the articles and book reviews of the *New York Times*. Since the field also produces books that potentially have a cultural impact, I will also track the number and depth of *New York Times* book reviews for the books that *AJS* has reviewed, a selection that has acclaimed them as the exemplary books in the field.

If isomorphism has guided those changes and detrimentally impacted the power of sociology's voice, the field's cultural impact will have been reduced in recent years. If the changes in the texts are the result of functional adaptation and contagion processes, the effects will not be detrimental and the cultural impact will not show a steady decline in recent years.

## ***Chapter 2: Why Institutional Isomorphism Appears to be Standardizing Sociology***

*"Institutional isomorphism"* is the term used by DiMaggio and Powell (1983) to describe the process that occurs when organizations are pressured to conformity and standardization by structural forces within the organizational field. It is so named in reference to Hawley's (1968) description of isomorphism as a "constraining process that forces one unit in a population to resemble other units that face the same set of environmental conditions."

Institutional isomorphism pressures organizations towards conformity in their practices and approaches through interactions with other organizations in the broader institutional environment and with other organizations in the field. When a field develops within the contemporary institutional context dominated by bureaucracies and a great deal of standardization, the institutional environment pushes the developing field towards adoption of the standardized organizational approach already entrenched in the broader environment. As organizational standards from the broader institutional environment become institutionalized into the developing field, its boundaries become narrower and more defined, regulating future entrance into the field. Once the field is defined, the organizational practices diffuse through the networks of interactions, and become normalized. Legitimate entry into the newly structured field then requires meeting the standards of the field, which entails adoption of the legitimate organizational models.

Thus, the existing hyper-standardization of the broader institutional environment pressures developing fields into conformity.

Based on interpretation of existing literature about the field of sociology, this process of institutional isomorphism appears to have been occurring in sociology.

Information about the field's development and trends in its publications suggest that the conditions, processes, and expected outcomes of institutional isomorphism are part of sociology's recent history.

### ***Isomorphism Stems from Structuration***

Institutional isomorphism is the result of a field's structuration (Giddens, 1979), a process of institutional definition that leads to the development of a highly organized and defined structure. There are four necessary components of structuration, all of which appear to be evident in sociology.

First, structuration involves increased interaction among the organizations within a field. Evidence of this happening in sociology can be found in the growing number of collaborative research projects published in *ASR*, with a co-authorship rate reaching nearly 75% in recent years (Laband and Tollison, 2000; McDowell and Michael, 1983).

Structuration also involves the development of defined structures and patterns of interaction within a field (Dimaggio and Powell, 1983). The more prestigious journals, being controlled by more prestigious departments, are more accepting of articles written by their faculty/graduates (Crane, 1967; Shamblin, 1970; Keith and Babchuk, 1994), demonstrating the presence of patterns of interaction within the field. Additionally,

defined structures can be seen in the extremely rigid boundaries to upward mobility in hiring that lead to the prestigious departments hiring mainly from other prestigious department (Burris, 2004).

Further, structuration involves an increased information load within the field and an awareness among the organizations that they are part of a common enterprise (Dimaggio and Powell, 1983). Both of these conditions can be seen within the growth of the primary professional association of sociology, the American Sociological Association. The nearly 5-fold increase in ASA membership since the 1950s (Simpson and Simpson, 2001) demonstrates the increased understanding of a common purpose within sociology. An increased information load is reflected in the rising number of ASA sections, from five (5) in 1961, to 25 in 1987, then to 44 in 2003 (Simpson and Simpson, 2001).

### ***The Mechanisms of Institutional Isomorphism***

This homogenization process that leads to isomorphic changes occurs through three mechanisms: mimetic processes, coercive pressures, and normative isomorphism. Although the typology is analytic and the three mechanisms are often intertwined, they tend to stem from different conditions and result in different outcomes, allowing them to be analyzed separately. Evidence from previous studies of sociology suggest that the conditions necessary for all three isomorphic mechanisms were part of the field's development.

### *Mimetic isomorphism in sociology*

According to DiMaggio and Powell's theory (1983), mimetic isomorphism results from the over-adoption of successful organizational models from other fields to such an extent that they become institutionalized standards for legitimate entry into the field, reducing the legitimacy and prevalence of other approaches (DiMaggio and Powell, 1983). Examining the development of sociology as a discipline, it is evident that organizational approaches already flourishing in the 'natural sciences' were adopted. Now, seemingly as a result, the focus on objectivity, quantitative analysis and methodological validity (focal in the use of the experimental IRMAD format) have now become nearly standardized in the research/publication process (Camic and Xie 1994; Clemens et al., 1996; Turner and Turner, 1990; Pontille 2003).

According to DiMaggio and Powell's theory (1983), mimetic isomorphism stems from initially useful, but limited, adoption of successful existing organizational models in a developing field. As sociology began to develop, a few innovative sociologists coming from other scientific fields brought with them the organizational approaches that mimicked the one through which they had previously found scientific legitimacy in established disciplines (Camic and Xie, 1994).

When successful, mimetically-adopted practices are reinforced and their further adoption is encouraged. The entrenched norms and values of existing scientific disciplines were generally unquestioned in the broader field of science, so organizations within the field adopted the emphasis on academic journals, objectivity, rigorous methods, and quantitative research that brought legitimacy to other disciplines (Camic and Xie 1994;

Clemens, et al., 1996; Turner and Turner, 1990). Since inclusion in the Voice of Sociology entails being published, the more the adopted research approach was rewarded by being selected for publication, the more logical it must have seemed to follow that approach. With more emphasis on journal publications and increased scientific recognition, competition increased and adherence to those methodological standards became used to decide what research was published (Perucci, O'Flaherty, and Marshall, 1983; Clark, 1996; Hargens, 1991; Pontille, 2003; Turner and Turner, 1990).

The over-adoption of organizational techniques that have been successful elsewhere that theoretically occurs when mimetic isomorphism pressures towards conformity is most likely to happen under conditions of uncertainty within a field (Dimaggio and Powell, 1983). Ambiguous goals, poorly understood technologies, and a lack of visible successful alternative models are examples of uncertainties that may encourage mimetic behavior. These institutional uncertainties can be seen in sociology's development, appearing to have encouraged the over-adoption of the organizational models from other scientific disciplines.

The initial lack of alternative approaches to conducting and reporting sociological research in the newly-founded field suggests that the conditions were right to encourage the wide-spread institutionalization of the aspects of 'natural science' model that had brought success. At first, sociology was only recognized as science by other disciplines when it was conducted according to the definition set by the norms of the existing scientific fields (Camic and Xie 1994; Clemens, et al., 1996; Turner and Turner, 1990). Thus, those methods were not only successful, but they were the only ready-made

approach showing positive results. More and more, this approach was adopted by sociological research organizations (Clemens, et al., 1996; Pontille, 2003; Ross, 1991; Turner and Turner, 1990).

Additionally, goal ambiguity and technological uncertainty present in sociology encouraged the over-adoption of the experimental sciences' focus on methodology in assessing scientific worthiness, further advancing the possibility that mimetic isomorphism led to the current trends in the writing. This is evident in the lack of consensus on the meaning of "generality and novelty" in sociological research (Zelditch, 1979) and a much-noted lack of theoretical consensus throughout the field's development (Abbott, 2000; Collins, 1986; Connell, 2000; Davis, 2001).

These mimetic processes theoretically lead to a reduced diversity of organizational practices when adopted organizational practices become the standard model for success through further adoption, gradually reducing the range of accepted models until a tipping point is reached whereby adherence is the only acceptable avenue to legitimate entry into the field (DiMaggio and Powell, 1983). Various studies show that the writings published as sociology have been changing over time, adhering more and more to the methodological and statistical focus adopted from other fields. As a result, quantitative methods (see, for example, Pontille, 2003, Clemens, et al., 1996) and methodology have become the primary gauge used in selecting articles for publication (Camic and Xie 1994; Turner and Turner, 1990). Now, the texts of sociology have become rather monotone as the system has been standardizing its selection process, and, thus, publishing a narrowing range of styles and methods (Camic and Xie, 1994; Hargens, 1991; Pontille, 2003; Turner and Turner, 1990).

### Coercive isomorphism in sociology

Another mechanism of institutional isomorphism is coercive isomorphism, which stems from "both formal and informal pressures exerted on organizations by other organizations upon which they are dependent and by cultural expectations in the society within which organizations function" (DiMaggio and Powell, 1983: 150). When a field depends on external sources of support, individual organizations in the field seeking those resources will tend to adopt the standards of those organizations in order to obtain that support.

Since its beginnings as a science, sociology has utilized financial resources from organizations outside the field to grow as a discipline, suggesting potential reliance upon organizations outside the field indicative of coercive isomorphism. Research grants, especially from Rockefeller Family Foundations, provided much of the economic capital for building the first sociology departments (Bulmer, 1984; Harvey, 1987; Turner and Turner, 1990). After World War II, public and private organizations alike began to offer greater support for multi-discipline research projects involving sociology, and the financing of sociological research continually increased from 1960 until 1995 (Pontille, 2003). In tune with the expectations of coercive pressures, the resources provided for social research provided much for sociology, making their continued and growing attachment to the field appealing. The increasing stream of resources provided legitimacy to the field and was crucial in the institutionalization and professionalization of the field (Turner and Turner, 1990).

Isomorphic change resulting from coercive pressures generally occurs in two institutional circumstances: when a field's dependency is concentrated in a small base of external resources, and/or when a field interacts heavily with government agencies (DiMaggio and Powell, 1983). Examination of our field's development suggests that sociological research has been strongly reliant upon a centralized resource source, and clearly demonstrates that government agencies' support has also been essential.

Coercive pressures from centralized resource dependency theoretically result in the uniform adoption of standardized administrative practices, such as reporting mechanisms, accounting practices, performance evaluations, and budgetary plans (Coser et. Al., 1982). Greater control by the dominant organization allows for a greater degree of potential influence over others' organizational practices. Since grant proposals must be written for selection according to outside performance scales, unilateral adoption of the same external scale would be one possible result.

As sociology received more external support, research in sociology showed an increasing tendency to adopt quantitative practices. Given that the "structure of sociology as an academic discipline and the production of ideas is intimately connected to the nature and level of resources that have been available to sociologists" (Turner and Turner 1990:8), support from national agencies and private foundations as well as increases in computer technology may have encouraged the diffusion of statistical significance testing. In the 1950s, "computerized commodity statistics" were not yet available (Abbott 2001:115), but the survey paradigm was dominant and financial commitments to social science research were extensive, especially from foundations. Not

only did the funding sources encourage standardization of practice, but the research institutes (e.g., ISSR and SSRC) that received research monies were typically headed by directors who steered research toward statistical analyses (Turner and Turner 1990). Standardized methods for evaluating the publication worthiness of research findings have also developed in sociology since external support became a normalized part of sociological research (Pontille, 2003), further suggesting that coercive isomorphism has resulted from centralized resource dependency.

Coercive isomorphism stemming from interactions with government agencies of the state occurs as a result of their ability to apply direct pressure for organizations within the field to adopt their hyper-objective standards. When government agencies come to dominate a field's resources, it results in greater coercive pressure for organizations to conform to their rule-boundedness, formal intentions of rationality, and emphasis on institutional roles (DiMaggio and Powell, 1983).

Government agencies have been instrumental in the development of sociology, as they have supplied much of the grant money and, thus, their standards seem reflected in those evolved within the field. The rising tide of research grants in the 1960's and 1970's included money from a few government agencies that was specifically aimed at encouraging empirical research of certain social issues (McCartney, 1970). Using those resources, though, came with additional involvement of the government in decision making (McCartney, 1970). Much research funding was aimed at large-scale research on large bodies of the population (Pontille, 2003). Since sociology began to receive more external funding, there has been a parallel increase in the publication of co-authored research

(Fisher, et al., 1998; Hargens, 1975; Laband and Tollison, 2000) and large-scale data collection efforts (Laband and Tollison, 2000; Zuckerman and Merton, 1973).

The growing utilization of on government resources has also been echoed by changes in the way sociological research is reported in journal articles and the way publication worthiness is evaluated, and the changes that have occurred reflect governmental focus on standards, objectivity, and empirical analysis. Much of the external research support in sociology has come from heightened interaction with government agencies that sought such quantitative, empirical studies of particular social problems. Since those agencies began offering funding, a higher proportion of the articles published in ASR and AJS have become quantitative in their focus (Pontille, 2003; Clemens, et al., 1996). The use of the objective tone in journal articles selected for publication has also grown steadily (Clemens, et al., 1996), having now become virtually universal in top journal publications. These trends suggest that the field has adopted a standard of quantitative, objectified research and analysis that is an embodiment of government agency's formal standards.

#### *Normative isomorphism in sociology*

The final mechanism of isomorphic organizational change is normative and results primarily from professionalization. Professionalization is "the collective struggle of members of an occupation to define the conditions and methods of their work, to control 'the production of producers' (Larson, 1977: 49-52), and to establish a cognitive base and legitimation for their occupational autonomy" (Dimaggio and Powell, 1983:152).

Professionalization leads to the development of standards for inclusion that are dictated

by the existing model of success. As these standards develop, they are passed down as norms, becoming further entrenched, leading to recognition as the singularly legitimate approach. Research on sociology again suggests that sociology has undergone a strong push towards professionalization that has led to increasingly defined norms expected to contribute to isomorphism.

Professionalization first involves the growth and development of professional networks between organizations, through which organizational models diffuse (DiMaggio and Powell, 1983). The American Sociological Association (ASA) has seen a 5-fold increase in membership since the 60s and there has been an 8-fold increase in the number of sections at its annual meetings (Simpson 2001). As they grow, the extent of a field's professionalization grows, reinforcing the norms they value and allowing the spread more quickly between members.

Professionalization involves the socialization of new members of a field to a particular set of norms for legitimacy and prestige. The resulting institutionalization of those norms with the field's members and their pursuit of those goals then contribute to pressures towards standardization.

In sociology, legitimacy and prestige are gained through publication, particularly in the most prestigious journals. In October, 1991, managing editors of the American Sociological Association (ASA) decided to "specify the kind of writing style and manuscript organization ASA journals expect" (Firebaugh, 1997: iii). In doing so, the foremost professional organization of the field normalized characteristics of the experimental format that been previously, but informally, adopted from the experimental

sciences. This made that approach the officially sanctioned way to write sociological articles and the official avenue to legitimacy in sociology.

Professionalization that leads to isomorphic change also occurs through the filtering of personnel. Once the norms are in place, non-adherence blocks involvement in the field, barring those with disparate approaches from inclusion. Such filtering appears to have occurred within sociology. Burriss (2005) found rigid boundaries to upward mobility in hiring of sociologists, and that the most prestigious sociological departments almost universally hire only from other top departments. This shows that the Ph.D. granting department is the single most important factor in faculty hiring at early stages of sociological careers, and suggests that professionalization has led to personnel filtering. In high-prestige organizations like these, "policies and structures will be copied throughout their fields" (DiMaggio and Powell, 1983: 153). This further suggests that this could lead to institutionalization of the organizational models promoted by prestigious departments that set trends for the field.

Additionally, normative isomorphism is theoretically expected to result in the development of an established and stable prestige hierarchy for organizations within the field (DiMaggio and Powell, 1983). With the spread of a single set of standards across a field, the "exchange of information among professionals helps contribute to a commonly recognized hierarchy of status, of center and periphery" (DiMaggio and Powell, 1983: 153). This is evident in sociology, as Burriss (2005) found a strong constancy of the prestige rankings of sociological departments, which he noted to be related to the departments' positions in the academic network. This suggests that the expected effects of normative

isomorphism have occurred in sociology, resultant from professionalization that has officially sanctioned the organizational models adopted from the experimental sciences and government agencies.

### ***The Homogenizing Impact of Isomorphism in Sociology***

Through the isomorphic processes described above, structural forces lead organizations within a field to become more similar in structure, process, and behavior (DiMaggio and Powell, 1983). The more entrenched the structures and standards become, the more pressure is exerted towards conformity in order to be eligible for inclusion. Thus, the efforts of individual organizations within the field to survive and thrive within the highly structured field lead, in the aggregate, to uniformity. When institutional isomorphism occurs, the expected result is gradual homogenization of a field's culture, structure, and output. Again, all three of these expected outcomes are suggested in previous literature on the field of sociology.

The output of sociology is the literature produced, for which standardization theoretically involves the development of a standard set of research and writing approaches. Lately, the literature has demonstrated this conformity as the publications have been incorporating increasingly constant methods and selection processes (Camic and Xie, 1994; Hargens, 1991; Pontille, 2003; Turner and Turner, 1990). As discussed previously, ASR and AJS have become almost entirely comprised of articles organized in the IRMAD format, quantitative in their analysis, using the same statistical significance tests and symbols, and objective in their tone (meaning written in the passive voice without any reference to the author or particular individuals studied), at the expense of

theoretical and qualitative work (Pontille, 2003; Clemens, et al., 1996; Wolfe, 1990; Leahey, 2005). Since those texts are the output of the field, their standardization can be interpreted as evidence of the homogenization of sociology's cultural product expected to result from institutional isomorphism.

Homogenization of the sociology's culture means a narrowing view of what it takes to produce sociology and be a sociologist. The commodities produced by a cultural field, such as sociology, reflect not only the perspective of the individual producers but also of the constructed meanings and expectations derived from the interactions that have occurred in the development of the field (Bourdieu, 1993).

The homogenization of sociology's culture seems apparent in the fields' publications. Academic writing must meet the standards of the field before becoming sociology, so the culture of sociology is therefore reflected in the publications. Sociology's collective norms and structure decide the boundaries of what becomes part of the field by measuring scientific worthiness. Publication records have become the predominant status measurement within sociology for individuals and departments (Perucci, O'Flaherty, and Marshall, 1983; Clark, 1996), demonstrating a standardization of norms in the field.

Finally, the homogenization of sociology's structure is suggested by the social hierarchy created through publications. In academia, prestige is accrued by gaining social capital through inclusion within the publication network (Burriss, 2004). Social capital entails the "possession of a durable network of more or less institutionalized relationships of mutual acquaintance and recognition" (i.e., group membership) (Bourdieu, 1986). Therefore, departments' prestige rankings are determined by their position in the

network structure of top journal publications . Since those rankings have been found to be incredibly constant over time (Burris, 2004), the structure of the field has apparently not been changing. Thus, the homogenizing structure of sociology is evident in the static prestige structure resulting from the field's stratification.

### ***Other Possible Explanations for Sociology's Standardization***

Despite evidence suggesting that the mechanisms of institutional isomorphism have contributed to the gradual standardization of organizational practices seen within sociology's publications, the diffusion of those practices may also be the result of functional adjustments spread across organizations. The early benefits accrued by the field through adoption of practices that are now so prevalent suggests that the development of such standards could also be the result of suitable adaptation coupled with contagion practices.

Explaining the spread of certain practices originally adopted from the 'hard sciences' and incorporated into sociology via contagion and suitable adaptation explanations rest on the assumption that organizations will adapt to their environments, incorporating innovations that are useful (Strang and Macy, 2001). If the incorporation of the now nearly standardized practices has been functional and appropriate, their adoption would be an example of suitable adaptation (Leahey, 2005). If so, the spread across organizations within sociology could be explained by necessity, the product of contagion practices (Leahey, 2005). Contagion theory predicts individuals and organizations will learn from and model the practices of others in their environment in order survive, and thereby

propagate the practice by using it themselves and perhaps serving as a model for others, a field-wide example of social learning (Strang and Macy, 2001).

Mimicry of approaches previously successful in other fields was initially useful for sociology's development. Camic and Xie (1994) explained that this early mimicry of certain aspects of the 'hard science' approach by sociology brought resources and spurred the allocation of more. The norms and values of other scientific fields were visible and generally accepted, so when sociology adopted the same emphasis on methods and objectivity, it brought recognition previously only given to those other disciplines (Camic and Xie 1994; Clemens et al., 1996; Turner and Turner, 1990). Sharing knowledge in highly regulated academic journals provided the field with an academic voice that was heard (Clemens et al., 1996). With more emphasis on journal publications and increased scientific recognition, competition increased and rigorous standards were used to decide what research was published (Perucci, O'Flaherty, and Marshall, 1983; Clark, 1998; Hargens, 1991; Pontille, 2003; Turner and Turner, 1990).). As objectivity was stressed and methods became more important in determining scientific worthiness in the 1960's and 1970's, sociology began to receive the large grants and recognition that had previously been given only to the "hard sciences" (Turner and Turner 1990; Ross 1991).

Additionally, the development of standards for conducting sociological research amounts to building of consensus in the paradigm. Doing so is essential for the development of a scientific field for, without consensus on basic assumptions, advancements cannot be made and scientists will instead spend time debating the basic assumptions (Kuhn, 1970).

### ***The Detrimental Effects of Isomorphism***

However, the initial benefits accrued from the gradual standardization of sociological practices do not necessarily indicate that institutional isomorphism has not been the driving force. Even when institutional isomorphism occurs within a field, the standardization generally involves the incorporation of principles and procedures that were initially successful, within the field or in other fields. Often they become so engrained into the field because their initial use met with success. What differentiates institutional isomorphism from more functional explanations for these changes is the end result.

When institutional isomorphism occurs, it pressures organizations within a field towards conformity to the extent that the developing standards are no longer beneficial to the field as a whole. Early adopters of organizational innovations are commonly driven by a desire to improve performance. But new practices can become, in Selznick's words (1957:17), "infused with value beyond the technical requirements of the task at hand." As use of an approach spreads, a threshold is reached beyond which it provides legitimacy rather than improving performance (Meyer and Rowan, 1977). Strategies that are rational for individual organizations may not be rational if adopted by large numbers. Institutional isomorphism process makes "organizations more similar without necessarily making them more efficient" (DiMaggio and Powell, 1983: 147).

In other academic and scientific settings, research has found evidence of the negative effects theoretically expected from institutional isomorphism's homogenization. The self-interested motives of external organizations were found to regulate university

resource allocation, especially in hard times (Covaleski, 1988). Dey and colleagues (1997) found evidence that coercive isomorphism led to the downfall of egalitarianism in university settings, leading to the conclusion that institutional forces in academia are capable of causing homogeneity in US academic departments. Likewise, a study of national scientific approaches in 'Less Developed Countries' and 'Under Developed Countries' showed that mimetic isomorphism drives their policies without making them more productive (Shenhav & Kamens, 1991).

In addition, the standardization of practices adopted from other sciences and external funding agencies within sociology has resulted in the widespread adoption of organizational approaches that has not always been suitable or beneficial to the field. This suggests that institutional forces of isomorphism have driven the changing form of sociological texts rather than functional adaptation.

In studying the diffusion of statistical techniques across the top journals, Leahey (2005) found that they were sometimes inappropriate, echoing doubts about the suitability of institutionalized quantitative methods found in earlier studies (see, for example, Cowger, 1987; Raftery, 1995). Prior statistical research and disciplinary comparisons suggest that the overall technical superiority (or what diffusion researchers call "rationality") of these statistical significance testing practices cannot be established. If statistical significance testing was technically the most appropriate procedure and technical "fit" was the sole criterion for choosing among alternative techniques, then all disciplines would have adopted the same practice (Leahey, 2005).

This is not entirely without potential consequence, either, as improper use of such techniques can produce results that are distorted, artificial and deceptive (Gardenier and Resnick, 2001; Godlee, 2000). They can also be detrimental to the statistical validity and ethical base of the findings according to the American Statistical Association (1999). Despite these concerns, certain statistical approaches have been so incorporated into the norms of sociology that they became a mandated part of ASR publications in 1991 (Leahey, 2005). That may indicate that the tipping point has been reached, as described by Dimaggio and Powell (1983), where mimicry of the established model provides legitimacy more than it benefits performance.

Additionally, the nature of the well-established prestige hierarchy that seems to have resulted from standardized assessments of academic and publication worthiness suggests isomorphism over functionalist explanations. If the change was useful, the continued prestige of the top departments would be paralleled by continued dominance in terms of productivity. Instead, the departmental prestige rankings from one decade to the next are not explained by changes in faculty productivity (Keith and Babchuk, 1994; 1998), and the good predictors of academic productivity do not weigh in hiring practices that award importance to prestige of Ph.D. university (Clemente and Sturgis, 1974; Long, 1978; Long, Allison and McGinnis, 1979; Long and McGinnis, 1981; McGinnis and Long, 1988; Baldi, 1995).

Further, the widespread practice of taking the natural sciences as a normative model has generated problems in theoretical cultures of social sciences, in particular (Turner, 1989; Wagner and Berger, 1985; Wallace, 1983). They have often been subjected

to an artificial leveling when the natural sciences are taken as normative in the name of scientific epistemology that does not characterize all social science fields (Mallard, Lamont, & Guetzkow, 2002).

### ***Examining Sociology for Isomorphic Symptoms***

Since isomorphic pressures stem from a field's structuration, its presence should be evident in the structure of the interactions between organizations in the field. Thus, if this process has driven the steady trend towards homogeneity in sociological texts, there should also be an evident trend towards increased homogeneity in the structure of interactions between organizations involved in their production.

In their theoretical development of the concept, DiMaggio and Powell (1983) laid out general hypotheses meant for testing the level of isomorphism within the structure of fields. The field of sociology, as a discursive field, is defined by the texts produced (Bourdieu, 1993). Therefore, the interactions between organizations involved in their production embodies the structure of the field. Thus, the structure of interactions evident in those texts can be analyzed to measure the level of isomorphic pressure in sociology.

Since the existing information on the field suggests that isomorphism has been occurring, application of those hypotheses measuring the level of isomorphic pressures should show increased levels during the time that the texts have been growing more homogeneous. In order to assess whether or not each mechanism of institutional isomorphism has been a driving force behind the standardization of sociology, trends in

the levels of isomorphism will be examined to determine if they match the steady trend towards standardization that has already been documented. If the trends in isomorphism predicted by any of the indicators of each mechanism do match the continuous rise in standardization, it will provide evidence suggesting that mechanism of institutional isomorphism has had an impact upon sociology.

### ***The Possible Loss of Cultural Potency for Sociology***

If isomorphic pressure has shaped sociology, the homogeneity that has ensued should also show detrimental effects that are increasing with recent years' increasing homogeneity. The impact of the changes in sociological writing ripple further than simply impacting the organizations within the field. Since sociology is a discursive field, its texts are the voice of the field. Therefore, changes in sociological literature also potentially affect the power of the field's voice within the general cultural realm. Therefore, if institutional isomorphism has driven the standardization of sociological writing, the detrimental effects are expected to produce a greater dilemma, the reduction of cultural potency for the entire field.

There is nothing wrong with standards, objectivity, or academic journals in sociology, in and of themselves. But most of what meets the narrowing standards has one format, a technical tone and complicated language that make our voice a 'high-brow' cultural product because they can only be understood and appreciated by people in the field (Shrum, 1991).

Producing knowledge that is incomprehensible and irrelevant to the rest of society makes little impact on our society because it lacks elements of cultural potency necessary for widespread inclusion in the mainstream culture: retrievability, resonance, and rhetorical ability (Schudson, 1989). Wolfe (1990) already notes a tendency towards the use of the objective tone, which can reduce the "resonance" of the cultural product, making it difficult for the reader to relate the information to their life (Schudson, 1989). Additionally, the "greater density of jargon or scientific shorthand" inherent to the experimental IRMAD model that is now so prevalent (Wolfe, 1990) can be considered as indicative of an increased complexity that reduces the "retrievability" of the information for non-academics (Schudson, 1989). Likewise for the increased use of complex statistical tools that has been growing more prevalent (Clemens, et al., 1996). The stylistic conformity and passive voice characteristic of the experimental model (Wolfe, 1990) bodes ill for the "rhetorical force" of the texts' message (Schudson, 1989), for a bland and non-personal tone surely does not impress itself upon the reader when they are interpreting the meaning of a situation in their lives. Interpreted in these terms, the changes evident in sociological literature suggest that the cultural potency of the field's voice has been reduced by the growing homogeneity.

Incorporation into the public knowledge for sociology's research efforts involves incorporation into its mainstream discourse, particularly the news media. The amount of attention received is driven by and drives public interest, which depend upon cultural potency. Therefore, the degree to which sociology is attended to in the mainstream media discourse will be analyzed to understand the level of its cultural potency. If it is

declining, it signals a gap between the growing list of publications and the amount of potential impact and knowledge of that literature. As measured by the amount of mainstream attention paid to sociology at various times, it is expected that the institutional isomorphism has resulted in a trend towards decreased cultural potency.

## ***Chapter 3: Looking for Institutional Isomorphism in Sociology***

To determine if sociology has lost cultural potency because of institutional isomorphism, two steps will be taken. First, the structure of the field will be examined at various points in time to determine if there is evidence of growing institutional isomorphism. Second, the amount of mainstream media attention to the field will be tracked over time to determine if the cultural potency of the field's texts has been reduced as a result of the changes to the literary form.

### ***Testing for Increased Isomorphism in Sociology***

It has been argued that the increasing levels of homogeneity found in sociological texts are the result of institutional isomorphism. If institutional isomorphism has driven the changes evident in sociological writing, the steady trend towards greater homogeneity previously found in the field's literature would stem from increasing levels of isomorphic pressure within the field. To determine if this is the case, it must be determined if the level of isomorphism present in the field has continuously risen over time, just as the homogeneity of sociological texts has.

Luckily, DiMaggio and Powell (1983) provided with their theoretical explanation of institutional isomorphism a series of general hypotheses for measuring the amount of isomorphic pressure within a field. These hypotheses provide a means to empirically gauge the degree of isomorphism stemming from each of the three mechanisms that appear to

have influenced the increasing standardization of sociological writing. Here, some of those hypotheses will be applied to measure the level of isomorphic pressure from each mechanism within sociology at various points in the history of the field. This way, it can be determined if there has been the expected upward trend in the degree of mimetic, coercive, or normative isomorphism believed to have led to the increasing homogeneity observed.

### *Sociology through the lens of AJS and ASR*

In order to measure the levels of isomorphism in sociology, a clearly bounded field must be examined (Dimaggio and Powell, 1983). To represent the field in such a way, two of the field's most influential journals, the American Sociological Review (ASR) and the American Journal of Sociology (AJS), will be analyzed to measure the extent of isomorphic pressure present in the interactions that led to their production. These journals are an appropriate representation of the field of sociology for a number of reasons.

Sociology is a discursive cultural field, and therefore is defined, shaped and represented by the texts that are its cultural products (Bourdieu, 1993). It is in a field's discursive texts that information is exchanged and influences the actions of others, so institutions such as sociology can be understood as products of this discourse. It is in the discourse that institutionalization of organizational practices occurs, such as those observed in sociology (Phillips, Lawrence, and Hardy, 2004). By using these journals to conduct discourse analysis, I will be able to ascertain "the conditions under which

institutionalization processes are most likely to occur" (Phillips, Lawrence, and Hardy, 2004, p.635).

Academic journals will be used for this discourse analysis because they are the primary products of sociology, contributing to paradigm propagation more than texts (Kuhn, 1970) and serving as a currency of disciplinary evaluation (Clemens, et al., 1996). Ultimately, they are the gatekeepers of science (Crane 1970) and, thus, the most relevant factor in the establishment of research practice.

These two journals, in particular, are the discursive texts that effectively embody the Voice of Sociology. They are the primary cultural products that "define the field" (Pontille 2003) and hold the most central place in the network of publications (Allen, 2004). According to Leahey (2005), they circulate among sociologists more widely than other journals and have consistently published innovative, pioneering work. Therefore, their ability to influence establish trends is enhanced (Turner and Turner 1990). Although not representative of the breadth of sociological research, articles in leading journals tell something about "disciplinary standards and ideals." (Platt, 1996:126).

Additionally, using these specific journals provides comparative consistency. Many of the changes evident in sociology that have been noted by previous research were found through analysis of the field's journals and, particularly, these two journals (see, for example, Clemens, et al., 1996; Pontille, 2003; Leahey, 2005). Therefore, I will be comparing trends in the levels of isomorphism measured within AJS and ASR publication networks with the growing degree of standardization previously found in those same publications.

### Longitudinal analysis of isomorphism in sociology

Information from the journal publications will be extracted at a series of points in time to allow trends in the level of isomorphism in the field to be compared to the increasing levels of standardization. The examination of the sociological publications longitudinally is appropriate because institutional isomorphism changes institutions over time (Dimaggio and Powell, 1983). There has also been a noted historic lack of longitudinal examination of institutional conditions (Burt, 2000; McPherson, et al., 2001), one that can be righted by this examination of sociology's publications. Additionally, to effectively analyze scientific fields, "one must unravel the changing community structure of science over time"(1970, 179-80).

Information will be collected from volumes of AJS and ASR at 15 year intervals, beginning in 1955, and including 1970, 1985, and 2000. Since the hypotheses being applied are designed to provide momentary indicators of the extent of isomorphism, this will make visible any changes in the extent of isomorphism across time. Fifteen year intervals were chosen because institutional change occurs slowly within fields as large as sociology. Also, by working with fifteen year intervals a large portion of the modern history of the field can be effectively analyzed. Considering the time required to code the data for each article within each issue of two journals in a given year, smaller intervals might lead to diminished returns in analytical opportunity.

The specific years selected for analysis were chosen because they allow for analysis of sociology's structure just before, during, and after the time period between

1960 and 1995. The growth of external grant support, and the accompanying institutionalization and professionalization of the social sciences during that period have been well documented (see, for example, Turner and Turner 1990; Ross 1991).

Additionally, these years match those used in some of the previous studies of sociological literature that I have interpreted as evidence of isomorphism's effects (Pontille, 2003). Therefore, these years make the levels of isomorphism found at each juncture applicable when interpreting the events in the field that appear to have contributed to institutional isomorphism.

### ***Structural Analysis with Affiliation Networks***

Since institutional isomorphism stems from structuration of fields and involves structural pressures towards conformity (Dimaggio and Powell, 1983), measuring the level of isomorphism within sociology requires that the structure of the field be examined. As pointed out by Dimaggio and Powell (1983), structuration and the resulting isomorphism are the theoretical products of interactions between organizations within a field and interactions with external organizations that provide resources and otherwise influence the field.

The journal publications analyzed will provide a window into the structure of such interactions between organizations involved in sociology's research and publication process. Each publication is the result of a series of interactions between individual authors, the institutions they are affiliated with, the organizations providing resources, and others. Therefore, each issue is the product of the structured social interactions within the field

of sociology and organizations directly influencing the research that is published. So, the interactions between the organizations involved upon the field through their involvement in the research published in *AJS* and *ASR* will be used to determine the field's structure.

Each year's journal issues will be conceived of as a series of publication events to which the organizations involved in the production of the articles are tied. This publication network will represent one mode of in each of the two-mode affiliation networks, with each issue of *AJS* and *ASR* being the individual nodes, or publication events. Since there are six issues of each journal in each volume, each year's publication network will include 12 publication events.

Since isomorphic pressure stems from interactions between organizations in the field and with those outside the field that provide resources, two types of ties between the publications and influential organizations will be mapped: those with the organizations where the research occurred and those with the organizations providing resource support. By coding the connections between journal publications and the research and support organizations involved in production of the information published, a pair of two-mode affiliation matrices will be constructed for each year examined to represent the structure of those interactions.

The *research site matrix* will represent the network of interactions between publication events and research organizations (see Appendix A for an example of a research site matrix). The extent of those organization's involvement in the field's defining texts will be represented by the value of membership ties to the publication

events, as greater involvement in publications lends greater influence and prestige in academia.

The value of membership ties between the publication events and research organizations will be determined by coding the organizational affiliations listed below the authors of all cited documents in each issue. Since the organizational model of every contributing author's institution impacts the research process, organizations affiliated with every author of an article will be coded. When a single organization is affiliated with a single issue through ties to more than one article, each article it is affiliated with will be considered a tie to that research organization. This way, the matrix reflects the strength of an organization's involvement when it is more concentrated in a single year. However, when the same organization is affiliated with more than one author for a single article, only one tie will be coded. This is because the impact on the field's structure is only effectual once, as part of that article.

The *support matrix* will represent the network of interactions between the publication events and the external support organizations for each year, and will be used to examine the structural influence upon the field of resource-providing organizations (see figure 3.2 for an example of a support matrix). The extent of the support organizations' involvement in the field's defining texts will be represented by the value of each organization's support ties to the publication events, as providing research support makes the expectations of the support organization influential upon the process and writing.

The value of support ties between the publication events and support organizations will be determined by coding as a support tie each time an organization is mentioned in the acknowledgements section of any cited documents. Since support (and influence) can come from more than one source, all organizations mentioned will be coded as having a tie to that publication event (issue). However, like the research matrix, the valued ties of support organizations can be greater than one to a single issue. This allows every article mentioning an organization to be coded so that it reflects the possibility of heightened influence through ties to multiple articles in one issue.

From the information contained in these matrices, the degree of isomorphism in sociology will be determined at each point in time by applying the hypotheses laid out by DiMaggio and Powell (1983). Network analysis will be used to guide the measurement and interpretation of these networks, as it is meant to examine the structure of social connections between actors (in this case, organizational actors), wherein each of the three processes of institutional isomorphism would be evident.

To analyze the network data collected and coded, the computer program UCINET, version 6.1, will be used. The publication network matrices will be inputted into the program, allowing it to make calculations that will be used to determine the levels of isomorphic pressures in sociology.

By doing so, the amount of pressure stemming from each isomorphic mechanism will be measured for each publication year examined. If institutional isomorphism has driven the structural changes of sociology, the growing homogeneity of the field's texts seen in

previous research should be paralleled by a coinciding growth in the level of isomorphic pressure on the field from at least one of the isomorphic mechanisms.

### ***Testing for Mimetic Isomorphism***

Mimetic isomorphism occurs when organizational approaches are adopted from outside the field and become institutionalized, gradually becoming reified as the expected approach for inclusion. Thus, the degree of isomorphism is reflected in the diversity of organizational approaches in the field. Therefore, the level of mimetic isomorphism at each year examined will be inversely indicated by the diversity of approaches visible within the networks of organizations involved in the productions of the texts. If isomorphism has influenced the standardization of sociological writing, there should also be a continuous trend towards fewer visible organizational models.

To determine if this has occurred, Hypothesis B-3 will be applied to measure the amount of mimetic isomorphism at each year examined. It states that, "*[t]he fewer the number of visible alternative organizational models for the field, the faster the rate of isomorphism in that field*" (DiMaggio and Powell, 1983, p.155). At each year, there will be two measures used to represent the diversity of organizational approaches in order to consider various aspects of the broad idea of 'organizational approaches'. The first characteristic of organizational approach examined will be the type of research institutions involved in published studies, as different types of research institutions utilize different approaches (for example, Long and McGinnis, 1981). The level of mimetic isomorphism in sociology will also be determined by the visibility of the grant-driven

research approach, as obtaining this support involves a particular research approach (McCartney, 1970)

### *Diversity of types of research institutions*

The approaches of the research sites tied to sociology's publication events are legitimated as being part of the 'proper' organizational model through affiliation with publication events. Different types of research institutions conduct research via varying approaches (Turner and Turner, 1990). The institutional context determines the research setting and facilities, physical resources available, and social context. Additionally, the distribution of scientific activities differ in the division between teaching, research, and administrative tasks with different research settings. These differences, in turn, affect opportunities for research and autonomy (Long & McGinnis, 1981). Therefore, the variety of visible organizational approaches will be indicated by the variability of the types of research institutions affiliated with the publication events. Therefore, the first characteristic of the organizational approach that will be examined is the type of research institutions involved in published studies.

There is a particular model of research that occurs at academic institutions that is different from that conducted by private citizens, public and private corporations, or government agencies. Previous analysis of the field has shown that academic research institutions provided the model adopted successfully by some early sociologists, including the use of the IRMAD [Intro, Related Research, Methods, Analysis, Discussion] article format that has grown increasingly common in AJS and ASR over time (Pontille, 2003). This suggests that mimetic isomorphism may have led to the homogenization of writing

styles after being adopted from the established scientific fields during sociology's early years. So, if mimetic isomorphism has driven those changes, it will be apparent in a steadily decreasing number of alternatives to the university-based research models that are visible and, thus, legitimated in the journals where that model initially provided them with success.

The two-mode research site matrix representing the interactions between the publication events and the research sites will be analyzed to determine if the organizational approach that involves research being conducted at universities has grown increasingly prominent over time. To measure the homogeneity of research approaches via the organizations involved, the research site ties in each year will be coded as belonging to one of a broad classifications of research institution: Academic, Government, Private, or Individual research. These are modeled after the conceptual differentiation explained by Harmon (1968), who delineated the varying research contexts between academia, business/industry, government, and all others.

Research sites that are universities and colleges will be coded as having an Academic research approach. Federal, state, and local government agencies will be coded as having a Government approach. The private research organizations, such as foundations, that are neither academic institutions nor government agencies will be coded as Private. When the authors are affiliated with a location rather than an organization their approach will be coded as Individual research, as this indicates that they are not affiliated with an organization. When the organization is unknown, the type of institutional approach of the research sites will be determined by using the on-line search

engine "Google" to find web pages that provide information about the organization that will allow classification.

For each year examined, then, the extent of visibility of each type of organizational approach will be indicated by the extent of its participation in the year's publication events. Their participation will be the represented strength of the membership ties between research conducted at that type of institution and the publications of AJS and ASR.

In order to make comparable the relative visibility of each institutional approach within sociology across years, the *rate of institutional involvement* of each type will be compared, rather than the raw strength of membership ties. The rate of institutional involvement of each type will be the percentage of total research site ties accounted for by ties to that type of institution and will, thus, measure the proportion of total research site ties to each type of institution in each network. That score will be calculated by dividing the total rate of membership of each type of institution in a given year by the total rate of membership of all types.

If mimetic isomorphism has led to homogeneity in organizational approaches in sociological writing, it would be indicated by a steady growth for the university-based research approach and a shrinking visibility of other approaches over time. Since the sample of journals collected is not random, statistical significance tests bear no import in analyzing the results. Additionally, the use of statistical significance tests is not appropriate to networks analysis. Instead, support for the hypothesis that mimetic

isomorphism has occurred would come from a continuously growing rate of institutional involvement for research conducted at universities.

Mimetic Hyp. 1: Thus, it is predicted that there will be a growing rate of institutional involvement for Academic research institutions over time, and a shrinking visibility for other types of research institutions.

### Visibility of Grant-driven Research Approach

The importance of external grants in supporting sociological research and the development of the field has previously been discussed in other literature (see, for example, Bulmer, 1984; Harvey, 1987; and Turner and Turner, 1990). The growing incorporation of external funding into sociological research has been noted as stemming from the adoption of organizational models like those of other science fields that had already been steadily receiving such grants (Turner and Turner 1990; Ross 1991). It has also been noted that those grants are generally intended to promote a particular type of research that involves large-scale data collection, empirical analysis, and a focus on objectivity (McCartney, 1970). Research on sociology has found that large-scale data collection efforts grew more and more common (Laband and Tollison, 2000; Zuckerman and Merton, 1973), encouraging collaboration, as demonstrated by the increase in co-authorship in the social sciences in recent decades (Fisher, et al., 1998; Laband and Tollison, 2000). This suggests that the incorporation of this research approach into the

field's publication networks has influenced the trend towards homogeneity seen in the writing.

To analyze this aspect of the diversity of visible approaches, the two-mode support matrix connecting the publication events with external funding will be examined. Since grants tend to be awarded to research exhibiting certain organizational approaches, the extent of connectedness between journal publications and some source of external research support will further illuminate the level of organizational diversity. Here, the ties between the publications and the support network will be used to determine if the organizational approach that involves the general style of research promoted through the receipt of support from external funding agencies has trended towards prominence over time, reducing the diversity of other visible approaches. If adoption of the organizational models receiving funding from external sources led to mimetic isomorphism within sociology, there should be a growing visibility of the research model relying on external support within the structure of interactions leading to the publications.

To measure that visibility, the *rate of grant-driven research* will be calculated for each publication network to represent the level of mimetic pressure towards conforming to that approach. This figure will be the proportion of each year's total articles that adhere to the externally-funded research model, and will indicate the visibility of that organizational approach. To do so, each article within each publication event will be binary-coded as either receiving (1) or not receiving (0) external support, based on the acknowledgements at the beginning of each article.

A continuous reduction of diversity of visible organizational models would provide evidence of mimetic isomorphism. This would involve a steadily increasing visibility of this externally supported research model over time, as indicated by a continuous rise in the proportion of articles acknowledging outside support across the years in question. That would indicate the loss of visibility for all other possible organizational approaches. Again, because of the nature of the sample used and network analysis, significance tests are not relevant and the presence of mimetic isomorphism would be indicated by substantive and continuous trends.

Mimetic Hyp. 2: Therefore, it is predicted that the rate of grant-driven research will increase over time, indicating institutionalization of this research approach through mimetic isomorphism.

### ***Testing for Coercive Isomorphism***

Coercive isomorphism results from pressure to conform to the standards of external sources of support. It stems from excessive reliance upon governmental organizations and/or a particular organization. The level of coercive pressure stemming from both of these sources will be determined by applying a hypothesis for measuring each.

#### *Coercive pressure from government organizations*

With increased reliance on state agencies for vital resources comes increased pressure to comply to their standards in order to obtain those resources. Widespread dependency upon government agencies is theoretically expected to lead to the adoption of

approaches that fit the paradigm of objective, formal rationality inherent in those state agencies. Sociology's reliance on government support is believed to have driven the trend towards increased use of the objective writing tone and contributed to the growth of empirically-minded quantitative analysis (Pontille, 2003; Clemens, et al., 1996).

To determine if coercive pressure from reliance upon state agencies has driven the changes in sociological literature, I will test to see if there has been an increasing dependence on such organizations within the publication network. This will involve application of Hypothesis B-2- "*[T]he greater the extent to which the organizations in a field transact with agencies of the state, the greater the extent of isomorphism in the field as a whole*" (DiMaggio and Powell, 1983, 155).

Determining the degree of reliance on government resources will be accomplished through analysis of the two-mode support matrix showing connections between the publication events and the support organizations acknowledged in the articles published. All of the organizations providing external support will be coded as belonging to a particular classification of organization, either government agencies, private agencies, or academic institutions. Universities and colleges will be coded as Academic organizations. Federal, state, and local government agencies will be coded as Government. Remaining research support organizations that are neither academic or government in nature will be considered Private support agencies. Again, in uncertain cases, the type of institutional approach of the research sites will be determined by using the on-line search engine "Google" to find web pages that provide information about the organization. If pressure from reliance on state agencies shaped sociological writing, it will be evident in increased

reliance upon state agencies over time and decreased reliance on other types of support organizations.

If there is an increased rate of transactions with the state, it can be found by comparing over time the relative strength of ties between each type of supporting organization and the total strength of support ties in the network. The valued strength of support ties to each type of support organizations represents how many times in each year studied that a particular type of organization supported (and influenced) the publication events. The *proportional resource dependency* will then be found to determine the relative extent of dependency on each type of organization by calculating the percentage of all support ties to each type. This will be calculated by dividing the total strength of support ties for each type by the total ties for the year.

These measures of sociology's relative dependency upon each of the different types of support institutions will be compared to examine trends in the extent of isomorphic pressure from reliance on state agencies. If the total strength of support ties for government agencies increases steadily relative to the total strength of support ties over time, it will show more influence from state agencies upon sociological research. Such an increase would support the prediction that coercive isomorphism has shaped sociology as a result of dependency upon state agencies for necessary resources.

Coercive Hyp. 1: Therefore, it is predicted that the field's proportional resource dependency on government agencies will increase over time, indicating growing coercive pressure in the field.

### Coercive pressure from centralized resource dependency

Coercive pressure within a field can also stem from too much dependence upon a single organization for necessary resources. Concentrated reliance on a single organization comes with pressure to conform to the expectations and standards of those organizations, particularly the adoption of standardized, objectified reporting procedures and evaluation mechanisms. Research on the field of sociology has indicated a growing incorporation of standardization in evaluation procedures that are now almost universal (see, for example, Turner and Turner 1990; Ross 1991) that could easily have stemmed from structural dependency upon resource organizations expecting such standardization. Such standardization is believed to have contributed to the growing prominence of the standardized IRMAD reporting format (Pontille, 2003) and the growing standardization of the .05 level of statistical significance and associated three-star symbolism for reporting results (Leahey, 2005).

The more the sociology's voice relies on support from a single source, the more the standards of that organization are going to become part of sociology, so the level of dependency upon individual organizations will be examined to determine if one organization is highly relied upon. This will entail application of Hypothesis B-1, which states that "*[t]he greater the extent to which an organizational field is dependent upon a single (or several similar) source of support for vital resources, the higher the level of isomorphism*" (DiMaggio and Powell, 1983, 155). For coercive pressure from reliance upon a single organization to have been influential on the homogenization of sociological writing, there

must be one organization that is consistently among the most relied upon, and the extent of that dependency must be growing.

Within the two-mode support matrix mapping the network of interactions between journal publication events and support organizations, each article supported can be considered an influential tie. In order to determine if there has been an increased reliance on a single or several similar sources of vital resource support, I will first determine if there is a particular organization that is consistently among the most relied upon. The most relied upon organizations will be determined by the *raw strength of support* ties between each support organization to each year's publication events. This is the total number of valued support ties of each organization providing support. If there is an organization that repeatedly has one of the five highest *raw strength of support* in the network, it will suggest that reliance has been concentrated in a single organization.

If reliance is becoming concentrated in a single (or a few similar) sources, the relative strength of ties to the most relied upon support organizations will increase. To determine if this is the case, I will then measure the relative extent of dependency upon the support organizations to determine if the reliance of any centrally relied upon organization is becoming relatively stronger, as would be expected to increase the degree of coercive pressure on the field. This will involve use of two indicators of the degree of reliance on particular organizations: the proportion of total support supplied by that organization and its centrality among the support organizations.

The first measure of relative dependency upon particular organizations that will be used in this analysis is the *proportional strength of support*. This proportion will be

determined by dividing the total value of support ties of each support organization by the total valued support ties of each year. This can be interpreted as the proportion of total research support ties in that year's network that are provided by a particular organization. Coercive isomorphism would be indicated by an increasing strength of participation and proportional dependency upon a single (or several similar) sources of vital support over time.

In order to further examine the degree of reliance by each particular organization, the co-membership network for each year's support organizations will be constructed by using the 'Affiliation' command in the UCINet program. The co-membership support network shows ties that represent mutual influence between support organizations upon publication events. For certain organizations to exert an excessive deal of influence upon sociology, the support network must be centralized so that a few specific organizations must be growing more central within the flow of information in that network. Highly centralized, stratified networks have been found to use coercive pressure on their members to achieve conformity of practices, causing homogeneity and increasing rates of adoption (Wejnert, 2002). If coercive isomorphism is evident, the same organizations will be repeatedly and increasingly central to that flow.

To measure the relative centrality of sociology's resource providers within the co-membership support network, the *normalized flow betweenness score* will be calculated for all support organizations. This will be done by using the 'Flow Betweenness' command under the 'Centrality' toolbar in UCINet program.

Flow betweenness is a measure of the contribution to the maximum flow capacity of a network. Normalized flow betweenness scores of the individual organizations measure how central they are to the passage of information, relative to other possible passages of information through the network. If the same external support organizations are repeatedly the most central within the co-membership network and their normalized flow betweenness scores show a steady increase over time, it will be evidence that resource dependency is becoming more centralized.

Therefore, if a support organization has become entrenched among those with the highest raw strength of support for each year, it will show reliance upon a single organization. If the field's relative dependency upon that organization increases with time, according to its proportional strength of dependency and normalized flow betweenness scores within the co-membership network, it will show that the field is depending more heavily upon that one source of support. This would indicate growing coercive isomorphism within sociology, suggesting that the steady increase in standardization of sociological writing has been influenced by this process.

Coercive Hyp. 2: Thus, it is predicted that the same organizations will repeatedly be among those with the five highest raw strength of support, and the proportional strength of support and normalized flow betweenness scores of those support organizations will have increased over time.

### ***Testing for Normative Isomorphism***

Normative isomorphism stems from professionalization, or controlling the production of the producers, primarily through the resting of legitimacy in the hands of the university system and through the development of professional networks. By filtering the personnel and guarding entrance into the field, sanctioned standards for legitimate entry into the field and prestige within it gradually develop. Through interactions between organizations within a professional network, those standards result in status ordering that privileges the already high-ranking organizations, and their continued sanctioning solidifies the hierarchy.

Earlier studies on the field have used other analyses to demonstrate that a status hierarchy does exist within sociology and that professionalization is increasing within the field (Burris, 2004). This suggests that normative isomorphism through professionalization and structuration have been present in sociology.

According to DiMaggio and Powell (1983), when this structuration of a field occurs, it leads to the development of stable and broadly acknowledged centers, peripheries, and status orders. Therefore, the extent of normative isomorphism will be determined through application of Hypothesis B-6: "*The greater the extent of structuration of a field, the greater the degree of isomorphics*" (DiMaggio and Powell, 1983, p.156). If normative pressures have been influential in the standardization seen in sociological writing, structuration within the field should show a steady rise also.

The degree of structuration within sociology will be determined by analyzing the status order resulting from publication-based prestige. In science, publication in journals results in prestige, the principal currency in academia (Smelser and Content, 1980). The research organizations tied to the publication of sociology's top journals receive prestige from that affiliation. Therefore, the structure of the organizations conducting research within the field of sociology is an effect of position of research organizations within networks of association and social exchange, so publication in the top journals equates to a form of social capital (Burriss, 2005). Therefore, the hierarchical status of sociological research organizations is determined largely by their involvement in the publications that define the field.

Thus, the status order resulting from publication-based prestige will be used to determine the degree of normative isomorphism within sociological research organizations in the years examined. If the most prestigious research organizations are consistent across the years studied, it will indicate a stable and (since these are the most prestigious journals) broadly acknowledged status order consistent with the expectations of normative isomorphism. If such a hierarchy exists, and the extent of its institutionalization in the field is increasing, it will then support the existence of increasing structuration expectant of increased normative pressures.

First, I will determine if there has been a stable status order among research organizations by determining whether there is a consistent group of high-prestige research sites. The prestige structure of sociology will be examined through analysis of the two-mode research site matrix connecting the research sites from whence published

articles were born and the publication events. The valued strength of membership for each research site in a given year's publication events will indicate the raw strength of its prestige for that year.

From that data, computing the *proportional strength of membership ties* for each research organization will provide an indicator of which organizations have the highest status relative to the other organizations in that year's network, making the figure comparable across years. The *proportional strength of membership* of each individual organization will be calculated by dividing the total valued ties of each research organization by the total value of research ties in that network. If there are research organizations among the five highest proportional strength of ties in more than two of the affiliation networks studied, it will indicate a stable and (since these are the most prestigious journals) broadly acknowledged status order that would provide evidence of normative pressures to conformity.

It will then be determined if the extent of structuration has been increasing in a way that would match the increasing homogeneity observed in sociological writing. If increasing normative isomorphism has been influencing sociological writing, the extent of structuration should also be increasing. This would be evident in an increasingly high-status position for those organizations consistently most tied to the publication events. This test will entail examining the level of prestige accorded to the central research organizations through their connection with the publication events.

Since centrality within a network equates influence, prestige, and power (Wasserman and Faust, 1994), the centrality of the individual research sites will be used

to determine if the level of structuration is increasing within sociology's status hierarchy. Centrality in the network structure increases the visibility of a model, creating control without overt control (Powell, 1983). Thus, the most central research organizations contributing to the top journals are the most prestigious and have the highest status, giving them the most influence over what is defined as sociology.

Therefore, the degree of structuration will be seen through the relative level of prestige of the research organizations, which will be determined by their centrality within the co-membership network of support organizations. This will be measured by calculating each research organization's *normalized Bonacich's eigenvector centrality score* using the 'Eigenvector' command beneath the 'Centrality' toolbar of the UCInet program.

Bonacich's (1972) centrality measure will be used here, as it was recently (Burris, 2005), to measure structural prestige of academic departments in a way that incorporates the prestige of other organizations in the network. It was developed for analyzing centrality within exchange or communication networks (Katz, 1953; Hubbell, 1965; Bonacich, 1972, 87; Knoke and Burt, 83; Wasserman and Faust, 94), and assumes all ties are reciprocal. This measure of centrality calculates the prominence of individual organizations in relation to the scores of other actors, making it an appropriate measure of social capital that takes into account total number of links for department and weighs them as a function of number and type of links maintained by other departments. The normalized measures will be used to accentuate the comparability across years, as centrality measures are dependent on the number of ties that varies in each year.

If normative isomorphism has occurred as a result of the professionalization of sociology, the field should have a stable, clearly-defined core group of research organizations as a result of prestige from involvement in journal publications. If normative isomorphism has been growing stronger, leading to the homogenization of sociology, those organization's influence should have grown stronger over time. As a result, the stratification between high and low status research organizations should have grown more severe. Therefore, if the high-status sociological research organizations are growing more centralized in the co-membership network, it will support the notion that the status hierarchy is become more structured. If so, this would provide evidence of increasing structuration in sociology, suggesting that normative isomorphism has shaped the standardization in the literature.

Normative Hyp. 1: Therefore, I predict that the above measures of prestige will show that a core group of research organizations will be repeatedly among those with the five highest proportional strength of ties, demonstrating existence of normative isomorphism in sociology. Further, it is predicted that the normalized Bonacich's eigenvector centrality scores of those core research organizations will have increased over time, demonstrating that the extent of normative isomorphism has been increasing.

### ***Measuring the Cultural Potency of the Voice of Sociology***

If institutional isomorphism has driven sociology's changes, the structural conformity of isomorphism is also expected to have been detrimental to the field. The increased standardization noted in sociological texts has involved trends that suggest their cultural potency may have been reduced. The increasing use of quantitative methods, the IRMAD format, and a passive voice can be interpreted as reducing the rhetorical force, retrievability, and resonance of the defining journals (Schudson, 1989). If these changes have diminished the field's cultural potency, it would result in a loss of attention to sociology in the mainstream culture. Therefore, the cultural potency of sociological writing will be examined by measuring the amount of mainstream media attention given to the field.

If institutional isomorphism has led to non-beneficial standardization, the negative impact would have followed an initial period of success. Sure enough, the initial impact of incorporating organizational approaches from other fields and resource providers was positive. Objectivity was stressed and methods became more important in determining scientific worthiness, and in the 60s and 70s sociology began to receive the large grants and recognition that had previously been given only to the "hard sciences" (Turner and Turner 1990; Ross 1991). However, the benefits did not last, as in the late 1970's the funding for social sciences began to decline (Turner and Turner, 1990). Therefore, if the effect of those changes on the field has been detrimental, it would be indicated by a decline in attention since the previously noted high for the field in 1965-1975.

To measure the amount of mainstream attention the field of sociology has received at various time intervals, the Proquest on-line database was used to search for references to the field of sociology and its literary works in the New York Times. This periodical has been at the forefront of news sources continuously and provides a well-constructed database of necessary information.

Two aspects of the field's inclusion in mainstream media will be examined. First, the extent to which the field in general was focally involved in reporting by the mainstream news media. Second, the extent to which the field's most acclaimed books and authors were reviewed.

#### *Mainstream media focus on sociology*

The first indicator of sociology's cultural potency during various time periods will be the extent to which the field was focally mentioned in articles published in the New York Times. Measuring this will involve calculating for each five year period from 1950-2000, the *proportional focus on sociology*, a ratio-level measure of sociology's cultural potency within all articles of the New York Times. This will be determined by calculating the percentage of all articles in which any iteration of the word 'sociology' can be found in either the citation or abstract (found by searching for "sociolog\*" within the citation/abstract for "document type=article" ). To indicate the proportional focus, the raw number of such focal references to sociology will be divided by the total number of articles published in the New York Times during each time period. The terms were sought within the citation and/or abstract of the documents, rather than anywhere within the

documents' texts, to ensure that the measure indicates instances when sociology or sociologists were focal.

The five-year periods examined were chosen to allow for easy comparison between the levels of isomorphism found in the publication networks and the level of mainstream media attention. The first five-year period begins 01/01/1950, and runs through 12/31/1954, with a similar pattern after that. The end date of the first year period coincides with the year in which the first volumes of *AJS* and *ASR* examined were published, allowing this period to demonstrate the mainstream attention for the field at the time of the first publication network examined.

It is expected that the changes seen in sociological writing will have been accompanied by a loss of cultural potency, ultimately leading to a decline in mainstream media attention. Since the changes have been described as beneficially adaptive during their initial development, the mainstream attention is expected to have risen initially, then begun a steady decline as the writing has grown more homogeneous to the point of detriment.

Media Attention Hyp. 1: Therefore, it is predicted that the proportional focus on sociology in New York Times articles will show will initially show growth trends before reversing course and demonstrating a steady decline after the mid-1970's.

### Mainstream reviews of sociology's top books

To further analyze changes in the cultural potency of sociology's publications, the amount of mainstream attention given to the books deemed most noteworthy by the sociological journal *AJS* will also be measured. Those books reviewed by the most prestigious journal are assumed to be exemplary of the field. Therefore, this test of the field's cultural potency will involve examination of the degree of mainstream book review attention given to those books reviewed in each volume of *AJS* examined in this study, being 1955, 1970, 1985, and 2000. Book reviews were discontinued in *ASR* during these last fifty years, so only those reviewed in *AJS* will be examined.

The amount of attention those books have received in mainstream book reviews will be used to indicate the extent to which the information contained therein has become part of the mainstream discourse. To determine the amount of mainstream attention paid to these texts, the reviews of the *New York Times* will be examined, as they are a guiding force in determining what is read by many people. The Proquest database will again be used to search for corresponding reviewership attention by searching the *NY Times* documents of the type 'review'.

Three measures of book review attention will be used to examine the degree of mainstream attention garnered by sociology's noteworthy books.

The *proportion reviewed* will measure the percentage of sociology books deemed prominent enough for review in *AJS* that were also reviewed in the *New York Times*. This will be calculated by dividing the number of sociology books reviewed by the *Times* by the total number reviewed by *AJS*. To find the number of those books reviewed in the *New*

York Times, the authors names were searched for within the periodical's review documents during the three year period following the first issue of that volume of *AJS*. This allows for their gradual incorporation into the mainstream media.

The degree of mainstream review attention will also be measured by coding the *raw number of featured reviews* in the New York Times for those acclaimed sociology books. This demonstrates the extent to which the preeminent sociology texts were given a heightened degree of mainstream attention, demonstrating a greater potential cultural impact. Within the same three-year period following review in *AJS*, the New York Times reviews of those books will be coded as featured reviews when they headline a review page, take up their own page entirely or are considerably longer than the other reviews in the issue. This allows for a rough gauge of how many prestigious sociology books received focal mainstream attention.

The extent of mainstream review attention paid to sociology's defining books will be further measured by the *number of first author reviews* in the New York Times of any books by the first authors of the books reviewed in these volumes of *AJS*. This will involve a search of all New York Times book reviews from the beginning of this study (since 01/01/1950) for reviews of books by those authors deemed prominent enough in sociology to have a volume reviewed in *AJS*. For each first author found in these *AJS* reviews, the total number of books they have ever had reviewed in the New York Times will be tracked. In this way, a broader indicator of the mainstream attention to sociology's top authors will be provided.

While the organizational approaches involved in the production of books and journals in sociology certainly differ, they are both products of the same field and therefore shaped by the norms that have shown a trend towards standardization. The trend towards increased use of quantitative methods, for instance, has been noted in books as well as journals, although to not as great an extent (Clemens, et al., 1996). Thus, those trends are expected to have the same detrimental impact on the books' cultural potency and, thus, the amount of mainstream media attention they are given.

Media Attention Hyp. 2: Therefore, it is predicted that all indicators of NY Times reviewership attention to sociology's premier books will be lower in 2000 than in earlier years.

## **Chapter 3: Found:**

### ***Increasing Isomorphism and Reduced Cultural Potency***

Testing for evidence of institutional isomorphism within sociology's structure was the first step in determining if isomorphism has led to a decline in cultural potency for sociology. To do so, I tested for increasing levels of isomorphic pressure from mimetic, coercive, and normative mechanisms by applying the hypotheses of DiMaggio and Powell (1983).

#### ***Trends in the Level of Mimetic Isomorphism***

In testing for evidence of increasing mimetic isomorphism, I looked for the presence of trend towards a narrowing range of organizational approaches sanctioned and legitimated through visible involvement in the publication events of *AJS* and *ASR*. The degree of mimetic pressure in sociology was measured by the degree of homogeneity in the organizational approaches involved in and visible within the publications.

Two aspects of the organizational approaches involved in the publication events were examined. The first one measured the proportional strength of the ties of the various types of research sites to see if the academic research approach has become more prominent over time. Additionally, the proportional rate at which journal articles involved a research approach that includes support from an external source was examined.

### Greater visibility of the academic research model

The first aspect of the diversity of organizational approaches examined was the *rate of institutional involvement* of the various types of research sites. This was done in order to see if the university-based research approach has become more prominent over time, reducing the diversity of visible approaches in the process. Table 4.1 lists the rate of institutional involvement and the total strength of ties of each type of research institution.

During the years examined, the rate of institutional involvement for academic research sites shows a slight trend towards greater inculcation of the university-based research model into sociology's publication networks. In 1955, the research approach of universities made up 91.5% of the total ties between certain types of research institutions and the publication events in sociology's top journals (see Table 4.1). That number increased to 95.5% in 1970, was almost identical in 1985 (94.7%), then increased again slightly to 96.4% in 2000. The upward trend is slight and not perfectly unidirectional over time, but the great rate at which that model dominated others even in the earliest year examined make it difficult for a larger trend to emerge.

It is noteworthy, too, that the inclusion of research conducted at certain types of institutions and, along with that, their respective approaches completely disappeared in more recent years. For instance, research conducted by individuals without association with a research organization was part of the *Voice of Sociology* on two occasions in 1955, yet it never happened again (see Table 4.1). Also, the amount of published research conducted at government agencies declined steadily from an initial high of 12 ties in 1955,

to 4 in both 1970 and 1985, then to 2 in 2000. Overall, the total strength of all non-university-based research approaches in the network in 1955 was 14, then fell to 9 in 1970, then to 8 in 1985, then all the way down to 4 in 2000. Thus, there is a clear trend towards a narrowing inclusion of non-university research sites in AJS and ASR over time.

**Table 4.1. Total strength of ties and rate of institutional involvement of various types of research institution, by year.**

Type of Research Institution	1955		1970		1985		2000	
	Strength of Ties	Rate of institutional involvement	Strength of Ties	Rate of institutional involvement	Strength of Ties	Rate of institutional involvement	Strength of Ties	Rate of institutional involvement
Academic	172	91.5%	190	95.5%	143	94.7%	134	96.4%
Private Research Org.	2	1.1%	5	2.5%	4	2.6%	2	1.4%
State Agencies	12	6.4%	4	2.0%	4	2.6%	2	1.4%
Individual Research	2	1.1%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
total	188	100	199	100	151	100	139	100

By examining the rate of institutional involvement for the different types of research institutions in the publication events, support was found for the expectation of an increasingly narrow range of organizational approaches visible in sociology's representative journals. The modest trend towards increased prominence of the university-based research approach and the strong decline in visibility of all other types of research institutions together provide evidence suggesting the presence of increasing mimetic processes within sociology.

*Increased visibility of grant-driven research*

Seeking evidence for mimetic isomorphism also included examination of the visibility and legitimation provided to research based on an organizational approach that involves the use of external resources. The *rate of grant-driven research* was used to

measure the extent of involvement in the publication network of the research approach driven by resource dependency. Table 4.2 shows both the proportional rate and raw strength of ties to externally-funded research in *AJS* and *ASR* at each year in the study.

**Table 4.2. Strengths and rates of grant-driven research, by year**

Year	Total # of Articles in Publication Network	# of Articles Tied to External Support Organizations	Rate of Grant-Driven Research
1955	125	54	43.2%
1970	101	54	53.5%
1985	97	58	59.8%
2000	75	56	74.7%

There is a very clear trend towards increased publication of articles involving research involving external support. The rate of grant driven research legitimating this organizational approach increases steadily and heavily over time, from 43.2% in 1955 all the way to 74.7% in 2000 (see Table 4.2). The steady and continuous increase supports the growing prominence of this organizational approach predicted in sociology, and the extremely high proportion that is now evident demonstrates the shrinking visibility of research that does not rely on external organizations. Thus, there is further evidence of a continuing diminishment of alternative organizational approaches made visible and, thus, further evidence that mimetic isomorphism has occurred within sociology.

The decreasing visibility of non-academic and non-grant-driven research in the publication networks of sociology support the prediction that the level of isomorphic pressure from mimetic processes has been growing in sociology. Therefore, it appears that increasing mimetic pressure has contributed to the standardization of the literature.

### ***Trends in the Level of Coercive Isomorphism***

Next, the structure of interactions with external organizations providing support for published research was examined to determine if coercive isomorphism has increasingly pressured the field to adopt the standards of those organizations. To determine the level of coercive isomorphism present from both possible sources, two hypotheses were applied (B-1 and B2, DiMaggio and Powell, 1983). First, the proportional strength of the publications' ties to different types of support organizations were examined to determine the level of coercive pressure from reliance upon government organizations. Then, the co-membership network of support organizations was examined to determine the amount of coercive pressure from reliance upon a centralized source of research support.

#### ***Coercive pressure from dependency on government agencies***

The two-mode research support matrix of each year was examined to determine if there has been an increasing reliance upon government agencies. From that matrix, sociology's *rate of resource dependency* on government, academic, and private support organizations was measured. Table 4.3 shows the rate of resource dependency and raw strength of support ties for each type of organization in each year.

Across the time period examined, the amount of reliance upon government agencies has not trended continuously upward. The proportional resource dependency for government agencies rose above 50% in all years after 1955, indicating a concentrated dependency upon government agencies (see Table 4.3). However, it was at its peak in 1970 (58.8%) and actually trended slightly downward from 1985 (58.0%) to 2000 (51.5%). Since

the proportional strength of reliance upon government agencies has not trended continuously upward, the amount of coercive pressure from reliance on governmental agencies appears not to have been growing.

**Table 4.3. Rate of Resource Dependency upon external support organizations, by type and year**

Type of Support Institution	1955		1970		1985		2000	
	Total Strength of Support Ties	Proportional Research Dependency	Total Strength of Support Ties	Proportional Research Dependency	Total Strength of Support Ties	Proportional Research Dependency	Total Strength of Support Ties	Proportional Research Dependency
<b>Academic</b>	27	30.3%	28	27.5%	29	29.0%	23	22.8%
<b>Government</b>	43	48.3%	60	58.8%	58	58.0%	52	51.5%
<b>Private</b>	19	21.3%	14	13.7%	13	13.0%	26	25.7%
<b>Total</b>	89	100.0%	102	100.0%	100	100.0%	101	100.0%

Even though the amount of coercive pressure from dependency upon state agencies did not climb steadily over time as predicted, these findings do not fully negate with the possibility that reliance upon government agencies contributed to the adoption of certain standards. For all years in this study, sociology's rate of resource dependency on government agencies has been the highest of all types of support organizations (see Table 4.3). In three of the four years (1970, 1985, and 2000) more than half of all external resource support came from state agencies, indicating government agencies have had a disproportionately high degree of influence on sociological research by supplying a disproportionate amount of resource support.

These findings demonstrate the existence of coercive pressure from reliance upon government resources. However, the constant increase in coercive pressure from reliance on state agencies predicted over time was not found.

### Increased coercive pressure from centralized resource dependency

Next, the ties to individual support organizations were analyzed to determine if there has been increasing reliance on a single resource provider that may have provided coercive pressure on the field. To do so, a two-tiered analysis was used to first determine if sociology's resource dependency was consistently concentrated in the same organization(s), and to then determine if the dependency on such organizations was becoming more concentrated.

First, it was necessary to determine if there was a single organization that was consistently among the most influential, allowing it to provide a constant impact on the practices of sociology. To do so, the amount of reliance upon each support organization was measured by their raw strength of support ties with the journal publications (see Table 4.4).

Based on the *raw strength of support* of all support organizations, one organization has continuously been the most relied upon by sociology in each of the last three years examined. The National Science Foundation (NSF) had the highest raw strength of support in 1970 (19), 1985 (18), and 2000 (23) (see Table 4.4). Further, the cumulative strength of sociology's reliance upon NSF across all years made up 16.9% of all support ties (see Table 4.5), more than three times the second most cumulatively relied upon agency (NICHD, 5.0%). Considering that NSF was not even among the five most relied upon organizations in 1955, this indicates the development of consistently strong dependence upon a single, governmental source for vital resources.

**Table 4.4. Support Organizations with highest raw strength of support, by year**

Year	Support Organization	# of Publication Events Tied to	Raw Strength of Support
1955	SSRC	7	9
	Harvard	4	7
	Air Force	6	6
	NIMH	4	6
	Rockefeller	5	6
1970	NSF	10	19
	NIMH	6	7
	NIH	4	4
	Office of Ed.	2	4
	Wisconsin	3	4
	Russell Sage	3	4
1985	NSF	11	18
	NICHHD	7	10
	NIMH	7	8
	Aging	3	4
	Wisconsin	3	3
2000	NSF	10	23
	NICHHD	5	7
	Sloan	4	4
	Spencer	4	4
	Aging	3	3
	UK ESRC	3	3

To then determine if the level of dependency upon this highly relied upon support organization (NSF) has been increasing, resulting in greater coercive pressure, two measures of relative dependency upon each organization were used. First, the *proportional strength of support* was calculated to indicate the strength of support organization's ties relative to the total strength of support ties within the year's publication networks. Additionally, the *normalized flow betweenness* score of each organization within the co-membership network of support organizations was also figured in order to measure the centrality of their position in the flow of influential information.

The proportional strength of support scores show that reliance upon NSF has been increasing over time. The percentage of total support ties involving NSF showed a strong overall upward trend over time, from 0% in 1955 to 24.7% in 2000 (see Table 4.6). The growing reliance upon NSF can also be seen in the growing chasm between it and the second most relied upon organization. By 2000, the proportional strength of support from NSF (24.7%) was more than three times that of the second most (NICHD, 7.5%, see Table 4.6).

**Table 4.5. Most relied upon support organizations, for all years**

Support Organization	Total Support Strength, per Organization for all years	% of All Years' Support Ties
NSF	61	16.9%
NICHD	18	5.0%
NIMH	16	4.4%
SSRC	12	3.3%

Additionally, NSF has become increasingly central in the co-membership network of support organizations. In 1970, NSF's normalized flow betweenness score was 19.8, followed by 20.1 in 1985, and 27.4% in 2000. By this gauge, NSF has grown steadily more central in the flow of support and, thus, influence across the years in question.

The raw strength of NSF's support ties to sociology's top journals has made it consistently the most relied upon external resource provider. This reliance has been increasing, too, as seen in the growing proportional strength of support it has provided and its increasingly central place within the network of support organizations. This supports the hypothesized growth of reliance upon a single organization, in this case NSF, demonstrating growing coercive pressure within sociology.

**Table 4.6. Measures of sociology's relative dependency upon most relied upon support organizations, by year**

Year	Support Organization	Proportional Strength of Support	Normalized Flow Betweenness Score
1955	SSRC	11.1%	10.5
	Harvard	8.6%	13.4
	Air Force	7.4%	6.3
1970	NSF	20.2%	19.8
	NIMH	7.4%	9.9
	NIH	4.3%	8.7
1985	NSF	19.6%	20.1
	NICHHD	10.9%	5.3
	NIMH	8.7%	7.6
2000	NSF	24.7%	27.4
	NICHHD	7.5%	6.2
	UK ESRC	3.2%	4

Overall, then, there is evidence to support the prediction that the level of coercive isomorphism has been increasing in sociology's publication network. Despite not seeing an overall increase in dependency upon government organizations, one federal agency (NSF) is constantly the most relied upon, and sociology's dependency upon that organization for resources has been steadily increasing.

### ***Trends in the Level of Normative Isomorphism***

The status order among research institutions created through ties to these top publications was then examined to determine if normative isomorphic pressures that come from structuration were evident, and if those pressures were increasing. To determine if structuration has led to the development of a stable core of research organizations, the *proportional strength of membership* ties was calculated to see if the same organizations

have consistently received the most prestige through publication ties. To then determine if the degree of normative isomorphism has increased, the *normalized Bonacich's eigenvector values* were calculated to determine if high status organizations have been growing more central and, thus, increasing the degree of structuration in the field.

There were four research sites that were among the most strongly connected to the publication network on a repeated basis, demonstrating the existence of a stable core of sociological research organizations. The *proportional strength of ties* for both the University of Chicago and the University of Michigan were among the top five in all four years examined, while the University of Wisconsin (1970, 1985, and 2000) and Harvard University (1955, 1970, and 2000) were among the most connected in three of the four networks (see Table 4.7). Additionally, Wisconsin had the highest proportional strength of ties in each of the last three, further emphasizing the stability of this core (see Table 4.7). Because these four research organizations were tied to the publication events so strongly in each year, they represent a stable pinnacle of the field's prestige hierarchy.

Trends in the levels of prestige awarded to that stable core of research sites were then sought across the various networks, as measured by their centrality within the co-membership network of research sites. There was no clear upward trend in the *normalized Bonacich's eigenvector centrality scores* for any of the four universities constantly at the center of sociology's prestige hierarchy (see Table 4.8). In fact, the normalized eigenvector centrality of the University of Chicago declined steadily from an initial high of 11.4 in 1955, while that of the University of Michigan remained relatively steady, and those of the other two organizations (Harvard and Wisconsin) bounced around

(see Table 4.8). Since none of these core research organizations grew steadily more central and, thus, more prestigious, there is no evidence of a growing concentration of prestige being awarded to the core universities.

**Table 4.7. Total and proportional strength of ties of core research organizations, by year**

Year	Research Site	# of Publication Events Tied To	Total Strength of Research Site Ties	proportional strength of ties
1955	Chicago	9	15	10.3
	Harvard	3	7	4.8
	Michigan	5	7	4.8
	Northwestern	4	7	4.8
	Yale	3	4	2.7
	Penn	4	4	2.7
1970	Wisconsin	10	15	9.6
	Chicago	9	11	7
	Michigan	7	8	5.1
	Johns Hopkins	4	5	3.2
	Harvard	4	5	3.2
	SUNY	4	4	2.5
1985	Wisconsin	7	7	4.9
	Michigan	5	6	4.2
	Arizona	6	6	4.2
	UCSB	5	6	4.2
2000	Wisconsin	9	10	7.2
	Harvard	5	7	5
	Chicago	4	6	4.3
	Ohio State	4	6	4.3
	Michigan	5	6	4.3

This analysis of the prestige hierarchy derived from ties to top publications shows that there is a stable core and status order, providing evidence of structuration and suggesting normative pressures. However, those research organizations that are part of the research site matrix have not shown a trend towards increased levels of prestige from their place in it. Therefore, these findings do not support the prediction of a steady rise in the level of normative pressure towards conformity within the field.

**Table 4.8. Normalized eigenvector centrality scores for core research organizations, by year**

Research organization	1955	1970	1985	2000
University of Chicago	11.4	8.6	3.6	3.7
Harvard University	3.0	4.6	0	5
University of Michigan	4.8	4.8	5.8	5.2
University of Wisconsin	1.2	9.7	6	8

### ***Trends in Mainstream Media Attention for Sociology***

One potentially damaging impact of institutional isomorphism expected to be evident in sociology was a decline in the field's cultural potency as a result of the increasingly technical, objective tone of these journals. It was predicted that a loss of cultural potency would lead to a reduction in the extent to which sociology has been focally mentioned in mainstream media publications. The relative amount of mainstream attention paid to the field in both articles and book reviews was then measured to determine if sociology's literary homogenization has been accompanied by such a loss of cultural potency.

### ***Recent Declines in Focal Attention to Mainstream Articles***

Examining the New York Times database, the trend in the *proportional focus on sociology* in that periodical's articles appears to be a nearly perfect inverted-'V' shape (see Table 4.9). From 1950-1965, there was a steady upward trend in the percentage of New York Times' articles that mentioned some derivative of the word sociology (i.e., sociology, sociologist, sociological, etc.) in either their citation or abstract. The proportion of mainstream articles focally incorporating sociology peaked between 1965 and 1979, holding steady at around .05% (see Table 4.9). From 1980 on, there was a steady trend

downwards that indicates decreasing mainstream attention being paid to the field. In 2000, the proportional focus on sociology was only .03%, the lowest it has been since before 1960 (see Table 4.9).

**Table 4.9. Proportional focus on sociology in NY Times articles, by 5-year period**

Years	# of articles w/ Sociol* in cit/abstract	Total # of NY Times articles	proportional focus on sociology in articles
1950-1954	140	658736	0.0213%
1955-1959	161	627539	0.0257%
1960-1964	206	590994	0.0349%
1965-1969	269	537084	0.0501%
1970-1974	216	440462	0.0490%
1975-1979	206	407591	0.0505%
1980-1984	150	362675	0.0414%
1985-1989	151	350207	0.0431%
1990-1994	135	311814	0.0433%
1995-1999	95	312306	0.0304%

Thus, the proportional focus on sociology in the New York Times grew steadily as the field first began incorporating the initially successful techniques that are now nearly standardized, peaking just as the field was most recognized by others in the early 1970's. As the field reportedly lost popular favor since then, the amount of focus on sociology also turned downwards, steadily decreasing since then. This supports the prediction that after rising in the earlier years examined, the proportional focus on sociology would trend steadily downwards as a result of diminished cultural potency of the field.

*Diminished Mainstream Review Attention for Sociology Books*

The field of sociology also produces books, which are also relevant to the field's cultural impact. As products of the same cultural field, their form is also guided (albeit

with not such extremity) by the homogenizing standards. Therefore, their cultural potency was also expected to suffer, leading to the prediction that they would also show diminishing mainstream media attention. To test this, three measures of mainstream attention were used to examine trends in the extent of attention those books reviewed by *AJS* received in the book reviews of the New York Times. Results of these measures can be found in Figure 4.10.

**Table 4.10. Various measures of reviewership attention in NY Times to *AJS*-reviewed sociology books, by year of review in *AJS***

year	# of books reviewed by <i>AJS</i>	# <i>AJS</i> books also reviewed by NY Times	Proportion Reviewed	# of featured reviews	# of first author reviews	total # of NYT reviews**
1955	108	15	13.9%	10	89	10340
1970	106	20	18.9%	7	74	3679
1985	143	13	9.1%	2	61	8687
2000	202	4	2.0%	3	22	10535

\*\* There were no reviews found in the NY Times Historical database from January 1, 1975 through December 31, 1981.

Of those noted sociology books, the same inverted-'V'-shaped trend was evident in the *proportion reviewed* by the New York Times, and the rate was clearly much lower in 2000 than ever before. The highest proportion of sociology books reviewed in the volumes of *AJS* examined that were also reviewed by the New York Times was in 1970, and that was only 18.9% (see Table 4.10). Since then, the proportion reviewed in the mainstream media has dropped drastically. In 2000, the most recent year examined, only 2.0% received that kind of mainstream book review attention (see Table 4.10). This is clear evidence of initial growth until the 1970's, followed by steadily declining mainstream attention, providing support for the predicted trend.

The degree of more pronounced mainstream media attention to those same sociology books was also examined by simply tallying the number that received the lengthier, more culturally-impactful featured reviews in the New York Times. Here, the *number of featured reviews* in the New York Times shows steady trend towards lessened levels of featured reviewership (see Table 4.10). Again, this indicator of mainstream attention is at its lowest observed level in the most recent year examined (2000, 3 featured reviews, see Table 4.10). In fact, the two earliest lists of sociology books (those reviewed in *AJS* in 1955 and 1970) each individually received more featured reviews than the those from 1985 and 2000 combined. Thus, the steadily declining number of featured reviews also supports the predicted decline in mainstream media attention.

As a final, broader measure of mainstream attention to sociology's featured books, the number of New York Times *reviews of any books by the first authors* listed in *AJS* was examined. Once again, there was a steady trend downward, from 89 reviews of books by sociology's noted authors from 1955, to only 22 reviews in the New York Times of books by the first authors of sociology's noted books in 2000 (see Table 4.10). Additionally, further curiosity led to the finding that the New York Times has never reviewed any books by some of sociology's professionally acclaimed authors, including Barry Wellman, Anthony Giddens, Immanuel Wallerstein, and Peter Blau. Thus, this supports the predicted decline of review attention in mainstream media for the primary authors in sociology.

All of these measures of the amount of mainstream media attention paid to sociology, its books, and its authors collectively demonstrate that sociology's inclusion in

the mainstream literary discourse has been declining, having bottomed out in recent times. This is in line with the predicted loss of cultural potency that seems to have sprung from isomorphism's effects on sociological texts. Additionally, the main indicators of mainstream attention, the proportional focus on sociology in the Times' articles and the proportion of its premier books reviewed in the Times, show inverted-V shaped trends that precisely match those expected. As the field was rewarded in the late 1960s and early 1970s for incorporation of organizational practices now so dominant, the mainstream attention peaked. Since then, those practices have become increasingly prominent, leading to the gradual standardization of sociological writing, a trend shadowed by a steady decline in mainstream attention. This provides further evidence suggesting that the loss of mainstream attention has been the result of isomorphism's detrimental impact on the way the field's texts are presented.

## ***Chapter 5: What Does Institutional Isomorphism Mean to Sociology?***

The extensive changes in sociological writing that have been observed in a multitude of previous studies of the field collectively amount to an overall trend towards an increasingly technical, quantitative sociology. This study sought to determine if there is evidence of increasing isomorphic pressures that may have driven those changes or, conversely, if the diffusion of those practices was the result of suitable adaptations by sociological researcher organizations and their spread through contagion processes.

To determine if institutional isomorphism was a contributing factor in the standardization of sociological writing, the amount of isomorphic pressure in the field from each of the three isomorphic mechanisms was measured at various times using the hypotheses set forth by DiMaggio and Powell (1983). It was hypothesized that the steady increases in the use of quantitative, technical, standardized organizational approaches in sociology would be paralleled by steadily increasing levels of mimetic, coercive, and normative isomorphism within the field. If found, these trends would suggest that institutional isomorphism was at least partially responsible for the ongoing homogenization. This would demonstrate, practically, that the widespread standardization occurring has been driven by structural pressures towards conformity, rather than simply by functional adoption of suitable practices.

The increasingly technical, complex form of sociological texts also amounts to the production of increasingly high-brow cultural products, a trend that suggests a potential

loss of cultural impact for the Voice of Sociology. This research additionally sought to map the amount of mainstream media attention paid to sociology in the New York Times at various times in order to gauge the cultural potency of the Voice of Sociology. It was hypothesized that the production of increasingly standardized, high-brow sociological literature has diminished the cultural potency of the field's voice, and that a steady downward trend in mainstream media attention in recent years would be the result. If this was the case, it would provide evidence demonstrating the detrimental impact theoretically expected to result from institutional isomorphism, further suggesting that the changes have not been functional.

Based on these tests, it appears that institutional isomorphism has been at least partially responsible for the steady homogenization observed in sociological texts. Steadily increasing levels of mimetic and coercive isomorphic pressure over time were found within the networks of organizations interacting in the publication process of ASR and AJS. Those trends match the trends towards standardization in the literature, suggesting that both mimetic and coercive isomorphism have been instrumental in driving the changes. There was also evidence of normative isomorphic pressure, but its magnitude did not steadily increase as the homogenization of the field increased. This suggests that though normative pressures towards conformity have existed in the field, they have not been directly responsible for driving the changes observed. A more detailed discussion follows.

### ***Meaning of Increasing Mimetic Isomorphism***

Mimetic isomorphism leads to homogenization of organizational approaches as a result of the over-adoption of the approaches of successful organizations in other fields. In sociology, mimicry of organizational approaches from other academic fields, and ultimately their over-adoption and institutionalization, was believed to have contributed to the homogenization apparent in sociological texts. The adoption of the academic research model that focuses on methodological rigor in evaluating scientific worthiness was believed to have contributed the steadily growing prominence of the methodologically-focused IRMAD organization in journal articles. The adoption of a grant-driven research approach that generally involves quantitative analysis was believed to have contributed to the growing prominence of quantitative analysis.

To test these theories, Hypothesis B-3 was applied, which states that "*[t]he fewer the number of visible alternative organizational models for the field, the faster the rate of isomorphism in that field*" (Dimaggio and Powell, 1983, p.155). The diversity of the types of organizational approaches (academic, government, private, and individual) and the relative diversity of grant-driven vs. non-grant-driven research models visible in those texts were calculated to measure the mimetic pressure in the field. It was predicted that both indicators would show a steady decrease in diversity over time. Indeed, these tests found decreasing visibility of the alternative approaches, being non-academic and non-grant-driven research models, supporting the prediction that the level of isomorphic pressure from mimetic processes has been growing in sociology.

One indicator of the degree of mimetic pressure was the diversity of institutional types involved in the production of sociological research made visible and legitimate through publication in *AJS* and *ASR*. While already predominant in 1955, studies conducted by academic institutions became slightly more common by 2000. Meanwhile, research conducted by government agencies and private organizations has been declining. Hence, the shrinking diversity in the types of research institution involved in sociological journals indicates a shrinking visibility of alternative organizational approaches, supporting my hypothesis. This suggests that the methodological focus associated with the academic research model has contributed to the growing prominence of the IRMAD organization evident in sociological publications.

Since research that receives support and that which does not are often very different in their approach and breadth, the proportion of articles relying upon external support was also used to indicate the diversity of approaches in sociology. There has been a strong increase in the visibility of grant-driven research, to the extent that in 2000, the vast majority of articles published acknowledged external support. These findings indicate that the organizational model geared towards receiving those grants has become almost universally accepted as the legitimate avenue to successful sociological research, at the expense of all other approaches. This, too, can be considered strong support for my hypothesis that mimetic pressure to adopt the grant-driven research approach has grown over time. Research receiving external grants has been noted as embodying certain organizational characteristics (McCartney, 1970), particularly an emphasis on empirical,

statistical analysis, further suggesting that these mimetic forces have contributed to the growing use of quantitative analysis associated with this approach.

### ***Meaning of Increasing Coercive Isomorphism***

When coercive isomorphism affects a field, it does so because of reliance upon organizations outside the field for vital resources. This study tested for growing coercive pressure, as indicated by growing subjugation to the resources of government agencies, in general and by mounting reliance upon a particular organization outside the field. Here, again, the evidence indicates that coercive isomorphism has been instrumental in driving the changes observed in the nature of sociological writing.

Widespread dependency upon government agencies is theoretically tied to the adoption of approaches that fit the paradigm of objective, formal rationality inherent in those state agencies. Sociology's reliance on government support was believed to have driven the trend towards increased use of the objective writing tone and contributed to the growth of empirically-minded quantitative analysis.

To test for coercive isomorphism from reliance on government agencies, Hypothesis B-2 was applied, which states that "*[t]he greater the extent to which the organizations in a field transact with agencies of the state, the greater the extent of isomorphism in the field as a whole*" (DiMaggio and Powell, 1983, 155). It was predicted that the relative dependency upon governmental organizations for research support (as opposed to other types of support institutions) has increased over time.

Through all years examined, sociology's rate of resource dependency was demonstrably highest for government agencies, with government agencies making up over half of all support ties in 1970, 1985, and 2000. Despite this strong evidence of coercive pressure from interactions with state agencies, the level of isomorphism did not progressively increase. The proportional strength of support ties to government agencies was slightly higher in 1970 and 1985 than in 2000. While this does not support the expectation of a continued upward trend in the hypothesis, the extensive dependence upon state agencies evident across the years studies does leave open the possibility that such continued reliance has impacted sociology in a way that would enable coercive pressures to contribute to the growing standardization of the field's works.

Centralized reliance on a single organization comes with pressure to conform to the expectations and standards of those organizations, particularly the adoption of standardized, objectified reporting procedures and evaluation mechanisms. Such reliance was believed to have contributed to the growing prominence of the standardized IRMAD reporting format and the growing standardization of the .05 level of statistical significance and associated three-star symbolism for reporting results.

To test for coercive isomorphism stemming from centralized reliance upon a single organization, Hypothesis B-1 was applied, stating that "*[t]he greater the extent to which an organizational field is dependent upon a single (or several similar) source of support for vital resources, the higher the level of isomorphism*" (DiMaggio and Powell, 1983, 155). It was predicted that there would be a single support organization that was repeatedly among the most relied upon, demonstrating reliance on a single source for support.

Further, it was predicted that this organization has grown increasingly central and proportionally more relied upon, demonstrating its increasing influence on the organizational practices of sociology.

Looking for coercive pressure begotten from predominant reliance on a single organization, a rapidly increasing reliance upon the National Science Foundation (NSF) was discovered. That organization, not even among the support organizations in 1955, was the resource provider most strongly tied to the publication network in each of the last three years examined (1970, 1985, and 2000). Additionally, the proportional strength of NSF's support ties increased over those years, as did its centrality within the network of support organizations. By 2000, NSF's normalized flow betweenness score, which represents its relative centrality within the flow of information from research support organizations, was more than three times that of the second-most central organization. All together, the many measures of NSF's increasingly focal position within the resource base of sociology supports the prediction of increasing reliance upon a single source of research support.

By finding such strong evidence of continuously concentrated reliance on government agencies for vital resources and an increasingly centralized dependence upon one government organization in particular, this study suggests that coercive isomorphism has impacted sociology as we know it. The influx of resources that has previously been deemed instrumental in the development of the social science seems to have come with a price. As NSF (and government organizations, in general) have been acknowledged for their support in the field's representative journals, they then became the standard for

support, perpetuating their influence over the production of sociological knowledge.

Approaching research and scientific writing according to their standards appears to have become part of what it takes to create sociology.

These coercive pressures that have come with external dependency also go a long way towards painting a backdrop for recent findings about the field. The growing dependence upon a single resource provider that is also a government organization suggests that coercive pressure to adopt NSF's focus on objectivity and standardized reporting and evaluation procedures has contributed to the rise of the objective tone, standardized IRMAD reporting format, and standardized use of .05 significance tests and the three-star reporting system.

### ***Meaning of Existing, but not Increasing, Normative Isomorphism***

Normative isomorphism stems from the professionalization and resulting structuration of a field. Professionalization leads to the development of officially recognized standards for assessment and status. Normative isomorphism is believed to have contributed to the development of now nearly universal standards of assessment for publication worthiness in sociology; specifically the institutionalization of the objective tone and IRMAD reporting format now officially sanctioned as the proper writing style and manuscript organization expected of ASA journals (ASA 1997, iii).

Additionally, normative isomorphism is theoretically expected to result in structuration, the net result of which is the development of an established and stable prestige hierarchy for organizations within the field. Since publication records are the

main indicator of prestige, the affiliation network connecting the publications and the research organizations shows which organizations received prestige through publication, providing an opportunity for analysis of the field's social hierarchy.

To measure the level of normative isomorphism present in the field, Dimaggio and Powell's (1983: 156) Hypothesis B-6 was applied, which states that "[t]he greater the extent of structuration of a field, the greater the degree of isomorphics" (Dimaggio and Powell, 1983, p.156). It was predicted that the structuration would show a steady increase, as evident in the existence of a stable group of high-status research organizations. Further, those organizations were predicted to have become more central in the research organization network, demonstrating increasing structuration over time.

The structure of the status hierarchy, as dictated by publication in these top journals, showed the existence of a stable core of research organizations. There were four universities that were among the five highest proportional strength of membership ties in at least three of the networks examined. Thus, this clearly demonstrates that a stable core of prestigious organizations has developed, supporting the predicted existence of structuration that indicates the presence of normative isomorphism.

At the same time, there was no evidence of a trends towards increasing structuration of the research site network, as the core universities among the most central and strongly tied in each year showed no trend towards occupying increasingly focal places in the network of research organizations. Their normalized eigenvector centrality scores did not demonstrate a steady trend upwards over time, meaning that

they did garner an increasing amount of prestige through centrality relative to the amount of prestige accorded the other research organizations.

While there is evidence that normative isomorphism exists within sociology, the status of the core research organizations has not shown a steady increase, and therefore does not support the prediction that the degree of structuration in the field has grown. Therefore, these results do not suggest that normative isomorphic pressures have contributed to the changing form of sociological writing.

While the extent of structuration did not increase over time, the evidence of a stable core of universities still supports its presence, a presence that still may have impacted the field considerably. The development of this stratified prestige hierarchy in a system where departmental prestige is based on publication does appear to be a product of professionalization that has occurred within sociology. As the field has attempted to define itself and its standards, those standards have been defined and institutionalized by those organizations first afforded prestige based on the system adopted from the 'natural sciences.' That is why those same universities have been repeatedly among the most tied to the production of the *Voice of Sociology*. Over time, the standards of professional sociology have become more entrenched as the field has become more professionalized, leading to previous findings of an entrenched group of core universities, based on publication records (Burris, 2004). The structuration of the field's prestige hierarchy in this way certainly also provides some explanation for the institutional affiliation effect on peer review (Blank, 1991).

### ***Meaning of Reduced Mainstream Media Attention***

Substantively more important than the evidence of isomorphic pressures to parallel these changes is the effect they have had on the Voice of Sociology. Additionally, institutional isomorphism is inherently associated with harmful effects stemming from standardization. So, to further clarify if institutional isomorphism has contributed to the field's evident homogenization, standardization's effect on the cultural potency of the writing was also tested.

The output of sociology is the field's literature, the Voice of Sociology, for which the observed trends in sociological writing appear to have led to the production of increasingly high-brow cultural products that possess a reduced level of cultural potency. Therefore, the effects of the observed standardization were examined by measuring the mainstream media attention that would be expected to suffer with diminished cultural potency across the same time period. Sure enough, as the homogenization of sociological texts has increased in recent years, it appears that the field's cultural potency has been steadily declining.

The amount of mainstream attention in the New York Times that has been directed at sociology and its texts has been steadily decreasing in more recent years according to four separate measures. The proportion of articles in which some iteration of the word 'sociology' is important enough to be included in the citation or abstract peaked in the 1970's, and was found to be at its lowest level in the study in the most recent year, 2000. Likewise for the proportion of sociology's influential books reviewed in the New York Times' book reviews. Furthermore, the extent to which those important books received

featured reviews and the number of reviews of anything by their authors simply trended directly downward. Together, these trends clearly demonstrate that sociology's standardization has been echoed by the predicted loss of mainstream attention paid to sociology in recent years.

### ***Impacts of Institutional Isomorphism Being Found in Sociology***

The evidence that mimetic and coercive pressures have been steadily increasing, coupled with the reduced cultural potency suggested by the recent reduction in mainstream media attention, provide evidence of the theoretical processes and results of institutional isomorphism within sociology. This evidence of institutional isomorphism corresponds chronologically with the standardization of an increasingly technical, complex form of sociological writing. Thus, this provides further evidence strongly suggesting that institutional isomorphism has been at least partially responsible for the literature's homogenization. Conversely, it provides evidence that the trend towards a more quantitative, technical sociological writing form has not been solely the result of suitable adaptations and contagion processes, for the results suggest that the changes are dysfunctional.

In a theoretical sense, the evidence supporting the hypothesized existence and effects of institutional isomorphism in sociology extends the already established validity of DiMaggio and Powell's (1983) organizational theory. As the most cited ASR article ever, it has been applied across disciplines and with varying methodologies. However, it seems to have only once before been applied to analyzing the discipline from which it sprung, and

even then it was applied as an explanatory mechanism, not an empirical test of their derived hypotheses (Leahey, 2005). This study begins to bridge that gap, applying the field-level theory to indicators of the entire field. The network analysis of the structural relationships in sociology's publication networks also provides an appropriate level of analysis that has been generally lacking in previous applications. Conceptually, this provides support that each step in the theoretical process, from the prerequisite structuration to the detrimental effects, can be demonstrated empirically in the real world.

At the same time, the evidence of institutional isomorphism's impact on the developing form of sociological texts does not necessarily mean that it is solely responsible for those changes. Multiple forces almost certainly have impacted the changes, as the structural pressures of institutional isomorphism cannot totally determine the selection of which research to publish; there is inherently some agency and isomorphism only provides pressure, albeit strong pressure. Additionally, the benefits accrued as a result of the widespread adoption of these organizational approaches include academic legitimacy and the development of consensus within the field. Both are essential obstacles for a developing scientific field to overcome, and they suggest that the result of the changes has been partially functional. Therefore, it is probable that the changes have also been driven to some degree by suitable adaptation and contagion processes.

More importantly, the changes observed have seemingly decreased the impact of the Voice of Sociology in the process. In order for knowledge to be produced by sociology, the research findings must be disseminated to have any cultural meaning

(Merton, 1968). Sociological publications are the conduit through which the research conducted is disseminated, so they determine the field's impact within the larger cultural realm. The practical value of sociological research, then, is dependent upon the cultural potency of the texts that make up that voice, which determines at least part of their potential for a larger social impact. With reduced cultural potency, the natural result is lessened involvement in the mainstream discourse, which amounts to reduced opportunity for dissemination. The complexity, standardization, and blandness of the current isomorphism of sociology's discursive field appear to present potential problems for the diffusion and application of the texts beyond the field. While a cultural product must also possess "institutional retention" through legitimacy in order to be culturally potent (Schudson, 1989), a balance is key, and a hegemonic perspective on sociology seemingly defeats itself. Without applicability outside of sociology, the legitimacy derived from the use of certain practices is wasted along with the valuable contributions to understanding social interactions that they promote.

Still, there is no way to determine if the reduced mainstream media attention is strictly, or even directly, the result of a loss in cultural potency tied to the changes in sociology's texts. Certainly, the degree of mainstream media attention provided to a scientific field is also impacted by the broader cultural setting. In the United States, an individualistic understanding of the world probably hinders the broad cultural impact of social research. Additionally, the information in the literature simply may not be accessible to a broader audience, regardless of how it is presented. For instance, this analysis would have been greatly hindered without the use of such 'high-brow' terms as

'institutional isomorphism', and without complicated statistical analyses like 'flow betweenness'.

That being said, the homogenization observed in sociology appears to be at least partially the result of institutional isomorphism, which also means that it is a self-perpetuating force. If it continues, there are many other potentially damaging effects. Some of the harmful effects of the continued standardization of sociology's culture and structure are already evident, and other potential drawbacks can be readily seen.

As sociology's culture grows homogeneous, the field takes on a narrowing view of what is involved in the production of sociological knowledge and who is qualified to produce it. Standardized culture entails extreme professionalization and increased reliance on credentials, potentially reducing the diversity of viewpoints welcomed into the field by eliminating those not legitimized by education level, scientific perspective, and academic affiliation. Research on other fields demonstrates that the greater the degree of professionalization, the less variation accepted within a field (see, for example, Torres, 1988). This means that as a result of professionalization, sociology's discourse could become less likely to include the potentially enlightening perspectives of many who possess a sociological imagination but not the academic resources to properly legitimate them. Already, Guetzkow and colleagues (2004) noted that social scientists tend to describe 'original data' only in terms of variations in quantitative analysis, rather than in terms of approach.

The detrimental impact of standardization within sociology's culture can already be seen in the widespread acceptance of the theoretical scientific premises of the natural

sciences (see, for example, Turner, 1989; Wagner and Berger, 1985; Wallace, 1983), even as they are not always applicable to social science fields (Mallard, Lamont, and Guetzkow, 2002). As a result of that sometimes blind adherence to existing norms, Leahey (2005) found that the over-standardization of analytical methods in journals has created problems in the field. The "three-star system" for signifying statistical significance, and the use of the .05, .01, and .001 alpha levels are so common as to have become a mandated part of the research practice of one of these journals in 1991. Yet, they were found to be theoretically inappropriate (Leahey, 2005), contrary to statistical ethics (American Statistical Association, 1999), and part of a process regularly prejudiced against null findings (Gardenier and Resnick, 2001; Godlee, 2000). Further advancement in the production of sociology might be hindered because the validity of beliefs can be sustained beyond evidence to the contrary if scientists embedded in research communities systematically interpret data in only one way (Kuhn, 1970).

Stratification also results from homogenization of a field's structure, and seems to have already begun to run contrary to the best interests of the field of sociology. Publication in the top journals brings organizations prestige, along with a disproportionate share of resources that perpetuates their status, according to the theory of cumulative advantage (Merton, 1973). The prestige stratification that has already resulted from institutional isomorphism is anti-thetical to the free market of ideas in science.

Already there exists evidence of a large inequality in returns to scientific labor (Allison, Long, and Krauze, 1982; Cole and Cole, 1973), and a lack of support for presumed relationship between academic productivity and departmental prestige expected in a

meritocratic system (Cole and Cole, 73; Keith and Babchuk, 1994, 1998; Jacobs, 1999). The structuration of the field and resulting prestige hierarchy already in place also appear to have led to the non-meritocratic effect of institutional affiliation on peer review (Blank, 1991), and the stasis in network of Ph.D. exchanges tying hiring departments with graduate programs of their hirees (Burriss, 2004). If the structure of sociology production grows more homogeneous, organizations conducting sociological research will be further stratified. If certain organizations have too much influence upon the research process and what gets published in sociology's defining journals, Merton's normative ethos of science (1973)-- the meritocratic application of universalistic criteria for judging worthiness—may be lost.

The clear evidence of institutional isomorphism in all its form found in the field of sociology clearly makes previous research on the field amount to more than evidence of its 'scientific development' through 'objectivity' and 'rigorous methods'. They appear to have already led to a degree homogeneity and stratification, and the isomorphic force seems to be growing. Consequences seem to have begun, and the theoretical extension of a continued trend towards homogeneity throughout the field does not agree with our scientific ethos.

### ***What Can be Done?***

To note, this research is not intended to put on trial the current members of our field or their practices. This is, after all, a structural force that is not the product of individual actions or the fault of any individual sociologist or sociology department. Yet

the evidence suggests that the field's active participants should be aware of and perhaps even consider altering the current trends. This notion is supplemented by the advice of Leahey (2005, 21) regarding the standardized over-use of certain statistical techniques that he found to also be the result of coercive isomorphism.

Perhaps sociologists can capitalize on the role of social factors to reduce the influence of other factors - such as misunderstanding, lack of knowledge, psychological pressure and the ostensible lack of alternatives - that contribute to trends in statistical significance testing practice. Training that takes place within intellectual communities is likely to be heeded and transferred easily by community members. Given the significance of institutional status, researchers in highly prestigious departments may be able to influence others' research practices through their roles as researchers, teachers and reviewers... Some researchers, not surprisingly at Harvard University, have made efforts to initiate change in statistical significance testing research practice.<sup>11</sup> Such researchers, especially in their capacity as peer reviewers, may have as much power to change current standards and promote sound research practices as certain journal editors.

Additionally, a seemingly novel concept to at least directly address the reduced cultural potency of the literature comes to mind. In the spirit of Gonzo journalism, perhaps a niche of sociologists/writers could be carved out to 'report' the findings of the field in consciously subjective terms, as they relate to the lives of non-sociologists. By embracing the inherent subjectivity of interpreting research findings and adding an element of deliberate 'readability', perhaps the practical meaning and potential of the field's findings could be disseminated without having to 'dumb down' the academic literature. As founding editor of the *American Journal of Sociology*, Albion Small said it best, "the aim of science should be to show the meaning of familiar things, not to construct a kingdom for itself in which, if familiar things are admitted, they are obscured

under an impenetrable disguise of artificial expression. If sociology is to be of any influence among practical men, it must be able to put its wisdom about things that interest ordinary men in a form which men of affairs will see to be true of life" (1895).

Unfortunately, evidence of a mounting problem for the field has been found, and but little has been provided in the way of concrete, proactive solutions beyond the standard deferment to 'Future Research Directions'. In all honesty, it seems that such a 'problem' as this must be confronted first through widespread recognition, so further research (and its dissemination!) may amount to a quasi 'solution.' Thus, some suggestions for further research are offered next, albeit somewhat hypocritically.

### ***What Future Research Should be Conducted?***

First, and foremost, further studies along this thread should involve some level of replication of these findings, as this is one of the initial attempts to apply the theory of institutional isomorphism broadly to the field of sociology. Such studies might involve the use of different methods and/or indicators, as well.

For instance, the tests for evidence of institutional isomorphism in this study were based on analysis of the structure of interactions involved in the publication only of the two most prestigious journals. While this is an apt indicator, it is but one. Sociological research findings are disseminated through books, as well as a slew of other 'secondary' journal publications. It would be appropriate, then, to follow up this initial investigation of institutional isomorphism with others that test for its presence and effects within the publication networks of books and secondary journal publications.

Additionally, this study was limited to analysis of publication networks in four years, spaced fifteen years apart. In the future, conducting similar tests on a more complete sample of sociology's publication networks may fill in those gaps, strengthening or refuting these findings.

Although previous research demonstrating the standardization of many aspects of sociology can be interpreted as trends towards homogeneity predicted to accompany institutional isomorphism, those findings were generally not based on structural examinations of the field. Since institutional isomorphism is a structural force, and this analysis was conducted by analyzing the changing structure of publication networks, future research on the subject might be well served to further examine the structural relationships within the field for evidence of homogeneity.

Having already found that, due to institutional isomorphism, an increasingly homogeneous sociology has seemingly contributed to reduced mainstream media attention. Future research might also attempt to determine if there is empirical evidence to document any of the other potential consequences of homogeneity. Or, more detailed analysis of the linkage between the form of sociological texts and the media attention they receive may serve to fill in the causal gaps between isomorphism and reduced mainstream attention.

Finally, this study has attributed the loss of mainstream attention to characteristics of the writing. However, other scientific disciplines seem to have shared the same trends in academic texts, but they have not necessarily seemed to result in the same detriments. Extending this study to examine other fields in a similar light may

enlighten about whether the trends towards high-brow writing are necessarily tied to reduced cultural impact.

'it is through originality, in greater or smaller increments, that knowledge advances'

-Merton, 1973 [1957]:293

**Appendix A. 2000 Research Site Matrix**

Research Site Organizations	Publication Events												Total Membership Ties
	ajs1	ajs2	ajs3	ajs4	ajs5	ajs6	asr1	asr2	asr3	asr4	asr5	asr6	
Academia Sinica	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
A.E. Casey Found.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
Arizona	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Arizona State	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Baruch Sch.Pub.Aff.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
Berkeley	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Bowling Green	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
Brown	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Calgary	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
Cardiff U.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
Census Bureau	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
Chicago	2	0	1	0	0	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	6
Colorado	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Columbia	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Cornell	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Duke	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	4
Emory	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
Eur. U. Inst.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	2
Florida State	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
Fudan U.	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Georgetown	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
Harvard	0	0	0	1	1	2	1	2	0	0	0	0	7
Ill. Health Dept.	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Illinois	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Indiana	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	1	0	4
Indiana U. of Penn.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
Iowa State	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Johns Hopkins	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	2
Kent State	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
Leeds U.	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
LSU	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
Maryland	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
Miami	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Michigan	0	0	2	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	0	6
Minnesota	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	3
Missouri	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Nationwide Global	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1

**Appendix A, cont. 2000 Research Site Matrix, continued**

Research Site Organizations	Publication Events												Total Membership Ties
	ajs1	ajs2	ajs3	ajs4	ajs5	ajs6	asr1	asr2	asr3	asr4	asr5	asr6	
NC State	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	2
Nijmegen U.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
North Florida	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
Northwestern	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	3
Notre Dame	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Nuffield College	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
NYU	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	3
Ohio State	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	1	6
Oregon	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Oxford	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Penn	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	2
Penn State	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	3
People's U.	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Princeton	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	4
Queens U.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
Rutgers	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Santa Fe	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Smith College	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
South Carolina	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
St. Cloud St.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Stanford	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	4
Stockholm Sch.Econ.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
SUNY	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Swedish Inst.Soc.Res.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
Texas	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
Tianjin Ac.Soc.Sci.	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Tulane	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
U.Amsterdam	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	2
U.Geneva	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
UCLA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
UConn	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
UCSB	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
UNC	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	1	0	4
Union College	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
USC	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
Vanderbilt	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Washington	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Whittenburg U.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
Wisconsin	2	1	0	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	10
WZB	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Yale	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
<b>Total Membership</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>139</b>

## Appendix B. 2000 Support Matrix

External Support Organizations	Publication Events												Total Support Ties
	ajs1	ajs2	ajs3	ajs4	ajs5	ajs6	asr1	asr2	asr3	asr4	asr5	asr6	
Aging	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	3
ASA	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Bank Sweden	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
Bechtel	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
Berkeley	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Carnegie	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
CASBS	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
CDC	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
Chicago	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Citibank	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Dept. Inter.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
Deut. Inst.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
Ford	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	2
Greenstone	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	2
Guggenheim	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
Haynes	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Hewlett	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
Intermedia	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
IUCPSR	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	2
Jap.Min.Ed.	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Justice Dept.	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
LA SeaGrant	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
Leeds	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Lon.Sch.Econ.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
MacArthur	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Mat./Ch. Hea.Bur.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
MinnHistCenProj	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
NC State	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Neth. ASHSS	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2
NICHD	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	1	2	7
NIH	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
NIMH	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	2
Northwestern	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
NSF	2	3	0	2	2	2	0	2	3	3	2	2	23
Ohio St.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
Penn State	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
Planck	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
Princeton	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	2
Rutgers	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
RW Johnson	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
Santa Fe Inst.	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Sloan	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	4

**Appendix B, cont. 2000 Support Matrix, continued**

External Support Organizations	Publication Events												Total Support Ties
	ajs1	ajs2	ajs3	ajs4	ajs5	ajs6	asr1	asr2	asr3	asr4	asr5	asr6	
South Carolina	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
Spencer	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	4
SSM Comm	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	2
SSRC	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
Stanford	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Stock.Sch.Econ.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
SUNY	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Syracuse	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
UCLA	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	2
UK ESRC	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	3
UNC	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	2
WashSentComm	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Wisconsin	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
WT Grant	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
WZB	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Yale	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
<b>Total Event Support</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>14</b>	105

## Works Cited

- Abbott, A. (2000). "Reflections on the Future of Sociology." *Contemporary Sociology*, 29: 296-300.
- Allen, M.P. (2003). "The 'core influence' of journals in sociology revisited." *Footnotes*.
- Allison, P.D.; Long, J.S.; and Krauze, T.K. (1982). "Cumulative advantage and inequality in science." *American Sociological Review*, 47: 615-625.
- Association, American Statistical (1999). "*Ethical Guidelines for Statistical Practice*."
- Baldi, S. (1995). "Prestige determinants of first academic job for new sociology PhDs, 1985-1992." *Sociological Quarterly*, 36: 777-789.
- Becker, H.S. (2003). "Long-term changes in the character of the sociological discipline: A short note on the length of titles of articles submitted to the American Sociological Review during the year 2002." *American Sociological Review*, 68, 3: iii-v.
- Beckman, C.M. and Phillips, D.J. (2005). "Interorganizational determinants of promotion: Client leadership and the attainment of women attorneys." *American Sociological Review*, 70, 4: 678-701.
- Berrett, T. and Slack, T. (1999). "An analysis of the influence of competitive and institutional pressures on corporate sponsorship decisions." *Journal of Sport Management*, 13, 2: 114-138.
- Blank, R.M. (1991). "The Effects of Double-Blind versus Single-Blind Reviewing: Experimental Evidence from the American Economic Review." *American Economic Review*, 81: 1041-1067.
- Bonacich, P. (1972a). "Technique for analyzing overlapping memberships." In Costner, H. (ed.), *Sociological Methodology*, 1972, pp.176-185. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Bonacich, P. (1987). "Power and centrality: A family of measures." *American Journal of Sociology*. 92: 1170-1182.
- Bourdieu, P. (1986). "The forms of capital." Pp. 241-258 in *Handbook of Theory and Research for the Sociology of Education*, ed. by J.G. Richardson. New York: Greenwood.
- Bourdieu, P. (1992). "The Logic of Fields." Pp. 94-114 in *An Invitation to Reflexive Sociology*, by P. Bourdieu and L. Wacquant. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Bourdieu, P. (1993). *The Field of Cultural Production*. New York: Columbia Univ. Press.
- Budros, A. (2001). "An institutional theory of organizational retrenchment: Adoption of early faculty retirement programs among Ontario universities." *Canadian Journal of Administrative Sciences*, 18, 3: 221-236.
- Bulmer, M. (1984). *The Chicago School of Sociology: Institutionalization, Diversity, and the Rise of Sociological Research*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Burris, V. (2004). "The Academic Caste System: PhD Prestige Hierarchies." *American Sociological Review*, 69, 2: 239-264.
- Burt, R.S. (2000). "Decay Functions." *Social Networks*, 22:1-28.
- Camic, C., and Y. Xie (1994). "The Statistical Turn in American Social Science: Columbia University, 1890 to 1915." *American Sociological Review*, 59, 6: 773-805.

- Clark, T.N. (1996). "Clientelism and universalism: Columbia sociology under Lazarsfeld and Merton." *Tocqueville Review*, 17: 183-205.
- Clemens, E.; Powell, W.; McIlwaine, K.; and Okamoto, D. (1996). "Careers in Print: Books, Journals and Scholarly Reputations." *American Journal of Sociology*, 101, 2: 433-494.
- Clemente, F. and Sturgis, R.B. (1974). "Quality of department of doctoral training and research productivity." *Sociology of Education*, 47: 287-299.
- Cole, J.R. and Cole, S. (1973). *Social Stratification in Science*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Cole, S. (1983). "The Hierarchy of the Sciences?" *American Journal of Sociology*, 89, 1: 111-139.
- Collins, R. (1986). "Is 1980s sociology in the Doldrums?" *American Journal of Sociology*, 91: 1335-1355.
- Connell, R.W. (2000). "Sociology and world market society." *Contemporary Sociology*, 29: 291-296.
- Coser, L.; Kadushin, C.; and Powell W. (1982). *Books: The Culture and Commerce of Book Publishing*. New York: Basic Books.
- Covaleski, M.A. and Dirsmith, M.W. (1988). "An institutional perspective on the rise, social transformation, and fall of a university budget category." *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 33, 4: 562-587.
- Cowger, C.D. (1987). "Correcting misuse is the best defense of statistical tests of significance." *Social Service Review*, 61, 1: 107-172.
- Crane, D. (1967). "The gatekeepers of science: Some factors affecting the selection of articles for scientific journals." *American Sociologist*, 2: 195-201.
- Davis, J.A. (2001). "What's wrong with sociology?" Pp. 99-120 in *What's Wrong With Sociology?*, ed. by S. Cole. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Press.
- Deephouse, D.L. (1996). "Does isomorphism legitimate?" *Academy of Management Journal*, 39, 4: 1024-1039.
- Dey, E.L.; Milem, J.F.; and Berger, J.B. (1997). "Changing patterns of publication productivity: Accumulative advantage or institutional isomorphism?" *Sociology of Education*, 70, 4: 308-323.
- Dimaggio, P. (1982). "The structure of organizational fields: an analytical approach and policy implications." Paper prepared for SNY-Albany Conference on Organizational Theory and Public Policy. April 1 and 2.
- Dimaggio, P. and Powell, W. (1983). "The Iron Cage Revisited: Institutional Isomorphism and Collective Rationality in Organizational Fields." *American Sociological Review*, 48: 147-160.
- Ferguson, P. (1998). "A Cultural Field in the Making: Gastronomy in 19<sup>th</sup> Century France." *American Journal of Sociology*, 104, 3: 597-641.
- Firebaugh, G. (1997). "Standards, centripetal forces, and some questions and answers about ASR: Editor's Comment." Editor's note in *American Sociological Review*, 62,1: v-vi.
- Fisher, B.S.; Cobane, C.T.; Vander Ven, T.M.; and Cullen, F.T. (1998). "Trends and patterns in political science." *Political Science Online*: 847-856.

- Gardenier, J.S. and Resnick, D.B. (2001). "The Misuse of Statistics: Concepts, tools, and a research agenda." *Unpublished manuscript*.
- Godlee, F. (2000). "The ethics of peer review." In *Ethical Issues in Biomedical Publication*, ed. by A.H. Jones and F. McLellan. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Giddens, A. (1979). *Central Problems in Social Theory: Action, Structure, and Contradiction in Social Analysis*. Berkeley: U. of California Press.
- Gimeno, J.; Hoskisson, R.R.; Beal, B.D.; and Wan, W.P. (2005). "Explaining the clustering of international expansion moves: A critical test in the US telecommunications industry." *Academy of Management Journal*, 48, 2: 297-319.
- Gornitzka, A. (1999). "Governmental policies and organisational change in higher education." *Higher Education*, 38, 1: 5-31.
- Granados, F.J. (2005). "Intertwined cultural and relational environments of organizations." *Social Forces*, 83, 3: 883-918.
- Greve, H.R. (1998). "Managerial cognition and the mimetic adoption of market positions: What you see is what you do." *Strategic Management Journal*, 19, 10: 967-988.
- Guetzkow, J.; Lamont, M.; and Mallard, G. (2004). "What is originality in the Humanities and the Social Sciences?" *American Sociological Review*, 69, 2: 190-212.
- Guler, I.; Guillen, M.F.; and MacPherson, J.M. (2002). "Global competition, institutions, and the diffusion of organizational practices: The international spread of ISO 9000 quality certificates." *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 47, 2: 207-232.
- Guthrie, D. (1999). "A sociological perspective on the use of technology: The adoption of internet technology in US organizations." *Sociological Perspectives*, 42, 4: 583-603.
- Han, S.K. (1994). "Mimetic Isomorphism and its effect on the audit services market." *Social Forces*, 73, 2: 637-664.
- Hargens, L.L. (1975). *Patterns of Scientific Research*. Washington D.C.: The American Sociological Association.
- Hargens, L.L. (1991). "Impressions and Misimpressions about Sociology Journals." *Contemporary Sociology*, 20: 343-349.
- Harmon, L.R. (1968). "Careers of Ph.D.s: Academic versus Nonacademic." Washington: *National Academy of Sciences—National Research Council*.
- Harvey, L. (1987). *Myths of the Chicago School of Sociology*. Brookfield, VT: Avbury/Gower.
- Haveman, H.A. (1993). "Follow the leader—Mimetic isomorphism and entry into new markets." *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 38, 4: 593-627.
- Hawley, A. (1968). "Human ecology." Pp.328-337 in *International Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences*, ed. by DL. Sills. New York, NY: Macmillan.
- Hicks, D. and Potter, J. (1991). "Sociology of scientific knowledge: A reflexive citation analysis of science disciplines and disciplining science." *Social Studies of Science*, 21, 3: 459-501.
- Hoffman, A.J. (1999). "Institutional Evolution and Change: Environmentalism and the U.S. Chemical Industry." *Academy of Management Journal*, 42, 4: 351-71.
- Hubbell, C.H. (1965). "An input-output approach to clique identification." *Sociometry*, 28: 377-399.

- Jacobs, D. (1999). "Ascription or Productivity? The determinants of departmental success in the NRC quality rankings." *Social Science Research*, 28: 228-239.
- Jacobs, JA(2005). "ASR's greatest hits." Editor's note in *American Sociological Review*, 70, 1: 1-3.
- Kale, S. and Arditi, D. (2005). "Diffusion of computer aided design technology in architectural design practice." *Journal of Construction Engineering and Management- ASCE*, 131, 10: 1135-1141.
- Katz, L. (1953). "A new status index derived from sociometric analysis." *Psychometrika*. 18: 39-43.
- Keith, B. and Babchuk, N. (1994). "A longitudinal assessment of productivity in prominent sociology journals and departmental prestige." *American Sociologist*, 25: 4-27.
- Keith, B. and Babchuk, N. (1998). "The quest for institutional recognition: A longitudinal analysis of scholarly productivity and academic prestige among sociology departments." *Social Forces*, 76: 1495-1533.
- Knoke, D. and Burt, R.S. (1983). "Prominence." Pp. 195-222 in *Applied Network Analysis*, ed. by R.S. Burt and M.J. Minor. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Kuhn, T.S. (1970[1962]). *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Laband, D.N. and Tollison, R.D. (2000). "Intellectual Collaboration." *Journal of Political Economy*, 108: 632-662.
- Larson, M.S. (1977). *The Rise of Professionalism: A Sociological Analysis*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Leahey, E. (2005). "Alphas and asterisks: The development of statistical significance testing standards in sociology." *Social Forces*, 84, 1: 1-24.
- Lehrman, W.G. (1994). "Diversity in Decline—Institutional environment and organizational failure in the American Life-Insurance Industry." *Social Forces*, 73, 2: 605-635.
- Lemola, T. (2002). "Convergence of national science and technology policies: The case of Finland." *Research Policy*, 31, 8/9: 1481-1490.
- Long, J.S. (1978). "Productivity and academic position in the scientific career." *American Sociological Review*, 43: 889-908.
- Long, J.S., Allison, P.D., and McGinnis, R. (1979). "Entrance into the academic career." *American Sociological Review*, 44: 816-830.
- Long, J.S. and McGinnis, R. (1981). "Organizational context and scientific productivity." *American Sociological Review*, 46: 422-442.
- Li, S.X. and Berta, W.B. (2002). "The ties that bind: Strategic actions and status structure in US-investment banking industry." *Organization Studies*, 23, 3: 339-368.
- Lu, J.W. (2002). "Intra- and inter-organizational imitative behavior: Institutional influences on Japanese firms' entry mode choice." *Journal of International Business Studies*, 33, 1: 19-37.
- Mallard, G.; Lamont, M.; Guetzkow, J. (2002). "Epistemological positions and peer review in the social sciences and humanities." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Sociological Association.
- March, J. G., and Olsen, J.P. (1989). *Rediscovering Institutions*. New York: Free Press.

- McCartney, J.L. (1970). "On being scientific: changing styles of presentation of sociological research." *The American Sociologist*, 5, 1: 30-35.
- McDowell, J.M. and Michael, M. (1983). "The determinants of co-authorship: An analysis of the economics literature." *Review of Economics and Statistics*, 65: 155-160.
- McGinnis, R. and Long, J.S. (1988). "Entry into academia: Effects of stratification, geography and ecology." Pp. 28-51 in *Academic Labor Markets and Careers*, ed. by D. Breneman and T. Youn. New York: Falmer.
- McPherson, M.; Smith-Lovin, L.; and Cook, J. (2001). "Birds of a Feather: Homophily in Social Networks." *Annual Review of Sociology*, 27: 415-44.
- Merton, R.K. (1973) [1942]. "The Normative Structure of Science." *The Sociology of Science*: pp. 267-78.
- Merton, R.K. (1968). "The Matthew Effects in Science, II: Cumulative Advantage and the Symbolism of Intellectual Property." *ISIS*, 79: 606-23.
- Moody, J. (2004). "The Structure of a Social Science Collaboration Network: Disciplinary Cohesion from 1963 to 1999." *American Sociological Review* 69:213-38.
- Najman, J.M. and Hewitt, B. (2003). (2003). "The Validity of Publication and Citation Counts for Sociology and Other Selected Disciplines." *Journal of Sociology*, 39, 1: 62-80.
- O'Brien, D. and Slack, T. (2003). "An analysis of change in an organizational field: The professionalization of English rugby union." *Journal of Sport Management*, 17, 4: 417-448.
- O'Brien, D. and Slack, T. (2004). "The emergence of a professional logic in English rugby union: The role of isomorphic and diffusion processes." *Journal of Sport Management*, 18, 1: 13-39.
- Paoline, E.A. and Sloan, J.J. (2003). "Variability in the organizational structure of contemporary campus law enforcement agencies—A national-level analysis." *Policing—An International Journal of Police Strategies & Management*, 26, 4: 612-639.
- Paradis, L.F. and Cummings, S.B. (1986). "The evolution of hospice in America toward organizational homogeneity." *Journal of Health and Social Behavior*, 27, 4: 370-386.
- Perrucci, R.; O'Flaherty, K.; and Marshall, H. (1983). "Market conditions, productivity, and promotion among university faculty." *Research in Higher Education*, 19, 4: 431-449.
- Phillips, N.; Lawrence, T.B.; and Hardy, C. (2004). "Discourse and Institutions." *Academy of Management Review*, 29, 4: 635-652.
- Platt, J. (1996). *A History of Sociological Research Methods in the United States*. Cambridge University Press.
- Pontille, D. (2003). "Authorship Practices and Institutional Contexts in Sociology: Elements for a Comparison of the United States and France." *Science, Technology, and Human Values*, 23, 2: 217-243.
- Powell, W. (1985). *Getting into Print: The Decision-Making Process in Scholarly Publishing*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Powell W.; White, D.R.; Koput, K.W.; Owen-Smith, J. (2005). "Network Dynamics and Field Evolution: The Growth of Interorganizational Collaboration in the Life Sciences." *The American Journal of Sociology*. 110, 4: 1132-1207

- Prasad, P. and Prasad, A. (1994). "The ideology of professionalism and work computerization—An institutionalist study of technological-change." *Human Relations*, 47, 12: 1433-1458.
- Raftery, A.E. (1995). "Bayesian model selection in social research." *Sociological Methodology*, 25: 111-163.
- Rao, H. (1994). "The social construction of reputation—Certification contests, legitimation, and the survival of organizations in the American automobile-industry—1895-1912." *Strategic Management Journal*, 15, SI: 29-44.
- Robertson, M.; Swan, J.; and Newell, S. (1996). "The role of networks in the diffusion of technological innovation." *Journal of Management Studies*, 33, 3: 333-359.
- Roggenkamp, S.D.; White, K.R.; and Bazzoli, G.J. (2005). "Adoption of hospital case management: Economic and institutional influences." *Social Sciences and Medicine*, 60, 11: 2489-2500.
- Ross, D. (1991). "Against canons: Liberating the social sciences." *Society*, 29, 1: 10-13.
- Schudson, M. (1989). "How Culture Works." *Theory and Society*, 18: 153-180.
- Sell, J.; Knottnerus, J.D.; Ellson, C.; and Mundt, H. (2000). "Reproducing social structure in task groups: The role of structural ritualization." *Social Forces*, 79, 2: 453-475.
- Shamblin, D.H. (1970). "Prestige and the sociology establishment." *American Sociologist*, 5: 154-156.
- Shenhav, Y.A. and Kamens, D.H. (1991). "The costs of institutional isomorphism: Science in non-western countries." *Social Studies of Science*, 21, 3: 527-545.
- Shrum, W. (1991). "Critics and Publics: Cultural Mediation in Highbrow and Popular Performing Arts." *American Journal of Sociology*, 97, 2: 347-75.
- Simpson, I.H. and Simpson, R.L. (2001). "The transformation of the American Sociological Association." Pp. 271-289 in *What's Wrong With Sociology*, ed. by S. Cole. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Press.
- Slack, T. and Hinings, B. (1994). "Institutional pressures and isomorphic change—An empirical test." *Organization Studies*, 15, 6: 803-827.
- Smelser, N.J. and Content, R. (1980). *The Changing Academic Market*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Soule, S.A. (1999). "The diffusion of an unsuccessful innovation." *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 566: 120-131.
- Steinberg, M. (1998). "Tilting the Frame: Considerations on Collective Action Framing from a Discursive Turn." *Theory and Society*, 27: 845-872.
- Small, A. (1895). The Era of Sociology. *American Journal of Sociology*, 1 (1): 1-15.
- Strang, D. and Meyer, J. (1993). "Institutional Conditions for Diffusion." *Theory and Society*, 22: 487-511.
- Strang, D. and Macy, M.W. (2001). "In search of excellence: Fads, success stories, and adaptive emulation." *American Journal of Sociology*, 107, 1: 147-182.
- Stone, M.M. (1996). "Competing contexts: The evolution of a nonprofit organization's governance system in multiple environments." *Administration & Society*, 28, 1: 61-89.
- Torres, D.L. (1988). "Professionalism, variation, and organizational survival." *American Sociological Review*, 53, 3: 380-394.

- Turner, J.H. (1989). "Introduction: Can sociology be a cumulative science?" in *Theory Building in Sociology*, ed. by J.H. Turner. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Turner, S.P. and Turner, J.H. (1990). *The Impossible Science: An Institutional Analysis of American Sociology*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Wagner, D. and Berger, J. (1985). "Do sociological theories grow?" *American Journal of Sociology*, 90: 23-63.
- Wallace, W.L. (1983). *Principles of Scientific Sociology*. New York, NY: Aldine.
- Wasserman, S. and Faust, K. (1994). *Social Network Analysis: Methods and Applications*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Weber, M. (1968[1921/1922]). *Economy and Society*. 2 volumes. Ed. by G. Roth and C. Wittich. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Wejnert, B. (2002). "Integrating Models of Diffusion of Innovation: A Conceptual Framework." *Annual Review of Sociology*, 28:297-326.
- Williamson, I.O. and Cable, D.M. (2003). "Organizational hiring patterns, interfirm network ties, and interorganizational imitation." *Academy of Management Journal*, 46, 3: 349-358.
- Wilner, P. (1985). "The Main Drift of Sociology Between 1936 and 1982." *History of Sociology*, 5, 2: 1-20.
- Wolfe, A. (1990). "Books vs. Articles: Two Ways of Publishing Sociology." *Sociological Forum*, 5, 3: 466-89.
- Zelditch, M. (1979). "Why Was the ASR So Atheoretical?" *Contemporary Sociology*, 8: 808-813.
- Zuckerman, H. and Merton, R.K. (1973[1971]). "Institutionalized Patterns of Evaluation in Science." In *The Sociology of Science*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.