The Development of the International Organization (IO) and Organizational Sociology Theories and Perspectives.
Part 4 - Definitions and Types of IO

Medani P. Bhandari [1],

[1] Akamai University, Hilo, Hawaii, USA

Abstract— This paper provides a pedagogical overview of how international organizations were formed, for what purposes and how their structure has been changed. The distinction between formal organizational studies and studies of international organizations is minimal, because both help to widen the idea of creating an original position for better combinations of favorable circumstances or situations in human affairs. The chapter will explain, the origin of the term international organization (OR); historical roots of or studies; and define or; analyze the types of ORs in the contemporary world; reveals the relationship between the international relation (IR) and regime theories application in the OR's studies; and the impact of the globalization. The chapter also unveils the relationships between organizational sociology and OR and finally it gives a general outline on the application institution theory in the study of OR following a brief summary. Organizations have the ability of inspiring and bringing people in concert to achieve combined goals. They are accountable for determining the intelligence needed to meet their goals. This chapter provides a glimmer of international organizations theory, origin, historical account, definitions and utilization of contemporary academic world intertwined with the international relations, regime and globalization as well as the organizational sociological theories and perspectives can be utilized to study of international organizations. This chapter will help to understand the historical account of international organization, pedagogical development and contemporary theories and practices of international organizations and organizational sociology.

Index Terms— international organizations, international relation, organizational sociology, organizations theory, globalization, regime theory.

I. GLOBALIZATION, ORGANIZATIONS, AND INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

Sociological analysis of national societies utilizing sociological perspectives centers on social organization, power, conflict, and culture at the global level (Evans 2005). Various organizational sociologists have explained the impact of globalization on organizational theory building and have defined globalization as the diffusion of capitalistic paradigms in the global social system. The importance of organizations must be acknowledged in the present world. As Daft (2003) notes, organizations (both national and international) bring together resources to achieve desired goals and outcomes, produce goods and services efficiently, facilitate innovation, use modern manufacturing and information technologies, adapt to and influence a changing environment, create value for owners, customers and employees, and accommodate ongoing challenges of diversity, ethics, and the motivation and coordination of employees. However, the globalized world has also brought various challenges to these organizations such as global competition, ethics and social responsibility, speed of responsiveness, the digital workplace, and diversity (Daft 2003).

The process of globalization has intensified the global interconnections of world societies. This process has made it routine to discuss social life in a global frame rather than a national or local one. This trend of globalization has also helped the standardization of organizational structures, organizational quality maintenance, and the regulation of organization management practices. Thus, standardized homogeneity can be

seen in organizations in the form of education, business, social enterprises (hospitals, charity organizations), government agencies, and national and international development agencies (Drori, Mayer and Hwang 2006). Globalization is not only an economic, political, and social process but also a cultural process, which is actually expanding and intensifying worldwide interdependencies. Organizational networks analyze these interdependencies, which are weakening national boundaries and classical bureaucracies. "World society models shape nation-state identities, structures, and behavior via worldwide cultural and associational processes. As creatures of exogenous world culture, states are ritualized actors marked by intensive decoupling and a good deal more structuration than would occur if they were responsive only to local, cultural, functional, or power processes" (Meyer et al. 1997, p. 173). The trend of the globalization process is leading the world society towards becoming a stateless society and helping to build the networks' purposive organizations. This is a shift from a power-centralized, traditional, authoritative structure. Meyer et al. (1997) examine this globalization process as a shift of organizational roles in terms of social and cultural dynamism, "the dynamism that is generated by the rampant inconsistencies and conflicts within world culture itself," especially "contradictions inherent in widely varied cultural goods: equality versus liberty, progress versus justice," and the like (Meyer et al 1997, p. 172).

The globalized neoliberal world economy has also influenced organizational strategy and structure. New administrative systems have been developed and traditional/classical hierarchical, top-down bureaucracy has been challenged by flexible administrative design. This new environment has also changed organizational culture in terms of its values, attitudes, and behaviors (which were guided by the Western Hegemonic (American) power system) (Daft 2003; Held 2004). In addition to changes in organizational settings, globalization has influenced the global economic system and its relationship with the natural environment; various perspectives have emerged for analyzing the role of transnational corporations. New global trade regimes have formed. Globalization has also changed the earlier perspectives on biophysical environmental change, which has helped policy-makers to formulate new agreements for environmental management. International organizations, as well as governments, have been forced to update their agendas to address global environmental degradation issues such as fresh water scarcity, renewable resource management, food supply, forest loss, biodiversity loss, and climate change, along with their ability to analyze and evaluate the conflicting perspectives.

Globalization has not only had positive impacts on global socio-political, economic, and environment management, but also has strong negative connotations, foremost among them, broadly, to discard the role and voice of the marginalized world. However, as I noted earlier, globalization is a continuous process embedded throughout the long history of the development of the western world. The notion of globalization is closely interlinked with development theory. Development theory dates from 13th century history, which reveals the transit of feudalism to capitalism. During the 13th to early 18th centuries, the goal of development was the improvement of social welfare. However, there was no social welfare in feudal society. This lack helped capitalism to flourish, as a free tool for its creation. Likewise, in the Age of Competitive Capitalism (1700-1860) political and economic power moved from the feudal aristocracy to the capitalist bourgeoisie, first in Europe and then in the rest of the world. Capitalism was exported to the rest of the world through the colonial system. Adam Smith's classical political economy and Karl Marx's Historical Materialism emerged in that period, followed by the age of imperialism (1860 to 1945). During the imperialism period, small industry collapsed, and big industries emerged in Europe. Neo-classical economic theory and the classical theory of imperialism were the products of that period. Lenin, Marshal, and Keynes were the major thinkers of that time. Keynes's theory of unemployment influenced the new steps to expand imperialism. The creation of the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank can be taken as examples of products of imperialism (Todaro and Smith, 2002). These organizations are considered the major stakeholders in diffusing the notion of globalization.

In this regard, various organizational sociologists have analyzed organizations in terms of global change and developed new approaches to study complex organizations.There are debates among the authors about the degree of the impact of globalization; however all accept the notion of a changing social, economic, and political global environment. There are also debates about the impact of globalization on international organization governance. Junne (2001) has noted that globalization might strengthen the role of international organizations through interactions. International organizations gain legitimacy through countries' specific (and global) legal procedures, justice, correct procedure, representation, effectiveness, and charisma. Globalization can make an impact on international organizations through (1) worldwide media coverage (2) the expansion of worldwide trade (3) the explosion of foreign direct investment (4) the integration of financial markets (5) the rise of the internet (6) international labor migration (7) global environmental problems and (8) the globalization of crime (Junne 2001, p. 200). Globalization has created demand and an environment for international organization through international cooperation, coordination, and networks. International organizations may not be able to cope with the demands of the globalized world, because organization may not be able to change their working modalities fast enough for public demand, because of life cycles, bureaucracy, posturing, and a lack of coordination (Junne 2001). However, to cope with the globalized world order international organizations have been modifying their working procedures and creating their own regimes so as to survive and continue their impacts on both the Northern and Southern

world. Globalization is a kind of unseen force which has been insisting that international organizations learn to survive and maintain themselves according to a changing global environment (through technological advancement). There is not much research upon how traditional organizations are shifting with and incorporating the new environment. This could be a new area of key research in the future.

As I have noted above, globalization has both positive and negative connotations. Among the latter, it is not creating favorable conditions for the global environment. Rischard (2001) has nicely summarized the environmental challenges posed through globalization in three major headings: (1) "sharing our planet: Issues involving and global commons; such as global warming, biodiversity loss, deforestation and desertification, water deficit, fisheries depletion, maritime security and pollution. He has also identified the major issues to be considered urgently in section 2, "sharing our humanity: issues requiring a global commitment; such as the fight against poverty, peace keeping and conflict prevention, education for all, global infectious diseases, digital divide, natural disaster prevention and mitigation; and in section (3) "sharing our rulebook: issues needing a global regulatory approach; reinventing taxation for the 21st century, biotechnology rules, global financial architecture, illegal drugs, trade, investment and competition rules, intellectual property rights, e-commerce rules, and international labor and migration rules (Rischard, 2002, p. 6, as cited by Held 2004, p. 12). International nongovernmental organizations have been highlighting those issues and creating a high-pressure environment through globalized connectedness and the mass media (mostly focused on the global commons). This notion of connectedness and networking is a positive aspect of globalization that international organizations have been utilizing to create an international regime. This principle of globalization is equally applied in the global social, economic, and political movements (human rights, women's rights, environmental conservation) and also in use in social knowledge construction.

So far, I found that international organizations have been in the main stream as a subfield of political science from 1900 onwards. Studies of international organizations published prior to the Second World War ignore or do not incorporate the contribution of classical organizational theorists such as Weber, Taylor and Fyol. In sociology, organization theory was in practice but was not fully developed as a subfield of study (it became a major field of study only from the 1970s) as it was in political science. Organizational theory is a wide discipline with deep roots in sociology. On the other hand, theory of international organizations is rooted in political science and has been examined by political actors. In addition to the sociologists and political scientists; scholars from anthropology, public administration, social psychology and economics also have been contributing to organizational theory building. Organizational study is fairly recent as a discipline in sociology. Political scientists have propounded numerous ideas back to ancient Rome and philosophers go even farther back in

time, while religious scholars trace their studies of organized religious organizations beyond that time. I think it is difficult to pinpoint when the exact time sociologists became interested in theories of organization and this seems a fruitful subject for further investigations.

One of the major international organizational theorist and authors of international organizations Professor Clive Archer (2008) (in my personal email correspondence) supports my investigation that the first complete book of international organization was by Leonard Woolf (1880-1969) (husband of Virginia Woolf 1882-1941) which published in 1916, in titled 'International Government'. Woolf was political leader worked on the behalf of League of Nations. However, the first academic text book of international organizations was published by Pitman Potter in 1922. On the other hand, according to Professor Richard Scott (2008 in my personal email correspondence) assures that until 1970 organizational study in sociology was only in its beginning phase. He mentions that "it's a bit difficult to select the first organization sociology text book. It is a toss-up among the following: J. March and H. Simon, Organizations 1958 (by two political scientists, but an important founding approach), A. Etzioni, A Comparative Analysis of Organizations 1961 and P. Blau and W.R. Scott, Formal Organizations: A Comparative Approach published in 1962". However, with confirmation with Scott, I would consider J. March and H. Simon's book in title "Organizations" published in 1958, as a first academic text book in organizational sociology. This account assures that organizational studies in sociology is very young but have been capturing great attention since 1980s. However, these publications also indicate that study of organizations is not new phenomena in sociology, which gives an option to search the link and gap between these two major fields of studies.

Potter's indicates that study of international organization was in practice even before 1900, in the discipline of law (I am waiting to verify from Clive Archer), which covers international intercourse, cosmopolitanism, international politics, laws, treatises, negotiations, conferences, international bureaucracy (administration), international control and international relations with the concrete example from the "League of Nations" - its role and its formation. The study of international relations, which is very closely associated with the study of international organizations, was begun in 1919 as a separate field of study in the United Kingdom. These accounts provide grounds to state that there was a long tradition of disciplinary distinction between organizational sociology and the study of international organizations. However, both fields developed from the same historical root of social sciences and have been contributing to the resolution of geo-political and socio-economic problems. Institutions, international relations, regime, globalization and organizational network theories are most commonly used in both international organizations and organizational sociology literature. The scholars of political sciences examine these agendas through positivist, constructivist, realist, neo-realist, liberal, neo-liberal; pluralist

perspectives and sociologists examine organizations through rational, natural and open perspectives. However, in terms of the application of theories both incorporate general social sciences theories (needless to state them: functionalism to postmodern, feminism, or radical). Robert Cox's (1981) principle of theory building applies in both cases because the basic aim of the foundation of organizations is to attain certain goals. The commonalities between organizational sociology and international organizations theory are mostly found in the literature published after the Second World War; and most importantly after the 1970s when multidisciplinary approaches began to flourish in the social sciences.

Scholars of contemporary international organizations have been advocating interdisciplinary approaches (Freiedrich Kratochwil, Michael Barnett, Martha Finnemore, Margaret Keck and Kathryn Sikkink). They argue that the role of international organizations has been expanding from the state centric framework to the people centric perspectives. In the current context, study of international organizations not only covers nation-states, international regimes and security alliances but also covers the international form of organizations that focus on non-state actors. In this context the role of international organizations is not solely centered in implementation of political agendas but also focuses on the social, cultural and economic power dynamism. Therefore, study of international organizations not only belongs to the political scientist but also belongs to the sociologist and includes a range of social science discourses.

Insofar, in this section I tried to explain what we know about the study of international organizations and to some extent how international organization theories are associated (broadly) with sociological theories and especially with organizational sociology. In the following section I will very briefly outline organizational sociology's major approaches and try to connect with how these approaches can be applied to study international organizations.

II. ORGANIZATIONAL SOCIOLOGY

"The study of organizations provides a theoretical framework for knowledge about human behavior in organizations and reviews the empirical evidence for the propositions that make up the theory. The theory emphasizes the motivations for organizational participation and the processes of decision making within organizations" Simon (1979).

Organizational sociology can be described as the study of formal groups organized to achieve or attain specific goals in efficient manner. Organizations have been leading the sociopolitical scenarios of the world for at least the last two centuries. In other words, organizations have been changing the world's socioeconomic landscape (Perrow 1991). As Perrow notes "organizations are the key to society because large organizations have absorbed society. They have vacuumed up a good part of what we have always thought of as society and

made organizations once a part of society into a surrogate of society (1991: 726, as cited by Scott and Davis 2007, p. 340). This influence, which has increased gradually over time, mostly in the developed regions of the world during the twentieth century, can be found in our everyday lives. Now, we are in organizational firms from birth to joining the workforce, as well as in our prayers, and we even die in organizations; along the way, we derive our identities from our associations with them. Organizations are related to every aspect of our daily life. Organizations are not only the building blocks of our societies, and a basic vehicle for collective action, but they are also our life form. They bring into being the social structure of our societies and basically form our futures. Organizations are a fundamental part of contemporary societies; we enthusiastically turn to them or create them when a need or crisis exceeds our own personal abilities or resources. Moreover, organizations are at the core spirit of every society and nation. Through organizations we make differences in our society and achieve collective goals. Theoretically, organizations are dedicated to extending the idea of creating a new base to create new opportunities. These broader contexts of organizations theories apply not only to the domestic organizational environment; but also, equally apply in the case of international organizations.

Sociologists have developed various perspectives and paradigms to analyze organizations based on the major classical writers of sociology. Organizational theory prior to 1900 emphasized the division of labor and the importance of machinery to facilitate labor. In the 1910s, the concept of scientific management arose, which describes management as a science with employers having specific but different responsibilities and encouraged the scientific selection, training, and development of workers and the equal division of work between workers and management. In the same era, the classical school listed the duties of a manager as planning, organizing, commanding employees, coordinating activities, and controlling performance; basic principles called for specialization of work, unity of command, scalar chain of command, and coordination of activities. In the 1920s the concept of human relations was introduced, which focuses on the importance of the attitudes and feelings of workers and recognizes that informal roles and norms influence performance. The classical school in the 1930s re-emphasized the classical principles, followed by group dynamics, in the 1940s, which encouraged individual participation in decision-making and noted the impact of work groups on performance.

International organizations literature is silent about this sociological history of organizational development. Historical knowledge of the organization can be informed to see the similarities and differences between organizational sociological theory and theory building relevant to international organizations. I am interested in investigating the historical background of theories, because I think history yields ideas that will enable me to categorize contemporary thoughts. This helps me to make judgments of how knowledge was developed and processed. Further, historical accounts document the

experiences faced by the authors, explain their relationships to contemporary society, explore their research and analysis methods and provide information about the debates and explanations within their context as well as their connections to previous authors (predecessors, allies, and rivals) (Chapoulie 2004).

Classical sociological theories have been criticized by contemporary organizational theorists since the late 1950s. As alternatives, contemporary sociologists have developed more theories and methods grounded in the same roots, but with new models (Kuhn 1962; Burrell and Morgan 1979; Morgan 1980; Ness and Brechin 1988; Taylor 2002; Scott 2003). Argyris (1957) states that the classical organizational theorists did not consider the workers' perspectives and that workers have minimal control over their working lives. Likewise, Salaman (1979) states that "a genuine sociology of organizations is not assisted by the efforts of some organization analysts to develop hypotheses about organizations in general, lumping together such diverse examples as voluntary organizations, charities and political organizations. It also obstructs the analysis of those structural elements which are dramatically revealed in employing organizations, but not necessarily in all forms of organization" (Salaman 1979, p. 33, as cited by Thompson and McHugh 2002, p. 6). Zey-Ferrell (1981) has summarized the major criticisms of organizational theories, mostly with reference to the comparative structural and structural contingency approaches.

Organizations are formed by the contexts or environments in which they are established. Modern organizations replicate the impact of their historical origins in societies characterized by growing privileged circumstances and conflicts over the control and distribution of products and services. Organizations come in many puzzling forms because they have been clearly designed to deal with a wide range of social, cultural, economic and political problems (Bhandari 2010, 2011, 2012, 2014). Because they have emerged under widely varying environmental conditions, they have to deal with complexity within and emerged externalities. However, this complexity is not a new phenomenon for the organizational theorists.

To address the complexity and the criticisms of organizational theories, various systems perspectives have been developed, particularly from the late 1950s. These system perspectives examine organizations as rational (embedded through the work of classical organizational theorists, Taylor, Fayol, Weber, Simon and March, and others), natural (including conflict approach and functionalist analysis of organization, by such theorists as Durkheim, Malinowski, Radcliffe-Brown, and Parson), Barnard's cooperative system; Selznick, Perrow, and Mayer: the institutional approach, in which new institutional theorists are generally working under the open systems perspective; this focuses on the broader importance of the environment although institutional theory does discuss the issue of organizational survival [not efficiency] which is a natural system perspective; Mayo: Hawthorne effect, and open system (based on social movements; Bertalanffy,

Boulding: Systems, Simon and March 1958 etc.) (Scott 2003). According to Kuhn (1983) all three - the natural, rational, and open systems perspectives co-exist and are important, but each has different methodologies. Each of them has different values, and each is based on different rhetoric. Kuhn's summary captures the notion of the systems perspective, because they are interlinked in one way or another. Similar notions can be found in the works of Granovetter (1985), Weick (1976), and Pfeffer (1982) who have extensively analyzed organizational theory with combined perspectives. These authors' arguments are based on Weber's bureaucratic principles, as well as sociological approaches dealing with social systems, social negotiated orders, social structures of power and domination, symbolic constructions and social power structures. In other words, most of the social sciences' epistemologies have been applied to study different aspects of organizations such as economic (Williamson 1975: transaction cost approach), market and labor (Pfeffer and Cohen 1984), ecology (Carroll 1984; Graham 1985); environment (Tushman and Anderson, 1986), organization as networks (Fligstein 1985; Chandler 1962; Harrison 1994; Uzzi 1996; Powell 1990). In terms of organizational theories, there are wide rages of applications. Specifically, organizational theorists concentrate mostly on contemporary theories such as contingency theory (Lawrence and Lorsch 1967; Galbraith 1974), bureaucracy (Weber 1946), cultural theory (Weick, 1985), critical (Marxist) theory (Burawoy 1979; Burrell and Morgan 1979) feminist organizational theories (Putman 1992; Mohanty 1984; Brewis 2005; Calas and Smircich 1996), conflict theory (Burawoy, 1979) economic theory (Friedman 1953; Granovetter 1985; Polanyi 1944; Williamson 1975).

Likewise, institutional theory has been applied to analyze organizations (Stinchcombe 1959; Selznick 1984; Rowan 1982; Meyer and Rowan 1977; Hirsch 1972; DiMaggio and Powell 1983), network theory (Powell 1990 and others) and organizational learning (Baum and Jintendra 1994; Cohen and Levinthal 1990). Similarly, population ecology theory has been used to study organizations (Astley 1985; Carrol and Hannan 1989). Organizations have also been analyzed with the application of post-modern approaches (Gergen 1992; Martin 1990), and with the application of Foucaultdian, Gramscian, and radical feminist approaches. Authors like Pfeffer and Salancik (1978), (Pfeffer 1982, 1992) have repeatedly applied resource dependency theory, and Weick (1976) has applied sense-making theory to analyze organizations and most commonly many authors have applied networks theory.

These sociological approaches could contribute to the theoretical basis for study of international organizations. How, what context and when depends on the nature and role of the international organizations. However, several such approaches can be applied to study a given international organization. The choice of approaches depends on the nature and purpose of the study as well as the complexity of the organization.

III. ORGANIZATIONS AS COMPLEX PHENOMENA

Organizational sociologists have extensively highlighted on the complexity of organizations, which can be a one of the major organizational sociological knowledge can be transfer or inform to study of international organizations. Jeffrey Pfeffer and Gerald R. Salancik (2003) on their various articles and particularly in their recent book the external control of organizations note that a resource dependence perspective argues that the world of organizations has changed in several important ways, including the increasing externalization of employment and the growing use of contingent workers; the changing size distribution of organizations, with a larger proportion of smaller organizations; the increasing influence of external capital markets on organizational decision-making and a concomitant decrease in managerial autonomy; and increasing salary inequality within organizations in the US compared both to the past and to other industrialized nations. These changes and their public policy implications make it especially important to understand organizations as social entities. Likewise, Fligstein, Neil (1987) states that one of the cause of organization complexity is organizations' internal and external power struggles which leads to claims from various actors about the goals and resources of the organization. Those who control are those who can use the resources available to force their view of appropriate organizational behavior. In the largest firms, there are two bases of control: formal ownership and authority. This preceding theory draws on theories of sub-unit power (Perow 1970, 1972), political economy (Zald 1969, 1970), strategic contingencies (Hickson, Hinings, Lee Schneck and Pennings 1971), resource dependence (Pfeffer and Salancik, 1978) and Pfeffers (1981) attempt to synthesis these theories of power. Actors' claims to power must rest on two sources: their positions within organizational structures and their claims to define and resolve important problems in an organization.

Karl Marx's notions also explain the cause of organizational complexity as due to power struggle. Marx considers market despotism to be the only factory regime compatible with the exigencies of capitalist development. Four conditions for the existence of market despotism are: (1) competition among firms, (2) the real subordination workers to capital, the separation of conception from execution, (3) the workers' dependence on the employer, on the sale of labor for a wage, where dependence on a particular capitalist is consolidated by a reservoir of surplus labor, (4) that the state would preserve only the external conditions of productions, and that it would not directly regulate either relations among capitalists or the process of production and its apparatuses (from Burawoy, 1987). Burrell, Gibson & Gareth Morgan (1979) state that sociology of regulation is concerned with organization are complex because according to them in the society (a) radical change (b) structural conflict (c) modes of domination (d) contradiction (e) emancipation (f) deprivation and (g) potentiality are always playing important role. Patrick Kenis (2002) state that organizational complexities and problems are related to the societal / unspoken, legal and bureaucratic

procedures and control mechanism of internal and external environment. They bring the empirical evidences of organizational control mechanism from "Personal centralized control" (Child 1984), "Coordination by feedback (March and Simon, 1958), "Control through supervision" (Blau and Scott 1963), "Behavioral control (direct)" (Ouchi 1977, 1979, 1980), "Bureaucratic control" (Child 1984), "Programs (activity coordination (March and Simon 1958), "Rules and Regulations" (Blau and Scott, 1963), "Behavioral control (rules and procedures)(Ouchi 1977, 1979, 1980), "Output control" (Child 1984), "Programs (output coordination)" (March and Simon 1958), "Performance records" (Blau and Scott 1963), "Output control" (Ouchi 1977, 1979, 1980), "Cultural control" (Child, 1984), "Recruitment and training" (Blau and Scott, 1963) and "Clan control" (Ouchi 1977, 1979, 1980).

Likewise, Joel A.C. Baum and Tim J. Rowley (2005) show Organizational Complexity with the illustration of several authors in three levels: (1) intra-organizational level where they claim organizations are complex because of complex adaptive systems, differentiations in agents, variations on decision making and problem solving techniques and networks, information technology and algorithmic complexity (2) organizational level: complex adaptive systems, loose coupling and models, edge of chaos, simple rules and complex behavior, emergence and recombination and evolution and (3) interdependence, cellular automata, micro-behavior and macro-structure complex inter-organizational dynamics, sensitivity to initial conditions and path dependence.

Furthermore, organizations, which provide security in the society, provide the environment to share and cope with problems and produce goods, deliver services, maintain order, and give a way to survive from individual level to societal stage. They help to minimize the challenges and establish order in the society. In relation to linkage with day to day individual and societal settings organizations are the fundamental building blocks of modern societies, and the basic vehicles through which collective action is undertaken. The eminence of organizations in modern society is obvious when we consider some consequences of their actions.

I think in the present time organizations are becoming more complex and difficult to understand because of rapid development of computer applications in organization, communication and information technologies, growing international competition for products and production, an increasing trend towards industrial deregulation and its expansion, narrowing life cycles of product and process because of new technology and increasing diversity in the work force. In terms of social complexities, globalization, multiculturalism and externalism are other parameters which are leading to greater complexities.

In my general literature survey, I did not find the utilization of these thick sociological theories of organizational complexities applied in the study of international organizations. The theoretical perspectives discussed could usefully contribute to the study of international organizations. However, networks

and institutional theories are commonly used by the sociologists and political scientists. In the following paragraphs I will briefly illustrate how political scientists and sociologists deal with the institutional theory and its usefulness and conclude this essay.

IV. APPLICATION INSTITUTION THEORY IN THE STUDY OF
INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

Study of institutional theory is a common activity in social sciences. Scott (2004) states that the roots of institutional theory run richly through the formative years of the social sciences, enlisting and incorporating the creative insights of scholars ranging from Marx and Weber, Cooley and Mead, to Veblen and Commons. Institutional theory examines the deep and flexible aspects of social structure. This theory analyses how institutional processes affect social behavior including that in social structures, schemas, rules, norms, and routines, and how authoritative guidelines develop in society. It examines how they are created, diffused, adopted, and adapted over space and time; and how they fall into decline and disuse (Scott 1987; DiMaggio and Powell 1983; Oliver 1991). The broader subject matter of institutional theory explores social structure and order, conflict, consensus and conformity. The founding authors such as Philip Selznick (old institutional theory), Paul Dimaggio, Walter Powell (new institutional theory) are equally cited by the sociologists as well as by the political scientists (Cook 1992; Lash 1971; Norton 1998; Otto 1996; Archer 1983, 1992; Hall and Taylor 1996; Barnett and Finnemore 2004). Most importantly new institutional theory has drawn more attention to the political scientists (Hall and Taylor 1996); however, historical institutionalism and sociological institutionalism are also not ignored by the scholars of international organizations and international relations.

Political scientist Nielsen, Klaus (2001, page 505) notes that DiMaggio distinguishes three new institutionalisms: rational-action neoinstitutionalism (RAN), social-constructivist neoinstitutionalism (SCN), and mediated-conflict neoinstitutionalism (MCN). The typology transcends the disciplinary boundaries although the three institutionalisms are seen as originating from economics, sociology, and political science, respectively. Likewise, the founder of new institutional theory DiMaggio (1991) states that social-constructivist neoinstitutionalism originated in sociology, although it too gained adherence among political scientists (Nielsen 2001). The major institutional theorists of political science, Marsh and Olsen (1989), note that Institutionalism, as that term is used here, connotes a general approach to the study of political institutions, a set of theoretical ideas and hypotheses concerning the relations between institutional characteristics and political agency, performance and change. Institutionalism emphasizes the endogenous nature and social construction of political institutions. Institutions are not simply equilibrium contracts among self-seeking, calculating individual actors or arenas for contending social forces. They are collections of structures,

rules and standard operating procedures that have a partly autonomous role in political life (c.f. Marsh and Olsen 2005, p. 3). The main difference in the application of institutional theory between political perspectives and sociological perspectives are that the first looks at the political ground of society and the second examines social order, structure, norms, rules and regulations authorized through institutions. Marsh and Olsen (2005) make clear the notion that institutional approaches are not limited to political science. They state that there is wide diversity within and across disciplines in what kinds of rules and relations are construed as "institutions". Moreover, approaches to political institutions differ when it comes to how they understand (a) the nature of institutions, as the organized setting within which modern political actors most typically act, (b) the processes that translate structures and rules into political impacts, and (c) the processes that translate human behavior into structures and rules and establish, sustain, transform or eliminate institutions (Marsh and Olsen 2005, p. 4). This shows that the political vision differs from the sociological approach, but uses the same perspectives such as institutional, rational actors and cultural community etc. Marsh and Olsen accept that perspectives can be distinguished according to the socio-political environment. They state that the key distinctions are the extent to which a perspective views the rules and identities defined within political institutions as epiphenomena that mirror environmental circumstances or predetermined individual preferences and initial resources; and the extent to which a perspective pictures rules and identities as reproduced with some reliability that is, at least in part, independent of environmental stability or change (Marsh and Olsen 2005, p. 5). "Institutions are not static; and institutionalization is not an inevitable process; nor is it unidirectional, monotonic or irreversible (Weaver and Rockman 1993, c.f. Marsh and Olsen 2005). This statement clearly indicates that it is inevitable to have various paradigms of institutional analysis, because institutional theory is still in the maturation phase. Even the founders are actively working and reframing their ideas (see the shift of thoughts in DiMaggio and Powell, Marsh and Olsen, Keohane and Scott's writings of 1980s and 2000 onwards).

Similarly, international relations scholars use realism, neo realism, pluralism and other approaches to the study of institutional roles in transnational situations. In this connection Robert Keohane (1988) compares the rationalistic and reflective approaches to studying how international institutions work and change. He states that 'institution' may refer to a *general pattern or categorization* of activity or to a *particular* human-constructed arrangement, formally or informally organized. Both types of institutions "involve persistent and connected sets of rules (formal and informal) that prescribe behavioral roles, constrain activity, and shape expectations (Keohane 1988, p. 383). Keohane (1988) focuses on institutions that can be identified as related complexes of rules and norms, identifiable in space and time (page 383). This account of Keohane does not differ from what sociologists such as Scott, DiMaggio and Powell are explaining about institutional theory.

It is generally thought that the rationalistic approach to international institutions argues that institutions emerge to reduce the costs of cooperation in order to facilitate mutually beneficially agreements and reduce transaction costs (the costs of specifying and enforcing contracts) and certain types of ambiguity.

Keohane argues that through the rationalistic approach we should expect international institutions to appear whenever the costs of communication, monitoring, and enforcement are relatively low compared to the benefits to be derived from political exchange (Keohane 1988, p. 387). Likewise, the reflexive approach according to Keohane (a sociological approach) stresses the role of impersonal social forces and the impact of cultural practices, norms, and values that are not based on utility maximization. This account of Keohane, which is supported by many contemporary political science institutional theorists (Duffield 2007; Hall and Taylor 1996; Thelen 1999) clearly gives grounds to state that there is an equal focus on institutional theory from both organizational sociologists and political scientists especially those from the fields of international relations and international organizations. However, as Marsh and Olson (2005) note, scholars who deal with political institutions are generally less concerned with *whether* institutions matter, than to what extent, in what respects, through what processes, under what conditions, and why institutions make a difference (page 9). On the other hand, sociologists go into detail and examine the embedded ground of the institution. DiMaggio and Powell (1983) propose three contrasting mechanisms for diffusion of institutions: coercive, normative and mimetic; their work can be taken as an example of vivid analysis of the institution. Furthermore, Strang and Meyer (1993)'s notion of relational versus cultural concepts of institutions, Oliver's (1992) analysis of pressures on the institution toward deinstitutionalization - functional, political and social - and Barley's (1986) micro level institutional change, Greenwood and Hinings' (1993) organizational level institutional change and the macro level institutional change of Scott (2000, 2004) are other good examples of the vividness of institutional analysis from the sociological perspective. Similarly, Nielsen's (2001) analysis of institutionalist approaches in social sciences where he explores the contemporary debates and typology or institution, Hall and Taylor's (1996) examination of new institutions through political perspectives (historical, rational choice, sociological and comparing institutionalism), Duffield's (2007) commentary on reflection, evaluation and integration of international institutions are examples of politically analysis of institutions. Likewise, John J. Mearscheimer (1995) in his article 'the False Promise of International Institutions' examines three institutionalist IR theories, namely liberal institutionalism, collective security and critical theory, and argues that institutions push states away from war and promote peace. Mearscheimer (1995) criticizes liberal institutionalism for largely ignoring security issues, ignoring other major obstacles to cooperation and failing to prove the point from an empirical perspective. He also criticizes critical theory, stating that it is an incomplete theory because it does not provide a satisfactory explanation for how states overcome their fears and learn to trust one another, accepts too easily the satisfaction of an extraordinarily complex network of requirements and has little support from the historical record.

These authors extensively use both sociological and political explanations of institutional theory. Therefore, there is not much of a knowledge gap between these two disciplines in the application of institutional theory (both old and new institutional theory). I am not arguing that there are no variations in paradigms of institutional theory but arguing that both political scientists and sociologists are focusing their discussions in the same subject matter.

So far, I noted how sociologists and political scientists examine the institution with the same theoretical approach but with different perspectives. This account also shows that there is no big knowledge gap in the two disciplines at least at epistemological level. Institutional theory is still young and various perspectives have been developed. The founders of institutional theory are still active and refining their thoughts, therefore, scholarly argumentation is not over about the disciplinary boundary. More than that I think there should not be disciplinary demarcation, but we need to develop a multidisciplinary approach to the local and global institutions. Similarly, Theret (2000) provides detail outline of the complexity of institutionalism. In this connection Neilsen (2001) also discusses aspects such as American neoinstitutionalism, Institutional-evolutionary economics, new economic sociology, new institutionalism in political science, Historical institutionalism, the cognitive-institutional approach as additional typology of neoinstitutionalism (page 512). He further argues that there should be clarification on methodological approaches in connection with political and sociological institutional perspectives such as the distinction between open system and closed system methodology, the distinction between positivist and post-positivist approaches, and within post-positivist approaches, the distinction between realist and idealist ontologies. I conclude this section with two major points Nelsen has raised. First, he criticizes DiMaggio and Powell for their lack of concern about the practical explanation of new institution theory in the transnational situation, which to some extent I agree with, second, he is accepting of and bridging the gap between political and sociological perspectives of intuitional theory. With the examples from DiMaggio and Powell (1998) of rational–action, social constructivist and mediated conflicts institutionalism he presents the change mechanism of institution through strategic action and selection, diffusion and political conflict of the institutionalism. He concludes that there is always tradeoff between internal development within more or less coherent frameworks on one side and cooperation among different approaches. Currently there seems to be much to say in favor of cross-fertilization, joint work and even merging of the approaches (Nelsen 2001, p. 514). I totally agree with Nelsen's

conclusion. The current world is interconnected economically, culturally, socially and politically due to technological development and the globalization process. The diffusion of knowledge is also spreading at an accelerating rate to the entire world. The demand for international laws was never as high as it is now because of transnational problems such as HIV/AID, terrorism, as well as the globalizing, social, economic and bio-physical environmental problems. Institutions create a 'set of rules, typically formalized in international agreements and embodied in organizations that stipulate the ways in which states should cooperate and compete with each other. They prescribe acceptable forms of state behavior and proscribe unacceptable kinds of behavior' (Mearscheimer 1995), therefore multidisciplinary approaches are needed to study the international institutions or to explore their role, demand and to create the new institutions as needed.

V. CONCLUSION

Social sciences epistemologies have historically been developed to tackle social problems, and formal and informal organizations were formed to address social issues as they appeared. When socio-economic and political problems cross borders, international organizations form to tackle those issues on international scale.

The term International Organizations was first used by a Professor of Law James Lorimer in 1867 and became a major field of study in political science by 1900. In the contemporary world the role of international organizations is universal. International organizations represent a form of institution that refers to a formal system of rules and objectives, a rationalized administrative instrument (Selznick 1957). There are varieties of international organizations according to their objectives and their functions. There are three categories of organizations: inter-governmental organizations, international non-governmental organizations (INGOs), and multinational enterprises. To consider any organization as international there should be a formal instrument of agreement between the governments of nation states, including three or more nation states as parties to the agreement and possessing a permanent secretariat performing ongoing tasks. A formal technical and material organization should have: constitution, local chapters, physical equipment, mechanics, emblems, letterhead stationery, a staff, an administrative hierarchy and so forth (Duverger 1972 as cited by Archer 1992, p. 2).

According to political science literature, international organizations form to attain certain goals of the governments and have specified rules and regulations formulated by the governments. In this regard, IOs are closely associated with international relations theory, regime theory and globalization theory. There are various perspectives for analysis of political environment which includes positivism, constructivism, realism, neo-realism, liberalism, neo-liberalism, and globalism and so on.

Sociologists "who study organizations have been and are rendering more valuable services to organizational theory and practice by maintaining the sociology of organization as a more or less distinct specialty than by simply joining hands with others in an interdisciplinary approach to the field" (Lammers 1981). Differing from the political scientists, sociologists examine organizations through three major perspectives such as rational, natural and open and developed, and various approaches from functionalism, neo-functionalism, structuralism, neo-structuralism, to postmodernism along with the other theories such as contingency, network, institution, resource dependency, transaction cost, ecology, demographic and so on.

The distinction between formal organizational studies and studies of international organizations is minimal, because both help to widen the idea of creating an original position for better combinations of favorable circumstances or situations in human affairs. Organizations have the ability of inspiring and bringing people in concert to achieve combined goals. They are accountable for determining the intelligence needed to meet their goals. Both can be found acting in every aspect of social life at local, national and international level, accommodating diversity in society and achieving communal goals. However, there is not much interdisciplinary research between organizational sociology and international organizations and also a huge gap in the literature. This is still a very important field of future research. In other words, there is not literature which explores matching the paradigms and explores the interconnectedness of the sociology of organizations and international organization theories. Organizational sociologists Ness and Brechin (1988) made an early attempt to explore this connectedness. They broadly rejected the functionalist notion of organizational study and instead follow contingency theory (according to Galbraith (1973)'s in contingency theory, there is no one best way to organize and in any way of organizing is not equally effective) to show the matching approaches (international relations, institutionalization, regime formation, realism, neo-realism, liberalism, globalism etc. of political sciences and rational, natural and open system perspectives and networks, transactional cost, institution etc. of organizational sociology) between organizational sociology and international organizations. In addition to that, there have been few efforts made in search of matching the common ground of organizations and international organizations from a sociological point of view. On the other hand, political scientists (Nye 2004; Friedma 2006; Agne 2005; Slaughter 2005; Ba and Hoffmann 2005; Howard 2002; Finnemore and Sikkink 1998; Barnett and Finnemore 1999 and others) have investigated the sociological ground of international organizations and elaborated on their political views to link with sociological organizational theory. Political scientists have been largely engaged on these topics; however, as far as I know, relatively little has been written by organizational sociologists have not focused on this important field of research. This essay is the first step of my journey along this path.

The study of international organizations can be a lifelong

research topic for the individual scholar. There is a large literature and potential for investigations with the application of many differing perspectives. To investigate the theories and perspectives of organizations is very challenging. This essay provides very a brief outline of what we generally know about international organizations. During my literature search I found that organizational sociologists have extensively used social theories that exist in the scholarship of social sciences to investigate the past, present and future role, and the complexity of formal organizations. Similarly, international organizations scholars have followed the same epistemology of the social sciences to investigate the roles of international organizations. Therefore, it was difficult to make recommendations regarding which organizational sociological theories and perspectives can be informed for study of international organizations, because most aspects are relevant. However, I think organizational sociological perspectives such as rational, natural and open systems theory (which are not extensively utilized in the IO and IR), can be utilized to study international organizations. Similarly, from organizational sociological knowledge, approaches such as contingency, resource dependency, transaction cost, and ecology, demographic and so on are among sociological approaches that can be transferred to the study of organizations.

I have perhaps provided only a glimmer of international organizations theory, origin, historical account, definitions and utilization of contemporary academic world intertwined with the international relations, regime and globalization as well as the organizational sociological theories and perspectives can be utilized to study of international organizations. I have given a general scenario of the available literature and theory, as I have found it. There are several epistemologies in social sciences which mutually can be applied to study both formal organizations and international organizations; however, there is gap on theories (not in all, because institutional and networks theories are mutually applied in study of formal organization as well as international organizations) as well as methods and their applications. To bridge this gap, it is essential to conduct a parallel research both from political and sociological perspectives as several multidisciplinary team projects.

As I feel it -
There are ample things to know, This first step is small and slow,
There are countless theories to grow And, words to weave and miles to go.
"The woods are lovely, dark and deep, But I have promises to keep, And miles to go before I sleep, And miles to go before I sleep" (*Robert Frost*).

VI.   Acknowledgement

VII.   References

Allen, N. and J. Meyer (1990). "Organizational Socialization Tactics: A Longitudinal Analysis of Links to Newcomer's Commitment and Role Orientation." Academy of Management Journal, 33(48): 847-858.

Ansell, C.K.; Weber, S. (1999). Organizing international politics: sovereignty and open systems. International Political Science Review, 20.

Archer, Angus (1983). Methods of Multilateral Management: The Interrelationship of International Organizations and NGOs, in the US, the UN, and the Management of Global Change 303, 309 (Toby Trister Gati ed., 1983), United Nations.

Archer, C. (1992). International Organizations (2nd Edition), Routledge, USA.

Argyris, C. (1957). Personality and organization: The conflict between system and the individual, Harper.

Argyris, C. (1972) Applicability of organizational sociology, Cambridge University Press.

Aristotle, Aristotle's (1997) Poluics and Poetics (in New York, Viking Press, Compass Books).

Aristotle, Ethics (1951 tr. by J. A. K. Thomson, Baltimore, Penguin). Ernest Barker, Greek Political Theory: Plato and His Predecessors (New York, Barnes & Noble,).

Arensberg, C. (1951). Behavior and organization: Industrial studies. In Social Psychology at the Crossroads, eds. J. H. Rohrer and M. Sherif, pp. 324-352. New York: Harper.

Armstrong, J. D. (James David), (1982). Rise of the international organization: a short history, London: Macmillan & Co

Agard Walter R. (1960). What Democracy Meant to the Greeks (Madison, University of Wisconsin Press).

Astley, W. G. (1985). "The two ecologies: population and community perspectives on organizational evolution." Administrative Science Quarterly, 30: 224-241.

Barnett Michael & Martha Finnemore. (1999). The Politics, Power, and Pathologies of International Organizations. (In Martin & Simmons)

Barkin, J. Samuel, (2006). International organization: theories and institutions, Palgrave, Macmillan.

Brechin Steven R. (1997). Planting Tree in the Developing World, A sociology of International Organization, The Johns Hopkins University Press, Baltimore.

Brechin Steven R. and D. Freeman (2004). Public Support for both the Environment and an Anti-Environmental President: Possible Explanations for the George W. Bush Anomaly, the Forum: A Journal of Applied Research in Contemporary Politics, 2(1), Article 6

Brechin Steven R. (2003). Comparative Public Opinion and Knowledge on Global Climatic Change and the Kyoto Protocol: The U.S. versus the World? International Journal of Sociology and Social Policy, 23(10), pp. 106-134, October 2003.

Brechin Steven R., Peter Wilshusen, Crystal Fortwangler and Patrick West (2002). Beyond the Square Wheel: Toward a More Comprehensive Understanding of Biodiversity Conservation as Social and Political Process, Society and Natural Resources, 15, 41-64.

Becker Howard and Harry Elmer Barnes (1998). Social Thought from Lore to Science, 3 vols. (New York, Dover Publications).

Benny Hjern, Chris Hull (1984). Going Interorganisational: Weber Meets Durkheim scandinavian Political Studies 7 (3), 197–212. doi:10.1111/j.1467-9477. 1984.tb00301.x

Berton H. Kaplan (1968). Notes on a Non-Weberian Model of Bureaucracy: The Case of Development Bureaucracy, Administrative Science Quarterly, Vol. 13, No. 3, Special Issue on Organizations and Social Development. (pp. 471-483).

Bennett, A LeRoy (1984). International Organizations, (3rd Edition), Prentice-Hall, Inc.

Bhandari, Medani P. (2014). "Is Tourism Always Beneficial? A Case Study from Masai Mara National Reserve, Narok, Kenya". Pacific Journal of Science and Technology. 15(1):458-483.

Bhandari, Medani P. (2014) "Civil Society and Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs) Movements in Nepal and terms of Social Transformation". Pacific Journal of Science and Technology. 15(1):177-189.

Shah AH, Bhandari Medani P. Al-Harbi NO, Al-Ashban RM (2014) Kaff-E-Maryam (Anastatica Hierochuntica L.): Evaluation of Gastro-Protective Activity and Toxicity in Different Experimental Models. Biol Med 6: 197. doi: 10.4172/0974-8369.1000197

Bhandari, Medani P. (2012) Environmental Performance and Vulnerability to Climate Change: A Case Study of India, Nepal, Bangladesh, and Pakistan, "Climate Change and Disaster Risk Management" Series: Climate Change Management, Springer, New York / Heidelberg, ISBN 978-3-642-31109-3

(2012) Centre for Integrated Mountain Development (ICIMOD) [for conservation and management of the Hindu Kush-Himalayas – Afghanistan, Bangladesh, Bhutan, China, India, Myanmar, Nepal, and Pakistan Environment], in Ritzer, George (Ed.) Blackwell Encyclopedia of Globalization, Wiley-Blackwell Publication Volume 3, 1076-1078.

(2012) International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN) [Implication of the global conservation policies and its contribution for the biodiversity conservation in the developing world], in Ritzer, George (Ed.) Blackwell Encyclopedia of Globalization, Wiley-Blackwell Publication Volume 3, 1086-1088.

(2012) The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) [The forth assessment reports on climate change: a factual truth of contemporary world], in Ritzer, George (Ed.) Blackwell Encyclopedia of Globalization, Wiley-Blackwell Publication Volume 3, 1063-1067.

(2012) South Asian Association for Regional Cooperation (SAARC) [Problems and opportunities in improving the livelihood of its member countries: Sri Lanka, India, Pakistan, Afghanistan, Bhutan, Maldives, Bangladesh and Nepal], in Ritzer, George (Ed.) Blackwell Encyclopedia of Globalization, Wiley-Blackwell Publication, Volume 4, 1891-1898.

(2011) "Viewpoints: What do you think should be the two or three highest priority political outcomes of the United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development (Rio+20), scheduled for Rio de Janeiro in June 2012? Natural Resources Forum 36, 251-252 (Wiley-Blackwell)

(2011) The conceptual problems of Green Economy and Sustainable Development and the Theoretical Route of Green Economy Initiatives, Applicability and the Future, Compilation Document - Rio+20 - United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development, United Nations, New York, (Major groups), 141-153 http://www.uncsd2012.org/rio20/content/documents/compilationdocument/MajorGroups.pdf

http://www.uncsd2012.org/rio20/index.php?page=view&type=510&nr=138&menu=20 http://www.uncsd2012.org/rio20/content/documents/138apec.pdf

(2019), Sustainable Development: Is This Paradigm The Remedy of All Challenges? Does Its Goals Capture The Essence of Real Development and Sustainability? With Reference to Discourses, Creativeness, Boundaries and Institutional Architecture, SocioEconomic Challenges, Volume 3, Issue 4, 97-128 ISSN (print) – 2520-6621, ISSN (online) – 2520-6214

https://doi.org/10.21272/sec.3(4).97-128.2019, http://armgpublishing.sumdu.edu.ua/wp-content/uploads/2020/01/9.pdf

(2019). Live and let other live- the harmony with nature /living beings-in reference to sustainable development (SD)- is contemporary world's economic and social phenomena is favorable for the sustainability of the planet in reference to India, Nepal, Bangladesh, and Pakistan? Adv Agr Environ Sci. (2019);2(1): 37−57. DOI: 10.30881/aaeoa.00020 http://ologyjournals.com/aaeoa/aaeoa_00020.pdf

(2019). "BashudaivaKutumbakkam"- The entire world is our home and all living beings are our relatives. Why we need to worry about climate change, with reference to pollution problems in the major cities of India, Nepal, Bangladesh and Pakistan. Adv Agr Environ Sci. (2019);2(1): 8−35. DOI: 10.30881/aaeoa.00019 (second part) http://ologyjournals.com/aaeoa/aaeoa_00019.pdf

Brechin, Steven R. and Bhandari, Medani P. (2011). Perceptions of climate change worldwide, WIREs Climate Change 2011, Volume 2:871–885.

Mathiason, John and Bhandari, Medani P. (2010). Getting the Facts Right: The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change and the New Climate Regime, Journal of International Organization Studies, Volume 1, Number 1, (September 2010) 58-71 http://www.journal-iostudies.org/sites/journal-iostudies.org/files/JIOS1014.pdf

Mathiason, John and Bhandari, Medani P. (2010). Governance of Climate Change Science: The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change and the New Climate Change Management Regime, the UNITAR-Yale, Geneva, USA, 2nd Issue (2010).

Bhandari, Medani P. (2004). An Assessment of Environmental Education Programs in Nepal, Environmental Awareness, International journal of Society of Naturalist, Vol.27, No.1. (ISSN 0254-8798)

Blau, P. M. (1955). The Dynamics of Bureaucracy. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

(1964). Exchange and Power in Social Life. New York: Wiley.

(1970). A formal theory of differentiation in organizations. Am. Sociol. Rev. 35:201-218.

(1973). The Organization of Academic Work. New York: Wiley.

(1974). Parameters of social structure. Am. Sociol. Rev. 39:615-635.

(1977). Inequality and Heterogeneity: A Primitive Theory of Social Structure. New York: Free Press.

(1994). Structural Contexts of Opportunities. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

(1995)- A circuitous path to macro structural theory. Annu. Rev. Sociol. 21:1-19.

Burawoy, M. (1979). Manufactured Consent, Chicago, University of Chicago Press.

Burrell, G. and G. Morgan (1979). Sociological Paradigms and Organizational Analysis, Heinemann.

Rowan, B. (1982). "Organizational Structure and the institutional environment: the case of public schools." Administrative Science Quarterly, 27: 259-279.

Barker, J., R. (1993). "Tightening the iron cage: concretive control in self-managing teams." Administrative Science Quarterly, 38: 408-437.

Barley, S. R. (1992). "Design and Devotion: Surges of Rational and Normative Ideologies of Control in Managerial Discourse." Administrative Science Quarterly, 37: 363-399.

Bowen, D. E., G. E. J. Ledford, et al. (1991). "Hiring for the Organization, Not the Job." Academy of Management Executive, 5(4): 35-51.

Baum, J. A. C. and V. S. Jintendra (1994). "Organization-Environment Coevolution" in J. Baum and V. S. Jitendra. The Evolutionary Dynamics of Organizations. New York, Oxford University Press: 379-402

Baran, B. (1987). "The technological transformation of white-collar work: a case study of the insurance industry" in H. I. Hartman. Computer Chips and Paper Clips. Washington DC, National Academy Press.

Barley, S. (1986). "Technology as an occasion for structuring: Evidence from observations of CT scanners and the social order of radiology departments." Administrative Science Quarterly, 31: 78-108.

Beniger, J. R. (1986). The Control Revolution: Technological and Economic Origins of the Information Society, Cambridge, MA, Harvard University Press.

Bimber, B. (1994). "Three Faces of Technological Determinism" in M. R. Smith and L. Marx. Does Technology Drive History. Cambridge, MA, MIT Press.

Braverman, H. (1974). Labor and Monopoly Capital: The Degradation of Work in the Twentieth Century, New York, Monthly Review Press.t

Barnard C. I. (1940). The Functions of the Executive, Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1940, p. 115.

Brewis Joanna (2005). Othering Organization Theory: Marta Calas and Linda Smircich, The Editorial Board of the Sociological Review, 2005, Blackwell Publishing, Ltd.

Brown, Reva (2004). Consideration of the origin of Herbert Simon's theory of "satisficing? (1933-1947) Management Decision, Volume 42 Number 10 2004 pp. 1240-1256

Barnes, Harry E. (1920) Durkheim's Contribution to the Reconstruction of Political Theory, Political Science Quarterly, Vol. 35, No. 2. 236-254.

Cooperrider David L., Jane E. Dutton, (editors 1999). Organizational dimensions of global change: no limits to cooperation, Sage Publication.

Carrol, G. R. and M. T. Hannan (1989). "Density dependence in the evolution of populations of newspaper organizations." American Sociological Review, 54: 524-548.

Chandler, A. (1984). "The Emergence of Market Capitalism." Business History Review, 58(winter): 473-503.

Collins, R. (1979). The Credential Society: An Historical Sociology of Education and Stratification, Orlando, FL, Academic Press.

Cohen, W. M. and D. A. Levinthal (1990). "Absorptive Capacity: A New Perspective on Learning and Innovation." Administrative Science Quarterly, 35: 128-152.

Cook, Blanche Wiesen (1992). Eleanor Roosevelt: Volume One, 1884-1933. New York: Viking Press, 1992, 259-260.

Cusimano, M.K. (1999). The challenge to institutions. In Beyond sovereignty: issues for a global agenda. Bedford/St Martin's, Boston, MA, USA.

Coicaud Jean-Marc and Veijo Heiskanen (edited 2001). Legitimacy of international organizations, United Nations University Press.

Clark, Ian (1999). Globalization and international relations theory, Oxford University Press.

Cicero, "On Old Age," Selected Works, Edited by Michael Grant (London: Penguin, 1971), p. 218.

Chapnis, A. (1983). "Engineering Psychology" in M. D. Dunnette. The Handbook of Industrial and Organizational Psychology. New York, Wiley: 697-744.

Charnitski Christina Wotell (2002). Gauging the Readiness of an Institution of Higher Education to Implement Change in Its Distance Education Program in Ways that are Consistent with the Paradigm of Organizational Agility, Doctoral thesis, Drexel University

Cusumano, M. (1989). Japanese Automobile Industry, Boston, Harvard University Press.

Calas, M.B. and Smircich L. (1996). "From 'The Woman's' Point of View: Feminist Approaches to Organizational Studies" Hand Book of Organizational Studies, Sage Publications.

DeVault Marjorie (2002). Institutional Ethnography: Using Interviews to Investigate Ruling Relations (With Liza McCoy). Pp. 751-76 in Handbook of Interview DeVault Marjorie Research, eds. Jaber Gubrium and James Holstein. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications

DeVault Marjorie (2004). What is Description? (One Ethnographer's View). Perspectives (ASA Theory Section Newsletter), 27 (#1): 4

Disney, Jennifer Leigh, Joyce Gelb (2000). Feminist Organizational ''Success'': The State of U.S. Women's, Movement Organizations in the 1990s, Women & Politics, Vol. 21(4)

Dunlap Riley E. and Angela G. Mertig (edited 1992). American environmentalism: the U.S. environmental movement, 1970-1990, Taylor and Francis.

Drori Gili S., John W. Meyer, and Hokyu Hwang (editors 2006). Globalization and organization: world society and organizational change, Oxford University Press

DiMaggio, Paul, J. and Walter W. Powell (1983). "The iron cage revisited: Institutional isomorphism and collective rationality in organizational fields," American Sociological Review 48: 147-160.

Giddens, A. (1979). "Agency, Structure" in A. Giddens. Central Problems in Social Theory. Berkeley, University of California Press.

Durkheim, Emile. (1915). The Elementary Forms of the Religious Life: A Study in Religious Sociology. Translated by Joseph Ward Swain. New York: Macmillan.

Durkheim, Emile. [1897/1951]. Suicide: A Study in Sociology: Tr. John A. Spaulding and George Simpson. Glencoe, IL: Free Press.

Durkheim, Emile [1893] 1964. The Division of Labor in Society. Tr. George Simpson. New York: Free Press.

Dalton, M. (1959). "Men Who Manage" in M. Granovetter and R. Swedberg. The Sociology of Economic Life. Boulder, CO, Westview Press.

Dore, R. (1983). "Goodwill and the Spirit of Market Capitalism." British Journal of Sociology, 34: 459-482.

Eccles, R. and N. Nohria (1992). Beyond the Hype, Cambridge, Harvard Business School Press.

Elliott, Lorraine (1994). International Conference on Diplomacy and the Changing Role of NGOs, in Australian and New Zealand Society of International Law: Proceedings of the Second Annual Meeting 223, 225 (1994).

Engels, F. (1958 [1894]). "The Peasant Question in France and Germany." In: Karl Marx and Frederick Engels: Selected Works, II, pp. 420–440. Moscow: Foreign Languages Publishing House.

Eller Shafritz, J. M., J. Steven Ott, and Yong Suk Jang (2005). Classics of Organization Theory, 6th Edition, Thompson/Wadsworth

Emirbayer, Mustafa (1996). Useful Durkheim, Sociological Theory, Vol. 14, No. 2. 109-130.

Fisher, C. D. (1986). "Organizational Socialization: An Integrative View." Research in Personnel and Human Resources Management, 4: 101-145.

Faunce, W. A. (1965). "Automation and the Division of Labor." Social Problems, 13: 147-160.

Frank, R. (1985). Choosing the Right Pond: Human Behavior and the Quest for Status, New York, Oxford University Press.

Friedman, M. (1953). "The Methodology of Positive Economics" in M. Friedman. Essays in Positive Economics. Chicago, University of Chicago Press.

Frost, P. J., L. F. Moore, et al., Ed. Eds. (1985). Organizational Culture. Beverly Hills, Sage.

Fincham R and Rhodes, P (1999) 'Principles of Organizational Behavior', Oxford University Press.

Falk Richard (1987). The Global Promise of Social Movements: Explorations at the Edge of Time, 12 Alternatives 173

Faure Michael, Joyeeta Gupta, Andries Nentjes (edited 2003). Climate change and the Kyoto protocol: the role of institutions and instruments to control global change, Edward Elgar Publisher

Thomas, Friedman (2006). The World is Flat, New York: Farrar Straus Giroux.

Finnemore Martha (2004). The Purpose of Intervention: Changing Beliefs about the Use of Force (Ithaca: Cornell University Press

Finnemore Martha and Kathryn Sikkink, (1998). "International Norm Dynamics and Political Change," International Organization, 52, no. 4 887-917.

Finnemore Martha (1996). National Interest in International Society, Cornell University Press, Ithaca.

Goldenweiser A. (1917). Religion and Society: A Critique of Émile Durkheim's Theory of the Origin and Nature of Religion, The Journal of Philosophy, Psychology and Scientific Methods, Vol. 14, No. 5. 113-124.

Gergen, K. J. (1992). "Organizational Theory in the Post-Modern Era" in M. Reed and M. Hughes. Rethinking Organizations: new directions in organization theory and analysis, Sage Publications: 207-226.

Galbraith, J. R. (1974). "Organization Design: An Information Processing View." Interfaces, 4: 28-36.

Grant Charles (2001) "A European View of ESDP," Centre for European Policy Studies working paper. EU

Gallarotti, G.M. (1991). The limits of international organization: systematic failure in the management of international relations. International Organization, 45.

Garvin, D.A. (1993). Building a learning organization. Harvard Business Review, Jul-Aug.

Griffin James M. (edited 2003). Global climate change: the science, economics and politics, Edward Elgar Publisher

Goodspeed, Stephen S. (1967). Nature and function of international organization, Oxford University Press.

Gay Paul du (edited 2005). Values of bureaucracy, Oxford.

Grazia Alfred De (1962). Political Behavior, the Elements of Political Science (Volume One), New, Revised Edition, Chicago university.

Gregory, Allan W., and Gregor W. Smith (1990). "Calibration as Estimation." Econometric Reviews 9:1 (1990): 57-89.

Gregory, K. L. (1983). "Native-View Paradigms: Multiple Cultures and Culture Conflicts in Organizations." Administrative Science Quarterly, 28: 359-376.

Geertz, C. (1978). "The Bazaar Economy: Information and Searchin Peasant Marketing." American Economic Review, 68(May): 28-32.

Gerschenkron, A. (1952). "Economic Backwardness in Historical Perspective" in M. Granovetter and R. Swedberg. The Sociology of Economic Life. Boulder, CO, Westview Press.

Granovetter, M. (1985). "Economic Action and Social Structure: The Problem of embeddedness." American Journal of Sociology, 91: 481-510.

Granovetter, M. (1995). Getting a Job: A Study of Contacts and Careers, Chicago, University of Chicago Press.

Hannan, M. T. and J. Freeman (1989). Organizational Ecology, Cambridge, Harvard University Press.

Hamilton, G. G. and N. W. Biggart (1988). "Market, Culture, and Authority: A Comparative Analysis of Management and Organization in the Far East." American Journal of Sociology, 94 (Supplement): S52-S94.

Hamilton, G. (1994). "Civilizations and the Organization of Economics" in N. Smelser and R. Swedberg. Handbook of Economic Sociology: 183-205.

Hirschman, A. (1982). "Rival Interpretations of Market Society: Civilizing, Destructive, or Feeble?" Journal of Economic Literature, 20(Dec.): 1463-1484.

Hackman, J. R. (1975). "On the Coming Demise of Job Enrichment" in E. L. Cass and F. G. Zimmer. Men and Work in Society. New York, Van Nostrand Reinhold Company: 97-115.

Hackman, J. R. (1985). "Designing work for individuals and for groups" in J. R. Hackman, E. E. Lawler and L. W. Porter. Perspectives on behavior in organizations. New York, McGraw-Hill Book Company: 242-258.

Hackman, J. R. and R. Wagemen (1995). "Total Quality Management: Empirical, Conceptual and Practical Issues." Administrative Science Quarterly, 40: 309-342.

Hirsch, P. M. (1972). "Processing Fads and Fashions." American Journal of Sociology, 77: 639-659.

Hardin, G. (1968). "The Tradegy of the Commons." Science, 162(December): 1243-1248.

Hopp, W. and M. L. Spearman (1996). "1: Manufacturing in America" in. Factory Physics. Chicago, Irwin.

Hounshell, D. A. (1984). From the American System to Mass Production -- 1800-1932, Baltimore, Johns Hopkins University Press.

Hutchins, E. (19XX). "The Technology of Team Navigation" in J. Galegher, R. E. Kraut and C. Egido. Intellectual Teamwork: Social and Technological Foundations of Cooperative Work. Hillsdale, NJ, Lawrence Erlbaum Associates: 191-221

Hill, L. A. (1992). Becoming a Manager, Boston, Harvard Business School Press.

Higgins, T.E. (1996). "Anti-Essentialism, Relativism, and Human Rights" Harvard Women's Law Journal.

Huntington Samuel P. (1999). "The Lonely Superpower," Foreign Affairs (March-April 1999).

Steven Everts (2001). "Unilateral America, Lightweight Europe? Managing Divergence in Transatlantic Foreign Policy," Centre for European Reform working paper

Harper John Lamberton (1996). American Visions of Europe: Franklin D. Roosevelt, George F. Kennan, and Dean G. Acheson (Cambridge University Press, 1996)

Haas, E.B. (1990). When knowledge is power: three models of change in international organizations. University of California Press, Berkeley, CA, USA.

Haas, P.M.; Haas, E.B. (1995). Learning to learn: improving international governance. Global Governance, 1995.

Hoffmann, Matthew J. (2005). Ozone depletion and climate change: constructing a global response / Matthew J. Hoffmann. Climate Change

Hannigan, John A (1995). Environmental sociology: a social constructionist perspective, Routledge, UK

Heckscher, C.; Donnellon, A., (ed. 1994). The post-bureaucratic organization: new perspectives on organizational change. Sage, Thousand Oaks, CA, USA.

Held, David (2004). Global covenant: the social democratic alternative to the Washington Consensus, Polity Prss.

Howard Michael (2002). The Invention of Peace and the Persistence of War, 2d revised ed. London: Profile Books.

Ierland Ekko C. van, Joyeeta Gupta, Marcel T.J. Kok. (edited 2003). Issues in international climate policy: theory and policy, Edward Elgar Publisher

Jayaram N.; forward by Satish Saberwal (editor 2005). All India Sociological Conference (26th: 2000: University of Kerala) On civil society: issues and perspectives, Sage Publications.

Kothari Rajni (1993). The Yawning Vacuum: A World Without Alternatives, 18 Alternatives 119

Kaufman, Herbert (1964). Organization Theory and Political Theory, the American Political Science Review, Vol. 58, No. 1. 5-14

Kuhn, Thomas (1983b). "Rationality and Theory Choice", Journal of Philosophy 80: 563-70.

Knapp, Peter (1986). Hegel's Universal in Marx, Durkheim and Weber: The Role of Hegelian Ideas in the Origin of Sociology, Sociological Forum, Vol. 1, No. 4. 586-609.

Kerr, S. (1975). "On the Folly of Rewarding A, While Hoping for B." Academy of Management Journal, 18(4): 769-783.

Kiesler, S. and T. Finholt (1988). "The Mystery of RSI." American Psychologist, 43(12): 1004-1015.

Knowles, M. (1984). The Adult Learner: A Neglected Species (3rd Ed.). Houston, TX: Gulf Publishing.

Kolb, D. A. (1984). Experiential learning: experience as the source of learning and development, Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey, Prentice-Hall, Inc.

Krasner, S. (1983). International regimes. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Kuiper Edith and Drucilla K. Barker (Editors 2006) Feminist economics and the World Bank: history, theory and policy,

Karns Margaret P. and Karen A. Mingst (2004). International organizations: the politics and processes of global governance, Lunne Rienner Publisher.

Lawrence, P. and J. Lorsch (1967). "Differentiation and Integration in Complex organizations." Administrative Science Quarterly, 12: 1-30.

Lash, Joseph (1971) Eleanor and Franklin. New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 346-348.

Langer William L. and S. Everett Gleason (1952) The Challenge to Isolation, 1937–1940 (Harper Bros., 14).

Levitt, B.; March, J.G. (1988). Organizational learning. American Review of Sociology, 14.

Lewis Douglas (edited 2006). International and regional organizations, Oxford.

Luterbacher Urs and Detlef F. Spring (edited 2001). International relations and global climate change, MIT

Lucas, Robert E. (1976). "Econometric Policy Evaluation: A Critique." The Phillips Curve and Labor Markets. Eds. Karl Brunner and Allan Meltzer. Amsterdam: North-Holland, 19-46.

Locke John, (1997). Of Civil Government, (Chicago, Regnery).

Louis, M. R. (1985). "Perspectives on Organizational Culture" in P. J. Frost, L. F. Moore, M. R. Louis, C. C. Lundberg and J. Martin. Organizational Culture. Beverly Hills, Sage: 27-29.

Louis, M. R. (1985). "An Investigator's Guide to Workplace Culture" in P. J. Frost, L. F. Moore, M. R. Louis, C. C. Lundberg and J. Martin. Organizational CLouis - Investigators Guide to Workplace Cultureulture. Beverly Hills, Sage: 73-93.

Lawler, E. E. I. and S. A. Morhman (1985). "Quality Circles After the Fad." Harvard Business Review, 65-71.

Levinthal, D. A. and J. G. March (1993). "The Myopia of Learning." Strategic Management Journal, 14: 95-112.

Levinthal, D. A. and J. G. March (1981). "A Model of Adaptive Organizational Search." Journal of Economic Behavior and Organization, 2: 307-333.

Louis, M. R. (1980). "Surprise and Sensemaking: What Newcomers Experience Entering Unfamiliar Organizational Settings." Administrative Science Quarterly, 25: 226-251.

Meyer, J. W. and B. Rowan (1977). "Institutional organizational: formal structure as myth and ceremony." American Journal of Sociology, 83: 340-363.

March, J. G. and Z. Shapira (1971). "Managerial Perspectives on Risk and risk Taking." Management Science, 33(11): 1404-1418.

March, J. G. and J. P. Olsen (1975). "The Uncertainty of the Past: Organizational Learning Under Ambiguity." European Journal of Political Research, 3: 147-171.

March, J. G., L. S. Sproull, et al. (1991). "Learning from Samples of One or Fewer." Organization Science, 2: 1-13.

March, J. G. (1991). "Exploration and Exploitation." Organization Science, 21(February): 71-87.

March, J. G. (1991). "Organizational Consultants and Organizational Research, J of Applied Communication Research." Journal of Applied Communication Research, 19: 20-31.

March, J. G. and Z. Shapira (1992). "Variable Risk Preferences and the Focus of Attention." Psychological Review, 99(1): 172-183.

March, J. G. (1994). A Primer on Decision Making, New York, The Free Press.

March, J. G. (1994). Three Lectures on Efficiency and Adaptiveness in Organizations. Helsingfors, Sweden, Swedish School of Economics and Business Administration

March, J. G. and J. P. Olsen (1995). Democratic Governance, New York, The Free Press.

March, J. G. (1995). "The future, disposable organizations and the rigidities of imagination." Organization, 2: 427-440.

March, J. G. (1996). "Learning to Be Risk Averse." Psychological Review,

Manning, P. K. (1977). "Talking and Becoming: A View of Organizational Socialization" in R. L. Blankenship. Colleagues in Organization: The Social Construction of Professional Work. London, Wiley & Sons: 181-205.

Marcson, S. (1960). The Scientist in American Industry: Some Organizational Determinants in Manpower Utilization, Princeton, NJ, Industrial Relations Section, Princeton University.

Mills, Albert J, Corman, Steven R Poole, Marshall Scott (2002). Perspectives on Organizational Communication. Finding Common Ground, Canadian Journal of Sociology. Fall 2002.Vol. 27, Iss. 4.

Miller, V. D. and F. M. Jablin (1991). Information seeking during organizational entry: Influences, tactics, and a model of the process." Academy of Management Review, 16(1): 92-120.

Martin Lisa L. and Beth A. Simmons (edited 2001). International institutions: an international organization reader, MIT Press.

Moran, Robert T. Philip R. Harris, William G. Stripp. (1938/1993). Developing the global organization: strategies for human resource professionals /

Meyer Birgit and Peter Geschiere (edited 1999). Globalization and identity: dialectics of flow and closure, Blackwell Publisher.

Machiavelli Niccolo, The Prince and the Discourses (New York, Random House, Modern Library College Editions).

Mearsheimer John (2002). Tragedy of Great Power Politics, W.W. Norton, New York 2002

Mohanty, C.T. (1984) "Under Western Eyes: Feminist Scholarship and Colonial Discourses" boundary 2, Vol. 12, No. 3 On Humanism and the University I: The Discourse of Humanism. (Spring-Autumn): 333-358

Mills, A.J. (2002). "Studying the Gendering of Organizational Culture Over Time: Concerns, Issues and Strategies." Gender, Work and Organizations. Vol. 9, No. 3 (June).

Mumby, D.K. and L.L. Putnam (1992). "The Politics of Emotion: A Feminist Reading of Bounded Rationality." The Academy of Management Review, Vol. 17, No.3: 465-486.

Martin, J. (1990). "Deconstructing organizational behavior taboos: The suppressions of gender conflict in organizations." Organization Science, 1: 339-359.

Maanen, J. V. and S. R. Barley (1985). "Cultural Organization: Fragments of a Theory" in P. J. Frost, L. F. Moore, M. R. Louis, C. C. Lundberg and J. Martin. OrVan Maanen & Barley - Cultural Orgs Fragments of a Theory organizational Culture. Beverly Hills, Sage: 31-53.

Macaulay, S. (1963). "Non-Contractual Relations in Business: A Preliminary Study." American Sociological Review, 28: 55-67.

Mintz, B. and M. Schwartz (1985). The Power Structure of American Business, Chicago, University of Chicago Press.

Marx, Karl. (1959). Toward the Critique of Hegel's Philosophy of right, in Marx and Engels, Basic Writings, Lewis S. Feuer (ed). New York: Doubleday & Co., Anchor Books.

(1845). Eleven Theses on Feurback.

(1973). Grundrisse. New York: Vintage.

(1964). Selected Writings in Sociology and Social Philosophy. (Translated by T.B. Bottomore). London: McGraw-Hill.

(1964b). Early Writings. Translated and edited by T. B. Bottomore. New york: McGraw-Hill.

(1848/1954). The Communist Manifesto. Henry Reginery Company: Chicago.

Marx, Karl and Friedrich Engels, (1962). Selected Works, 2 vols. Moscow: Foreign Language Publishing House.

Marx, Karl and Friedrich Engels, (1930). The German Ideology. New York: International Publishers.

Merton, Robert K (1968). Social Theory and Social Structure. New York: Free Press.

Nerfin Marc (1986). Neither Prince nor Merchant: Citizen--An Introduction to the Third System, in World Economy in Transition 47 (Krishna Ahooja-Patel et al. eds., 1986).

Norton, Mary Beth, (et al eds 1998). A People and a Nation. Boston and New York: Houghton Mifflin Company, 657-660.

Nelson Richard R. (1994). "Economic Growth Via the Coevolution of Technology and Institutions," pp. 21-32 in Loet Leydesdorff and Peter Van den Besselaar, eds., Evolutionary Economics and Chaos Theory: New Directions in Technology Studies, New York: St. Martin's Press

Nye Joseph (2004). Soft Power (New York: Public Affairs).

Ness Gayl D. and Brechin Steven R (1988). Bridging the gap: international organizations as organizations, International Organization 42, 2

Noble, D. F. (1979). "Social choice in machine design: The case of automatically controlled machine tools" in A. Zimbalist. Case Studies in the Labor Process. New York, Monthly Review Press.

Orlikowski, W. J. (1991). "Integrated Information Environment or Matrix of Control? The Contradictory Implications of Information Technology." Accounting Management and Information, 1: 9-42.

Orlikowski, W. J. (1995). "Improvising Organizational Transformation over Time: A Situated Change Perspective." Information Systems Research WP #3865-95   November   1995, http://dspace.mit.edu/bitstream/1721.1/2598/1/SWP-3865-34131434.pdf

Otto, Dianne (1996). Nongovernmental Organizations in the United Nations System: The Emerging Role of International Civil Society, Human Rights Quarterly 18.1 (1996) 107-141

Orr, J. (1996). "About Copier Technicians" in. Talking About Machines: An Ethnography of a Modern Job. Ithaca, NY, ILR Press.

Parente, D. H. (1998). Across the manufacturing-marketing interface: Classification of significant research. International Journal of Operations & Production Management, 18 (12), 1205.

Parsons, Talcott (1951). The Social System. Glencoe, IL: Free Press.

Parsons, Talcott (1971). The System of Modern Societies. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Pfeffer, J. and G. Salancik (1978). The External Control of Organizations, Harper & Row.

Pfeffer, J. (1982). Organizations and Organization Theory, Pittman.

Pfeffer, J. (1992). Managing with Power: Politics and Influence In Organizations, Boston, Harvard Business School Press.

Polanyi (1944). The Great Transformation, Boston, Beacon Press.

Polanyi, K. (1957). "The Economy as Instituted Process" in m. Granovetter and R. Swedberg. The Sociology of Economic Life. Boulder, CO, Westview Press.

Perin, C. (1991). "The moral fabric of the office: Panopticon Discourse and Schedule Flexibilities" in P. S. Tolbert and S. Barley. Organizations and Professions, Volume 8, Research in the Sociology of Organizations. Greenwich, CT, JAI Press.

Perrow, C. (1983). "The Organizational Context of Human Factors Engineering." Administrative Science Quarterly, 28: 521-541.

Pickering, J. M. and J. King (1995). "Hardwiring Weak Ties: Inter-organizational Computer-Mediated Communication, Occupational Communities, and Organizational Change." Organization Science, 6(4): 479-486.

Parker, M. (2002). "Queering Management and Organization" Gender, Work and Organization. Vol. 9. No.2 p. 146-166.

Padgett, J. F. (1995). "The emergence of simple ecologies of skill: a hyper cycle approach to economic organization" in B. Arthur, S. Durlauf and D. Lane. The Economy as a Complex Evolving System.

Posner, Michael H. (1994). The Establishment of the Right of Nongovernmental Human Rights Groups to Operate, in Human Rights: An Agenda for the Next Century 405 (Louis Henkin & John L. Hargrove eds., 1994).

Peter R. Baehr & Leon Gordenker (1992). The United Nations in the 1990s 116 (1992); United Nations.

Pangle Thomas L. and Peter J. Ahrensdorf, (1999). Justice among Nations: On the Moral Basis of Power and Peace (University Press of Kansas, 1999), 200–201.

Papaconstantinou George (1995). "Globalisation, Technology, and Employment: Characteristics and rends," STI Review, No. 15, 1995, p. 177.

Potter, Pitman B. (Pitman Benjamin) (1922, 1928). Introduction to the study of international organization, Century Company, USA.

Potter Pitman B. (1935). The Classification of International Organizations, I, The American Political Science Review, Vol. 29, No. 2. (Apr. 1935), pp. 212-224.

Potter Pitman B (1922). Origin of the System of Mandates under the League of Nations, The American Political Science Review, Vol. 16, No. 4. 563-583.

(1922). Reviewed work(s): The History and Nature of International Relations by Edmund A. Walsh, The American Political Science Review, Vol. 16, No. 3. 503-503

(1923). Political Science in the International Field, The American Political Science Review, Vol. 17, No. 3 -381-391.

(1931). Permanent Delegations to the League of Nations, The American Political Science Review, Vol. 25, No. 1 - 21-44.

(1945). Origin of the Term International Organization, The American Journal of International Law, Vol. 39, No. 4 -803-806

Pugh Derek S., David J. Hickson (2007). Writers on organizations, Sage Publications.

Palacios Juan J. (edited 2008). Multinational corporations and the emerging network economy in Asia and the Pacific, Gulf Pushing Company.

Parkinson C. Northcote (1958). Evolution of Political Thought (New York, Viking Press, Compass Books).

Rowlands, Ian H (1995). Politics of global atmospheric change, Manchester University Press.

Ragnar Frisch, (1933). "Editorial." Econometrica 1 (1933a): 1-4.

Rousseau Jean-Jacques (1954). Social Contract (New York, Hafner Library of World Classics # 1, 1954).

Balakrishnan, Rajagopal (2003). International Law from Below (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2003).

Ross, David P. (1993). Family Security in Insecure Times. National Forum on Family Security, Canadian Council on Social Development. http://workinfonet.bc.ca/lmisi/Making/CHAPTER2/TANDG1.HTM

Roethlisberger F. J. and Dickson W. J. (1941). Management and the Worker, Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1941, p. 524.

Robbins, L. (1932). An Essay On the Nature and Significance of Economic Science, New York, New York University Press.

Rohlen, T. (1973). "The Education of a Japanese Banker" in Unknown. The Future of Organization Design: 526-534.

Roy, D. F. (1959). "Banana Time: Job Satisfaction and Informal Interaction." Human Organization, 18: 158-168.

Roloff, M. E. (1981). Interpersonal Communication: The Social Exchange Approach, Beverly Hills, CA, Sage.

Sakamoto Yoshikazu (edited 1994). Global transformation: challenges to the state system, United Nations University Press.

Simpson, Gerry (1992). Some Recent Theoretical Orientations in International Law, in Proceedings, supra notes 73, at142, 146.

(1991). False Harmonies and Tragic Ironies: Human Rights in the New World Order, Int'l Legal Sec. J. 5, 6.

Scott, W. Richard (2003). Organizations: Rational, Natural & Open Systems 5th Edition

Scott W. Richard, John W. Meyer, and associates (1994). Institutional environments and organizations: structural complexity and individualism, Sage Publications.

Selznick, Philip, (1949) TVA and the grass roots; a study in the sociology of formal organization, University of California Press.

Selznick, Philip (1948). Foundations of the Theory of Organization, American Sociological Review, Vol. 13, No. 1. 25-35

Selznick, P. (1984). "Guiding Principles and Interpretation: A Summary" in. TVA and the Grass Roots. Berkeley, UC Berkeley Press: 249-266.

Selznick, Philip (1943). An Approach to a Theory of Bureaucracy, American Sociological Review, Vol. 8, No. 1.47-54.

Simon, Herbert A. (1969). The Sciences of the Artificial, the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, the Murray Printing Company, USA,

(1969). "Applying Information Technology to Organizational Design", in Public Administration Review, Vol. 33, No. 3, 268-278.

(1976). Administrative Behavior. A Study of Decision-Making Processes in Administrative Organization, Third Edition, The Free Press, Collier Macmillan Publishers, London, UK

Slaughter Ann-Marie (2005). A New World Order (Princeton: Princeton University Press

Shafritz, J.M., Ott, J.S. (Eds.2001). "Classics of Organization Theory", 5th Ed., Harcourt, 2001

Schein, E. (1996). "Culture: The Missing Concept in Organization Studies." Administrative Science Quarterly, 41(2): 229-240.

Smircich, L. (1983). "Concepts of Culture and Organizational Analysis." Administrative Science Quarterly, 28(3): 339-358.

Smith, A. (1776). Wealth of Nations, Chicago, University of Chicago Press.

Strauss, G. (1955). "Group Dynamics and Intergroup Relations" in W. Whyte, F. Money and Mot. New York, Harper & Row.

Stinchcombe, A. L. (1959). "Bureaucrats and Craft Administration of Production: A Comparative Study." Administrative Science Quarterly, 4(2): 168:187.

Scarselletta, M. (1996). "The infamous lab error: education, skill, and quality in medical technician's work" in S. Barley and J. Orr. Between craft and science: technical work in US settings. Ithaca, NY, ILR Press.

Smith, M. R. (1994). "Technological Determinism in American Culture" in M. R. Smith and L. Marx. Does Technology Drive History? Cambridge, MA, MIT Press: 1-35.

Shea, G. F. (1994). Mentoring: Helping Employees Reach their Full Potential, American Management Association.

Seidman, S. (1994). "Queer-Ing Sociology, Sociologizing Queer Theory: An Introduction." Sociological Theory, Vol. 12, No.2: 166-177.

Terry Maley (2004). Max Weber and the Iron Cage of Technology, Bulletin of Science Technology Society 2004; 24; 69

Turner J. H. (1990). Emile Durkheim's Theory of Social Organization, Social Forces, Vol. 68, No. 4. 1089-1103.

Tiryakian, E.A. (1981). The sociological import of a metaphor: tracking the source of Max Weber's 'iron cage' Sociological inquiry 51,1: 27-33

Thompson, P. and McHugh, D. (2002). Work Organizations, 3rd edition, Palgrave.

Tilly, Charles (1978). From Mobilization to Revolution. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Tilly, Charles (1981). "Useless Durkheim." Pp. 95-108 in As Sociology Meets History New York: Academic Press.

Tolbert, P. S. and L. G. Zucker (1983). "Institutional sources of change in the formal structure of organizations: the diffusion of civil service reform, 1880-1935." Administrative Science Quarterly, 28: 22-39.

Tushman, M. L. and P. Anderson (1986). "Technological discontinuities and organizational environments." Administrative Science Quarterly, 31: 439-465.

Trist, E. L. and K. W. Bamforth (1951). "Some social and psychological consequences of the long wall method of coal getting.".

Trist, E. L. (1978). "On socio-technical systems" in W. A. Pasmore and J. J. Sherwood. Socio-technical Systems. La Jolla, CA, University Associates.

Turkle, S. (1985). The Second Self: Computers and the Human Spirit, New York, Simon & Schuster.

Thomas, M. Franck (1992). The Emerging Right to Democratic Governance, 86 Am. J. Int'l L. 46 (1992).

Tescal Fernando R. (1992). The Kantian Theory of International Law, 92 Colum. L. Rev. 53 (1992).

Thiele Leslie P. (1993). Making Democracy Safe for the World: Social Movements and Global Politics, 18 Alternatives 273.

Taylor, Paul Graham (1993). International organization in the modern world: the regional and the global process, Pinter Publisher.

Viotti Paul R., Mark V. Kauppi (1999). International relations theory: realism, pluralism, globalism, and beyond, Allyn and Bacon 3rd edition.

Vaubel Roland (1986). A public choice approach to international organization, Public Choice 51:39-57

Voegelin Eric, (1957). Plato and Aristotle, in Order and History (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 3-268.

Van Maanen, J. (1977). "Experiencing Organization: Notes on the Meaning of Careers and Socialization" in J. Van Maanen. Organizational Careers: Some New Perspectives.

Van Maanen, J. and E. H. Schein (1979). "Toward of Theory of Organizational Socialization." Research in Organizational Behavior, 1: 209-264.

Van Maanen, J. and S. Barley (1984). "Occupational Communities: Culture and control in organizations." Research in Organizational Behavior, 6: 287-365.

Westley Frances R. and Philip S. Miller (edited 2003). Experiments in consilience: integrating social and scientific responses to save endangered species, Island Press.

Weber Max (1961). Basic Concepts in Sociology, New York, Citadel Press.

(1946). "Science as a Vocation" in H.H. Gerth and C. Wright Mills (Translated and edited), From Max Weber: Essays in Sociology, pp. 129-156, New York: Oxford University Press.

(1949) "Objectivity in social science and social policy" in the methodology of the social sciences, translated by Edward A Shils and Henry A Finch, New York: Free Press 1949.

(1904-05/1992) The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism. trans. T. Parsons/intro. A. Giddens. London: Routledge.

Wieland, George F. (1974). The Contributions of Organizational Sociology to the Practice of Management: A Book Review Essay, The Academy of Management Journal, Vol. 17, No. 2. 318-333.

Weick, K. (1985). "The Significance of Corporate Culture" in P. J. Frost, L. F. Moore, M. R. Louis, C. C. Lundberg and J. Martin. Organizational Culture. Beverly Hills, Sage: 381-389.

Williamson, O. E. (1981). "The Economics of Organization: The Transaction Cost Approach." American Journal of Sociology, 87(3): 548-577.

(1975). Markets and Hierarchies, The Free Press.

(1985). "Contractual Man" in. The Economic Institutions of Capitalism, the Free Press: 43-63.

Wiggenhorn, W. (1990). "Motorola U: When Training Becomes an Education." Harvard Business Review, 5(4): 35-51.

Yadong Luo, (2007). Global dimensions of corporate governance, Blackwell Publishing.

Young, Oran R. (2002). Institutional dimensions of environmental change: fit, interplay, and scale, MIT Press.

Young, Oran R. (1989). International cooperation: building regimes for natural resources and the environment, Cornell University Press.

Zacher, M.W. (1999). The United Nations and global commerce. Department of Public Information, United Nations, New York, NY, USA.

Zey-Ferrell, Mary (1981), Criticisms of the Dominant Perspective on Organizations, the Sociological Quarterly 22 -181-205

Zelizer, V. A. (1978). "Human Values and the Market: The Case of Life Insurance and Death in 19th-Century America." American Journal of Sociology, 84: 591-610.

Zuboff, S. (1984) In the Age of the Smart Machin, Basic Books; Reprint edition, New York, https://www.amazon.com/Age-Smart-Machine-Future-Power/dp/0465032117