

## JUSTICE ORGANIZATIONS, Fall 2017

CRIM 740  
Mondays 4:30 to 7:10 p.m.  
**Danielle S. Rudes**  
Commerce Bldg., ACE!, 4400 University Blvd, Ste. 4100

Spring, 2017  
Enterprise Hall, #274  
cell: 714.642.8141  
[drudes@gmu.edu](mailto:drudes@gmu.edu)

### COURSE DESCRIPTION

The primary objective of this course is to familiarize students with organization theory and research as ways to make sense of, navigate, and act on the criminal justice and legal systems. Class sessions will acquaint students with major frameworks in organization theory and their application to the system of criminal justice and legal organizations that implement and enforce law, especially police departments, regulatory agencies, courts, and juvenile justice and corrections.

The first section provides a general conceptual foundation for the course, including a working definition for organizations, their basic elements, and some of the key issues of concern for both researchers and practitioners. We then examine the internal dynamics of criminal justice and legal organizations from the perspectives of *rational systems* frameworks (that view organizations in terms of formal structures and goals), and then *natural systems* frameworks (that focus more on the informal, human side of organizations, including personal needs, culture, informal networks, decision making, and politics). Next, we address *open systems* frameworks that focus on the relationships between organizations and their external environments. The final part of the course investigates ten key challenges faced by all organizations: decision making, power/politics, technology/structure, culture, conflict/resistance, social inequality, ethics/deviance, leadership, change and effectiveness while also introducing students to implementation science. Throughout the course, we relate theory and research in the lectures, readings and assignments to the experiences of people who actually work in and/or study criminal justice or legal organizations.

### REQUIRED READINGS

There is one book for this course. Additionally, we will draw on an array of works written by organizational researchers (and/or researchers in other fields who use an organizational lens for examining complex problems). Some of these works cover general organizational concepts and dynamics while others use an organizational perspective to examine criminal justice or legal organizations. Students might benefit from working through the book first to lay a foundation for key concepts and then do the other readings. Class lessons both complement and supplement the readings, but do not explicitly cover each assigned reading. You should complete all reading *before* attending class or tackling the other course assignments. *All course readings are listed in the course outline under each lesson and can be printed out and/or read online via the course blackboard page.*

### COURSE OBJECTIVES

- (1) Learn the basic elements of organizations and the utility of organizational analysis;
- (2) Become familiar with and understand the primary streams of organization theory, and
- (3) Be able to apply organization theory to critically analyze central challenges faced by criminal justice and/or legal organizations.

## REQUIREMENTS

### Reading and Discussion Forums

Students are required to do all of the course readings (prior to class each week) and attend class each week. Because much of organization theory and research developed in the contexts of private organizations and workplaces, part of this course is a translation process. That is, we will be extending many ideas that developed in organizational contexts far removed from the criminal justice or legal systems. Many of these ideas travel well to criminal justice and legal organizations, while some do not.

The vitality of any course depends in part on student questions, comments, and ideas. Student participation is especially important because the intent here is that you not simply memorize a bunch of concepts and facts, but that you are able to apply the concepts to the organizations where you work or study to understand how and why they operate as they do. Therefore, in addition to completing the readings in a timely fashion, students should take notes on the readings and come to class ready for vibrant discussions.

### Random Article (in-class) Discussions:

To improve student thinking and retention of important material (and frankly to encourage careful and thoughtful reading), all students will be chosen at random to discuss four assigned course readings with the class. To do this, students must come to class having read all weekly assigned readings and be ready to briefly discuss one (if their name is chosen) with the class. To “discuss” each reading, students should come to class prepared to answer the following questions about each reading:

- 1) What is the **main point** or argument this author(s) is/are trying to convey?
- 2) How does this reading **advance our thinking** about the way organizations organizational actors operate, behave and/or think?
- 3) How does this reading **contribute to the overall theme**? (i.e., how does it connect with other readings from this week/topic?)
- 4) How does this reading **help you answer a particular question or set of questions** about a relevant topic in policing, courts, corrections, or juvenile justice?

For random selection, all student names will be placed into a bag **four** times (numbered 1, 2, 3, and 4). Each class, Dr. Rudes will select a certain number of names from the bag and those students will discuss a reading of Rudes’ choosing (from that week’s readings). To allow for some flexibility, students are permitted to “pass” on discussing a reading twice. When this happens, their name (with their number) goes back into the bag for another week’s pick. If a student’s name is chosen on a class when they have an *excused* absence, the student is not penalized; their name simply returns to the bag. If the student’s name is called during a class when they have an unexcused absence, that pick will count as a “pass” if they still have one or Dr. Rudes will record that grade as zero. These discussions should take roughly five minutes each.

### Brief Themed Arguments

All students will prepare **two** brief themed arguments (roughly three pages each) in response to a research question of the students’ choosing. The intent of this assignment is to deepen students’ knowledge about two areas of organizational study and illicit analytic thinking about that area through succinct argumentation. These are not fully formed arguments, just the beginning of an argument to get

students thinking. The finished product will look like one section of a literature review for a journal article.

This assignment requires students to choose *one or two readings from the required readings on the syllabus* (around a particular theme) **and** find *four additional theoretical, conceptual or empirical articles* on their own that when combined with the course readings help the student form an argument about a particular topic/theme. For example, if a student wants to argue that how police officers make discretionary decisions about when to arrest individuals involved in interpersonal or intimate partner violence (IPV) is heavily influenced by organizational culture, the student might choose a reading from the discretionary decision making section of our syllabus and a reading from the organizational culture section of our syllabus and then find four outside articles on this topic. Then, the student will use six readings to write an introductory paragraph and two or three substantive paragraphs laying out the beginning of an argument (in the style of a literature review...i.e., what does prior literature say on this topic and how does it help (or not) answer a particular research question). In this example, the student might have an introductory paragraph where they provide an introduction to the topic and/or situate their study in a broader or narrower context. Then, they might ask their research question. This may be followed by a paragraph each on discretion and org culture...OR...the student may choose to focus several paragraphs on studies of how and where org culture has been studied with discretion in policing (or related criminal justice agencies)...OR...the student may choose to write his/her whole memo on discretion and save the discussion for culture for the last paragraph that details the next part of the argument. There is no correct way to do this, as each argument is unique to its' writer. Students will finish the brief themed argument paper with a paragraph or a list of bullet points about where they would go next with this argument if they had unlimited pages to write and/or empirical data to analyze. Students will submit them via Blackboard. Arguments should be double-spaced with 11- or 12-point font and 1 inch margins all around and must include proper in-text citation and a full reference list.

**The last day to turn in brief themed arguments via Blackboard is November 29th at MIDNIGHT.** It is inadvisable to turn in both assignments without any time in-between. It is best to turn one in earlier on in the semester, get Rudes' feedback and then turn in another and so on (so you can use Rudes' feedback to improve, if/as needed). Twenty percent of the course grade will be based on the brief themed arguments (20% each x 2).

#### **Brief Themed Arguments Grading Scale**

- |                 |   |
|-----------------|---|
| <b><u>A</u></b> | Well-organized, clear, and precise. Contains insights that go beyond the basic facts. Analyzes and provides a synthesis of information in new, original ways. Judgments are critical and reflect an awareness of alternatives, social relations and historical perspective. |
| <b><u>B</u></b> | Well-organized, coherent, technically sound, but provides little insight beyond basic data.   |
| <b><u>C</u></b> | To the point, content is perhaps relevant, but loosely organized. Not much detail. Imprecise. May have factual errors. Meets some, but not all, requirements.   |
| <b><u>D</u></b> | Provides some relevant material, but is generally weak in organization and understanding of ideas. Does not meet all requirements.  |
| <b><u>E</u></b> | May have some relevant material but is weak in organization and understanding of ideas. Many errors, omissions and coherence problems. Does not meet requirements.  |

#### **Mini Empirical Paper**

Students will prepare one mini empirical paper (8 to 10 pages) that uses the course readings (and outside readings) to answer a research question they create (with some limitations) inductively

deduced from a set of qualitative fieldnotes (data). Students can choose which readings (from the course and beyond) to incorporate into their literature review. The purpose of the mini empirical paper is to help students grapple with the readings and apply key concepts and theories from an organizational perspective to real-world data. Although the brief themed arguments and class discussion will identify major points made in the readings and criticize them where appropriate, the main thrust of the mini empirical paper will be on developing promising ideas suggested in or inspired by prior theoretical or empirical scholarship by making a strong, supported and thoughtful analytic argument using actual qualitative data. To develop a strong literature review, students will need to consult additional readings for these papers. Students can repurpose all or part of what they wrote their brief themed argument papers within the context of the mini empirical paper if that works. [A side note: If you are planning to take the comprehensive exam in JOAL, I strongly encourage you to try to make a strong, supported argument here. If you are going to use the brief analytic memos as a way of prepping for the JOAL comprehensive exam, please consider writing your memo using examples from an area of criminal justice that you know less about. For example, if you consider yourself a policing scholar, try writing in the area of juvenile justice or courts or corrections. The JOAL exam requires this on the General question and this class is a good place to hone your skills. To be knowledgeable and exhibit expertise in organizational theory and behavior you must be able to apply an organizational lens to a variety of contexts.] Forty percent of the course grade is based on this mini empirical paper.

Your paper will have the following components:

- **INTRODUCTION**: Introduce the topic (your argument; your research question)
  - Because of the data you have available your research question will likely be formatted similarly to the following questions:
 

- *What are X's perceptions of X and how/why does that matter for doing X?*
    - *What are the mechanisms under which X occurs?*
    - *Under what conditions does X occur?*
- **LITERATURE REVIEW/THEORETICAL FRAMING**: Provide a brief literature review citing academic journal articles alerting your reader to what the literature currently says/knows about your topic
- **FINDINGS**: Analyze the data into a finding/results section using your knowledge from course materials (from readings/lecture/films) using key concepts, theoretical frameworks
- **DISCUSSION/CONCLUSION**: Discuss how/why your finding matters in light of where corrections has been, is presently and/or is headed in the future. Conclude with your thoughts on the salience of your finding/argument for future correctional policy/practice and if you foresee any unexpected outcomes as a result.

Students must complete all work on this and all assignments for this course independently. Dr. Rudes will discuss paper outlines with students anytime (by appointment), but will not pre-read any portion of a students' mini empirical paper or brief analytic memo prior to the student turning it in. Mini empirical papers are due no later than **Friday, December 8<sup>th</sup> at midnight**.

## ***CRIM 740: Grading Rubric for Mini Empirical Paper***

### **1. PURPOSE**

Addresses the assignment question/issue  
Introduction: provides clear sense of content/topic  
Introduction engages reader (has a hook)  
Clear statement of position  
Engages reader's interest  
Appropriate to audience  
Presentation (form/genre) is appropriate  
Appropriate voice/tone

Highly Competent ☐      Competent ☐      Emerging Competence ☐      Not Competent ☐

### **2. STRUCTURE OF ARGUMENT**

Logical flow of introduction with purpose explicit somewhere in the introduction  
Has a consistent and logical argument  
Organization: well-organized flow, repetition of key words, topic sentences, transitions between paragraphs  
Conceptual sophistication/style reflects complexity of thought  
Accurate use of headings as appropriate

Highly Competent ☐      Competent ☐      Emerging Competence ☐      Not Competent ☐

### **3. SUPPORT OF ARGUMENT**

Demonstrates knowledge of material  
Sources used appropriately to support points  
Sources integrated into arguments  
Includes empirical/reality-based evidence (quantitative or qualitative) as appropriate  
Balanced treatment of ideas/issues

Highly Competent ☐      Competent ☐      Emerging Competence ☐      Not Competent ☐

### **4. WRITING MECHANICS**

Documentation and citation: sufficient and consistent, including one style of citation used adequately and correctly throughout the paper; adequate number of sources referenced; paraphrases and quotations used appropriately and fully cited. Correct incorporation of citation at the sentence level.  
Understands how to construct sentences/paragraphs  
Word choice, syntax, grammar, spelling, and punctuation  
Uses consistent voice and tone  
Appropriate use of first person  
Uses active voice  
Avoids contractions, slang, vague pronouns

Highly Competent ☐      Competent ☐      Emerging Competence ☐      Not Competent ☐

### **5. INDEPENDENT THOUGHT**

Develops own line of reasoning and/or applies knowledge  
Synthesizes knowledge, not just regurgitation or summary  
Provides interesting/valuable insights

Highly Competent ☐      Competent ☐      Emerging Competence ☐      Not Competent ☐

### **OVERALL SCORE**

Highly Competent ☐      Competent ☐      Emerging Competence ☐      Not Competent ☐

**Final Paper Grade** \_\_\_\_\_

**Overall Course Grading Summary: (100 points possible)**

- 4 random article (in-class) discussions (20% total) (5 points each) = 20 points total
- 2 brief themed arguments (40% total) (20 points each) = 40 points total
- 1 mini empirical paper (40%) = 40 points

**Note:** Late essays and assignments will only be accepted with a valid excuse (e.g., a situation beyond the control of the student).

**Grading Scale**

96-100 = A+	86.5-89.9 = B+	76.5-79.9 = C+	60-69.9	D
93-95.9 = A	83.5-86.4 = B	73.5-76.4 = C	<59.9--	F
90-92.9 A-	80-83.4 = B-	70-73.4 = C-		

**EXPECTATIONS OF STUDENTS**

---

**Academic Integrity**

Students must be responsible for their own work, and students and faculty must take on the responsibility of dealing explicitly with violations. The tenet must be a foundation of our university culture. [See <http://academicintegrity.gmu.edu/distance>].

**Honor Code**

Students must adhere to the guidelines of the George Mason University Honor Code [See <http://academicintegrity.gmu.edu/honorcode>].

**MasonLive/Email (GMU Email)**

Students are responsible for the content of university communications sent to their George Mason University email account and are required to activate their account and check it regularly. All communication from the university, college, school, and program will be sent to students solely through their Mason email account. [See <https://thanatos.gmu.edu/masonlive/login>].

**Patriot Pass**

Once you sign up for your Patriot Pass, your passwords will be synchronized, and you will use your Patriot Pass username and password to log in to the following systems: Blackboard, University Libraries, MasonLive, myMason, Patriot Web, Virtual Computing Lab, and WEMS. [See <https://thanatos.gmu.edu/passwordchange/index.jsp>].

**Responsible Use of Computing**

Students must follow the university policy for Responsible Use of Computing. [See <http://universitypolicy.gmu.edu/1301gen.html>].

## SUMMARY LESSON OUTLINE WITH WEEKLY ASSIGNED READINGS

DATE	TOPIC	READINGS
8/28	<b><i>Conceptual Foundations</i></b> <u>Guiding Question(s)</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Where does the study of organizations come from? What is an organizational approach and why is it useful for understanding justice and social control?</li> <li>What does it mean to use an organizational lens/perspective in the social sciences?</li> </ul>	Scott & Davis, Ch. 1
NO CLASS, September 4th for Labor Day		
9/11	<b><i>Rational Systems: Bureaucracy &amp; Scientific Management</i></b>  <u>Guiding Question(s)</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>What forces gave rise to large-scale formal organizations?</li> <li>Which ideas shaped early development of organizational history?</li> <li>What is organizational structure? How is it observable and measurable?</li> <li>What influence does organizational structure have on the practices and performance of justice and social control organizations?</li> </ul>	Scott & Davis, Ch. 2 Weber (1946) Taylor (1919) Thompson (1967) Robinson (2003)
9/18	<b><i>Natural Systems: Human Relations, Humanistic Management, Shadow Structures, Culture</i></b>  <u>Guiding Question(s)</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>What accounts for the emergence of theoretical models critical of earlier perspectives?</li> <li>How far do these new perspectives go in introducing social factors in organizations?</li> </ul>	Scott & Davis, Ch. 3 Homans (1941) Barnard (1938) Lipsky (1980) Conover (2000)

9/25

***Open Systems (part one):***

Scott & Davis, Ch. 4, 5, 9 & 10  
Katz et al. (2002)  
Garland (2001)  
Mastrofski et al. (1987)  
Burns & Stalker (1961)  
Gibson (1980)

Guiding Question(s)

- How did the shift in perspective—from internal organizational arrangements to technology, power, external relations and information processing—change the nature of theorizing about organizations?
- What are organizational environments?
- What are the relevant analytic dimensions for measuring environments in and around justice and social control organizations?
- What do studies show about the relevance of organizational environments for the performance of justice and social control organizations?

10/2

***Open Systems II: Neo- Institutionalism***

Meyer & Rowan (1977)  
DiMaggio & Powell (1983)  
Morrill & McKee (1993)  
Edelman et al. (1999)

Guiding Question(s)

- How and why has the conception of organizational environments and institutional analysis evolved over time?
- Why do organizations tend to look like each other (i.e., in structure, policy, performance)?

10/10

***Decision Making***

**TUESDAY**

H. Simon (1945/1997)  
Burawoy (1979)  
Conley & O'Barr (1990)  
Viglione et al. (2015)  
Nardulli & Eisenstein (1984)  
Weick et al. (2005)

Guiding Question(s)

- What sources, forms and uses, and factors influence organizational and individual decision making within the workplace?

10/16

***Power and Politics***

Pfeffer (1980)  
Jacobs (1990)  
Meyerson & Scully (1995)  
Bies & Tripp (1998)  
Martin & Meyerson (1998)

Guiding Question(s)

- What are the sources, forms and uses of power within and across organizations?
- How/why do these sources/forms/uses impact organizational structures, performance or actors?



10/16	<i>Technology &amp; Structure</i>	<p>Scott &amp; Davis, Ch. 6  Barley (1986)  Hagan (1977)  Chan (2001)</p> <p><u>Guiding Question(s)</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>How do technology and information shape and constrain organizational structure? How do organizations set and manage boundaries?</li> <li>How does technology and structure facilitate or constrain organizational change?</li> <li>How are technologies used by justice and social control organizations?</li> <li>How much and in what ways does technology influence practice and performance in justice organizations?</li> </ul>
10/23	<i>Culture</i>	<p>Ouchi &amp; Wilkins (1995)  Kunda (1992)  Terrill et al. (2003)  Edelman &amp; Suchman (1999)</p> <p><u>Guiding Question(s)</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>What are the sources, forms, structures and uses of culture in and across organizations?</li> <li>How is organizational culture measured and observed?</li> <li>What are the consequences of organizational culture for the practices and performance of justice and social control organizations?</li> <li>What are the forces that cause organizational cultures to change and how long does it take?</li> </ul>
10/23	<i>Conflict &amp; Resistance</i>	<p>Emerson &amp; Messinger (1977)  Kolb &amp; Putnam (1992)  Morrill (1998)  LaNuez &amp; Jermier (1994)  Hepburn &amp; Albonetti (1980)  Van Maanen (1992)</p> <p><u>Guiding Question(s)</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>What are the sources, forms and uses of conflict in and across organizations?</li> <li>What does organizational resistance look like? How and why does resistance matter for organizational development, growth and change?</li> </ul>
10/30	<i>Ethics &amp; Deviance</i>	<p>Vaughan (1999)  Lawrence &amp; Robinson (2007)  Manning &amp; Redlinger (1978)  Jesilow et al. (1993)  Monahan &amp; Quinn (2006)</p> <p><u>Guiding Question(s)</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>How are organizational ethics constituted within and between organizational forms?</li> <li>What are the sources, forms and uses of deviance in and across organizations?</li> </ul>

10/30

***Leadership***

Etzioni (1959)  
McGregor (1957)  
Kras et al. (2015)  
Kras et al. (2017)  
Aarons (2006)

Guiding Question(s)

- How do leaders influence, impact, and alter organizational goals, directions, missions and reform?
- Who constitutes organizational leaders? How and why?
- What are the most important dimensions and dynamics of leadership?
- What makes an effective leader? Are these factors equally relevant to all types of organizations? Why/How?
- What are the consequences of leadership for justice and social control organizational practice?

11/13 ***Implementation Science***

Guest Speaker, Dr. Faye S. Taxman

Scott & Davis, Ch. 12  
Taxman et al. (2012)  
Taxman & Belenko (Ch. 3 & 4)  
(2011)

Guiding Question(s)

- How is effectiveness defined, considered, treated in organizational study?
- What are the sources, forms and structures in consideration when assessing organizational effectiveness? What is missing?

11/6

***Change***

Feldman (2003)  
Hannan & Freeman (1984)  
Vallas (2003)  
Ekland-Olsen & Martin (1988)  
DeCelles 2012  
Farrell et al. 2011  
Rudes (2012a)  
Willis et al. (2004)

Guiding Question(s)

- How does change occur within organizations and among organizational actors?
- What are the sources and forms that constrain or facilitate organizational change/reform?

**11/20 *Implementation Science & EBPs***

**Guest Speakers, Kimberly Meyer & Teneshia Thurman**

Nutley (2003)  
Rousseau (2006)  
MacKenzie (2000)  
Rudes et al. (2012b)  
Viglione et al. (2017)

Guiding Question(s)

- How is effectiveness defined, considered, treated in organizational study?
- What are the sources, forms and structures in consideration when assessing organizational effectiveness? What is missing?

**11/27 *Social Inequality & Course Wrap Up***

Scott & Davis, Ch. 7  
Kanter (1977)  
Britton (2003)  
Miller et al. (2003)  
Pager & Quillian (2005)  
Pettit & Western (2004)

Guiding Question(s)

- What are the sources, forms and uses of social inequality in and across organizations?
- In what ways does social inequality impact other organizational features such as conflict, change, effectiveness, etc.? How is it manifested? What, if any, could be solutions to social inequality in organizations?

**12/4      One-On-One Workshopping of Mini Empirical Paper (by appointment)**

## REFERENCE LIST FOR COURSE READINGS

(Note: with the exception of the Scott & Davis text below, all readings are PDFs and are available on BB)

- Aarons, Gregory. A. (2006). Transformational and transactional leadership: Association with attitudes toward evidence-based practice. *Psychiatric Services*, 57(8), 1162-1169.
- Barley, Stephen R. (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.
- Barnard, Chester. (1938). *Functions of the Executive*, pp. 82-95, 165-171. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Bies, Robert J. & Thomas M. Tripp. (1998). Two Faces of Powerless: Coping with Tyranny in Organizations. Pp. 203-219 in Roderick M. Kramer & Margaret A. Neale's (Eds.) *Power and Influence in Organizations*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Britton, Dana M. (2003). The Rest of the Job: Coworkers, Supervisors, and Satisfaction. Pp. 166-215 in *At Work in the Iron Cage: The Prison as Gendered Organization*. New York University Press.
- Burawoy, Michael. (1979). *Manufacturing Consent: Changes in the Labor Process Under Monopoly Capitalism*, Pp. 170-80 in Michael J. Handel's (Ed.) *The Sociology of Organizations: Classic, Contemporary, and Critical Readings* (2003). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Burns, Tom and G. M. Stalker. (1961). The Management of Innovation. Pp. 45-51 in Michael J. Handel's (Ed.) *The Sociology of Organizations: Classic, Contemporary, and Critical Readings* (2003). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Chan, J. B. (2001). The technological game: How information technology is transforming police practice. *Criminal Justice*, 1(2), 139-159.
- Conley, John M. & William M. O'Barr. (1990). The Jurisprudence of Informal Court Judges. Pp. 82-112 in *Rules Versus Relationships: The Ethnography of Legal Discourse*. University of Chicago Press.
- Conover, Ted. (2000). School for Jailers. Pp. 12-56 in *Newjack: Guarding Sing Sing*. New York: Random House.
- DeCelles, Katherine A., Paul E. Tesluk & Faye S. Taxman. (2012). A field investigation of multilevel cynicism toward change. *Organization Science*, DOI: 10.1287/orsc.1110.0735.
- DiMaggio, Paul & Walter Powell. (1983). The iron case revisited: Institutional isomorphism and collective rationality in organizational fields. *American Sociological Review* 48:147-60.
- Ekland-Olsen, Sheldon & Steve J. Martin. (1988). "Organizational Compliance with Court-Ordered Reform." *Law & Society Review*, 22:2:359-384.
- Edelman, Lauren B. & Mark Suchman. (1999). When the 'Haves Hold Court: Speculations in the Organizational Internalization of Law. *Law & Society Review*, 33: 941-991.

- Edelman, Lauren B., Christopher Uggen, & Howard S. Erlanger. (1999). The Endogeneity of Legal Regulation: Grievance Procedures as Rational Myth. *American Journal of Sociology*, 105:2:406-54.
- Etzioni, Amitai. (1959). Authority Structure and Organizational Effectiveness. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 4:1:43-67.
- Farrell, J., Young, D. W., & Taxman, F. S. (2011). The effects of organizational factors on use of juvenile justice supervision practices. *Criminal Justice & Behavior*, 38: 565-583.
- Feldman, Martha S. (2003). A Performative Perspective on Stability and Change in Organizational Routines. *Industrial and Corporate Change*, 12:4:727-52.
- Garland, David. (2001). Policy Predicament: Adaptation, Denial, and Acting Out. Pp. 103-138 in *The Culture of Control: Crime and Social Order in Contemporary Society*. University of Chicago Press.
- Gibson, James L. (1980). Environmental Constraints on the Behavior of Judges: A Representational Model of Judicial Decision Making. *Law & Society Review* 14: 343-370.
- Hagan, J. (1977). Criminal justice in rural and urban communities: a study of the bureaucratization of justice. *Social Forces* 55: 597.
- Hannan, M.T. & J. Freeman. (1984). Structural Inertia and Organizational Change. *American Sociological Review* 49:149-64.
- Hepburn, John R. & Celesta Albonetti. (1980). Role Conflict in Correctional Institutions. *Criminology*, 17:4:445-59.
- Homans, George. (1941). Pp. 56-86 & 96-99 in *Fatigue of Workers: Its Relation to Industrial Production*. New York: Reinhold Publishing Corporation.
- Jacobs, Mark. (1990). "Erratic Organizational Support." Pp. 125-144 in *Screwing the System and Making it Work*. University of Chicago Press.
- Jesilow, Paul, Henry N. Pontell & Gilbert Geis. (1993). Pp. 148-151, 154-164 & 172-175 in *Prescription for Profit: How Doctors Defraud Medicaid*. University of California Press.
- Kanter, Rosabeth Moss. (1977). Some Effects of Proportions of Group Life: Skewed Sex Ratios and Responses to Token Women. *American Journal of Sociology*, 82:5: 965-990.
- Katz, Charles M., Edward R. Maguire & Dennis W. Roncek. (2002). The Creation of Specialized Gang Units: A Macro-Level Analysis of Contingency, Social Threat and Resource Dependency Explanations. *Policing: An International Journal of Police Strategies and Management*, 25:3:472-506.
- Kolb, Deborah & Linda Putnam. (1992). Introduction: The Dialectics of Disputing. Pp. 1-xx in *Hidden Conflict: Uncovering the Behind-the Scenes Disputes*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Kras, K. R., Portillo, S., & Taxman, F. S. Managing from the Middle: Frontline Supervisors and Perceptions of Their Organizational Power. *Law & Policy*.

- Kras, K. R., Rudes, D. S., & Taxman, F. S. (2017). Managing up and down: community corrections middle managers' role conflict and ambiguity during organizational change. *Journal of Crime and Justice*, 40(2), 173-187.
- Kunda, Gideon. (1992). Pp. 8-22, 88-91 & 108-113, & 154-159 in *Engineering Culture: Control and Commitment in a High Tech Corporation*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- LaNuez, Danny & John M. Jermier. (1994). Sabotage by Managers and Technocrats: Neglected Patterns of Resistance at Work. Pp. 219-251 in John M. Jermier, David Knights & Walter R. Nord (Eds.) *Resistance and Power in Organizations*. New York: Routledge.
- Lawrence, Thomas B. & Sandra L. Robinson. (2007). Ain't Misbehavin: Workplace Deviance as Organizational Resistance. *Journal of Management*, 33:3:378-94.
- Lipsky, Michael. (1980). Pp. xi-xiii, 3-4, 13-17, 27-31, & 81-86 in *Street-Level Bureaucracy*. Russell Sage.
- MacKenzie, D. L. (2000). Evidence-based corrections: Identifying what works. *Crime & Delinquency*, 46(4), 457-471.
- Manning, Peter K. & Lawrence J. Redlinger. (1978). "Invitational Edges of Corruption: Some Consequences of Narcotic Law Enforcement." Pp. 147-166 in *Policing: A View From the Street*, edited by Peter K. Manning & John Van Maanen. Santa Monica, CA: Goodyear Publishing Co.
- Martin, Joanne & Debra Meyerson. (1998). Women and Power: Conformity, Resistance, and Disorganized Coaction. Pp. 311-348 in Roderick M. Kramer & Margaret A. Neale's (Eds.) *Power and Influence in Organizations*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Mastrofski, Stephen, R. Ritti, D. Hoffmaster. (1987). Organizational Determinants of Police Discretion: The Case of Drinking Driving. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 15:5:387-402.
- McGregor, Douglas. (1957). The Human Side of Enterprise. Pp. 108-113 in Michael J. Handel's (Ed.) *The Sociology of Organizations: Classic, Contemporary, and Critical Readings* (2003). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Meyer, J.W. & B. Rowan. (1977). Institutionalized Organizations: Formal Structure as Myth and Ceremony. *American Journal of Sociology*.
- Meyerson, Debra E. & Maureen Scully. (1995). Crossroads Tempered Radicalism and the Politics of Ambivalence and Change." *Organizational Science*, 6:5:585-600.
- Miller, Susan L., Kay B. Forest, & Nancy C. Jurik. (2003). Diversity in Blue: Lesbian and Gay Police Officers in a Masculine Occupation. *Men and Masculinities*, 5:4:355-385.
- Monahan, Susanne C. & Beth A. Quinn. (2006). Beyond 'Bad Apples' and 'Weak Leaders': Toward a Neo Institutional Explanation of Organizational Deviance. *Theoretical Criminology*, 10:3:361-385.
- Morrill, Calvin. (1998). Honor and Conflict Management in Corporate Life. Pp. 230-259 in Philip Smith's (Ed.) *The New American Cultural Sociology*. Cambridge University Press.

- Morrill, Calvin & Cindy McKee. (1993). Institutional Isomorphism and Informal Social Control: Evidence from a Community Mediation Center. *Social Problems* 40: 445-463.
- Nardulli, P., R. Flemming, & J. Eisenstein. (1984). Unraveling the complexities of decision making in face-to-face groups: a contextual analysis of plea-bargained sentences. *American Political Science Review* 78:912.
- Nutley, S. Walter, I. & Davies, H.T. (2003). From knowing to doing: a framework for understanding the evidence-into-practice agenda. *Evaluation*, 9(2), 125-148.
- Ouchi, William G. & Allen L. Wilkins. (1995). Organizational Culture. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 11:457-83.
- Pager, Devah & Lincoln Quillian. (2005). Walking the Talk: What Employers Say Versus What They Do. *American Sociological Review*, 70:3:355-380.
- Pettit, Becky & Bruce Western. (2004). Mass Imprisonment and the Life Course: Race and Class Inequality in U.S. Incarceration. *American Sociological Review*, 69:2:151-169.
- Pfeffer, Jeffrey. (1980). Power. Pp. 1-33 in *Power in Organizations*. Boston: Pitman.
- Robinson, Matthew B. (2003). McDonaldization of America's Police, Courts, and Corrections. Pp. 77-90 in *McDonaldization: The Reader* edited by George Ritzer. Thousand Oaks, CA: Pine Forge Press.
- Rousseau, D. M. (2006). Is there such a thing as "evidence-based management"? *Academy of management review*, 31(2), 256-269.
- Rudes, Danielle S. (2012a). Framing organizational reform: Misalignments and disputes among parole and union middle managers. *Law & Policy*, 34(1), 1-31.
- Rudes, D. S., Taxman, F. S., Portillo, S., Murphy, A., Rhodes, A., Stitzer, M., ... & Friedmann, P. D. (2012b). Adding positive reinforcement in justice settings: Acceptability and feasibility. *Journal of substance abuse treatment*, 42(3), 260-270.
- Scott, W. Richard & Gerald F. Davis. (2007). *Organizations and Organizing: Rational, Natural and Open Systems Perspectives*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson & Prentice Hall. **TEXTBOOK**
- Simon, Herbert. [1945] (1997). The Psychology of Administrative Decisions. Pp. 92-117 in *Administrative Behavior: A Study of Decision Making Processes in Administrative Organizations*. New York: Free Press.
- Taxman, F.S., & Belenko, S. (2011). *Implementing evidence-based practices in community corrections and addiction treatment*. Springer.
- Taxman, F.S., Henderson, C., Young, D.W., & Farrell, J. (2012). The Impact of Training Interventions on Organizational Readiness to Support Innovations in Juvenile Justice Offices. *Administration of Mental Health Policy and Mental Health Services Research*. DOI 10.1007/s10488-012-0445-5.

- Taylor, Frederick Winslow. (1919). Pp. 14, 26-27, 4-35, 58-59, 70, 100-101, 142 & 144 in *The Principles of Scientific Management*. Harper & Row.
- Terrill, W., Paoline, E. A., & Manning, P. K. (2003). Police culture and coercion. *Criminology*, 41(4), 1003-1034.
- Thompson, E. P. (1967). Time, Work-Discipline, and Industrial Capitalism. *Past and Present*, 38: 56-97.
- Vallas, Steven P. (2003). Why Teamwork Fails: Obstacles to Workplace Change in Four Manufacturing Plants. *American Sociological Review*, 68:2:223-250.
- Van Maanen, John. (1992). Drinking Our Troubles Away: Managing Conflict in a British Police Agency. Pp. 32-62 in *Hidden Conflict in Organizations* edited by Deborah M. Kolb & Jean M. Bartunek. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Vaughan, Diane. (1999). The Dark Side of Organizations: Mistake, Misconduct and Disaster." *Annual Review of Sociology*, 25:271-305.
- Viglione, J., Blasko, B. L., & Taxman, F. S. (2017). Organizational Factors and Probation Officer Use of Evidence-Based Practices: A Multilevel Examination. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, 0306624X16681091.
- Viglione, Jill, Danielle S. Rudes & Faye S. Taxman. (2015). Misalignment in Supervision: Implementation of Risk/Needs Instruments in Probation. *Criminal Justice & Behavior*, 42(3), 263-85.
- Viglione, J., Lerch, J., Rudes, D. S., & Taxman, F. S. (2017). Big Stick Management: Misconducts as Discipline Within a Correctional Reentry Facility. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 44(2), 163-183.
- Weber, Max. In Gerth, H.H. & C. Wright Mills. (1946). Bureaucracy. Pp. 196-198, 228-229, 232-233, & 240 in *From Max Weber: Essays in Sociology*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Weick, Karl, Kathleen M. Sutcliffe & David Obstfeld. (2005). Organizing and the Process of Sensemaking. *Organizational Science*, 16:4:409-21.
- Willis, James J., Stephen D. Mastrofski & David Weisburd. (2004). Making Sense of COMPSTAT: A Theory Based Analysis of Organizational Change in Three Police Departments. *Law & Society Review*, 41: 147-88.