Raimund Hasse & Georg Krücken

Competition and Actorhood:
A Further Expansion of the Neo-institutional Agenda

Abstract: The focus of this contribution is on developing a neo-institutional understanding of the social construction of competition and on impacts of competition on organizations. Starting point is the downplaying of the issue of competition in neo-institutionalism. Against this background we present some ideas on how to conceptualize competition from the macro-sociological and constructivist strand of neo-institutionalism. According to this perspective, competitive actors are results of ongoing construction processes. The notion of "others" – to borrow a concept from George Herbert Mead that plays a strong role in neo-institutional thinking – is of pivotal importance here. These "others" can instill a sense of competition in areas that hitherto had not been shaped by competition. It will be argued that competitive settings allow for a common horizon, and that they result in mutual observation processes and in the identification of trends and trendsetters among competitive actors. Furthermore, competition requires internal management capacities, with which organizations try to convince themselves and their environments that they (can) respond rationally and strategically to competitive challenges. In order to illustrate the fruitfulness of related research-perspectives we focus on universities, which in most contributions to organization research are seen as entities whose competitiveness as organizational actors has been rather low relative to that of business organizations. Finally, further implications for neo-institutional research and theory development are discussed.

Zusammenfassung: Der Fokus dieses Beitrags liegt auf der Entwicklung eines neo-institutionalistischen Verständnisses der sozialen Konstruktion von Wettbewerb sowie auf Auswirkungen des Wettbewerbs auf Organisationen. Ausgangspunkt ist die Vernachlässigung von Wettbewerbsthemen im Neo-Institutionalismus. Vor diesem Hintergrund werden Ideen zur Konzeptualisierung von Wettbewerb aus einer makro-soziologischen und konstruktivistischen Ausrichtung des Neo-Institutionalismus vorgestellt. Entsprechend dieser Perspektive sind Wettbewerbsakteure Resultate andauernder Konstruktionsprozesse. Die Figur des „Anderen" – um ein Konzept von George Herbert Mead zu beleihen, dass eine grosse Rolle im neo-institutionalistischen Denken spielt – ist dabei von entscheidender Bedeutung. Diese "Anderen" können einen Sinn für Wettbewerb in Gebieten entfalten, die ehedem nicht durch Wettbewerb geprägt waren. Es wird argumentiert, dass Wettbewerb-Settings Vergleichshorizonte eröffnen und dass sie zur wechselseitigen Beobachtung sowie zur Identifikation von Trends und Trendsetters unter Wettbewerbsakteuren führen. Zudem erfordert Wettbewerb interne Managmentkapazitäten, mit denen Organisationen sich selbst und ihre Umwelt davon zu überzeugen versuchen, dass sie rational und strategisch auf Herausforderungen des Wettbewerbs reagieren (können). Zur Illustration der Fruchtbarkeit hierauf bezogener Forschungspektiven gehen wir auf Universitäten ein, die in den meisten Organisationsstudien als Einheiten gesehen werden, deren Wettbewerbsorientierung im Vergleich zu Wirtschaftsunternehmen schwach ausgeprägt gewesen ist. Der Beitrag endet mit einer Diskusion weiterer Implikationen für die neo-institutionalistische Forschung und Theorieentwicklung.

Introduction

The issue of legitimation has become the trademark of neo-institutional research, both conceptually and empirically. Competitive features, by contrast, have attracted much less attention. In order to compensate for this negligence, our paper addresses the interplay of competition and actorhood. The macro-sociological and constructivist strand of neo-institutionalism that is mainly associated with the work of John Meyer and his colleagues (see Krücken and Drori 2009; Drori et al. 2006) will serve as a frame of reference for the further expansion of the neo-institutional agenda. From this point of view,

competitive actors are not taken-for-granted units of analysis, but results of ongoing construction processes. The notion of "others" – to borrow a concept from George Herbert Mead that plays a strong role in neo-institutional thinking (see Meyer 1996; Meyer and Jepperson 2000) – is of pivotal importance here, as "others" can instill a sense of competition in areas and actors that hitherto had not been shaped by competition. Competition is also closely linked to management because the construction of competitive actors requires management capacities.

Neo-institutional theorizing on actorhood serves as a starting-point for our account on competition, as it tries to expand the neo-institutional agenda by reconstructing modern actors, be they individuals, organizations, or nation-states. A modern actor is "a goal oriented, bounded, integrated, technically effective entity" (Meyer 2009: 38) that is nevertheless not an autonomous decision-maker. Instead, modern actors can be understood only by reconstructing "their practical embeddedness in taken-for-granted culture and relationships" (Meyer 2009: 39). Here, the orientation toward "generalized others" is seen as the driving-force behind the ever-increasing importance of actorhood, not intentional and autonomous behavior on the part of the actors themselves. In a very institutional fashion, these "others" are seen as the "scriptwriters" whose script is followed by the actors. This understanding of actorhood and the role "others" play within this concept can be utilized in order to reflect on the construction of competitive actors in society. "Others" here refer to third parties that set the institutional framing of competition. Such third parties include state organizations like regulatory agencies, but also private for-profit and not-for-profit organizations like financial rating agencies and NGOs as well as professional associations that operate in different sectors of society.

As the non-profit and the public sector are currently a global laboratory for experimenting with stronger competitive forces, non-profit and public sector organizations are highly interesting research objects for analyzing the ongoing construction of competitive actors. Though these construction processes have rarely been looked at in neo-institutional research, focusing on the non-profit and the public sector is hardly new to the neo-institutional research agenda. As a matter of fact, early empirical work in neo institutionalism was characterized by a strong emphasis on that sector: schools, foundations, museums, publishing houses, and health care organizations. In 1977, John Meyer called for a focus on "education as an institution" (Meyer 1977). This piece charted the path for institutional work on education as well as other institutionalist writings that more generally laid the foundation for the so-called neo-institutionalism in organizational analysis, including the seminal texts by Meyer and Rowan (1977) and DiMaggio and Powell (1983). Subsequent empirical work was guided by the assumption that organizations in the non-profit and the public sector are particularly suited for neo-institutional analyses and understanding the significance of legitimation for organizations. Following an influential distinction by Meyer and Scott (1983) such organizations were seen as part of the institutional sector. Business firms, on the other hand, were mainly seen as part of the technical sector, driven not by the quest for legitimation but by competitive forces and efficiency concerns. As a result, in 1991 Walter Powell self-critically questioned the early neglect of the private for-profit sector by stating that "much of the empirical research thus far has focused on nonprofit organizations and public agencies (schools, the mental sector, health care, cultural institutions, etc.)" (Powell 1991: 183).

A bit more than twenty years later, this statement no longer accurately represents the state-of-the-art. The last two decades have seen a strong emphasis by neo-institutionalists on the analysis of business firms, from numerous different angles and at various different levels. Overviews by Walgenbach and Meyer (2008), Greenwood et al. (2008), and Fligstein and Dauter (2007), for example, give ample evidence of the increasing significance of the private sector as a major research object for neo-institutional analyses. Organizational changes and structures in organizational fields have been

thoroughly examined. As with earlier studies on non-profit and public sector organizations, legitimation is seen as the main explanatory force here. By explicitly focusing on the role of legitimation in the business sector, the neo-institutional approach has been a major influence in organization and management studies. Following an analysis by Davis (2005), most submissions to the Organization and Management Theory Division of the Academy of Management come from a neo-institutional perspective, while other approaches, including those from economics and business administration, figure less prominently. This institutionalization of neo-institutionalism in organization and management studies is certainly a success story. It has been achieved through broadening the agenda by increasingly focusing on business organizations instead of non-profit and public sector organizations, which seem to be a too easy of a target for an approach that puts legitimation first, rather than competitive forces or efficiency concerns. But what can be considered as a promising starting point for developing a neo-institutional perspective on competition?

Our neo-institutional understanding of competition is that competition is based on social framing processes that allow organizations but also individuals to perceive themselves as competitive actors. From this point of view, competition is neither a natural relation which automatically sets in when resources are scarce, nor is it restricted to (modern) economies. Instead, it results from ongoing construction processes which, e.g., may also coordinate mass media, sports and science. Therefore, one has to analyze carefully how frames are constructed in which competitive behavior can evolve.

In order to construct competition, actors need to be linked to each other by third parties. Through this, previously isolated units become more closely interconnected in society. Such integrative effects of competition have been described in Georg Simmel's early and seminal reflections on competition (Simmel 1903 and 2008). According to Simmel, due to the role of others that act as referees in competitive settings competition needs to be distinguished from direct conflicts (cf. Werron 2010). In this, we follow Simmel, while many other conceptualizations of competition emphasize direct and zero-sum conflicts over scarce resources. In organizational research, e.g., such a direct and conflict-oriented perspective on competition is most prominently being put forward by Hannan and Freeman (1977). In contrast to Simmel, however, according to our understanding, the integrative effects of competition do not stem from the common anticipation of consumers' needs, but rather from the third parties that set the framing of competition, thereby linking potential competitors to each other. Competitive settings allow for a common horizon, mutual observation processes and the identification of trends and trendsetters among competitive actors. State agencies (as in the case of quasi-markets for social services) or organizations which evaluate and rank competitive actors (as in the case of universities) can play the role of such third parties.

Competition also requires internal management capacities as organizations and other competitive actors have to perceive themselves and demonstrate successfully to their environments that they are rational, strategic actors. With respect to business firms, students of organization have found ample evidence for activities and structures which aim at signalling compliance with norms of rationality. In the case of public sector and non-profit organizations, organizational rationality may be less taken for granted, but there is a clear trend towards reforms which symbolically and materially aim at strengthening rationality on the organizational level. Therefore, we see these organizations as particularly suited for an analysis of the construction of competitive organizational actors.

The course of argument can be summarized as follows: First, as competition is seen as the main driving-force in the business sector, we summarize some findings on economic competition and actorhood (section 2.). Here, we point to neo-institutionalists and others which have highlighted the

relevance of external framing for competition, and we focus on the construction of internal management capacities. Important research has been conducted in this latter area both along neo-institutional lines and in historical analyses. Then (in section 3), we explore whether these insights and our subsequent interpretation can be used to analyze non-profit and public sector organizations. By focusing on universities we will discuss the interplay of framing processes, management capacities, and the construction of competitive actorhood in the educational sector. At the end of this section on the current transformation of university organizations into competitive actors, we briefly point to research perspectives that focus on the construction of competitive actorhood among states and individuals in the field of higher education, and we refer to schools which are a different kind of educational organization. Following these examples, implications for neo-institutional theory and research in general will be addressed (in section 4).

1. Competition in the business sector: The importance of framing and management

Before discussing the importance of framing and management as two central aspects of competition in the business sector we would like to explicitly mention that we see competitive forces as pervasive in society. They are not limited to the business sector, but rather can be observed in numerous other sectors like politics, science, mass media, and sports (Hasse 2003: 18-32). Nonetheless, competition and competitiveness are of particular importance in the business sector. Competition compels adaptation, as those who do not compete successfully are threatened by selective forces (Hasse and Krücken 2012). Insufficient competitiveness in situations of intense competition might lead to the death of individual firms or entire populations (Barnett 2008). Compared to this, competitive forces are less directly threatening in, for example, academia and access to niches of less intense competition is easier. Public universities do not cease to exist when they underperform continuously, and a university professor who is not very successful in his or her research area can not only move into less competitive areas, but he or she can also focus more strongly on managerial positions in academia, academic teaching, consulting and advisory roles, further education or many other legitimate professorial activities.

According to neo-institutional insights from economics and sociology, competition cannot be perceived as a natural and anthropological given state; instead, specific social conditions are constitutive in this ongoing institutionalization process. These conditions range from formal legal requirements to cognitive and sense-making processes among competitors. Elaborate political and legal frameworks are necessary to create and maintain competition. Property rights and the capacity to enforce them have often been seen as a historical and causal prerequisite for "The Rise of the Western World" (North and Thomas 1973). In his subsequent work, North (1991) coined the definition of institutions as the "rules of the game", consisting of formal legal rules and informal social norms. In accordance with North's long-range historical insights on the importance of framing for the full evolution of competitive forces, Neil Fligstein's analysis of the structural changes within the American business sector in the 20th century emphasizes how market competition has been shaped by external regulatory forces (Fligstein 1990). Other aspects of ongoing framing processes are also currently being discussed, like, for example, worker and consumer rights, and environmental protection. In addition to these political and legal framings, establishing product categories may enforce competition as it makes products comparable, at times even standardized. Furthermore, a sufficient number of competitors seems to be necessary. This point is far from trivial as competitive dynamics tend to reduce the number of competitors to a very few or even only one supplier, possibly resulting in oligopolistic or monopolistic

structures. Also here, political and legal environments are of paramount importance. In addition, the structuring of the field among competitors implies cognitive processes in which competitors make sense of their competitive environment. Based on their analysis of the Manhattan hotel industry, Joel Baum and Theresa Lant have shown that competitive processes among organizations are based on the perception of belonging to a specific competitive group. Only within this socially constructed group do competitive processes occur, while all other possible competitors appear to be irrelevant (Lant and Baum 1995, Baum and Lant 2003). To summarize: Neo-institutional and other research has shown that competition in the business sector requires regulatory and cognitive framing processes that structure the relationship between competitors.

Another striking feature of competition in the business sector is the ever-increasing role of management. In the business sector, mainly organizations, i.e. firms, compete with one another. Firms as rational, goal-oriented entities emerged with the advent of capitalism, and during that phase of history, also the entrepreneurial role became institutionalized. While both of these actors, the capitalist firm and the entrepreneur, came into being simultaneously, management, both as a role and a function in the industrial firm, originated later in history. For the United States, Alfred D. Chandler (1977) has given some especially central accounts of the rise and institutionalization of management. According to him, between the mid 19th and early 20th century the sheer growth of firms and the increasing complexity of both internal and external environments moved firm owners away from the position of guiding and controlling their firms and their workers. Similar developments have been described for other industrialized countries (Chandler 1977: 498-500). In this process, a more scientific perspective on how to run a firm, one advocating a stronger internal division of labor and distinct management roles and functions, became institutionalized. In 1911 the proliferation of the concept of management found its full expression with Frederic Taylor's „The Principles of Scientific Management" (Taylor 1911). Roughly speaking, guidance and control of firms shifted from owners to managers, and a new and ever-important occupational group was born that comprises at least several elements of a profession. The trend toward the managerial control of business firms persisted over time, and early thinkers on knowledge or post-industrial society such as Peter Drucker (1969) or Daniel Bell (1973) stressed the increasing importance of management roles and functions in both firms and society at large.

This extremely abbreviated outline of the history of management in the business sector is relevant for our argument for two reasons. We assume, first, that the rise of management in the business sector is not only related to the size and complexity of organizations and their environments, but also to the increased structuring of competitive fields in that sector, due, most importantly, to a wide variety of regulatory forces, which can be analyzed from a neo-institutional perspective. Second, based on this assumption, we assume there is a similar shift toward the managed organization in other societal sectors as illustrated by the example of the educational sector in section 3. Though the rise of the management profession has been accompanied by critical reflections – ironically, among the above mentioned thinkers the strongest criticism was not coming from the business historian Chandler or the sociologist Bell, but from Drucker who many saw as a "management guru" – there is widespread, albeit not uncontested agreement on the functional advantages of management. Competition in the business sector does not lead only to the proliferation of formal organizations. A specific type of organization is needed, i.e. the strategically acting organization with explicit goals and active management. Gathering relevant information on the environment, for example, in order to enhance the capacity to survive by positioning the firm in a niche or by imitating peers and trendsetters implies management capacities as well as the competent processing and transformation of such information into strategies. From a neo-institutional point of view, however, the legitimizing aspects of

management should be stressed, too. Management has also to be seen as a necessary means of asserting the organization's rationality within the organization and its environments. Decades of organizational research by James March (1999), Henry Mintzberg (1994) and others highlighting the limits to rationality and strategic planning could hardly falsify the strong assumptions about the rationality of business firms. Myriads of managerial structures and procedures can be identified through which business firms convince themselves and others that they are rational, strategic actors. Apparently, in no other societal sector is strategic management enacted in such a ritualistic way and sophisticated accounting and auditing procedures, which also serve legitimizing purposes, are a characteristic trait of business firms (Carruthers 1995; Westphal and Zajac 1998; Beck and Walgenbach 2005; Hasse 2010; see also Meyer/Bromley 2012 for a more general account on accounting procedures and the rise of the modern organization).

Both strands of research are highly relevant for a general neo-institutional account of competition. The first one is important as it focuses on the essential role of framing processes and related third parties in the construction of domains where competition might unfold. In this, ahistorical approaches that see competition as simply given and natural are rejected. Yet, one can push neo-institutional analyses of framing processes a step further, as they do not only delineate the "rules of the game", but also the contours of the actors involved. Such a perspective is rather new to our field, as even in the neo-institutional accounts we briefly discussed above, strategic and market-based behavior among organizations and individuals often is supposed to be a given fact (Hasse and Schmidt 2010). Behavioral traits, however, have to be seen as the result of historical and sociological processes. With regard to the prerequisite for strategic behaviour, i.e. means-ends-rationality, one can draw on research that has been conducted in other fields, for example in general sociology and the history of ideas. For example, Norbert Elias (1969, 1982) in his two volumes on "The Process of Civilization" has argued how rational, self-controlling actors emerged under specific historical conditions in medieval and early-modern Europe. In a similar vein, Albert O. Hirschman's small book "The Passions and the Interest" describes how in the 17th and 18th century the widespread belief that unpredictable passions were seen as the main driver of human behavior was replaced by understanding human actors as being driven by interests based on rational calculating behavior, hence paving the way for the rise of capitalism (Hirschman 1977). In these processes, not only the "rules of the game", but also the actors therein have been created (see also Meyer 2005: 10). Here, the second strand of neo-institutional research on competition, which focuses on the role of management, comes in. It is evident that the increasing role of formal organizations as societal actors is reflected in the rise of management. Furthermore, a specific kind of formal organization has become most prominent, i.e. the rational, goal-seeking and competitive organization that requires management capacities in order to pursue its strategies. Regarding the importance of framing processes, neo-institutional research has been conducted, showing that management and related techniques are a means for constructing legitimacy directed at external constituencies. These insights can be utilized as resources for developing a neo-institutional account of competitive actors. We try to show the fruitfulness of this perspective by focusing on universities, which in most comparative and organizational research are seen as entities whose competitiveness as organizational actors is rather low relative to that of business organizations.

2. The construction of universities as competitive actors

In a general discussion of public sector reforms Nils Brunsson and Kerstin Sahlin-Andersson claim that public sector organizations are transforming into "complete organizations" that, among other

features, are based on identity, hierarchy, and rationality (Brunsson and Sahlin-Andersson 2000). With regard to universities, similar observations have been made by Georg Krücken and Frank Meier (2006) and Harry de Boer, Jürgen Enders, and Liudvika Leisyte (de Boer et al. 2007). Likewise, Richard Whitley has developed an important typology of universities as strategic actors, while he also highlights their limitations and variations (Whitley 2008). The transformation of the university into a competitive actor that we observe most conspicuously in Europe implies that it is now seen less as an institution – i.e., it is less taken-for-granted what it means to be a university. Instead, identity is part of an ongoing construction process in which each university develops missions and targets which can be fulfilled by strategic means.

In this process two hitherto unquestioned features of universities are challenged: the distinctiveness of the national university system and the uniqueness of the university as a specific type of organization. In universities, according to comparative and organizational research, centralized power was limited and strong internal governance was mostly absent. Being torn between internal (departments, professors) and external (state) forces, university organizations have only very little in common with the state bureaucracy as described by Max Weber (1978) or with powerful organizational actors with their strong leadership, which historical and sociological research, for example by Alfred D. Chandler (1977) and Charles Perrow (2002), on business firms has shown. Comparative research on universities makes this point very obvious (see, for example, the seminal work by Clark 1983). Following Clark (1983) and many others the traditional German university concept was an example of a system based on strong state authority and an equally strong academic oligarchy. There was hardly any room and legitimacy for universities as independent decision-making actors. The French model with its especially strong reliance on state authority was even further away from one in which intra-university governance and strong leadership could be fostered. The state focused on disciplinary, but not on organizational, boundaries when it came to regulating universities. Correspondingly, university professors did not identify with their organizations. Christine Musselin (1999: 45) concluded: "Nowhere was a university considered as an entity".

The picture for the United States is more ambiguous. As compared to its European counterparts, market forces ever since have played a much more important role as a governance mechanism in American higher education. Therefore, organizational competitiveness and its requirements – framing processes and specialized management – is historically deeper entrenched and can be based on much more previous experiences in the United States. On the other hand, though, the community character of American universities is stressed in many of the reflections among academics on the organizational setting in which they are embedded. In the 1970s, organizational researchers in the United States such as Cohen, March, and Olsen (1972) pointed to "garbage can" decision-making processes and labelled universities as "organized anarchies". Their scholarly descriptions found their counterpart among practitioners. An allegedly powerful university president like Kerr depicted himself in his seminal piece from 1963 as a "mediator" between different forces beyond his control (Kerr 2001: 27-29). He went on to compare the university – which he labelled "multiversity" in order to express what he saw as a loss of unity – to a "pluralistic society with multiple cultures" and to the United Nations (see also Soo and Carson 2004). In a recent study of the state-of-the art of American research universities, Jonathan R. Cole (2009: 66) basically confirms these organizational accounts from the 1960s and 1970s as still being accurate when he states: "Authority depends on the consent of the governed […] Universities are loosely governed organizations."

In the following we highlight some of the most conspicuous aspects of the ongoing transformation of the university as an institution into a competitive organizational actor. First, rankings of entire

university organizations both at a national level and a global scale are of paramount importance for the self-perception as a competitive actor (see also Hazelkorn 2011). Rankings at the national level have a long tradition in the United States, but scarcely any in other countries. Global comparisons of universities are also not entirely new. Since at least the early 19th century intensive observation and exchange processes have taken place. However, these processes have accelerated over time. Long-term trends that have nonetheless become much more articulated during the last years are the withering charisma of the nation-state as a source of meaning and identity and the facilitating role of information and communication technologies as means of comparing units at a world-wide scale. More recently, global rankings, such as the Shanghai Ranking or the University Ranking by the British "Times", have been constructed and now contribute to the formation of a common global frame in which universities can perceive themselves as competitors and behave accordingly (Heintz and Werron 2011). To some degree, one may see a certain parallel to the creation of leagues in the history of American basketball, which transformed basketball teams that previously travelled the country as on-the-road theatre groups into competitive actors (Leifer 1988). Though we see the creation and influence of rankings as being most relevant at the university level, one can analyze their increasing importance also at the level of schools of higher education. Michael Sauder and Wendy Nelson Espeland (2009) analyzed the effects of rankings on law schools, using Foucault's concept of discipline. Based on neo-institutional assumptions, Linda Wedlin (2006) conducted a comparative study on rankings in the field of business schools. Following these and related studies, we would argue that competition among universities depends upon and is even created by the development of rankings, evaluations, and statistics of all kinds. It thus may be argued that differences which make a difference only occur against the backdrop of a socially constructed comparability.

Second, universities traditionally were seen as institutions, i.e. taken-for-granted units whose activities one hardly has to think about. Currently, what used to be taken-for-granted institutions are developing more individual profiles. Branding activities of universities are of high importance here. Likewise, the development of mission statements by universities has to be taken into account. Many universities have transformed traditional and standard accounts of what a university as an institution is expected to do (like "research and teaching") into their "own" and explicit mission. Such a mission statement might not add any information concerning the central activities of a particular university. Nevertheless, this transformation of a general institutional account into a specific organizational one confirms the idea that the university is an autonomous entity that deliberately chooses its own destiny as a "real", organizational actor. As such, the university can be seen as an entity that is ready to compete with other universities. Through mission statements universities position themselves in particular niches, hence allowing for competition within that niche but avoiding competition with those universities that display a different profile. Furthermore, as "mission statements" are a management tool that comes from business organizations, their recent more frequent use in higher education indicates a cross-sectoral diffusion process is underway.

Third, and against the backdrop of universities as loosely coupled organizations, it becomes evident that decision-making structures within universities are becoming increasingly hierarchical, both at the departmental and the overall level of the organization. There is increasing concern for leadership in academia, and traditional collegial bodies of decision-making like the academic senate are losing importance. Rectors and deans are increasingly understood not as collegial parts of the overall professoriate but as powerful decision-makers that position "their" organizations within competitive fields. Higher education researcher Burton Clark (1998, 2004) has highlighted the increasing role of leadership in academia in a variety of case studies in Europe, America, and Africa. Here, the co-production of actorhood, management and comparative framings is evident. The idea that the

university is in need for strong leadership comes with the requirement to position the entire organization and its organizational subunits within competitive fields. The construction of competitive fields is brought about by framing processes. Such processes most typically imply third parties, but like in the business sector they can also be based on mutual observation and the bottom-up development of benchmarking-processes.

Fourth, organizational accountability is becoming more important. In this, a broader societal trend toward what Michael Power (1997) called "the audit society" is reflected. The attribution of responsibility, which traditionally in universities has been much more individualized, is now transforming into an organizational attribute. As organized actors, universities have to be understood as units which produce decisions for which they are held accountable. Also omissions or "non-decisions" can be reconstructed as decisions, so that the decisions and the related risks the organization faces multiply. Again, it was Power (2007) who provided evidence of the intimate link between accountability, management, risk and decision-making. The increasing accountability within the organization and with regard to its environments leads, on the one hand, to an increase of financial units and related managerial professionals. With tighter accounting budget-related issues and expertise are becoming more important to the university. For the UK and the Commonwealth States Danielle Logue (2010) found evidence of the creation and ever-increasing importance of the chief financial officer (CFO). On the other hand, accountability leads to bureaucratization and legalization in university organization. This is most visible in the United States, which in general is characterized by a particular litigious environment, and consequently legal units and expertise in higher education organizations are flourishing. This inserts a heavy dose of risk-aversion into the system, which allows for predictability among competitors. Though in popular literature on competition in the business sector bold risk-taking is cherished, there is broad consensus in economic theory that individual risk-aversion and the mutual assumption that others behave similarly is a prerequisite for competition (see the seminal papers in Arrow 1971).

Fifth, and in line with one of the core criteria for modern actorhood as outlined in the seminal paper by Meyer and Jepperson (2000), universities as organized actors have to be open to advice from the outside. At first glance, taking external advice sounds odd, given the traditional understanding of the university as the place in society that has privileged access to superior knowledge. But modern actorhood requires such advice-taking, and universities have become increasingly open to management consultancy (Serrano-Velarde 2010). We assume that the openness toward management consultancy has to be seen as a variable that is dependent on organizational characteristics. More specifically, we assume that the perception of university representatives that they are embedded in international competition and the existence of strong internal management capacities make the request for such advice much more likely, while self-positioning in regional niches and weak management capacities makes turning to external consultants highly unlikely. It has been pointed out by many neo-institutional analyses that management consultants are of eminent importance for trans-national and trans-sectoral diffusion processes (Kipping and Engwall 2002; Sahlin-Andersson and Engwall 2002). Following these studies, we see management consultants as important, yet not systematically studied carriers of the idea that universities have to be perceived as competitive actors.

Sixth, the new, empowered, and competitive university is related to the ongoing elaboration, expansion and differentiation of a fine-grained formal organizational structure. A contemporary university has offices for a variety of tasks that previously, for the most part, were not regarded as part of the organization's responsibility. Through the use of quantitative data and analysis John Meyer and

his colleagues have shown that the concept of the modern nation-state depends on the existence of a broad, yet standardized set of ministries if it is to be recognized as a legitimate actor by the wider social environment (Meyer et al. 1997). In a similar vein to what Meyer et al. (1997) have shown with regard to the state, we propose that the modern university is equipped with an increasing number of offices and organizational subdivisions that are not just the result of functional requirements but are part of its attempts to be granted legitimacy by the wider social environment. Especially during the last decade many new positions have been created in fields like planning, student services, quality control, and public relations, i.e., in fields that contribute to the concept of an integrated, goal-oriented entity that is deliberately choosing its own actions and that can be perceived of as a competitive actor (see Rhoades and Sporn 2002 for the United States, Gornitzka and Larsen 2004 for Norway, Krücken 2011 for Germany). Likewise, one can also observe a profound process of restructuration. Lower-level positions like those for clerical work are decreasing in number, while the number of higher-level positions in the administration is increasing. Following these studies, management, related positions and units are becoming ever more important as the perception of competitive pressures increases.

Seventh, there is a trend toward professionalized management of universities and the emergence of a management profession. There are numerous indicators for this trend in very different regions of the world. One might think of the emergence of specialized journals, the establishment of academic programs and courses on higher education management, and the emergence of professional networks of higher education managers. Like management consultants, but probably more important than these, professional management and related networks are exercising isomorphic pressures on universities as they diffuse knowledge and templates with regard to how to conceptualize and run a competitive university organization. Here one finds very interesting parallels to developments in other areas of the non-profit sector, which allows for cross-sectoral research on institutional and organizational change. Hokyu Hwang and Walter Powell, for example, have described a similar trend towards the professionalization of charity organizations in the San Francisco Bay Area (Hwang and Powell 2009). Management training, networking and the use of procedures from the business sector, such as strategic planning and external financial audits are spurring the institutionalization of a management professionalization in that field, and both the field and the individual organizations have become far more structured and rationalized than a few decades ago.

Although all these aspects of the overall trend toward competitive actorhood are related to organizations in the field of higher education, other types of modern actors and other organizations in the educational sector – like schools – are currently being transformed into competitive actors, too. Let us begin with the former, i.e. nation-state actors and individual actors in higher education. Rankings have an impact on states as they try to position themselves in a global arena. Global university rankings affect not only university organizations, but also nation-state actors and even the European Union. The latter, driven by France and other member states that see their universities as undervalued in these global rankings, has launched its own globally oriented university ranking project. Furthermore, the OECD sets the framework for comparison and competition among its member states by comparing their national enrolment rates and R&D expenditures. In addition, states get good advice from the OECD and other transnational organizations, and they develop strategies and structures in order to be recognized as a modern and legitimate actor that pursues higher education as a central goal of modern statehood. In this, distinct national ideals vanish and give way to the more general ideal of the globally competitive state.

Also individuals in higher education are increasingly conceptualized as competitive actors that employ a vast array of technologies for self-management. In this, the general trend in society toward

individualization is reflected. We believe that individual competitiveness is of growing importance to both university students and academics. Increasingly, the image of the university student is less that of a group-oriented and intrinsically motivated person, but as a rational individual that orients his or her choice of degree courses and subjects according to the expected return-on-investment and who, in order to pursue his or her goals, is familiar with technologies of self-management. The effects of the massification of higher education are of paramount importance here as admission has become increasingly selective and labour market entry has become equally more competitive. In addition, the growing importance of tuition fees shapes the actors involved. Likewise, rankings of universities, schools, and departments are playing an ever-increasing role. Similar to the transformations occurring at the organizational level, we see American universities as frontrunners of a more general trend. For the most part, European countries began experimenting with tuition fees and rankings only in recent years, while the picture regarding admissions is more heterogeneous, depending on country, organization, and subject.

Likewise, the concept of the academic is changing. The idea of being part of a community of scholars that is so much cherished in the self-perception of academics is seemingly being substituted by individual competitiveness and related intellectual and social capacities. With regard to such a claim, however, caution is warranted. It is not unlikely that one myth is being substituted with another, even though the reality has not changed that dramatically. Accounts from eminent scientists, from Galileo Galilei to Francis Crick, give ample evidence of the competitive behavior induced by the reputational structure of science that puts a premium on the first one that comes up with something new, while the second can only confirm or replicate, but not discover. The rapidly intensifying efforts to quantify and compare, which have been described by Espeland and Stevens (2008), also influence individual academics. Both globalization and technological progress, in particular the ability to retrieve data on oneself and others on a large scale and within a short amount of time as well as the increased frequency of formal assessments, have massively spurred the self-perception of academics as competitive individual actors, while the community aspect is downplayed. In sum: Though we agree with those scholars who see competitive behavior as being an intrinsic and timeless part of the scientific field, we insist on the dynamic character of competition and the necessity of taking more recent developments into account. Individual competitiveness among academics also goes hand in hand with technologies of self-management, a part of which is directly related to the logic of the academic field like, for example, the micro-management of publishing, while another part is related to more general aspects of management like, for example, enhancing individual soft skills.

Not only universities and other actors in the higher education field can be analyzed from a neo-institutional perspective that highlights the relation between competition and actorhood. School organizations are another highly interesting venue for such comparative research. Despite all their differences, like university professors school teachers adhere to professional ideals that allow them to claim competencies and responsibilities for dealing with students independent of a strong organizational context. Similar to universities, schools were characterized as rather weak organizations where active management played only a very minor role.

Against this background, education became the model to illustrate the issue of loose coupling in organizational research (Weick 1976). For John Meyer and Brian Rowan in their early neo-institutional work, schools were paradigmatic cases for illustrating the decoupling of political reforms and formal representations of school objectives on the one hand and the professional practice of teachers on the other (Meyer and Rowan 1977). This line of institutional research attracted a great deal of attention because of a growing consensus about the importance of school education. However, competitive

dynamics between schools were not an issue in neo-institutional research. Organizationally, however, it is important to notice that since the early work of Weick (1976), Meyer and Rowan (1977) and others some profound changes have occurred. First, concerns about educational achievement have triggered a trend towards standardized skills tests. The results of such tests allow for comparing and evaluating – districts and nations, but also schools. Second, on the basis of test results political and administrative decision makers can be legitimized in providing schools with incentives (or, to lesser extent, to sanction them). Third, educational aspirations have risen – school affairs have become objects of active decision making by students and parents. As a consequence, schools have begun to compete for talented and motivated students.

According to a more recent contribution by Heinz-Dieter Meyer (not to confound with Rowan's co-author from 1977) and Brian Rowan, these changes have been so profound that the notion of loose coupling needs to be substantially revised. They argue that "new social developments […] have produced novel institutional practices with which institutional theory and research have yet to catch up" (Meyer and Rowan 2006: 2). Empirically, it is an open question as to what extent this competitive structure has been accompanied by organizational changes leading to the rise of schools as competitive actors – and there is also huge national variation in this respect. We assume, however, that compared to universities the transformation of schools into organizational, competitive actors is still lagging behind. Neither is the reputational structure of schools and its impacts on issues of resources and legitimation as pronounced as in the case of universities, nor do we find similar results with respect to organizational changes toward a more active management. However, from our point of view, schools are a very good case to illustrate the social construction of competition and competitive actors. This process is not very far advanced, and, therefore, it can be observed "in the making". Though we agree with Meyer and Rowan's (2006) remarks on the important changes over the last decades, we believe that the classical neo-institutional account of loose coupling still holds true for schools, as much of the new organizational and competitive actorhood of schools relies on window-dressing for external constituencies. Likewise, we assume that the trend toward organizational actorhood of universities, which we described in more detail above, produces a lot of loose coupling. However, the relationship between the more recent neo-institutional ideas on the social construction of organizational actorhood and the more traditional loose coupling account is not unequivocal and should be further explored in neo-institutional research and theorizing (see also Bromley et al. 2012).

Discussion

In the previous sections we tried to roughly outline how to conceive of the relationship between competition and actorhood from a neo-institutional perspective by particularly focusing on the importance of framing and management. We reframed insights taken from analyses of business sector organizations from an actorhood perspective and then examined the similarities and differences when looking at universities and other actors in the educational sector. In the end of the paper we will identify four new research perspectives for the entire field which might result from our explorations.

First, different comparative research perspectives unfold. We began our paper by stating that early research on non-profit and public sector organizations led neo-institutionalists to focus on the issue of legitimation, after which many of them expanded into the business sector. Currently, we see non-profit and public sector organizations as a laboratory for studying competitive mechanisms in neo-institutional research. We suppose that we will see strong differences between the sectors, fields, and

national settings in which competition among organizations that are constructed as competitive actors occurs. Seemingly, the construction process in the business sector is further advanced, as competition in this sector is deeply embedded in the way individual and organizational actors perceive themselves and their environments. Nevertheless, "others" that construct the competitive field also play an important role here. By seeing competition as an ongoing construction process, one can discuss these different and well-established strands of research from a new perspective and, in addition, other types of "others" may become of interest, such as, for example, the mass media and consulting firms. Likewise, taking into account the history of industrial management is fruitful. Professional management came into being with the growing complexity of firms and their environments and is linked to the competitiveness of firms. In this regard we see strong similarities to the current transformation of non-profit and public sector organizations. However, specific and distinct logics prevail in shaping the managerial turn. Educational organizations, for example, are still shaped by a professional logic that buffers the effects of managerialization. Furthermore, management is important for the institutionalization of the general concept of the organization as a competitive actor as this concept is new to many non-profit and public sector organizations and implies both structural and cultural transformations. Here, we see business firms, where the general concept is taken-for-granted, as far more advanced and the question is basically under which context-specific logic of competition organizational competitiveness evolves (Barnett 2008).

Second, by focusing on the construction of actors through competitive framings and capacities for self-management one can link neo-institutional thinking to post-Foucauldian research and theory. Whereas links to other social theories like those of Pierre Bourdieu and Anthony Giddens have been widely explored, the link to Michel Foucault and scholarly work in that tradition is still an unbeaten path (Drori and Krücken 2009: 23-24; for a broader reflection on European social theory and North American neo-institutionalism see Krücken 2002). Identity formation in a rationalized society is an important subject for both Meyer and Foucault, and the role of classifications, rankings, and statistics play a pivotal role in both approaches. "Scripted actorhood" (Meyer) or "submission and obedience" (Foucault) are not simply opposing, but intimately linked to subjectivity. The modern subject has to define itself through adherence to a societal meta-frame that fosters competitive behaviour, active positioning and entrepreneurship, both at the individual level and the level of organizations and states. Such issues are discussed in different strands of post-Foucauldian thinking in European social theory, for example in Great Britain in the debate on "governmentality" (Rose and Miller 2008) or in Germany under the label "the entrepreneurial self" (Bröckling 2007). Also in France one finds interesting debates that are relevant in this regard. Though not as closely linked to Foucault as the authors mentioned before, we also see parallels with Boltanski and Chiapello's "The New Spirit of Capitalism" from 2005 and with other contributions to the *Économie des Conventions* that are worth exploring (Diaz-Bone and Salais 2012). Linking neo-institutional thinking to these discussions also allows for critically contextualizing the ongoing neo-institutional debate on "institutional entrepreneurs" (cf. Hasse and Schmidt 2010) within a broader frame of reference that highlights the institutional construction of such actors.

Third, one can take our ideas on the construction of actorhood in competitive settings as a first step for integrating culturalist and rationalist sociological theorizing. Typically, these approaches to understanding the behaviour of individuals and collectivities are seen as being juxtaposed in an irreconcilable and antithetical way. While in cultural accounts the embeddedness of actors and actions in broader cultural frames of reference and the related taken-for-grantedness of general scripts and norms are stressed, rational accounts are instead based on the assumption that instrumental, strategic behaviour dominates. Neo-institutional research and theorizing has a long history of criticizing rationalist accounts, mainly in organizational research, but also with regard to individuals

and nation-states. This programmatic stance against rationalist accounts has been instrumental for the institutionalization, extension and stabilization of an approach that is highly successful in organization and management studies, as we tried to show in section 1. However, we see a lot of undiscovered terrain when trying to move beyond that juxtaposition by focusing on the social construction of instrumental, strategic actors. From a neo-institutional and culturalist perspective actors and their capacities for strategic behavior are not anthropologically given; they are, instead, being under constant social construction. In this paper we tried to highlight some aspects of such construction processes. Based on the assumption that the institutionalization of instrumental, strategic behavior can be reconstructed sociologically, one can simultaneously observe the behavior of rational actors that follow the new script of competitive, self-managed actorhood. Therefore, we see culturalist and rationalist accounts as complementary to each other, not as irreconcilable. The current wave of rationalization taking place in education, public administration, hospitals, charity organizations and other organizations also allows for recalibrating the theoretical agenda of neo-institutionalism. Non-profit and public sector organizations, which were most prominent at the beginning of neo-institutional research for establishing a theoretical agenda, in which non-technical and non-rational forces were highlighted, are nowadays being transformed into competitive, strategic actors. Neo-institutional theorizing could benefit a lot from carefully taking into account these transformations and making sense of the underlying dialectics of culture and rationality.

Fourth, directing neo-institutional theory and research towards the analysis of the interplay between competition and actorhood adds a strong dose of reflexivity to the field. According to us, there are two main reasons the social sciences play a strong, though not always acknowledged role in the processes described. On the one hand, the social construction of actors through competitive framings is hardly imaginable without the social sciences, which are heavily involved in the process of conceptualizing such framings. This takes place through what Strang and Meyer (2009: 140-141) call "theorization", i.e., "the self-conscious development and specification of abstract categories and the formulation of patterned relationships such as chains of cause and effect. Without general models, cultural categories are less likely to arise and gain force." Theorization, on the other hand, is accompanied by social scientists' collecting and providing comparative data on how individuals, organizations, and nation-states look and, more importantly, how they should look. Such data are of critical importance as they create a mirror, allowing, perhaps even forcing competitors to mutually observe one another and behave strategically (our metaphor is drawn from Harrison White 1981). Debates in economic sociology on the "performativity" of expert discourses (MacKenzie et al. 2007) take the role and responsibility of experts seriously. Likewise, such reflexivity with regard to our role and responsibility is much needed in our field as well.

REFERENCES

Arrow, K.J. (1971): *Essays in the Theory of Risk-Bearing*. Amsterdam: North-Holland Publishers.

Barnett, W. P. (2008): *The Red Queen among Organizations. How Competitiveness Evolves.* Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Baum, J. A. C., and Lant, T. K. (2003): Hits and Misses: Managers' (Mis)Categorization of Competitors in the Manhattan Hotel Industry. In: Baum, J. A. C., and Sorenson, O. (eds.), *Geography and Strategy. Advances in Strategic Management* 20. Oxford: JAI Press/ Elsevier, 119-156.

Beck, N., and Walgenbach, P. (2005): Technical Efficiency or Adaptations to Institutionalized Expectations? The Adoption of ISO 9000 Standards in the German Mechanical Engineering Industry. *Organization Studies* 26, 841-866.

Bell, D. (1973): *The Coming of Post-Industrial Society. A Venture in Social Forecasting.* New York: Basic Books.

de Boer, H., Enders, J., and Leisyte, L. (2007): On Striking the Right Notes. Shifts in Governance and the Organizational Transformation of Universities. *Public Administration* 85, 27-46.

Boltanski, L. and Chiapello, E. (2005): *The New Spirit of Capitalism.* London: Verso.

Bröckling, U. (2007): *Das unternehmerische Selbst. Soziologie einer Subjektivierungsform.* Frankfurt/ Main: Suhrkamp.

Bromley, P., Hwang, H., and Powell, W.W. (2012): Decoupling revisited. Common pressures, divergent strategies in the US nonprofit sector. *M@n@gement* 15, 468-501.

Brunsson, N., and Sahlin-Andersson, K. (2000): Constructing Organizations: The Example of Public Sector Reform. *Organization Studies* 4, 721-746.

Carruthers, B.G. (1995): Accounting, Ambiguity, and the New Institutionalism. *Accounting, Organizations and Society* 20, 313-328.

Chandler, A. D. (1977): *The Visible Hand. The Managerial Revolution in American Business.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Clark, B. (1983): *The Higher Education System. Academic Organization in Cross-National Perspective.* Berkeley: University of California Press.

Clark, B. (1998): *Creating Entrepreneurial Universities: Organizational Pathways of Transformation.* New York: Pergamon Press.

Clark, B. (2004): *Sustaining Change in Universities. Continuities in Case Studies and Concepts.* Maidenhead: Open University Press-McGraw-Hill.

Cohen, M. D., March, J. G., and Olsen, J. P. (1972): A Garbage Can Model of Organizational Choice. *Administrative Science Quarterly* 17, 1-25.

Cole, J. R. (2009): *The Great American University. Its Rise to Preeminence, its Indispensable National Role, Why it Must Be Protected.* New York: Public Affairs.

Davis, G. F. (2006): Mechanisms and the Theory of Organizations. *Journal of Management Inquiry* 15, 114-118.

Diaz-Bone, R. and Salais, R. (eds.) (2012) : The Économie des Conventions - Transdisciplinary discussions and perspectives (HSR-focus). *Historical Social Research/ Historische Sozialforschung* 37(4).

DiMaggio, P. J., and Powell, W. W. (1983): The Iron Cage Revisited: Institutional Isomorphism and Collective Rationality in Organizational Fields. *American Sociological Review* 48, 147-160.

Drori, G., and Krücken, G. (2009): World Society. A Theory and Research Program in Context. In: Krücken, G., and Drori, G. (eds.), *World Society. The Writings of John Meyer.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 3-35.

Drori, G., Meyer J. W., and Hwang, H. (2006): *Globalization and Organization.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Drucker, P. (1969): *The Age of Discontinuity. Guidelines to our Changing Society.* New York: HarperCollins Publications.

Elias, N. (1969): *The Civilizing Process. Vol. I: The History of Manners.* Oxford: Blackwell.

Elias, N. (1982): *The Civilizing Process. Vol.II: State Formation and Civilization.* Oxford: Blackwell.

Espeland, W. N., and Stevens, M. (2008): A Sociology of Quantification. *European Journal of Sociology* 49, 401-436.

Fligstein, N. (1990): *The Transformation of Corporate Control*: Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Fligstein, N., and Dauter, L. (2007): The Sociology of Markets. *Annual Review of Sociology* 33, 105-128.

Gornitzka, A., and Larsen, I. (2004): Towards Professionalisation? Restructuring of Administrative Work Force in Universities. *Higher Education* 47, 455-471.

Greenwood, R., Oliver, C., Sahlin, K., and Suddaby, R. (eds.) (2008): *The SAGE Handbook of Organizational Institutionalism.* Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Hannan, M.T., and Freeman, J. (1977): The Population Ecology of Organizations. *American Journal of Sociology* 82, 929-964.

Hasse, R. (2003): *Die Innovationsfähigkeit der Organisationsgesellschaft. Organisation, Wettbewerb und sozialer Wandel aus institutionentheoretischer Sicht.* Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag.

Hasse, R (2010): Ökonomisierungstendenzen bei Non-Profits, Großunternehmen und Start-ups. – eine theoriegeleitete Diskussion empirischer Trends. In: Endreß, M. and Matys, T. (Hg.), *Die Ökonomie der Organisation - die Organisation der Ökonomie.* Wiesbaden: VS, 93-119.

Hasse, R. and Krücken, G. (2012): Ökonomische Rationalität, Wettbewerb und Organisation. Eine wirtschaftssoziologische Perspektive. In: Engels, A. and Knoll, L. (Hg.), *Wirtschaftliche Rationalität. Soziologische Perspektiven.* Wiesbaden: Springer VS, 25-45.

Hasse, R. and Schmidt, L. (2010): Unternehmertum, Arbeit, Sprache. Zur Mikrofundierung des Neo-Institutionalismus. In: *Sociologia Internationalis* 48: 1-28.

Hazelkorn, E. (2011): *Rankings and the reshaping of higher education: The battle for world-class excellence.* New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Heintz, B. and Werron, T. (2011): Wie ist Globalisierung möglich? Zur Entstehung globaler Vergleichshorizonte am Beispiel von Wissenschaft und Sport. In: *Kölner Zeitschrift für Soziologie und Sozialpsychologie* 63, 359-394.

Hirschman, A. O. (1977): *The Passions and the Interests. Political Arguments for Capitalism before its Triumph.* Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Hwang, H., and Powell, W. (2009): The Rationalization of Charity: The Influences of Professionalism in the Nonprofit Sector. *Administrative Science Quarterly* 54, 268-298.

Kerr, C. (2001): *The Uses of the University.* 5th Edition (1st ed. 1963). Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.

Kipping, M., and Engwall, L. (2002): *Management Consulting.* Emergence and Dynamics of a Knowledge Industry. New York: Oxford University Press.

Krücken, G. (2002): Amerikanischer Neo-Institutionalismus – europäische Perspektiven. *Sociologia Internationalis* 40, 227-259.

Krücken, G. (2011): *A European Perspective on New Modes of University Governance and Actorhood.* University of California, Berkeley, CSHE, Research & Occasional Paper Series 17.11.

Krücken, G., and Drori, G. (2009): *World Society. The Writings of John W. Meyer.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Krücken, G., and Meier, F. (2006): Turning the University into an Organizational Actor. In: Drori, G., Hwang, H., and Meyer, J. (eds.), *Globalization and Organization. World Society and Organizational Change.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 241-257.

Lant, T. K., and Baum, J. A. C. (1995): Cognitive Sources of Socially Constructed Competitive Groups: Examples from the Manhattan Hotel Industry. In: Scott, W. R., and Christensen, S. (eds.), *The Institutional Construction of Organizations. International and longitudinal Studies.* Thousand Oaks: Sage, 15-38.

Leifer, E. (1988): Making the Majors: The Transformation of Team Sports in America. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Logue, D. (2010): *The Diffusion of Management Innovations: Understanding 90 years of Global Organisational Change in Universities.* Completed dissertation, December 2010. Said Business School, University of Oxford.

MacKenzie, D., Muniesa, F., Siu, L. (eds.) (2007): *Do Economists Make Markets? On the Performativity of Economics.* Princeton: Princeton University Press.

March, J. G. (1999): *The Pursuit of Organizational Intelligence.* Malden: Blackwell.

Meyer, H.-D., and Rowan, B. (2006): Institutional Analysis and the Study of Education. In: Meyer, H.-D. and Rowan, B. (eds.), *The New Institutionalism in Education.* New York: State University of New York Press, 1-14.

Meyer, J. W. (1977): The Effects of Education as an Institution. *American Journal of Sociology* 83, 55-77.

Meyer, J. W. (1996): Otherhood: The Promulgation and Transmission of Ideas in the Modern Organizational Environment. In: Czarniawska, B., and Sevón, G. (eds.), *Translating Organizational Change.* Berlin: de Gruyter, 241-252.

Meyer, J. W. (2005): Einleitung. In: Hasse, R., and Krücken, G., *Neo-Institutionalismus.* 2nd., revised and extended edition. Bielefeld: transcript-Verlag, 5-12.

Meyer, J. W. (2009): Reflections: Institutional Theory and World Society. In: Krücken, G., and Drori, G. (eds.), *World Society. The Writings of John W. Meyer.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 36-63.

Meyer, J.W. and Bromley, P. (2012): The Worldwide Expansion of "Organization". Unpublished Manuscript. Stanford University. Department of Sociology.

Meyer, J. W., Boli, J., Thomas, G. M., and Ramirez, F. O. (1997): World Society and the Nation-State, *American Journal of Sociology* 103, 144-181. (Reprinted in: Krücken, G., and Drori, G., (eds.), World Society. The Writings of John W. Meyer. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009: 173-205.)

Meyer, J. W., and Jepperson, R. (2000): The 'Actors' of Modern Society: The Cultural Construction auf Social Agency. *Sociological Theory* 18, 100-120 (Reprinted in Krücken, G., and Drori, G., eds., World Society. The Writings of John W. Meyer. Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2009, 111-135).

Meyer, J. W., and Rowan, B. (1977): Institutional Organizations. Formal Structure as Myth and Ceremony. *American Journal of Sociology,* 83, 1977, 340-356 (Reprinted in Krücken, G., and Drori, G., eds., World Society. The Writings of John W. Meyer. Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2009, 89-110).

Meyer, J. W., and Scott, W. R. (1983): *Organizational Environments. Ritual and Rationality.* Oxford: Blackwell.

Mintzberg, H. (1994): *The Rise and Fall of Strategic Planning.* New York: The Free Press.

Musselin, C. (1999): State/ University Relations and How to Change Them: The Case of France and Germany. In: Henkel, M., and Little, B. (eds.), *Changing Relationships between Higher Education and the State.* London: Jessica Kingsley, 42-68.

North, D. C. (1990): *Institutions, Institutional Change and Economic Performance. Political Economy of Institutions and Decisions.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

North, D. C., and Thomas, R. P. (1973): *The Rise of the Western World. A New Economic History.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Perrow, C. (2002): *Organizing America. Wealth, Power, and the Origins of Corporate Capitalism.* Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Powell, W. W. (1991): Expanding the Scope of Institutional Analysis. In: Powell, W. W. and DiMaggio, P. J. (eds.), *The New Institutionalism in Organizational Analysis.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 183-203.

Power, M. (1997): *The Audit Society.* Rituals of Verification. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Power, M. (2007): *Organized Uncertainty. Designing a World of Risk Management.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Rhoades, G., and Sporn, B. (2002): New Models of Management and Shifting Modes of Cost Production: Europe and the United States. *Tertiary Education and Management* 8, 3-28.

Rose, N. S., and Miller P., (2008): *Governing the Present: Administering Economic, Social and Personal Life.* Cambridge: Polity Press.

Sahlin-Andersson, K., and Engwall, L. (eds.) (2002): *The Expansion of Management Knowledge. Carriers, Flows and Sources.* Palo Alto: Stanford University Press.

Sauder, M., and Espeland, W. N., (2009): The Discipline of Rankings: Tight Coupling and Organizational Change. *American Sociological Review* 74, 63-82.

Serrano-Velarde, K. (2010): A Fish out of Water? Management Consultants in Academia. *Minerva* 48, 125-144.

Simmel, Georg (1903): Soziologie der Konkurrenz. *Neue Deutsche Rundschau* 14, 1009-1023. English translation 2008: Sociology of Competition. *Canadian Journal of Sociology/ Cahiers Canadiens de Sociologie* 33, 957-978.

Soo, M., and Carson, C. (2004): Managing the Research University. Clark Kerr and the University of California. *Minerva* 42, 215-236.

Strang, D., and Meyer, J. W. (2009): Institutional Conditions for Diffusion. In: Krücken, G., and Drori, G. (eds.), *World Society. The Writings of John W. Meyer.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 136-155 (originally published 1993).

Taylor, F. (1911): *The Principles of Scientific Management.* London: Harper & Brothers.

Walgenbach, P., and Meyer, R. (2008): *Neoinstitutionalistische Organisationstheorie.* Stuttgart: Kohlhammer.

Weber, M. (1978): *Economy and Society*. An Outline of interpretive Sociology Berkeley: University of California Press.

Wedlin, L., (2006): *Ranking Business Schools: Forming Fields, Identities and Boundaries in International Management Education*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.

Westphal, J.D., and Zajac, E.J., (1998): The Symbolic Management of Stockholders. Corporate Governance Reforms and Shareholder Reactions. *Administrative Science Quarterly* 43, 127-153.

Weick, K. E. (1976): Educational Organizations as Loosely Coupled Systems. *Administrative Science Quarterly* 21, 1-19.

Werron, T. (2010): Direkte Konflikte, indirekte Konkurrenzen. Unterscheidung und Vergleich zweier Formen des Kampfes. In: *Zeitschrift für Soziologie* 39, 302-318.

White, H., C. (1981): Where Do Markets Come From? *American Journal of Sociology* 87, 517-547.

Whitley, R. (2008): Universities as Strategic Actors: Limitations and Variations. In: Engwall, L., and Wearie, D. (eds.): *The University in the Market*. London: Portland Press, 23-37.