Drivers of Community Strength: An Institutional Logics Perspective on Geographical and Affiliation-Based Communities

Juan Almandoz, Christopher Marquis and Michael Cheely

Recent research on communities and organizations has engaged in two broad and disconnected conversations. On the one hand, sociologists and organizational scholars have explored the enduring influence of embeddedness in geographical communities on organizations (see Marquis & Battilana, 2009 for a review). For example, Almandoz (2012) showed that one important factor affecting the success of local bank founding teams was the teams' local embeddedness and presence of community logics. This research shows that despite global trends, local phenomena are still important because different locations comprise distinct historical, cultural and normative environments that determine appropriate personal and organizational practices (Lounsbury, 2007; Marquis, 2003; Marquis, Davis, & Glynn, 2013).

On the other hand, several scholars have also explored the impact and governance of new types of affiliation-based communities that are often enabled by technology and do not depend on physical proximity (Jeppesen

& Frederiksen, 2006; Mok, Wellman, & Carrasco, 2010; O'Mahony & Ferraro, 2007; Preece, 2000, 2001; Preece & Maloney-Krichmar, 2005). New, free and widespread communication technology has transformed the popular meaning of community to encompass not only close-knit groups in a shared space but also location-independent networks of individuals bounded by strong, meaningful and supportive relationships (Wellman, 2001; Wellman & Gulia, 1999). This second stream of research has explored for instance how virtual communities govern themselves to collaborate more effectively in the production of collective goods (O'Mahony & Ferraro, 2007), and how organizations can create and harness those types of communities to reach higher levels of organizational performance and achieve innovation (Autio, Dahlander, & Frederiksen, 2013).

The existence of those two streams of research on classical (geographical) and modern (affiliation-based) forms of community were foreshadowed by the early work

of Wellman on the 'community question'. Wellman and colleagues demonstrated that modern communication and mobility – modern technology enabling multiple social networks – did not eliminate but rather made possible meaningful community ties spreading onto wider geographical spaces. Intimate social relations still existed but they were no longer confined to cohesive and insulated neighborhoods or geographical communities (Wellman, 1979). Comparing and contrasting these two research streams on geographical and affiliation-based communities invites an exploration of the two topics addressed by this chapter: first, the similarities and differences in notions of community underlying research on geographical and affiliation-based communities; and second, the mechanisms by which a community logic can produce cultural and material resources for organizations (Marquis, Lounsbury, & Greenwood, 2011; Thornton, 2004). Addressing those questions is important to understand more fully the nature of communities, and to understand also the mechanisms affecting when and how communities influence organizations.

Our analysis takes an institutional logics perspective (Thornton, Ocasio, & Lounsbury, 2012), a theoretical framework that views society as composed of a number of different fields or contexts, known as institutional orders, each having a pattern of beliefs, practices, values, assumptions and rules that determine what is meaningful and legitimate in that context (Friedland & Alford, 1991; Thornton & Ocasio, 1999). Under an institutional logics perspective, a community logic can influence individual and organizational behavior by providing a framework of action, evoking norms, competing with other institutional orders (Greenwood, Raynard, Kodeih, Micelotta, & Lounsbury, 2011; Nigam & Ocasio, 2010) and, as a result, it can facilitate resources to those who appeal to community motivations (DiMaggio, 1988; Luo, Chung, & Sobczak, 2009). An institutional logics perspective is useful for understanding the two types of communities we examine

for two reasons. First, this perspective provides a structured framework that serves as a basis of comparison between geographical and affiliation-based communities. For example, there are meaningful distinctions in the root metaphor (Thornton et al., 2012) that determine how knowledge is structured and action organized in those two forms of community; or there may be differences in the sources of legitimacy, authority and norms, identity and other factors. Second, since it is a society-level perspective, the institutional logic approach can further help unpack how different logics – for example, political, economic and religious – interact in multiple geographical and virtual settings, showing how the impact of a community logic may depend on the relative strength (or weakness) of competing logics in society.

A new engagement with community research under an institutional logic perspective is important because new forms of community have emerged with the help of Internet technology that have shown tremendous impact on social, economic and political events, and have forced us to reconsider the nature and impact of communities. Open communities in some settings have become powerful agents achieving impressive performance results even for standards of hierarchical organizations. A new engagement with community research is greatly facilitated by the institutional logics lens, a powerful tool to analyze multiple forms of communities in society, one that only recently has focused on the community logic.

This paper makes several theoretical contributions. First, it develops and deepens the concept of a community institutional logic, which was recently introduced as such in the literature (Marquis et al., 2011; Thornton et al., 2012); second, it develops the distinction between geographical (traditional) and affiliation-based (modern) communities and explores drivers of community strength in how those types of communities impact organizations (thus conceptualizing community orientation as a variable); and third,

it brings a new and especially powerful lens, the institutional logics perspective, into the traditional question of how modern life has influenced the relevance of communities in society.

COMMUNITY AS AN INSTITUTION

In line with Marquis, Lounsbury and Greenwood (2011), we define communities as 'collections of actors whose membership in the collective provides social and cultural resources that shape their action. Membership can result from a number of factors including propinquity, interest in a common goal or common identity' (p. xvi). In this definition, two critical components include the potential to draw resources from the community and the motives of interaction (Weber, 1921) which lead to a sense of belonging, shared identity, and goodwill towards other community members. Even if the community was formed to achieve shared interests, central to this definition of community is that relationships among members transcend self-interest – even though they may also include it. Ideal-type examples of communities would be a cohesive village in a rural area, a religious group that meets regularly, or an active fan group of a famous musician that shares a platform where members exchange songs, news and stories about their idol.

Another key component of community is also captured by Brint (2001), who said that members in communities are 'bound together *principally* by relations of affect, loyalty, common values, and/or personal … interest in the personalities and life events of one another' (p. 8). In this definition, the word *principally* distinguishes communities from other organizations or associations that have primarily another purpose but may have adopted, primarily for instrumental reasons, a community culture. To qualify as a community, community members must value the community for its own sake or for the positive impact it has on common values, and not only for its instrumental benefits. Closely connected with the definition of community, but not strictly necessary to it, are its small size, the presence of dense social ties, joint involvement and collaboration, democratic relationships, perceptions of similarity, and intrinsic motivation. Concepts antithetical to community include rational-legal authority, hierarchy, and interested and instrumental purposes.

The definition suggests that there may be degrees of community. A small rural village may be more of a community than another with lower degrees of affect, loyalty, and common values. Interestingly, much of the literature on geographical communities has revealed that these are often riddled with power, interest, and division, often concealing a structure of privilege – i.e., they are not really communities (Coleman, 1961; Hunter, 1953). Harley Davidson, a profit-seeking business organization with a large community of fans, may not itself be a community because of its primary instrumental purpose. It could perhaps be better described as a business organization that has adopted a community institutional logic for instrumental reasons. But the collective of fans of Harley Davidson´s products may be a community to the extent that members value the group not for company objectives but for its own sake. A food cooperative that has an instrumental purpose – say, to make money for its members – may be more likely to develop into a community than a corporation because of its democratic and egalitarian ethos, which is more compatible with meaningful relationships among members than the legal-rational-hierarchical relationships among members of corporations.

Our definition of community as a group of people bound together by meaningful relationships from which members can extract cultural and material resources is broad enough to exist within or outside a formal organization – as long as those relationships are not merely instrumental. It could be a

partial organization, like international standard organizations or human rights groups, existing outside and between formal organizations (Ahrne & Brunsson, 2008), or a professional association, or a crowd-funding network – if their members are bound together by meaningful relationships. A community may also emerge over time, for example as neighbors start developing deeper and more meaningful relationships. Religious groups are likely to form particularly strong communities because the religious logic has a 'vertical' dimension and many other components connected with belief, worship, ceremony and other religious practices that create meaningful bonds among members – but there may be different degrees in the extent to which religious groups form communities. For some scholars, like Durkheim (1965[1915]), religion is a product of society and thus he reduces the religious logic to a special case of a community logic. However, the institutional logics perspective clearly differentiates those two logics. In sum, the strength of a community derives in part from the extent to which it has value in itself, above other instrumental benefits that members derive from it.

Our definition of geographical community is different from that of *field*, a central concept in institutional theory. The concept of field developed originally to provide a wider context for organizations than the term 'industry' by including other critical actors and resource providers, such as agencies, professional and trade associations, regulators, the media and the state (Wooten & Hoffman, 2008). Geographical community, as we define it, is also different from local relational networks (Meyer, 1977; Meyer & Scott, 1983) or more broadly the local context, which provides variable cues about normative and institutional appropriateness and legitimacy to organizations (Marquis & Battilana, 2009). While it is true that geographic communities include people nested in a great variety of institutions and organizations that define a local field – or local context of organizations – critical to our definition of

community is the meaningful nature of the relationships among community members. According to our definition, one local context may be a geographical community and not another. The institutional logics perspective explains how it is there can be a high degree of variation in how present a community institutional logic is in a given context. The reasons may include historical factors, available categories, mechanisms directing attention, presence of institutional entrepreneurs, etc. (Thornton et al., 2012).

The concept of affiliation-based community, as we define it, may be more closely associated in some instances with social movements that energize and mobilize people and provide resources to create, transform or resist institutional arrangements (McCarthy & Zald, 1977; Schneiberg & Lounsbury, 2008) because collective action for a common cause often engenders a sense of community, where group members share common beliefs and are bound together principally by relations of affect, loyalty and common values. If participants in the social movement value each other for their common values more than the instrumental benefits they may obtain from the collective action, then such a movement may be seen as a community.

GEOGRAPHICAL AND AFFILIATION-BASED COMMUNITIES

While more fine-grained categories of communities could be created, as noted, we subdivide all communities into two basic types. We define *geographical communities* as those communities that are in some way based upon the shared geography of its members, including neighborhoods, towns and cities (see Marquis & Battilana, 2009). At the empirical level, researchers have focused on the city, the neighborhood and even the county as the units of analysis. The government census establishes geographical demarcations based on commuting distance, which

is a helpful way of capturing the possibility of face-to-face interactions among residents. Another way of measuring communities may be in terms of relational networks, i.e., what geographical boundary would place any two individuals with a high probability at two degrees of separation of a face-to-face relationship among community members. We define *affiliation-based communities* as broad networks of individuals expanding beyond a geographical location and bounded by strong, meaningful and supportive relationships built on voluntary membership and shared interests, identities and values (Wellman, 2001; Wellman & Gulia, 1999). While Internet platforms have enabled or changed significantly many affiliation-based communities, we do not consider that use of such platforms imply a new category of community beyond our two basic types.

Both types of communities are generally motivated by community members' need to belong (Baumeister & Leary, 1995; Bruhn, 2011). The main distinction between the two types is that, while affiliation-based communities are generally designed and constructed to achieve a particular goal, geographical communities emerge incidentally from the relationships between people living in close proximity to one another. The process of living and working together becomes, under certain circumstances, a source of identification and meaning for those living in a given place (Cuba & Hummon, 1993), and renders their relationships with one another more meaningful and supportive. Based on that distinction, we would consider regions and nations with a strong degree of shared identification (what Anderson (1983) called 'imagined communities') as affiliation-based and not geographical communities. In larger geographical settings, the common boundary shared by members is usually too wide to ensure face-to-face relationships. Based on our definition perhaps Andorra and Liechtenstein could be considered a geographical community but not the United States or Spain.

We consider those categories – geographical and affiliation-based communities – to be all-encompassing, i.e., covering the full spectrum of communities. This categorization is similar to that of Brint (2001), who divided communities into geographic and choice-based categories. However, our categories are obviously not mutually exclusive. There are certainly communities with a clear goal driving the affiliations of their members that also share a clear geographical boundary. Examples may be a local charity or a community foundation. Those hybrid communities that are both geographical and affiliation-based would exhibit characteristics of both types of community.

Scholars have traditionally argued that the changes associated with modernity, such as globalization, social mobility and improvements in communication technology, will result in the decline over time of the influence of communities on individuals and organizations (DiMaggio & Powell, 1983; Meyer, Boli, Thomas, & Ramirez, 1997; Tönnies, 1887). But this conventional argument presumes a geographically bounded understanding of community. The institutional logics perspective, however, includes within the scope of communities other types of communities that are not necessarily geographically constrained (Marquis et al., 2011). Examples of these other communities include academic communities (Crane, 1969; Knorr-Cetina, 1999), collaborative communities (Adler, 2001; Heckscher & Adler, 2006), occupational communities (Bechky, 2003; Orr, 1996), online communities (Butler, 2001; Fayard, DeSanctis, & Roach, 2004), open source communities (Dahlander & O'Mahony, 2011), brand and consumer communities (Kruckeberg & Starck, 2004; McAlexander, Schouten, & Koenig, 2002; Muniz Jr & O'Guinn, 2001), and user communities (Morrison, Roberts, & Von Hippel, 2000; Von Hippel, 2005; see O'Mahony & Lakhani, 2011, for a review).

These affiliation-based types of communities are more prevalent than ever, even if the

members of the communities interact physically with less frequency and share fewer affective and normative ties (Gläser, 2001). Interestingly, some of the modern processes that have contributed to the decline of geographical communities may have enabled the creation of affiliation-based communities (O'Mahony & Ferraro, 2007). Virtual communities of open source programmers, for instance, could likely not exist without such modern trends as the improvements in communication technology and networks (Von Krogh & Von Hippel, 2006). Similarly, globalization, which disseminated various norms, values and practices all over the world, contributed to the development of various dispersed communities based on affiliation, bringing people together in collaborative projects as complex as Wikipedia (Piskorski & Gorbatai, 2013).

While both forms of community fit into the framework of a community institutional logic, there are also meaningful differences that could be relevant in determining the factors driving the strength of each form of community. The mechanisms by which both types of communities operate and influence organizations can be usefully expressed in terms of the constitutive elements of community logics elaborated by Thornton et al. (2012), such as root metaphor, sources of legitimacy, sources of authority and norms, sources of identity, and bases of attention and strategy. Using this structured set of categories can shed light on mechanisms by which cultural and material resources made available by the community logic can become community capital – defined here as the capacity and motivation of a community to produce resources that can be used by organizations in community-oriented endeavors.

The following categories used by Thornton, Ocasio and Lounsbury (2012) to make sense of differences among institutional logics (p. 73) could be useful to conceptualize differences among geographical and affiliation-based communities: root metaphor, sources of legitimacy, sources of authority and norms, sources of identity, and basis of attention and strategy.

Root Metaphor

In geographical communities, the root metaphor, which determines the manner in which knowledge is structured and action organized, is a common boundary (Thornton et al., 2012). This boundary separates those who are members and those who are not. It could be any kind of geographical, political, cultural, commercial, or symbolic dividing line, including rivers, road intersections, markets areas, political jurisdictions that could have an impact on the actors and organizations enclosed within it (Carroll & Swaminathan, 2000; Dobbin, 1994; Guthrie, 2003; Wade, Swaminathan, & Saxon, 1998). Inclusion within a common boundary is associated with other homogeneity-producing factors such as the presence of layers of institutional and cultural infrastructures that can perpetuate institutional legacies, create a common frame of reference and shape future behavior (Marquis, 2003; Marquis & Lounsbury, 2007; Raynard, Lounsbury, & Greenwood, 2012; see Marquis & Battilana, 2009 for a review). Such inclusion can often be accompanied by multiple layers of shared identity among community members in religion, class, culture, language, accent, provenance and ethnicity. Irish immigrant neighborhoods in New York, like Woodlawn in the Bronx, or West Brighton in Staten Island, were communities that reflected distinctions in all those relevant dimensions (Alba, Logan, & Crowder, 1997; Kantrowitz, 1969). Additionally, as shown by network research, the physical proximity of community members structures and facilitates social relationships and frequent interaction (Galaskiewicz, 1997; Podolny, 2001; Turk, 1977). These multiple contexts for interaction generate thick local networks in which everybody knows everybody else. These 'overlapping' and 'redundant' ties among members and the multiple layers of shared identity are

likely to make the boundary thicker and the community stronger (Burt, 2000; Coleman, 1988; Granovetter, 1985; Portes & Sensenbrenner, 1993).

In affiliation-based communities, the root metaphor is the community members' conscious affiliation and belief in a particular value, product, interest, goal, etc. (Brint, 2001; Marquis et al., 2011; Storper, 2005). This shared affiliation can be the basis of a rich collaboration among members in a common cause or project (Adler, 2015). Members of affiliation-based communities, however, are not as likely as members of geographical communities to share deep relational networks as these tend to be place-bound (Becattini, 1990; Putnam, 1993), nor are they as likely to interact with other community members in a variety of different contexts. Finally, the commonalities of members of affiliation-based communities are likely to be more limited than what is found in geographical communities (Brint, 2001). Members of a professional community of accountants, for instance, may share a profession, but they are no more likely to share race, religious views, political affiliations, or hobbies, than any other two people (see Thornton, Jones, & Kury, 2005). Ordinarily, we would expect this narrow scope of identification to weaken the strength of the affiliation-based community, at least compared to geographical communities where the bonds between members are wider in scope. This can be counteracted, however, if the shared affiliation of the members is central to their core identity (McCall & Simmons, 1978; Stryker, 2000; Watson, 2008).

Sources of Legitimacy

In geographical communities, the community members' belief in trust and reciprocity is the source of legitimacy (i.e., the means by which power or influence is institutionalized and given a moral grounding) (Coleman, 1988; Thornton et al., 2012). When one community member (individual or organization)

enjoys relationships based on trust and reciprocity with the community and is perceived as trustworthy by other community members, the others will accept this member´s influence. The belief in trust and reciprocity in geographical communities stems from, among other things, the presence of redundant and overlapping ties connecting community members (Uzzi, 1996, 1999). The community ties ensure that news about a community member's untrustworthy behavior are disseminated rapidly, thus deterring such behavior.

The source of legitimacy in affiliation-based communities is primarily the unity of will of the members (Raymond, 1999; Thornton et al., 2012). Members who share the same affiliation are more likely to accept the power and influence of one another, but only in matters directly related to the goals of the community (Algesheimer, Dholakia, & Herrmann, 2005). Affiliation-based communities are not, like geographical communities, necessarily legitimized by belief in trust and reciprocity, because members of affiliation-based communities rarely have redundant and overlapping ties or points of contact. However, building trust is an important component in the success of those affiliation-based communities (Boyd, 2002, 2003). Because trust and reciprocity may be taken for granted and therefore potentially abused, affiliation-based communities may require mechanisms such as reputation systems to punish the deviant behavior of community abusers (Jøsang, Ismail, & Boyd, 2007).

Sources of Authority and Norms

In both geographical and affiliation-based communities, the source of authority, or reason why a particular authority is obeyed, is the community members' commitment to the community and to the values or ideology of the community (Almandoz, 2012; Thornton et al., 2012), not hierarchical control (Blau, 1968). Members are embedded in their

community, and from it they receive a certain sense of belonging which they share with the other members of the community. This shared sense of belonging is connected to a desire to fit in, socialize with, and care about the concerns of the others in the community. These shared priorities contribute to a real commitment of the community members to the values of the community as a whole. In geographical communities, the source of authority may be rooted in the community itself more than the content of shared values and identities of community members. By contrast, in affiliation communities, the source of authority may be centered in the values or identities of the communities more than in the community itself (Rao, Monin, & Durand, 2003). This commitment to those community values or identities can be the source of an effective collaboration among community members that may not need hierarchical coordination and control (Adler, 2015).

The basis of norms that leads both geographical and affiliation-based community members to accept normative restrictions is group membership in a valued community that imposes local standards for organizational practices (Lazaric & Lorenz, 1998; Owen-Smith & Powell, 2004; Storper, 1997) and shapes local norms (Litwak & Hylton, 1962; see Marquis et al., 2011 for a review). Members accept subjection to the norms of the community because they hold the community and/or its values in high regard. There may be different degrees of compliance with community norms depending on how much the community or its values are important to the members. In geographical communities where membership may be more accidental – resulting from convenience or happenstance rather than affective involvement or joint sense of identity – more variation is expected in member's subjection to community norms. In affiliation-based communities where at least in some cases a common purpose has been embraced by all members, community norms are likely to have a higher degree of acceptance, although

some degree of free-riding is unavoidable (Walsh & Warland, 1983).

Sources of Identity

The sources of identity in geographical communities are the emotional connections that members share and the value that they obtain from reputation in the community (Almandoz, 2012; Thornton et al., 2012). These factors are fostered by the community members' multiple levels of shared identity, which, due to homophily, lead similar individuals to like and relate to one another (McPherson, Smith-Lovin, & Cook, 2001). A community identity in a geographic setting is 'cobbled together from existing elements or bits of meaning, symbols or values' that are provided by distinctive elements of the community that are shared by its members (Glynn, 2008). The greater or more encompassing the similarity, the more that we expect community members to like and relate to one another. These multiple levels of shared identity can also foster greater emotional connection through the accentuation of an us-versus-them mentality (Ashforth & Mael, 1989). When the distinction between community insiders and outsiders embraces multiple dimensions, the identities of the two groups may be separated by fault lines (Lau & Murnighan, 1998), leading to an even higher degree of contrast between the two groups. This multi-layered contrast between community insiders and outsiders accentuates us-versus-them behaviors and attitudes and reinforces the community's sense of identity.

The source of identity for affiliation-based communities, on the other hand, is reputation and ego-boosting in the context of a purposeful association, as well as the intrinsic value or interest that brings members together into the community, more than multi-layered connections among members (Lerner & Tirole, 2004; Osterloh & Frey, 2000; Raymond, 1999; Thornton et al., 2012). As mentioned earlier, identification in affiliation-based

communities is generally narrower in scope than the identification in a geographical community and it leaves many dimensions of a person's identity unaddressed. Members of affiliation-based communities generally have fewer interactions with one another and – to the extent that the relations between members are sustained through long-distance, cold and impersonal communication technology – those interactions are expected to generate weaker community ties than those expected in geographical communities – of course, unless the shared values that constitute the reason for the community are deeply meaningful to the core identity of the members (McCall & Simmons, 1978; Stryker, 2000). On the other hand, since those narrow affiliation-based community identities constitute the whole reason for interactions among community members it is likely that agreement and consensus may be more easily attained than in geographical communities where conflicting identities may be at play.

As other research has noted, the expansion of membership and the creation of coherent stories play a crucial role in legitimating the collective identity of groups (Wry, Lounsbury, & Glynn, 2011) in both geographical and affiliation-based communities.

Basis of Attention and Strategy

In a geographical community, the basis of attention, or that which attracts and focuses attention of members, is the community member's investment in the group, while the basis of strategy, or what motivates a member's behavior, is the desire to increase honor and status in the community (Podolny, 1993; Raymond, 1999; Thornton & Ocasio, 1999). The investment of a geographical community member includes deeply personal matters such as a home, social network, and attachment to the local culture and environment, and therefore it understandably commands a considerable measure of attention. In affiliation-based communities, on the other hand, the main basis of attention is likely to be the personal investment in the shared values and interests that led to the creation of the group in the first place (Algesheimer et al., 2005). The influence of an affiliation-based community (unlike that of a geographical community) will therefore only be activated in contexts that immediately relate to the purpose of the community (Ridings & Gefen, 2004).

All those meaningful differences between geographical and affiliation-based communities (see Table 7.1) are likely to have important

Table 7.1   Constitutive elements of community logics: contrasting geographical and affiliation-based communities

	Geographical community	Affiliation-based community
Root metaphor	A common geographical boundary	Conscious affiliation and belief in a particular cause
Sources of legitimacy	Belief in trust and reciprocity	Unity of will of the members in community goals
Sources of authority and norms	Commitment to membership in a valued community	Commitment to community values and identities
Sources of identity	Community reputation and emotional connection with other members (wide scope of shared identity)	Reputation in a purposeful community and intrinsic value of the community's goals (narrow scope of shared identity)
Basis of attention and strategy	Investment in and honor and status within the community, relevant in multiple settings and contexts	Investment in and honor and status within the community, relevant in limited contexts connected with the purpose of the community

consequences in the degree to which a community is stronger or weaker and the degree to which its strength is affected by the factors examined below.

FACTORS DRIVING COMMUNITY STRENGTH

After describing the attributes and constitutive categories of geographical and affiliation-based communities, we can consider factors driving community strength, explore how these factors relate to the geographical and affiliation-based community forms, and illustrate how those factors increase the community´s capacity to provide resources to community-oriented organizations. We focus on five such drivers that seem especially relevant and have been previously discussed in the literature: identification with the community (which often includes resistance to an opposing institutional logic), effective community organization or structure, pivotal events, enforceability of trust, and the presence of strong community leaders.

Identification with the Community

When community members identify closely with their community, they are more likely to be influenced by the community and its particular norms, values and practices, and as a result more likely to provide support to causes aligned with the community. At the geographical level, the community member's identification with the community can be reinforced by a variety of factors, such as the cohesiveness of local networks that contribute to cooperation and build trust (Fleming, King, & Juda, 2007; Fleming & Marx, 2006; Greenwood, Díaz, Li, & Lorente, 2010), and pride in local surroundings, history and iconic landmarks (Nowell, Berkowitz, & Foster-Fishman, 2006). Brown and Humphreys (2006), in their field study of employees and managers at a British college, found that unattractive physical surroundings made employees less likely to view their work place as a community. The presence of beautiful, unique, historical or otherwise meaningful landmarks – whether natural or man-made – increase people's sense of identification and thus the strength of the community (Cuba & Hummon, 1993). Other factors may also increase 'place attachment' (Brown, Perkins, & Brown, 2003), such as the degree of home ownership in the area (Taylor, 1996) which is correlated with knowing more neighbors (Fischer, 1982), and participation in community groups (Rossi & Weber, 1996).

Community identity at the geographical level can also be reinforced by the incursion of outside groups or opposing logics that may challenge the community. Individuals may view the entrance of global corporations and standards as a threat to the uniqueness of their community (Marquis & Lounsbury, 2007; Robertson, 1995) and may choose to demarcate their boundaries more clearly (Scott & Storper, 2003; Sorge, 2005). The entrance of carriers of an opposing logic can serve as a clarion call that galvanizes resistance to that logic, increasing community members' identification with their community, and strengthening the community as a whole. In the context of banking, the community logic was a source of resistance to the advance of the logic of market efficiency embodied by large, centralized banks acquiring small local banks that thus lost their community orientation (Marquis & Lounsbury, 2007). The disappearance of those small community banks, which were often seen as a symbol of the community, drove community members to organize founding groups to attempt to establish new banks.

In the context of Dutch bars, a community logic became the cultural framework to organize opposition led by local bar owners to government's anti-smoking regulations that could jeopardize (profitable) community building in those bars (Simons, Vermeulen,

& Knoben, 2016). Finally, community opposition to fire insurance by the Amish was similarly a case of a conflict between market and community logics. The Amish saw their close-knit, traditional, community lifestyle threatened by the influence of the commercial logic of the market represented by fire insurance contracts. The Amish, acting upon the logic of the community, forbade fire insurance contracts because of the potentially negative effect such contracts would have on reciprocity and community-building – compared to calling on each other for help (Marglin, 2008). In short, community identification can be reinforced through opposition to another, more general logic that is becoming progressively more dominant and can be seen as a threat.

Communities with a strong sense of identification can be fruitful avenues to obtain organizational resources for actors who can position their organization, product, or service as a representative of the community logic, while casting their competitors as representatives of an opposing logic. A new group of bank founders, for instance, may appeal to community motivations by appointing community leaders to the bank board, serving primarily local borrowers and local depositors, and donating to local charities, while casting larger banks as indifferent or possibly even harmful to the community (Almandoz, 2012, 2014). Dutch bar owners, by appealing to the community motivations, managed to draw support from local residents, who were increasingly loyal to their bars (Simons et al., 2016). Similarly, members of an Amish community that has rejected fire insurance because of its incompatibility with their community values are more likely to show up and provide support when a neighbor's barn needs to be rebuilt (Marglin, 2008).

In affiliation-based communities the degree of identification of members is also an important source of community strength that can result in abundant resources of community capital, especially when those communities are rooted in core identities of its members. Religious communities, for example, can more easily provide resources to causes linked to those particular communities (Park & Smith, 2000). The ongoing competition from an opposing logic can also present a uniquely important means to strengthen the affiliation-based community and gather support from community members. Open source computer programmers thrive as a community in part thanks to Microsoft's dominant and closed proprietary server software and also thanks to their presumed monopolistic practices (Kogut & Metiu, 2001). International green activists reacting to an oil industry oblivious to the environment (Gelbspan, 2005) and animal rights groups responding to the cruelty of dog and cock fights (Beers, 2006) are other examples of affiliation-based communities driven by opposing logics that strengthen the identification of members to the community and make that community more likely to provide resources to related causes. The main difference between affiliation-based and geographical communities is that the latter are likely to provide resources only to narrowly targeted purposes related to the goals of the community.

Effective Community Governance

The effective governance of a community is another driver that can strengthen a community and thereby increase its capacity to provide community capital. Communities that are well governed and establish clear procedures for communication and coordination can more easily transcend personal interests and guide collective action, more effectively unlock resources, and deal with harmful elements, and more successfully compete with opposing logics.

The effective governance of geographical communities can be provided by local elite groups, unions, fraternal organizations, booster clubs, universities, cultural, educational, and corporation boards, parish groups, philanthropic organizations of

various kinds, economic development and government organizations and more – when well run and when sufficient significant time investment is devoted to them – are likely to facilitate the provision of community capital (Davis & Greve, 1997; Piore & Sabel, 1984; Useem, 1984; Wry, Greenwood, Jennings, & Lounsbury, 2010). Che and Qian (1998) highlight how local community governments in rural China served essentially as the board of directors and management of the township-village enterprises (TVEs) and showed how their effective governance of the TVEs helped to ignite great economic and employment growth in those communities. Similarly, the effective governance of Chicago's South Shore neighborhood allowed it to benefit from the community development bank Shorebank's housing rehabilitation projects and credit provision services while other communities that lacked this underlying organizational structure were not as able to benefit from bank services (Taub, 1994). The South Shore neighborhood was organized by committed citizens with steady jobs who were actively engaged in and intensely interested in the well-being of their community and were willing and able to band together to remove destabilizing elements from their community. Similarly, the effective governance of worker cooperatives[1] – by means of wide, meaningful membership, participation in committees, contractual agreements, and promises of support that endowed members with a good deal of trust – allowed them to compete successfully with other forms of governance from markets and hierarchies, support its members in times of economic loss, and contribute to the development of immigrant and religious groups that could survive and flourish in an era of corporations. In tough times, community members were able to appeal to others in the cooperatives and managed to attain the resources that they needed to carry on (Schneiberg, 2002; Schneiberg, King, & Smith, 2008).

Effective community governance is also an important factor driving the strength of affiliation-based communities. As affiliation-based communities are geographically dispersed, they are far more reliant on effective communication and structure to maintain an effective community. But given that such communities have relatively simple and targeted purposes and tend to be connected through technology, an upfront investment in setting up a system greatly facilitates – with little ongoing maintenance – the governance of the community. Efficient communication methods, via websites, chain text messages, and general wireless Internet use was especially important in igniting the region-wide chain of protests that came to be known as the Arab Spring (Eltantawy & Wiest, 2011; Khondker, 2011). The rapid communication between protest organizers and followers in a wide region helped to keep the flame of the rebellion burning and worked to strengthen the community and gather support to its cause. Similarly, a new wireless infrastructure, location-sensing wireless mechanisms, and community supercomputers enable collective action, with minimum additional governance, in communities devoted to a myriad of purposes: political change, celebrity-stalking, efficient transportation in crowded cities, etc. (Rheingold, 2007). Good design of a community website with an orderly structure, comprehensible processes, and clear disclosure of benefits and responsibilities for community members are good governance practices that can facilitate the success of an affiliation-based community (see Shneiderman, 2000).

Pivotal Events

Pivotal events, which comprise mega-events like the Super Bowl or major political conventions, natural disasters like earthquakes and hurricanes, and economic and environmental shocks, have been shown to prompt shifts in institutional logics in local environments (Glynn & Lounsbury, 2005; Tilcsik & Marquis, 2013), strengthening communities and increasing their capacity to provide

community capital. Researchers have shown how different kinds of pivotal events can create a sense of unity in a community, enhance local corporate actors' sense of citizenship, increase the levels of solidarity and altruism in communities, or serve as a powerful impetus to community fervor as community members join together in the wake of a crisis or opportunity (Hiller, 2000; Truno, 1995; Waitt, 2001). All of these factors strengthen geographical communities.

Community actors can take advantage of these pivotal events to appeal to community motivations and attain resources needed for their ends. How successful they are in taking advantage of the opportunity afforded by those pivotal events may depend on the degree of identification of members with the community and the presence of efficient community governance. Local non-profits and community leaders, for example, can take advantage of the natural disasters and mega-events by appealing to local corporations for donations (Schwartz, 1997). Because the events are likely to make community development goals more salient (Burbank, Andranovich, & Heying, 2001), the local non-profits will be more likely to attain resources from the local corporations. Tilcsik and Marquis (2013) have noted the increase in corporate giving in the wake of mega-events and natural disasters, an effect that declines over time.

Pivotal events also have the potential to strengthen affiliation-based communities and unlock related community capital. For example, as recent news have demonstrated, public insults against the Prophet Muhammad from Western media provoke united, angry and strong reactions from wide segments of the worldwide Muslim community who consider such impious utterances as blasphemous. Those insults have spontaneously mobilized Muslim organizations and individuals to protest, launch legal complaints, lobby, and those protests have resulted in violence, including the attack producing the death of 11 people in the French satirical weekly newspaper *Charlie Hebdo* in Paris (Eko & Berkowitz, 2009). Similarly, community banks were indirectly able to take advantage of the Financial Crisis of 2008 (a pivotal event) to attain community capital in the form of increased deposits. As many blamed Wall Street banks for the crisis, community bankers spurred a social movement/community called 'Move your Money Project' which encouraged depositors to abandon Wall Street banks to turn to Main Street Banks (see Brescia & Steinway, 2013).

The difference between the effect of pivotal events on affiliation-based communities compared to that on geographical communities is that, unless affiliation-based communities are based on core dimensions of member identities, the impact of pivotal events may be short-lived. Unless community members are frequently connected as they would be in geographical communities the effect of a pivotal event in focusing attention on a community need may quickly dissipate. Not surprisingly, in spite of the initial outrage against Wall Street banks, the Move Your Money Project quickly lost momentum and did not cause a significant change in the behavior of bank customers. As they went on with the business of their ordinary lives, the bank customers quickly forgot about their concerns about Walls Street banks. By contrast, the community support generated in the aftermath of the 9-11 attack in New York City or of Hurricane Katrina in New Orleans (Beller, 2015; Berry, 2013; Gotham, 2008; Tierney, 2003) were more enduring not only because the impact of such events was comparatively more devastating for community members but also because they were constantly facing those events on a daily basis in their frequent relationships with other community members.

Enforceability of Trust

Another driver that strengthens communities and facilitates the provision of community

capital is the enforceability of trust (Dacin, Ventresca, & Beal, 1999; Podolny & Page, 1998; Portes & Sensenbrenner, 1993). When trust is enforceable, or when the community can collectively and effectively penalize those who act in an untrustworthy manner, the community is more likely to retain high levels of trust, which in turn makes the community stronger. The enforceability of trust in geographical communities stems from, among other things, the presence of redundant and overlapping ties, as well as the visibility of actions. In short, overlapping and redundant ties ensure that information about deviant actions is spread rapidly. These factors serve as an informal control mechanism that deter untrustworthy behavior, and ultimately lead to higher levels of trust as community members have confidence that others will act in a trustworthy manner. Uzzi (1996) highlights how the trust between individuals who share long term, close commercial ties can reduce transaction costs and create new opportunities for the exchange of goods, resources and useful information. These resources can be crucial for the success of an enterprise.

Trust, however, is not equally enforceable in geographical and affiliation-based communities. In affiliation-based communities, trust can be more difficult to enforce, which in ordinary circumstances could lead to a weakening of community strength. As already mentioned, because relational systems are generally place-bound (Becattini, 1990; Putnam, 1993), affiliation-based community members are generally not in frequent contact with one another unless it is for the purpose that brings them together in the community. For this reason, information about one community member's untrustworthy behavior may not be as widely disseminated, nor will community members be as upset when their relationship with another community member is damaged – it is possible to have never even met the other person. These factors remove many of the possible deterrents to untrustworthy behavior that are

present in geographical communities and thereby decrease the level of trust in the community thus weakening communities as a whole.

Some affiliation-based communities, however, use a variety of means to make trust enforceable, making up for what is ordinarily lacking in affiliation-based communities. They may require community members to generate a profile that includes their real name, an authentic photograph, and other personal information, or they may erect barriers to exiting and rejoining the community, and may prominently display references from other community members and third party certifications of each community member's conduct. These measures, which serve to connect the members' identity in the affiliation-based community with their identity in the real world, help to generate real consequences for untrustworthy behavior. Other measures to promote enforceable trust include providing guarantees with compensation if one of the community members is dissatisfied with a given exchange and facilitating dispute resolution services (see Shneiderman, 2000). These measures facilitate the creation of community capital by increasing levels of trust.

The ridesharing service Uber, lodging rental service AirBnB, and the e-commerce website eBay, each use a number of the above-mentioned trust enforcing mechanisms to great effect and, consequently, have been able to attain community capital in the form of valuable user reviews, free publicity and new customers (Boyd, 2002; Marquis & Yang, 2014). At first glance, these three institutions, as businesses and carriers of the institutional logic of the market, may seem to be poor examples of communities and, therefore, may appear to be irrelevant to our current conversation. After all, they provide goods and services and seek to maximize profits. Yet a key success factor of these organizations – whether they can be considered communities or not based on our conceptualization – has been their ability to transcend the definition

of a business into an affiliation-based community where strong and meaningful relationships are expected (Wellman, 2001; Wellman & Gulia, 1999). The philosophy that underlies these organizations – that people are good and can generally be trusted to deal equitably with one another if the necessary safeguards are in place – could be considered a manifestation of the community logic. Further, these organizations give their members the freedom to connect with one another and to provide services person to person without necessarily dictating prices or making excessive use of intermediaries. Over time, individuals' participation in the communities, whether by provision or consumption of their services or by the contribution of reviews or other valuable information, can become a source of trust and identification (Bagozzi & Dholakia, 2006; Hertel, Niedner, & Herrmann, 2003; Jones & George, 1998 reach a similar conclusion in the context of open-source Linux User Groups).

The ability of these organizations to rise to the status of communities, or at least to incorporate the community logic into their model, while still maintaining the market logic, has unlocked crucial resources that allowed them to succeed phenomenally by the standards of the community logic – drawing numerous members and developing a strong sense of identification – and ironically by the standards of the market logic, especially in promoting innovation and collaboration (Adler, 2015) – expanding the sizes of their companies and generating impressive profits. These institutions provide an interesting example of how, in certain situations, various institutional logics can mutually sustain and strengthen one another rather than merely compete (Greenwood et al., 2010).

Community Leaders

The presence of community leaders is another factor that can strengthen communities and drive the creation of community capital. Community leaders can strengthen communities by promoting identification, unity, and trust, for example by developing a distinctive community culture, or by making the impact of community activities visible, so that community approaches are legitimate and preferred over alternative approaches (Podolny, Khurana, & Hill-Popper, 2004; Suddaby & Greenwood, 2005). This style of leadership is quite different from the command-and-control hierarchical and bureaucratic approach prevalent in organizations. Effective community leaders, in addition to building identification and trust, can boost two other drivers of community strength by reinforcing mechanisms of community governance and taking advantage of pivotal events.

Bill Bowerman, the track coach of the University of Oregon and Co-founder of Nike, Inc., strengthened his local community of Eugene, Oregon by developing a unique, attractive community culture that the locals could be proud of (Howard-Grenville, Metzger, & Meyer, 2013). Bowerman engaged the inhabitants of the town in the training, supporting and fundraising of the University's track program and runners and went even further by organizing jogging clubs in order to encourage the inhabitants of Eugene to participate in the sport itself. By the end of Bowerman's tenure as head coach, the town was so famous for the skill of its runners and devotion of its fans that it had won the moniker 'Track Town, USA'. When a community is energized by a leader, it is more capable of providing community capital, often to causes and projects led by the community leaders themselves. Bill Bowerman was able to draw all-star track athletes from across the country to his program at the University of Oregon, fundraise for the enormous Hayward Field running track, and develop an early support group and customer base for his fledgling shoe company, later known as Nike, Inc.

The motivations of local community leaders may be purely altruistic or mixed

with self-interest tied to the economic or social development of the community. Bill Bowerman's community-building experience was instrumental to his success with Nike. Similarly, the success of many political candidates has often been built on careers of public and community service (Light, 1999). Almandoz (2012) also found a mix of altruism and self-interest in the composition of founding boards of community banks. These often include restaurant owners, non-profit managers, people with real estate backgrounds, and others who have a personal stake in the development of the community.

Leaders also play a crucial role in strengthening communities in affiliation-based communities that need not share a common local geography. Charismatic religious and political leaders at the national level often play an important role in energizing and providing unity and direction to purposeful communities and social movements at a national or international level (Conger & Kanungo, 1988; Davis, McAdam, Scott, & Zald, 2005). Nelson Mandela, the first black president of South Africa, managed to unite a country deeply divided by the structure and legacy of apartheid and succeeded in drawing support and moving forward a number of important social and economic development goals. His influence before and after becoming President was built on dialogue, collective empowerment and connective leadership (Kirk & Shutte, 2004). Martin Luther King attracted a wide base of support from people unified by deeply felt values – including religious beliefs, nonviolence philosophy, democratic theory and pragmatism (McAdam 1996; Platt & Lilley 1994) – thus succeeding in creating a collective identity among his followers (Morris & Staggenborg, 2004) and energizing a well-organized social movement that was called into action by particular pivotal events (Carson, 1987).

The above drivers of community strength are summarized in Table 7.2.

Table 7.2   Drivers of community strength

	Geographical	*Affiliation-based*	*Both*
Identification with the community	Place attachment. Pride in local surroundings, history and iconic landmarks	Stronger if the community is related to the core identity of community members (i.e., religious community)	Stronger when cohesive networks and when community is threatened
Effective community governance	Local elite groups, trade organizations, cooperatives, etc., which may require significant and ongoing time investment	Stronger if enabled by clear and efficient technology and a targeted purpose. Upfront investment needed but limited ongoing investment	Clear procedures for communication and coordination support collective action in pursuit of a collective good
Pivotal events	Extraordinary events affecting a local area attract attention and support from local organizations	Extraordinary events affecting a cause attract sustained attention to the degree that community-members are deeply affected in their core identity or interests	Other drivers such as members' identification with the community and effective governance may moderate the impact of pivotal events
Enforceability of trust	Information about deviant actions spreads rapidly because of redundant and overlapping ties	Guarantees, dispute resolution mechanisms, and third party references can generate trust	Visibility of actions and frequency of positive interactions facilitates trust
Community leaders	Motivated by altruism and self-interest linked to community development	Charisma often plays an important part in meaning-making and shaping a community culture	Promoting identification and unity by developing a distinctive community culture, or by making the impact of the community visible

CONCLUSION

This study has taken a societal level perspective in the original spirit of Friedland and Alford (1991) and has examined the influence of different types of communities on organizations. Rather than entering the old debate on whether communities are still relevant for organizations, we have considered the factors that drive or reduce the impact of two different types of communities on organizations. In the service of this goal, we conceptualized community strength as a variable for both geographical and affiliation-based communities. While this simple categorization hides an enormous amount of diversity, it still serves the purposes both of highlighting the variability of the concept and the need to better understand how those differences affect community strength.

This study suggests multiple directions for future research, especially avenues considering community as an independent variable. First, in line with a society-level analytical perspective (Friedland & Alford, 1991) researchers could explore further, in different settings, how the overarching logics of family, government, or religion support or contradict the community institutional logic. This line of research should perhaps focus on moderators of community influence in organizational responses to multiple and complex institutional logics (Greenwood et al., 2010). For example, are community-oriented strategies more or less welcome in sectors with a strong presence of family and religion institutional logics? Under what conditions do those logics reinforce one another or compete for attention (Ocasio, 1997)? A systematic analysis of the interaction of other institutional logics with the community logic in different sectors (healthcare, government, the arts, etc.) would enrich our society-level understanding of the community institutional logic.

Second, at the field level, a question that deserves more attention is under what conditions community logics are especially powerful in environments dominated by contradictory logics. Adler (2015) observed that in individualistic and competitive contexts (i.e., 'capitalist' societies) community may assume greater 'ideological prominence' precisely to compensate for its absence as 'society's material foundation'. Under what conditions can a community logic become a source of differentiation for organizations that, despite legitimacy concerns, can provide community capital to those organizations? This question could perhaps be fruitfully explored in the context of the impact of community-related corporate social responsibility activities in various sectors (law, banking, real estate …). The mechanisms and drivers of community strength theorized in this chapter – identification with the values of the community, pivotal events, etc. – could be empirically tested in those future studies.

Third, at the field/organizational level, many researchers have issued calls to integrate perspectives involving interest-driven and purposive behavior in institutional work (DiMaggio, 1988; Greenwood, Oliver, Suddaby, & Sahlin-Andersson, 2008). Given how institutional environments shape organizations, one critical dimension of agent behavior would be how an organization may shape a community for its own ends. Certainly, marketing approaches to develop a sense of community seem to have worked well for Harley Davidson, Macintosh and BMW. Could those strategies be replicated successfully by other business organization in other sectors? In what contexts would creating a community or fostering a community orientation among stakeholders be most helpful? Would the answer vary depending on what performance outcomes are pursued? Online communities have been successful, for example, in producing high levels of collaboration and innovation. What mechanisms are most effective to achieve those outcomes?

Fourth, also at the field/organizational level, more research can be focused on communities as agents that help translate demands from the external environment to the local. Community organizations – those

that coordinate and energize a geographical community – have recently been shown to be important in the translation of institutional prescriptions from the external environment to the local level (Binder, 2007; Boxenbaum & Johnsson, 2008; Sahlin & Wedlin, 2008; Zilber, 2006). More research on translation could help explain how community processes edit institutional models, by making them generalizable and plannable (Sahlin & Wedlin, 2008) and then fill in specific and selective elements aligned with community identities, interests and needs (Lok, 2010; Zilber, 2006).

Fifth, at the organizational/individual level, other studies have explored how the community identities of key decision-makers within organizations influence the extent to which a community logic affects organizational strategies and values (Almandoz, 2012, 2014; Pache & Santos, 2010). More research could explore how community identities are affected by career backgrounds in different sectors and how identities and career backgrounds may be especially helpful as channels to draw community capital. For example, what professional fields are most helpful and for what types of community resources (including money, time and social legitimacy)? What mechanisms are used by professionals in different fields to link the organization with those key resources? While we may expect that professionals in different careers are connected to different sorts of resource networks, which may be more or less conducive to community support, an important question to continue exploring is to what extent community capital is contingent on access to community networks or on other motivational factors instead, including identification, commitment and trust of those key decision makers (see Almandoz, 2012).

Communities could also be explored as the dependent variable at the field or societal level. This study has briefly considered how modern social trends, including the impact of technology, may have had a negative impact on geographical communities and a positive

impact on affiliation-based communities – as they have greatly facilitated the latter. Most studies rooted on an institutional logics perspective have developed a uniform characterization of community logics. To the degree that researchers have studied heterogeneity in institutional logics, such heterogeneity has been based on the difference between the community logic and other such institutional logics as the financial or market logic. Perhaps it is time to explore further heterogeneity, or what others have called intra-logic heterogeneity (Meyer & Höllerer, 2014) within each of the overarching institutional logics, including the community logic, as a result of variations in space and time, or as a result of other such factors as improvements in communication technology. If individuals in society satisfy their need for belonging in technology-enabled 'minimalist' communities with limited face-to-face interactions, and weaker affective and normative ties (Gläser, 2001), will the total social and community capital in society become richer or poorer? Will there be more or less collaboration and attention to civic affairs?

Second, while we have conceptually separated geographical and affiliation-based communities as a tool to help us understand the variegated nature of communities, we may also ask to what extent and under what conditions do affiliation-based communities depend also on local communities to connect more deeply with community members and draw community support. Our study suggests differences in both kinds of community, especially in how they generate trust, which could greatly influence the impact of those communities. Certainly, technology has greatly facilitated the creation and governance of affiliation-based communities in ways that do not require much face-to-face interactions. But can those purposive communities replace the old-fashioned local communities in how they produce a sense of belonging that may later have positive consequences for community endeavors? Are those two types of community complementary or are they

substitutes for each other so that investments in one undermine the effectiveness of investments in the other?

Note

1   We consider worker cooperatives as communities in this case because of the more meaningful relationships involved among members.

REFERENCES

Adler, P. S. (2001). Market, hierarchy, and trust: The knowledge economy and the future of capitalism. *Organization Science*, *12*, 215–234.

Adler, P. S. (2015). Community and innovation: From Tönnies to Marx. *Organization Studies*, *36*(4), 445–471.

Ahrne, G., & Brunsson, N. (2008). *Meta-organizations*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.

Alba, R. D., Logan, J. R., & Crowder, K. (1997). White ethnic neighborhoods and assimilation: The greater New York region, 1980–1990. *Social Forces*, *75*(3), 883–912.

Algesheimer, R., Dholakia, U. M., & Herrmann, A. (2005). The social influence of brand community: Evidence from European car clubs. *Journal of Marketing*, *69*(3), 19–34.

Almandoz, J. (2012). Arriving at the starting line: The impact of community and financial logics on new banking ventures. *Academy of Management Journal*, *55*(6), 1381–1406.

Almandoz, J. (2014). Founding teams as carriers of competing logics: When institutional forces predict banks' risk exposure. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, *59*(3), 442–473.

Anderson, B. (1983). *Imagined Communities*. London, UK: Verso.

Ashforth, B. E., & Mael, F. (1989). Social identity theory and the organization. *Academy of Management Review*, *14*(1), 20–39.

Autio, E., Dahlander, L., & Frederiksen, L. (2013). Information exposure, opportunity evaluation, and entrepreneurial action: An investigation of an online user community. *Academy of Management Journal*, *56*(5), 1348–1371.

Bagozzi, R. P., & Dholakia, U. M. (2006). Open source software user communities: A study of participation in Linux user groups. *Management Science*, *52*(7), 1099–1115.

Baumeister, R. F., & Leary, M. R. (1995). The need to belong: Desire for interpersonal attachments as a fundamental human motivation. *Psychological Bulletin*, *117*(3), 497–529.

Becattini, G. (1990). The Marshallian industrial district as a socioeconomic notion. In F. S. Pyke, G. Becattini, & W. Sengenberger (eds.), *Industrial districts and inter-firm co-operation in Italy* (pp. 37–51). Geneva: International Institute for Labour Studies.

Bechky, B. A. (2003). Sharing meaning across occupational communities: The transformation of understanding on a production floor. *Organization Science*, *14*, 312–330.

Beers, D. L. (2006). *For the prevention of cruelty: The history and legacy of animal rights in the United States*. Athens, OH: Ohio University Press.

Beller, T. (2015). Don't call it Katrina. Retrieved from www.newyorker.com/culture/cultural-comment/dont-call-it-katrina. Accessed on 8 July 2015.

Berry, J. (2013). Eight years after Hurricane Katrina, New Orleans has been resurrected. Retrieved from www.thedailybeast.com/articles/2013/08/29/eight-years-after-hurricane-katrina-new-orleans-has-resurrected.html. Accessed on 8 July 2015.

Binder, A. (2007). For love and money: Organizations' creative responses to multiple environmental logics. *Theory and Society*, *36*(6), 547–571.

Blau, P. M. (1968). The hierarchy of authority in organizations. *American Journal of Sociology*, *73*(4), 453–467.

Boxenbaum, E., and S. Jonsson. (2008). Isomorphism, diffusion and decoupling. In R. Greenwood, C. Oliver, R. Suddaby, & K. Sahlin-Andersson (eds.), *The SAGE Handbook of Organizational Institutionalism* (pp. 78–98). London: Sage.

Boyd, J. (2002). In community we trust: Online security communication at eBay. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*, *7*(3).

Boyd, J. (2003). The rhetorical construction of trust online. *Communication Studies*, *54*(3), 249–264.

Brescia, R. H., & Steinway, S. (2013). Scoring the banks: Building a behaviorally informed community impact report card for financial institutions. *Fordham Journal of Corporate and Financial Law*, *18*, 339–378.

Brint, S. (2001). Gemeinschaft revisited: A critique and reconstruction of the community concept. *Sociological Theory*, *19*(1), 1–23.

Brown, A. D., & Humphreys, M. (2006). Organizational identity and place: A discursive exploration of hegemony and resistance. *Journal of Management Studies*, *43*(2), 231–257.

Brown, B., Perkins, D. D., & Brown, G. (2003). Place attachment in a revitalizing neighborhood: Individual and block levels of analysis. *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, *23*(3), 259–271.

Bruhn, J. G. (2011). *The sociology of community connections*. New York: Springer Science & Business Media.

Burbank, M. J., Andranovich, G. D., & Heying, C. H. (2001). *Olympic dreams: The impact of mega-events on local politics*. Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner.

Burt, R. S. (2000). The network structure of social capital. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, *22*, 345–423.

Butler, B. S. (2001). Membership size, communication activity, and sustainability: The internal dynamics of networked social structures. *Information Systems Research*, *12*(4), 346–362.

Carroll, G. R., & Swaminathan, A. (2000). Why the microbrewery movement? Organizational dynamics of resource partitioning in the U. S. brewery industry. *American Journal of Sociology*, *106*(3), 715–762.

Carson, C. (1987). Martin Luther King, Jr: Charismatic leadership in a mass struggle. *Journal of American History*, *74*(2), 448–454.

Che, J., & Qian, Y. (1998). Institutional environment, community government, and corporate governance: Understanding China's Township-Village Enterprises. *Journal of Law, Economics, & Organization*, *14*(1), 1–23.

Coleman, J. S. (1961). *The adolescent society*. New York: Free Press.

Coleman, J. S. (1988). Social capital in the creation of human capital. *American Journal of Sociology*, *94*, S95–S120.

Conger, J. A., & Kanungo, R. N. (1988). *Charismatic leadership: The elusive factor in organizational effectiveness*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey–Bass.

Crane, D. (1969). Social structure in a group of scientists: A test of the 'invisible college' hypothesis. *American Sociological Review*, *34*, 335–352.

Cuba, L., & Hummon, D. M. (1993). A place to call home: Identification with dwelling, community, and region. *Sociological Quarterly*, 111–131.

Dacin, M. T., Ventresca, M. J., & Beal, B. D. (1999). The embeddedness of organizations: Dialogue and directions. *Journal of Management*, *25*(3), 317–356.

Dahlander, L., & O'Mahony, S. (2011). Progressing to the center: Coordinating knowledge work. *Organization Science*, *22*(4), 961–979.

Davis, G. F., & Greve, H. R. (1997). Corporate elite networks and governance changes in the 1980s. *American Journal of Sociology*, *103*(1), 1–37.

Davis, G. F., McAdam, D., Scott, W. R., & Zald, M. N. (2005). *Social movements and organization theory*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

DiMaggio, P. (1988). Interest and agency in institutional theory. In L. G. Zucker (Ed.), *Institutional patterns and culture* (pp. 3–21). Cambridge, MA: Ballinger.

DiMaggio, P. J., & Powell, W. W. (1983). The iron cage revisited: Institutional isomorphism and collective rationality in organizational fields. *American Sociological Review*, *48*, 147–160.

Dobbin, F. (1994). *Forging industrial policy: The United States, Britain, and France in the railway age*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Durkheim, Emile (1965 [1915]). *The elementary forms of the religious life*. New York: Free Press.

Eko, L., & Berkowitz, D. (2009). Le Monde, French secular republicanism and the Mohammed cartoons affair: Journalistic re-presentation of the sacred right to offend. *International Communication Gazette*, *71*(3), 181–202.

Eltantawy, N., & Wiest, J. B. (2011). The Arab Spring. Social media in the Egyptian revolution: Reconsidering resource mobilization theory. *International Journal of Communication*, *5*(18).

Fayard, A., DeSanctis, G., & Roach, M. (2004). The language games of online forums. Proceedings of the Sixty-third Annual Meeting of the Academy of Management (CD), ISSN 1543-8643. Retrieved from http://oz.stern.nyu.edu/seminar/1118.pdf.

Fischer, C. S. (1982). *To dwell among friends*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Fleming, L., King, C., & Juda, A. (2007). Small worlds and regional innovation. *Organization Science*, *18*, 938–954.

Fleming, L., & Marx, M. (2006). Managing creativity in small worlds. *California Management Review*, *48*(4), 6–27.

Friedland, R., & Alford, R. R. (1991). Bringing society back in: Symbols, practices and institutional contradictions. In W. W. Powell & P. J. DiMaggio (eds.), *The new institutionalism in organizational analysis* (pp. 232–262). Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.

Galaskiewicz, J. (1997). An urban grants economy revisited: Corporate charitable contributions in the twin cities, 1979–81, 1987–89. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, *42*, 445–471.

Gelbspan, R. (2005). *Boiling point: How politicians, big oil and coal, journalists and activists are fueling the climate crisis – and what we can do to avert disaster*. New York, NY: Basic Books.

Gläser, J. (2001). 'Producing communities' as a theoretical challenge. *Proceedings of the Australian Sociological Association*, 1–11.

Glynn, M. A. (2008). Beyond constraint: How institutions enable identities. In R. Greenwood, C. Oliver, R. Suddaby, & K. Sahlin-Andersson (eds.), *The SAGE Handbook of Organizational Institutionalism* (pp. 413–430). London: Sage.

Glynn, M. A., & Lounsbury, M. (2005). From the critics' corner: Logic blending, discursive change and authenticity in a cultural production system. *Journal of Management Studies*, *42*(5), 1031–1055.

Gotham, K. F. (2008). From 9/11 to 8/29: Post-disaster recovery and rebuilding in New York and New Orleans. *Social Forces*, *87*(2), 1039–1062.

Granovetter, M. (1985). Economic action and social structure: The problem of embeddedness. *American Journal of Sociology*, *91*(3), 481–510.

Greenwood, R., Díaz, M. A., Li, S. X., & Lorente, J. C. (2010). The multiplicity of institutional logics and the heterogeneity of organizational responses. *Organization Science*, *21*(2), 521–539.

Greenwood, R., Oliver, C., Suddaby, R., & Sahlin-Andersson, K. (2008). *The SAGE handbook of organizational institutionalism*. London: Sage.

Greenwood, R., Raynard, M., Kodeih, F., Micelotta, E. R., & Lounsbury, M. (2011). Institutional complexity and organizational responses. *Academy of Management Annals*, *5*(1), 317–371.

Guthrie, D. (2003). *Survey on corporate–community relations*. New York: Social Sciences Research Council.

Heckscher, C., & Adler, P. S. (2006). *The firm as a collaborative community: The reconstruction of trust in the knowledge economy*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Hertel, G., Niedner, S., & Herrmann, S. (2003). Motivation of software developers in Open Source projects: an Internet-based survey of contributors to the Linux kernel. *Research Policy*, *32*(7), 1159–1177.

Hiller, H. H. (2000). Mega-events, urban boosterism and growth strategies: An analysis of the objectives and legitimations of the Cape Town 2004 Olympic bid. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, *24*, 439–458.

Howard-Grenville, J., Metzger, M. L., & Meyer, A. D. (2013). Rekindling the flame: Processes of identity resurrection. *Academy of Management Journal*, *56*(1), 113–136.

Hunter, F. (1953). *Community power structure: A study of decision makers.* Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press.

Jeppesen, L. B., & Frederiksen, L. (2006). Why do users contribute to firm-hosted user communities? The case of computer-controlled music instruments. *Organization Science*,*17*(1), 45–63.

Jones, G. F., & George, J. M. (1998). The experience and evolution of trust: Implications for cooperation and teamwork. *Academy of Management Review*, *23*(3), 531–546.

Jøsang, A., Ismail, R., & Boyd, C. (2007). A survey of trust and reputation systems for online service provision. *Decision Support Systems*, *43*(2), 618–644.

Kantrowitz, N. (1969). Ethnic and racial segregation in the New York metropolis, 1960. *American Journal of Sociology*, *74*(6), 685–695.

Khondker, H. H. (2011). Role of the new media in the Arab Spring. *Globalizations*, *8*(5), 675–679.

Kirk, P., & Shutte, A. M. (2004). Community leadership development. *Community Development Journal*, *39*(3), 234–251.

Knorr-Cetina, K. (1999). *Epistemic cultures: How sciences make knowledge*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Kogut, B., & Metiu, A. (2001). Open-source software development and distributed innovation. *Oxford Review of Economic Policy*, *17*(2), 248–264.

Kruckeberg, D., & Starck, K. (2004). The role of ethic of community building for consumer products and services. In M. L. Gallician (Ed.), *Handbook of product placement in mass media: New strategies in marketing theory, practice, trends and ethics* (pp. 133–146). New York, NY: Best Business Books.

Lau, D. C., & Murnighan, J. K. (1998). Demographic diversity and faultlines: The compositional dynamics of organizational groups. *Academy of Management Review*, *23*(2), 325–340.

Lazaric, N., & Lorenz, E. (1998). Trust and organizational learning during inter-firm cooperation. In N. Lazaric & E. Lorenz (eds.), *Trust and economic learning* (pp. 207–225). Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.

Lerner, J., & Tirole, J. (2004). Efficient patent pools. *American Economic Review*, *94*(3), 691–711.

Light, P. C. (1999). *The new public service*. Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution Press.

Litwak, E., & Hylton, L. F. (1962). Interorganizational analysis: A hypothesis on co-ordinating agencies. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, *6*(4), 395.

Lok, J. (2010). Institutional logics as identity projects. *Academy of Management Journal*, *53*(6), 1305–1335.

Lounsbury, M. (2007). A tale of two cities: Competing logics and practice variation in the professionalizing of mutual funds. *Academy of Management Journal*, *50*(2), 289–307.

Luo, X., Chung, C., & Sobczak, M. (2009). How do corporate governance model differences affect foreign direct investment in emerging economies? *Journal of International Business Studies*, *40*(3), 444–467.

Marglin, S. A. (2008). *The dismal science: How thinking like an economist undermines community.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Marquis, C. (2003). The pressure of the past: Network imprinting in intercorporate communities. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, *48*, 655–689.

Marquis, C., & Battilana, J. (2009). Acting globally but thinking locally? The enduring influence of local communities on organizations. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, *29*, 283–302.

Marquis, C., Davis, G. F., & Glynn, M. A. (2013). Golfing alone? Corporations, elites and nonprofit growth in 100 American communities. *Organization Science*, *24*(1), 39–57.

Marquis, C., & Lounsbury, M. (2007). Vive la résistance: Competing logics and the consolidation of U.S. banking. *Academy of Management Journal*, *50*(4), 799–820.

Marquis, C., Lounsbury, M., & Greenwood, R. (2011). Introduction: Community as an institutional order and a type of organizing. In C. Marquis, M. Lounsbury, & R. Greenwood (eds.), *Research in the sociology of organizations*, Vol. 33 (pp. ix–xxvii). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

Marquis, C., & Yang, Z. (2014). The sharing economy in China: toward a unique local model. *China Policy Review*, (9), 109–111.

McAdam, D. (1996). The framing function of movement tactics: Strategic dramaturgy in the American civil rights movement. In D. McAdam, J. D. McCarthy, & M. N. Zald (eds.), *Comparative perspectives on social movements* (pp. 338–356). New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

McAlexander, J. H., Schouten, J. W., & Koenig, H. F. (2002). Building brand community. *Journal of Marketing*, 66, 38–54.

McCall, G. J., & Simmons, J. L. (1978). *Identities and interactions*. New York: Free Press.

McCarthy, J. D., & Zald, M. N. (1977). Resource mobilization and social movements: A partial theory. *American Journal of Sociology*, 1212–1241.

McPherson, M., Smith-Lovin, L., Cook, J. M. (2001). Birds of a feather: Homophily in social networks. *Annual Review of Sociology*, *27*, 415–444.

Meyer, J. W. (1977). The effects of education as an institution. *American Journal of Sociology*, *83*(1), 55–77.

Meyer, J. W., Boli, J., Thomas, G. M., & Ramirez, F. O. (1997). World society and the nation-state. *American Journal of Sociology*, *103*(1), 144–181.

Meyer, R. E., & Höllerer, M.A. (2014). Does institutional theory need redirecting? *Journal of Management Studies*, *51*(7):1221–1233.

Meyer, J. W., & Scott, W. R. (1983). *Organizational environments: ritual and rationality*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Mok, D., Wellman, B., & Carrasco, J. (2010). Does distance matter in the age of the Internet? *Urban Studies*, *47*(13), 2747–2783.

Morris, A., & Staggenborg, S. (2004). Leadership in social movements. In D. A. Snow, S. A. Soule, & H. Kriesi (eds.), *The Blackwell companion to social movements* (pp. 171–196). Oxford: Blackwell.

Morrison, P. D., Roberts, J. H., & von Hippel, E., (2000). Determinants of user innovation and innovation sharing in a local market. *Management Science*, *46*(12), 1513–1527.

Muniz Jr, A. M., & O'Guinn, T. C. (2001). Brand community. *Journal of Consumer Research*, *27*(4), 412–432.

Nigam, A., & Ocasio, W. (2010). Event attention, environmental sensemaking, and change in institutional logics: An inductive analysis of the effects of public attention to Clinton's health care reform initiative. *Organization Science*, *21*(4), 823–841.

Nowell, B. L., Berkowitz, Z. D., & Foster-Fishman, P. (2006). Revealing the cues within community places: Stories of identity, history, and possibility. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 37(1–2), 29–46.

Ocasio, W. (1997). Towards an attention-based view of the firm. *Strategic Management Journal*, *18*(S1), 187–206.

O'Mahony, S., & Ferraro, F. (2007). The emergence of governance in an open source community. *Academy of Management Journal*, *50*(5), 1079–1106.

O'Mahony, S., & Lakhani, K. R. (2011). Organizations in the shadow of communities. In C. Marquis, M. Lounsbury, & R. Greenwood (eds.), *Research in the sociology of organizations*, Vol. 33 (pp. 3–36). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

Orr, J. E. (1996). *Talking about machines: An ethnography of a modern job*. Ithaca, NY: ILR Press.

Osterloh, M., & Frey, B. S. (2000). Motivation, knowledge transfer, and organizational forms. *Organization Science*, *11*(5), 538–550.

Owen-Smith, J., & Powell, W. W. (2004). Knowledge networks as channels and conduits: The effects of spillovers in the Boston biotechnology community. *Organization Science*, *15*(1), 5–21.

Pache, A., & Santos, F. (2010). When worlds collide: The internal dynamics of organizational responses to conflicting institutional demands. *Academy of Management Review*, *35*(3), 455–476.

Park, J. Z., & Smith, C. (2000). 'To whom much has been given …': Religious capital and community voluntarism among churchgoing protestants. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, *39*(3), 272–286.

Piore, M. H., & Sabel, C. F. (1984). *The second industrial divide: Possibilities for prosperity*. New York: Basic Books.

Piskorski, M. J., & Gorbatai, A. D. (2013). Testing Coleman's social-norm enforcement mechanism: Evidence from Wikipedia. Harvard Business School Strategy Unit Working Paper (11–055).

Platt, G. M., & Lilley, S. J. (1994). Multiple images of a charismatic: Constructing Martin Luther King Jr's leadership. In G. Platt & C. Gordon (eds.), *Self, collective behavior and society: Essays honoring the contributions of Ralph H. Turner* (pp. 55–74). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

Podolny, J. M. (1993). A status-based model of market competition. *American Journal of Sociology*, *98*(4), 829–872.

Podolny, J. M. (2001). Networks as the pipes and prisms of the market. *American Journal of Sociology*, *107*(1), 33–60.

Podolny, J. M., Khurana, R., & Hill-Popper, M. (2004). Revisiting the meaning of leadership. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 26, 1–36.

Podolny, J. M., & Page, K. L. (1998). Network forms of organization. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 24, 57–76.

Portes, A., & Sensenbrenner, J. (1993). Embeddedness and immigration: Notes on the social determinants of economic action. *American Journal of Sociology*, *98*(6), 1320–1350.

Preece, J. (2000). *Online communities: Designing usability and supporting sociability*. New York, NY: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Preece, J. (2001). Sociability and usability in online communities: Determining and measuring success. *Behavior & Information Technology*, *20*(5), 347–356.

Preece, J., & Maloney-Krichmar, D. (2005). Online communities: Design, theory, and practice. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*, *10*(4), DOI: 10.1111/j.1083-6101.2005.tb00264.x.

Putnam, R. D. (1993). *Making democracy work: Civic traditions in modern Italy.* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Rao, H., Monin, P., & Durand, R. (2003). Institutional change in Toque Ville: Nouvelle cuisine as an identity movement in French gastronomy. *American Journal of Sociology*, *108*(4), 795–843.

Raymond, E. S. (1999). *The cathedral and the bazaar: Musings on Linux and open source by an accidental revolutionary*. Cambridge, MA: O'Reilly.

Raynard, M., Lounsbury, M., & Greenwood, R. (2012). Legacies of logics: Sources of community variation in CSR implementation in China. In M. Lounsbury & E. Boxenbaum (eds.), *Research in the sociology of organizations*, Vol. 39 (pp. 243–276). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

Rheingold, H. (2007). *Smart mobs: The next social revolution.* New York, NY: Basic Books.

Ridings, C. M., & Gefen, D. (2004). Virtual community attraction: Why people hang out online. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*, *10*(1), DOI: 10.1111/j.1083-6101.2004.tb00229.x.

Robertson, R. (1995). Glocalization: Time-space and homogeneity–heterogeneity. In M. Featherstone, S. Lash, & R. Robertson (eds.), *Global modernities* (pp. 25–44). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Rossi, P. H., & Weber, E. (1996). The social benefits of homeownership: Empirical evidence from national surveys. *Housing Policy Debate*, 7, 1–35.

Sahlin, K., & Wedlin, L. (2008). Circulating ideas: Imitation, translation and editing. In R. Greenwood, C. Oliver, R. Suddaby, & K. Sahlin-Andersson (eds.), *The SAGE handbook of organizational institutionalism* (pp. 218–242). London: Sage.

Schneiberg, M. (2002). Organizational heterogeneity and the production of new forms: Politics, social movements and mutual companies in American fire insurance, 1900–1930. In M. Lounsbury & M. Ventresca (eds.), *Research in the sociology of organizations*, Vol. 19 (pp. 39–89). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

Schneiberg, M., King, M., & Smith, T. (2008). Social movements and organizational form: Cooperative alternatives to corporations in the American insurance, dairy, and grain industries. *American Sociological Review*, *73*, 635–667.

Schneiberg, M., & Lounsbury, M. (2008). Social movements and institutional analysis. In R. Greenwood, C. Oliver, R. Suddaby, & K. Sahlin-Andersson (eds.), *The SAGE handbook of organizational institutionalism* (pp. 648–670). London: Sage.

Schwartz, D. (1997). *Contesting the Super Bowl*. New York: Routledge.

Scott, A. J., & Storper, M. (2003). Regions, globalization, development. *Regional Studies*, *37*, 549–579.

Shneiderman, B. (2000). Designing trust into online experiences. *Communications of the ACM*, 4*3*(12), 57–59.

Simons, T., Vermeulen, P., & Knoben, J. (2016) There is no beer without a smoke: Community cohesion and neighboring communities' effects on organizational resistance to anti-smoking regulations in the Dutch hospitality industry. *Academy of Management Journal*, *59*(2), 545–578.

Sorge, A. (2005). *The global and the local: Understanding the dialectics of business systems.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Storper, M. (1997). *The regional world: Territorial development in a global economy*. New York, NY: Guilford Press.

Storper, M. (2005). Society, community, and economic development. *Comparative International Development*, *39*(4), 30–57.

Stryker, S. (2000). Identity competition: Key to differential social movement involvement. In S. Stryker, T. Owens, & R. White (eds.), *Identity, self, and social movements* (pp. 21–40). Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.

Suddaby, R., & Greenwood, R. (2005). Rhetorical strategies of legitimacy. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, *50*(1), 35–67.

Taub, R. P. (1994). *Community capitalism: The South Shore Bank's strategy for neighborhood revitalization*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press.

Taylor, R. B. (1996). Neighborhood responses to disorder and local attachments: The systemic model of attachment, social disorganization, and neighborhood use value. *Sociological Forum*, *11*, 41–74.

Thornton, P. H. (2004). *Markets from culture: Institutional logics and organizational decisions in higher education publishing*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Thornton, P. H., Jones, C., & Kury, K. (2005). Institutional logics and institutional change in organizations: Transformation in accounting, architecture, and publishing. In C. Jones & P. H. Thornton (eds.), *Research in the sociology of organizations*, Vol. 23 (pp. 125–170). Bingley, UK: Emerald Group.

Thornton, P. H., & Ocasio, W. (1999). Institutional logics and the historical contingency of power in organizations: Executive succession in the higher education publishing industry, 1958–1990. *American Journal of Sociology*, *105*(3), 801–843.

Thornton, P. H., Ocasio, W., & Lounsbury, M. (2012). *The institutional logics perspective: A new approach to culture, structure and process*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Tierney, K. J. (2003). *Conceptualizing and measuring organizational and community resilience: Lessons from the emergency response following the September 11, 2001 attack on the World Trade Center.* Newark, DE: University of Delaware Disaster Research Center.

Tilcsik, A., & Marquis, C. (2013). Punctuated generosity: How mega-events and natural disasters affect corporate philanthropy in U.S. communities. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, *58*(1), 111–148.

Tönnies, F. (1887). *Gemeinschaft und Gesellschaft: Abhandlung des Communismus und des Socialismus als empirischer Culturformen*. Leipzig: Fues.

Truno, E. (1995). Barcelona: City of sport. In M. De Moragas & M. Botella (eds.), *The keys to success: The social, sporting, economic and communications impact of Barcelona '92* (pp. 43–56). Barcelona: Centre d'Estudis Olimpics I de l'Esport, Universitat Autonoma de Barcelona.

Turk, H. (1977). *Organizations in modern life*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey–Bass.

Useem, M. (1984). *The inner circle: Large corporations and the rise of business politics in the U.S. and U.K.* New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Uzzi, B. (1996). The sources and consequences of embeddedness for the economic performance of organizations: The network effect. *American Sociological Review*, *61*, 674–698.

Uzzi, B. (1999). Embeddedness in the making of financial capital: How social relations and networks benefit firms seeking financing. *American Sociological Review*, *64*, 481–505.

von Hippel, E. (2005). *Democratizing innovation*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

von Krogh, G., & von Hippel, E. (2006). The promise of research on open source software. *Management Science*, *52*(7), 975–983.

Wade, J. B., Swaminathan, A., & Saxon, M. S. (1998). Normative and resource flow consequences of local regulations in the American brewing industry, 1845–1918. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, *43*, 905–935.

Waitt, G. (2001). The Olympic spirit and civic boosterism: The Sydney 2000 Olympics. *Tourism Geographies*, *3*, 249–278.

Walsh, E. J., & Warland, R. H. (1983). Social movement involvement in the wake of a nuclear accident: Activists and free riders in the TMI area. *American Sociological Review*, *48*(6), 764–780.

Watson, J. (2008). *Nursing: The philosophy and science of caring*. Boulder, CO: University Press of Colorado.

Weber, M. (1978 [1921]). *Economy and society*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Wellman, B. (1979). The community question: The intimate networks of East Yorkers. *American Journal of Sociology*, *84*(5), 1201–1231.

Wellman, B. (2001). Physical place and cyberplace: The rise of personalized networking. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, *25*(2), 227–252.

Wellman, B., & Gulia, M. (1999). Virtual communities as communities: Net surfers don't ride alone. In P. Kollock & M. A, Smith (eds.), *Communities in cyberspace* (pp. 167–194). London: Routledge.

Wooten, M., & Hoffman, A. J. (2008). Organizational fields: Past, present and future. In R. Greenwood, C. Oliver, R. Suddaby, & K. Sahlin-Andersson (eds.), *The SAGE handbook of organizational institutionalism* (pp. 130–147). London: Sage.

Wry, T., Greenwood, R., Jennings, P. D., & Lounsbury, M. (2010). Institutional sources of technological knowledge: A community perspective on nanotechnology emergence. In N. Phillips, G. Sewell, & D. Griffiths (eds.), *Research in the sociology of organizations*, Vol. 29 (pp. 149–176). Bingley, UK: Emerald Group Publishing.

Wry, T., Lounsbury, M., & Glynn, M. A. (2011). Legitimating nascent collective identities: Coordinating cultural entrepreneurship. *Organization Science*, *22*(2), 449–463.

Zilber, T. B. (2006). The work of the symbolic in institutional processes: Translations of rational myths in Israeli high tech. *Academy of Management Journal*, *49*(2), 281–303.