THE "SOCIOLOGICAL CITIZEN" RELATIONAL INTERDEPENDENCE IN LAW AND ORGANIZATIONS[1]

Susan SILBEY, Ruthanne HUISING
and Salo Vinocur COSLOVSKY

RÉSUMÉ. — Dans cet article, nous développons trois exemples de ce que nous appelons des "Citoyens sociologues" (des employés chargés de vérifier le respect des normes de sécurité et de l'environnement, des procureurs et des cadres d'entreprise), qui considèrent leur travail et se considèrent eux-mêmes comme faisant partie d'un réseau complexe d'interactions et de processus, et non comme occupant un poste avec des intérêts et des responsabilités limités. Au lieu de se spécialiser étroitement, et de ne prendre en considération que de façon épisodique les connections plus larges et les répercussions de leurs actions, ces acteurs considèrent leur organisation ou leur état comme le résultat de décisions, d'indécisions, de processus d'essais et d'erreurs, et non comme le résultat d'une action rationnellement organisée. Dans cette entité dynamique, ils conçoivent leur propre rôle comme insignifiant en soi mais essentiel à l'ensemble. Nous situons d'abord cette observation dans la notion de fait social de Durkheim, puis nous faisons l'hypothèse que les sciences sociales du XXe siècle ont produit une conception réifiée des relations sociales qui masque inutilement ce travail quotidien de construction sociale dans la pratique. À l'inverse, une analyse partant de l'hypothèse d'un "Citoyen sociologue" permet d'explorer plus systématiquement les variations de performance des organisations. Nous suggérons, premièrement, que la perception de la structure de l'action sociale et des interdépendances relationnelles par les acteurs peut varier de manière prévisible. Deuxièmement, nous estimons que cette perception des interdépendances relationnelles peut affecter, à son tour, la performance des différents rôles.

MOTS CLÉS. — Respect des règles, changement organisationnel, perspective transactionnelle, innovation réglementaire, procureur général, lois sur la protection de l'environnement.

1. This material is based in part upon work supported by the National Science Foundation under Grants No. 0216815 and 0518118. Any opinions, findings, and conclusions or recommendations expressed in this material are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the views of the National Science Foundation. We are most grateful for the very helpful comments of John-Paul Ferguson, Douglas Goodman, Leila Kawar, Ronen Shamir, and Marc Steinberg. Joelle Evans provided important insight and translation.

ABSTRACT. — In this paper we describe three examples of what we call "the sociological citizen", environmental health and safety workers, law enforcement officers, and firm managers who see their work and themselves as links in a complex web of interactions and processes rather than as offices of delimited responsibilities and interests. Instead of focusing closely and only sporadically taking account of the larger connections and reverberations of their actions, these actors view their organizations or states as the outcome of human decisions, indecisions, trial and error, rather than rationally organized action. In this dynamic entity, they reconceive their own role as insignificant by itself yet essential to the whole. We locate this observation first within Durkheim's notion of social facts and later hypothesize that twentieth century social science may have contributed to reified conceptions of social relations unnecessarily obscuring this ground level everyday work of social construction. We offer this conception of the sociological citizen as a hypothesis with which to explore more systematically variations in organizational performances and outcomes. We suggest, first, that actors'perceptions of the structure of social action and relational interdependence will vary in perhaps predictable ways. Second, apprehension of relational interdependence will, in turn, affect role performances.

KEY WORDS. — Compliance, organizational change, transactional perspective, regulatory innovation, attorneys general, environmental regulation.

Introduction

Durkheim famously observed that in societies with a complex division of labor, administrative, commercial and procedural law would predominate, serving to reconstitute ruptured interdependencies and helping to sustain the organic solidarity characteristic of industrialized societies. Nowhere did he suggest, however, that relational interdependence or the compensatory and reparative functions of law would be intended by or manifest to broad segments of the society's actors.[2] Indeed, he was adamantly opposed to the notion that the basic mechanisms of social solidarity and coordination would be components of popular consciousness. Although Durkheim remained committed to the notion of social life as a "system of representations and mental states", his analyses depended on a sharp distinction between the mental life of the individual and collective representations "subject to their own laws which individual psychology could not foresee" (1982, 253). He insisted that "not a single word of mine must be understood" to suggest "that social facts can be understood immediately by states of individual consciousness" (1982, 253).

2. In the essays collected posthumously as *Professional Ethics and Civic Morals,* Durkheim (1957) suggested that among closely associated corporate groups "in which the rest of the population have no part" such a sense of the whole might develop. We take this up in our concluding discussion below.

For Durkheim, the essentially meaningful character of social interaction is systematically obscured, uncovered only through meticulous causal analysis of social facts, that is, through sociology and what fifty years later C. Wright Mills (1959) would call "the sociological imagination". According to Mills (1959, 5), "the sociological imagination enables its possessor to understand the larger historical scene in terms of its meaning for the inner life and the external career of a variety of individuals. It enables him [sic] to take into account how individuals, in the welter of their daily experience, often become falsely conscious of their social positions". Because social actors normally focus closely, Mills, following Durkheim, suggested that individuals attend to their explicit troubles, indifferent to the invisible threads that connect their individual biography to historical trajectories. Thus, although both Durkheim and Mills insisted on the necessity of mapping the relational interdependence that constituted the social whole, neither expected this perspective, and thus this capacity, to persist widely beyond the bounds of professional sociology.

This paper describes a phenomenon we have observed among organizational managers and law enforcement officers, a phenomenon we call the *sociological citizen*. Although we might easily have called this phenomenon the sociological imagination, we use the word citizen to identify and highlight among an unexpected population of non-sociologists the capacity to see relational interdependence and to use this systemic perspective to meet occupational and professional obligations. To the sociological citizen, the firm is understood as the outcome of human decisions, indecisions, trial and error, and just plain making do, a "garbage can" rather than a rational plan (Cohen, March and Olsen, 1988). We will describe three cases in which actors (an environmental health and safety agent, a state Attorney General in Brazil, managers involved in organizational redesign projects) see their work and themselves as links in a complex web of interactions and processes rather than as a cabin of demarcated responsibilities and limited interests. Instead of focusing closely, as we normally do to manage daily affairs, and only sporadically taking account, if ever, of the larger reverberations of one's actions, these actors view their organizations or states as a dynamic entity in which their own role is reconceived as insignificant by itself yet essential to the whole.

Although divisions of labor demand dependable role performances, few persons enact solely their formal scripts, even in highly

stratified organizations with complex divisions of labor. Because human beings are "wholes" (Selznick, 1949, 1969) performing roles (Goffman, 1959, 1967), their wholeness precludes exclusive role performance. Much happens in organizations that is not predicted nor explained by formal roles and responsibilities. Indeed, tracking excessive or diminished role performances has preoccupied many twentieth century sociologists of organizations and the law. Researchers have often labeled such performances organizational failures, or "gaps" between the law on the books and law in action. Although whole persons fill these roles, as Durkheim claimed, their awareness of their own roles as distinct and discrete subsets of their social world rarely extends to awareness of the structure of role interactions, to the sociology of roles and performances. As Durkheim claimed, consciousness of the structure of social action, relational interdependence, is not likely to be widely shared among the citizenry. The citizen is quick to recognize his or her own role's demands as arbitrary constraints on social interaction, but he or she is slow to realize that the system imposing those constraints itself emerges from such repeated patterns of interaction. The research reported here provides two insights into this discrepancy. First, whether actors *in situ* shall perceive the structure of social action and relational interdependence will vary by the circumstances in (perhaps) predictable ways (Ewick and Silbey, 2003). Second, apprehension of relational interdependence in turn affects role performance.

Following necessarily brief presentations of three examples, we will locate our conception of the sociological citizen within contemporary research on organizations and law. If Durkheim and Mills expected sociologists to trace the patterns of relational interdependence, twentieth century methodological inventions inadvertently undermined their ambition. We surmise that the emergence in recent years of neo-institutionalist, cultural and network paradigms signifies an effort within sociology to move beyond reductionist models to create empirical research methods that attempt to capture the interdependence and holistic aspects of social relations. In sum, we offer our brief empirical observations as theoretical provocations inviting others to engage the conversation.

Three Examples

A. How is Brian Jones different?

Within organizations there sometimes exist some numbers of people that stand out in their approach to routine and unexpected situations in the everyday life of the organization. These are people that "just do it". They take on work as their responsibility and do so with little ado and much aplomb. When the unexpected occurs, they respond with speed, decisiveness and mostly good sense. Practicality and tacit know-how pervade their approach. Their work is more often performed outside of formal planning meetings but instead makes progress by simply getting on with things. Their method may appear systematic or improvisational. It is rarely articulated, however, more often just seems to happen. The alternative, more conventionally bureaucratic approach to routine or challenging problems is not so much a lack of response as responses that become impediments to immediate or longer-term progress. The action may be enthusiastic, even responsive, but mostly ineffective or inefficient.

In the course of observing the design and implementation of a system for managing environmental health and safety hazards in university's research laboratories, we noticed these variations in the ways the environmental health and safety (EHS) staff performed and interpreted their work. Among the more than 60 EHS personnel, a handful stood out by their effectiveness and ability to conceptualize problems and fashion solutions. Some research offers explanations for these differences located in individual psychology, demography and disposition (Howell and Higgins, 1990; Scott and Bruce, 1994), while more structural explanations focus on rewards, position in the organization, type of work, nature of the work, networks, cultural capital, authority (Choi, 2007; Damanpour, 1991; Fuller et al., 2006; Ohly et al., 2006). In section (C) below, we suggest that a process of disengagement from organizational roles and routines and immersion in an alternative community can lead to a holistic vision of the organization as a network of relational interdependencies. This sociological perspective, we hypothesize, may lead to differential work performances, problem-solving skills, and capacity for teamwork. Here, we describe an example that provoked our curiosity.

Consider the following random selection of problematic situations that confronted environmental health and safety personnel over a two-month period during the summer of 2003. A problem is defined by the situated actor who, by describing the situation to others or calling for help, in effect declares that "things are not the way they ought to be and someone ought to do something about it". In all cases, steps were taken to address the problem. However, the nature of these responses varied.

(1) The elevator breaks down with two EHS personnel in it. It is not in service the next morning when a number of guests are expected for a safety training session.
(2) Due to construction, the truck that removes chemical waste cannot enter the campus to do the regular pick up.
(3) The presence (required) of large bins (that serve as "satellite accumulation areas") in fume hoods is affecting airflow.
(4) Each set of specialist experts (e.g. biohazard, industrial hygiene, radiation, chemical waste, safety) has a different set of criteria for what can be poured down the drains based on the type of hazard and the type of drain. The rules conflict and the laboratory scientists are confused.
(5) The state regulators are due to arrive any day and the filters for the fume hoods in the radiation storage area are so dirty that they are reversing the flow of air. The new filters are not in but the old filters will cause a violation.
(6) New hoods are being installed in newly renovated labs. The majority of hoods have problems with the installations: pieces missing, broken pieces, incorrect installation. The hoods cannot be certified until fixed, the installation company says it won't come back, and the lab personnel (principal investigators, post-docs, students) are scheduled to move back into the lab.
(7) A subcontractor is loading waste on campus but the equipment they have brought to do the job is inappropriate making the work inefficient and dangerous.
(8) A lab has been found to be disposing of their contaminated sharps inappropriately putting the safety of the waste handlers and disposers in jeopardy.
(9) Extensive mold damage is found in a basement reading room. What is the source and what needs to be done to fix the problem?

(10) A chemical waste specialist encounters a container that includes biological hazards. He doesn't know if he can take the container back to the waste shed.

Some of these events are instances of common mechanical failure, e.g. the elevator not working (1). Many are examples of common difficulties of coordination with subcontractors, e.g. construction workers (2), waste pick up contractors (2, 7), delayed delivery of hood filters (5), unfinished hood installation (6). Other problematic situations, however, emerge specifically from the effort to regulate experimental practices in the labs, e.g. scientists' disposing of contaminated sharps incorrectly (8), placement of required satellite accumulation areas within hoods interfering with mandated volume of air flow (3), division of labor and expert knowledge among the EHS specialists (10), or directly conflicting advice from the different EHS experts (4). Interpretation of and responses to these situations varied among the staff. The variations can be mapped through their informal and strategic use of language, mobilization of resources, and exercise of authority (Huising, 2007). For purposes of this paper, we wish to emphasize the way some EHS staff enact a particular style of response we are calling sociological citizenship.

Consider example (3) above, a rather common dilemma where two legal requirements are difficult to satisfy simultaneously (Haines and Gurney, 2003). Scientists are required by the US Resource Conservation and Recovery Act to keep the open jars of chemicals in a secondary container that would capture any overflow or spill from the primary container : jar of chemicals. These secondary containers are usually open plastic bins in which several jars of chemicals are sitting. If the researcher is working in an exhaust hood, which is also required when working with chemicals, the individual chemical jars and the single secondary container holding the collection of jars, labeled *"satellite accumulation areas"* in the legal regulations, must also be within the hood. These bins (with jars of chemicals) tend to be placed toward the back of the working surface in the hood so that the researcher can arrange her piping, flasks and equipment within arms' reach. Thus the observed problem for the EHS staff: the presence of large bins that act as *"satellite accumulation areas"* (legally required) in fume hoods (legally required) is affecting airflow.

The problem was initially brought to the appropriate person to solve: a member of the EHS staff responsible for hoods and airflow

in the labs. Diane[3] did not solve the problem, nor did she bring the problem to others in her group of industrial hygienists. When the subject is subsequently raised in a meeting of the entire EHS staff, Diane's boss, Robert, does not take responsibility for the issue either. Robert is a nationally known ventilation expert. Hoods are his thing, but in this case he doesn't offer his expertise or the assistance of his large staff. He makes light comments about the need for an expansive research project which would find a material with which to construct bins that would be able to contain liquid but allow air to pass through—in his mind an impossible set of conditions and thus a humorous response. A radiation expert recommends using the standard protections and *"fixes"* for radiation spills, plexi-glass and duck tape, making clear that it is not his problem ; his materials will not work for chemical waste and blocked hoods. The staff director recommends a cross-group project, to which everyone (radiation experts, chemical waste specialists, hood specialists, industrial hygienists, even biohazard personnel) might contribute. Nothing happens.

The problem makes its way several weeks later to Brian Jones, a member of the chemical waste team. Brian comes to this position on the university EHS staff after several other jobs, including several years as a consultant. His boss, Alan, sees this as a large, involved task and offers to assist by reassigning Brian's existing obligations so that Brian can have the time to work on this perplexing problem. Brian thinks that perhaps they can come up with a standardized solution for most hoods. Alan immediately objects,

> "there can't be a standardized solution. The airflow in any given hood depends on where people stand, what else is in the hood and so on".
>
> Brian responds that Alan "may be right, but that they cannot control for all the variables", but

he will see what he can do. In contrast to Brian and by his own admission, Alan is a high level thinker. He refers to himself as a systems thinker, and is often heard complaining that the EHS office is not well organized and does not approach the work with sufficient systems perspective.

Brian quickly decides how he will approach this problem—who will be involved, what they will end up with, how long it should take. His estimate of the time it will take is one third of his boss's and he

3. Names of persons and organizations are pseudonyms.

promptly operationalizes the problem, ignoring the variables that cannot be controlled, e.g. where people stand and what they put in the hood. His first step, he later reported, was to contact some EHS professionals at other universities with whom he is in regular contact at conferences and on listserves. He asks if they have this problem, and how they were handling this *"persistent problem"*, as he referred to it. He found out that everyone he contacted used these same grey plastic bins as secondary containers for the satellite waste accumulation and that researchers everywhere were putting the bins in the hoods, and that air flow was a problem just about everywhere. Although Brian heard confirmation that the problem was neither unique to this university nor rare, he did not like any of the suggestions he collected about how to deal with the disrupted air flow in the hoods.

So, being pragmatic, decisive, moving from the abstract (e.g. his colleague's expert knowledge about ventilation or waste management) to the concrete, Brian surveys the offices, labs, and miscellaneous spaces around the university looking for solutions. At the next EHS staff meeting, he rises to discuss possible approaches to this *"persistent"* and *"perplexing"* problem. His move to the front of the room is a bit clumsy as his hands are full of bulky plastic objects. He has five objects and a clipboard with paper on which he has outlined his presentation. One of the objects is a riser for a computer monitor. The other two are blue plastic flats, care of Pepsi-Cola, normally used to hold cans and bottles of soft drinks. One is larger than the other. The fourth and fifth objects are the grey chemical bins routinely used in the hoods—one half the size of the other. He stands behind the table at the front of the room. He places the first three objects on the table—the computer monitor stand, the two Pepsi-Cola frames for drink containers, and then places the two bins on top of these.

Brian explains that he has found all of these in the trash, among office detritus, and right outside the EHS department. He explains that he got these three ideas by looking around the office, and in the garbage cans,

> "literally, I found this on the corner outside my office".

By placing the chemical bins on the computer monitor riser or the soft drink frames, 90% of the air vent that had been covered by the bin would now be unblocked. He says he will be working with industrial hygiene to test each of the options, and also mentions that he is going to a conference in Colorado the next week on college and university hazardous waste and that he will ask his colleagues

there again for their issues and solutions as well as opinions about his approach. He mentions other constructions he had tried, including playing around with *"scissor lifts"* but that he and the others he consulted with had concerns about the lifts' stability. He explains that in addition to testing the airflow they will be considering the stability of each of these *"found"* objects.

Brian's presentation was a jolt for a group that had been meeting monthly for over a year to design the environmental health and safety management system. The meetings are generally a graveyard for ideas, suggestions and problems. The solutions discussed are often high-level process fixes that have a low probability of being implemented or they are attempts to use technology to automate and systemize solutions. Problems are constantly revisited and solutions, while discussed, are not decided on or pursued.

Brian has drawn on a variety of resources to generate potential solutions: a networked community of similar practitioners, existing solutions (scissor lifts), local resources (trash). There is something about his presentation that is refreshing, yet strange. It is refreshing as it signifies practical action is being taken on a problem. Material solutions are presented. Brian has attacked a problem in a very direct, efficient way. He has also explained his approach in a very simple manner. He doesn't think it impossible or something that is not part of his occupational or work domain. He is not seeking an abstract principle or rule, does not reject work that might rightly be others, but simply moves ahead. He taps into the expertise of people in the field but seems to recognize that the experts, including those for whom he works, do not generate ideas, they merely reject or approve others' innovations. Is Brian doing something that others find embarrassing? He is suggesting that a problem common to research laboratories across the nation may be dealt with by using bits of garbage. Intentionally or not, is he trivializing the problem? Is he indirectly poking fun at the experts? We cannot pursue these interpretations here. Suffice to say, he acts as if his mission is synonymous with the university and its mission, in this case to pursue scientific research while insuring environmental, health and safety.

B. The Prosecutor as Sociological Citizen

There are approximately 8,000 prosecutors in the Brazilian ministério Público (MP). They work in 26 different state-level agencies (one for each state of Brazil's federation), plus a federal agency, which is divided into four branches (labor, military, federal

district and remaining federal crimes). Prosecutors are well insulated from external meddling and the vagaries of electoral politics. Some of the insulation takes place at the level of the field offices distributed throughout the nation, and some at the level of the agency itself, formally independent of the executive, legislative and judicial branches of government. The MP decides, on its own personnal selection criteria, promotion policies, organizational structure, and salaries. The MP elects the head of agency from within its ranks, presents its own budget to the legislature, and governs itself through a variety of councils and committees whose members are selected both on seniority and internal elections in which all prosecutors vote. Prosecutors also enjoy a series of professional prerogatives guaranteed by the Brazilian constitution: admitted through competitive entrance exams, promoted from within (i.e. there is no lateral entry), with a high-level of job security in which they cannot have their salaries reduced, cannot be transferred against their will, and cannot have their caseload assigned. As a counterbalance, prosecutors must withdraw from the bar and are not allowed to practice private law or manage businesses on the side.

The Brazilian MP has been in existence for more than a century, but over the past few decades, it changed dramatically, transforming itself by adopting and publicizing a new mission, namely "to protect society, democratic values, and the constitution". It is common for prosecutors to be proud of defending the poor and the powerless. As Brazil was transitioning from a military dictatorship into a democracy, prosecutors distanced themselves from the historically discredited state by aligning themselves with budding NGOs, social movements, churches and other progressive groups. They began by using available legal instruments (such as the forest code of 1965 and an all-purpose criminal law) to get involved in collective, general, social, economic and environmental issues, and eventually succeeded in passing several laws that increased their jurisdiction to "defend society" through civil litigation. This combination of a new role ("to defend society"), new legal instruments (civil litigation), new allies (NGOs, etc.), and a new political positioning (MP constitutionally separate from elected government) coalesced in a strong collective orientation that is nonetheless sufficiently vague to allow heterogeneous political and personal aspirations. The MP displays two distinct orientations: legal mobilization on behalf of a sense of general public good and business as usual. These can supplement each other but they can also provide contradictory incentives.

Prosecutors are strongly encouraged by organizational and professional incentives to act conservatively, reactively, and formalistically. In their own parlance, their primary duty is to *"baixar a pilha"*. i.e. *"to lower the pile of cases"* that slowly accumulates on top of their desks. To miss the deadline on a case is one of the most serious infractions that a prosecutor can commit. So they call good prosecutors *"tractor"* or *"cowcatcher"*. Excellence, from this perspective, means to keep the wheels turning, to be fast enough in sending files onwards to their next stop in the bureaucratic process, so no backlog emerges. However, prosecutors sometimes disengage from business as usual to engineer complex solutions to difficult, seemingly intractable problems. We illustrate that orientation in this paper.[4]

As a consequence of their broad mission ("to defend democratic values and the constitution"), and extensive legal armory, Brazilian prosecutors have extensive jurisdiction over a large array of cases and controversies. Prosecutors work in three areas: conventional criminal prosecution, *custos legis,* and collective affairs *("tutela colectiva")*. In the role of *Custos Legis,* prosecutors file amicus briefs on behalf of those parties whom society must look after, such as children or the legally insane. When functioning as *tutela colectiva,* prosecutors behave as public interest or "cause" lawyers[5] (Sarat and Scheingold, 1998), employed by the state but in charge of defending the collective rights of various classes of people through civil suits. For instance, they may defend communities affected by environmental harm, users of sub-par public services (health, education, water, sanitation, transportation, etc.), taxpayers (by prosecuting alleged cases of corruption), and customers supposedly wronged by corporations. When performing this function, prosecutors can subpoena documents without a court order (through *"inquérito civil"*), settle cases as they see fit (through *"Termo de Ajuste de Conduta"*—TAC), and initiate public interest litigation *("Ação Civil Pública")*. These include all those routine criminal cases (such as extortion, assault, robbery, embezzlement, kidnapping, homicide, etc.) that can be reduced to a bipolar (two opposing parties),

4. See Coslovsky (2007) for discussion of the several prosecutorial styles.

5. We recognize that these terms, public interest lawyer, cause lawyer, or class-action lawyer have their origins in the US and American sociolegal scholarship. They refer to professional legal practices that self-consciously serve not a single, paying client, but as the Brazilian term, *tutela collectiva,* suggests, a collective set of interests and persons.

retrospective (facts have already taken place), or self-contained (decision applies to litigants only) transactional structure.

But prosecutors also confront civil cases whose structure can be much more complicated to establish, i.e. those in which the infraction has not taken place yet and it is not clear who is to blame, what are the proper remedies, who should contribute to the solution, and whether stringent enforcement is advisable at all.

Consider the following examples:

(1) In the municipality of Santo Antonio de Padua, located in the poorest region of Rio de Janeiro state, there is a cluster of small firms that produce low-value granite tiles that are sold in the domestic market. These firms employ thousands of people. Cutting the tiles generates a large quantity of stone powder that is illegally dumped into local rivers, killing wildlife and rendering the water unusable to downstream farmers. The firms are often established too close to the river margins, also not permitted by Brazilian law.

(2) In the municipality of Franca there is a large cluster of footwear producing firms that employ a similarly large number of people, but many are self-employed who work from home, so they receive none of the legal protections mandated by Brazilian labor law (such as insurance, sick days, paid vacation, retirement funds, etc.).

(3) Throughout the Brazilian south, thousands of small peasants engage in pig farming, with the full support of a few large firms ("integrators") that eventually buy, slaughter, and process the livestock and then export the meat. However, farmers dump the pig feces and other noxious effluents into local rivers contaminating the underground water supply of neighboring cities.

(4) Throughout the Brazilian northeast, shrimp farmers of all sizes create a lively labor market in an economically depressed region. However, many of these farms are established on top of mangroves, which are being destroyed in the process. The mangroves are publicly-owned, legally protected areas that support essential environmental rehabilitation as well as essential resources, fuel and food, to many impoverished coastal communities.

(5) Sugarcane farms throughout Brazil feed the sugar and ethanol industries, which have fed Brazil's booming economy. However, this economic dynamism comes with a substantial cost to

the environment and human labor. First, the crushing of sugarcane generates a toxic by-product *("vinhoto")* that can contaminate the soil and water sources. Second, sugarcane fields must be harvested within days (or even hours) of the crop peaking, so farmers bring in large number of laborers from poor regions in Brazil. These laborers are often overworked (some even die of exhaustion) and rarely get the protections mandated by Brazilian labor law. Third, manual harvesting requires that the fields be burned; this action pollutes the air and covers nearby cities with soot.

(6) In Carajas, the eastern part of the Brazilian Amazon, perhaps thousands of small, informal, and highly mobile firms dedicate themselves to producing charcoal, which is sold in vast quantities to pig-iron mills in the same region. To make pig-iron, which is a predecessor to steel, one needs to process iron-ore together with some source of carbon. A large proportion of this charcoal is made by severely abused workers (including debt servitude and child labor) engaged in illegal deforestation.

Faced with any of these cases, what is a prosecutor to do? One option is to vigorously enforce the law, but this course of action is likely to create economic hardship and social unrest. Moreover, to turn the coercive power of the state against small firms and the poor is not attractive to the average prosecutor. Another option is to ignore the situation, let things stay as they are, but this would be dereliction of duty, so no self-respecting prosecutor admits to following this second option. Thus, many prosecutors experience themselves caught between these two extremes and, as a consequence, adopt a "business as usual" approach, that is, they confront the problem with paperwork. They start a legal case, investigate and then investigate some more; they sue some people or other government agencies and let the situation follow its course, hoping that either the problem will solve itself or that the prosecutor will be transferred to another post before a scandal erupts. Nonetheless, Coslovsky (2007) identified notable exceptions to this common pattern. Some prosecutors disengage from business as usual and eventually succeed in engineering an appropriate solution to these complicated problems. Consider the following example.

It is fairly common throughout the Brazilian coast (and throughout the developing world) that low income people in search of adequate housing forcibly occupy protected (and often public) areas

(de Sousa Santos, 1992, 1995). From the prosecutors' perspective, the problems with squatter settlements are manifold. First, many of these areas had been put aside because they fulfill important environmental functions (for instance, the occupation of watersheds and reservoirs may threaten the water supply of millions of people). Second, some tracts of land are hazardous to occupants themselves (for instance, certain zones may be prone to flooding, contaminated by industrial residues, or too close to highways or pipelines). Third, the economic and political entrepreneurs who are behind these settlements do not provide basic services to occupants such as water, sewage, electricity, drainage, or proper internal roads, as required by law. Finally, these neighborhoods are not part of formal city plans and thus are not served with public transportation, health or education services.

To make matters worse, once a small group of dwellers gets established in an area, the tendency is for the settlement to consolidate and grow. First, tough, often illegitimate entrepreneurs reap relatively easy economic and political profits by encouraging the growth of the settlement. Second, people bring friends and relatives. Third, each small victory by the squatters who mobilize to obtain public services and amenities encourages even more people to move in. Beyond a minimal population, it becomes close to impossible and also cruel to forcibly remove the residents.

Many prosecutors, when facing this kind of situation stick to "business as usual", i.e. they request more documents, try to indict some people as responsible for the mess (defendants are hard to find so they are rarely served with legal process papers), and by-and-large they push paper around while the squatter settlement grows and develops ever more permanent roots. Yet, one prosecutor, Jessica Riveiro, handled the problem differently. Her first decision was to have the city encircle the settlement with a fence, to prevent its growth. Needless to say, many dwellers hated the idea, and she ended up facing death threats. Moreover, the city government claimed that it had no money to pay for this kind of intervention.

To understand what happened next, one must realize that Jessica is a prosecutor in an industrial town in which large petrochemical industries have been infringing environmental codes for decades. So, at the same time that she was dealing with squatter settlements, she was also dealing with these pollution cases. More specifically, she was trying to get the petrochemical firms to change

their practices, rehabilitate the environmental damage, and pay for damages that cannot be undone. From past experience she had learned that firms do not like to pay cash for reparations owed. They claim that the money will fuel corruption and eventually disappear in red tape. Instead, firms prefer to pay in kind, so they can publicize the rehabilitative action as an example of the corporation's social responsibility. Knowing these preferred practices, Jessica located a petrochemical defendant and offered to settle the pollution case against the firm: she would drop the charges if the firm agreed to provide the city with hundreds of yards of sturdy chain-link fence.

The squatters were very unhappy with Jessica's plan, and she knew that they could easily knock the fence down overnight. She also knew that water supply in that region was unreliable, particularly during hot summer months. She offered the settlement residents a deal: agree to the installation of the fence, and even care for it, in exchange for improved water services. The community agreed. Now she had to bring the water agency in. Eventually, the water agency agreed to extend an existing water line while improving services in that region, but they did not have enough money to pay for the full project. The mayor demonstrated an interest in providing laborers and tractors to dig the ditches, but Jessica rejected the offer—in fact, she "forbade" the mayor from doing it. She wanted dwellers themselves to work on this construction. Many are recent immigrants without any attachment to the locale, and she wanted to raise their sense of ownership. Eventually, the entire project succeeded.

In a similar case of a squatter settlement in an environmentally protected area, Jessica produced a different solution. In this case she did not suggest containment but rather arranged for the whole community to voluntarily move elsewhere. How did she do it? She learned that a state-level agency had just completed a public housing complex in the vicinity, but that units had not been allotted or occupied as yet. And through her routine professional activities, she had connections with a local judge, as well as officers in the municipal government. She negotiated a settlement with the leaders of the squatters and the city, with the judge acting as the fulcrum. Jessica organized the city to evict the squatters and demolish their shacks and houses, but at the same time, she also arranged for the judge to order that the now-homeless people be immediately transferred to the new housing complex. The only entity that was

caught by surprise was the state housing agency, which had its own list of candidates for the newly built units, but all the others were very satisfied with the result.

C. Becoming a Sociological Citizen

When the CEO of Durable Products[6] suddenly retired, a firm-wide business process redesign initiative, mid-way to completion, was shelved. A year earlier, a group of eleven employees—including a marketing manager, a production supervisor, and a sales representative—had been pulled from their jobs to work full time on a redesign of the company's order acquisition project. These employees had never before participated in an organizational change project and had no previous exposure to business process redesign.[7] Their assignment began with a jolt. They gave up their offices and reports and relocated to a large conference room. They learned the work involved in generating and securing orders including the inefficiencies, communication gaps, and blind spots of the existing procedures. Attending educational seminars, visiting other organizations, and working with a coach from within the firm, they learned how to reorganize work according to the idea of "process". Over the year, the members of the team went from reluctant, skeptical participants in the project to skilled organizational architects, articulate spokespersons, and committed supporters of fundamental change in the firm. When the project was cancelled and the members were asked to return to their original jobs, most of them found they could not—not only at Durable Products but at any company. The experience had changed them. Most of the team left the company within a year, moving to jobs, some with competitors, where they would have the opportunity to continue redesigning organizational processes.

Viewed from the perspective of organizational change and firm profitability, this is an example of failure. The organization pursued a significant initiative but was unable to sustain the effort to achieve the original goal. Nonetheless, the Durable Products case generated an interesting, unanticipated side effect (Merton, 1936). Actors

6. Durable Products is a pseudonym for a large manufacturer located in the United States.

7. Business Process Redesign is a concept for organizational design and operation popularized in the early 1990s.

embedded in a mature organization emerged from the failed project with the motivation, the potential, and the resources to transform the work practices of other organizations. The home organization did not change but the redesign team members did. Working on organizational redesign, the project team members experienced a perceptual and moral transformation in which they were able to see the organization as a whole entity, as a means rather than an end in itself, and as a product of human collaboration. They became, in the terms we are using in this paper, sociological citizens.

Process redesign is a term used for a number of common strategies of organizational change and revitalization. The underlying concept is simple. Following the classical Weberian notion of efficient rational organization, most firms manage employees'work, knowledge, and information in functional hierarchies, e.g. marketing, sales, human resources, manufacturing. Organizational redesigners argue, however, that functions do not produce the goods and services that customers purchase. The production of goods and delivery of services, from beginning to end, cuts across the organization of bureaucratic functions. Functional boundaries are often problematic, preventing circulation of information and skill, encouraging inward looking fiefdoms, decreasing responsiveness to customer needs. By emphasizing the need to connect production across functional hierarchies—to map the processes of production—to improve products and services, process redesigners create the conditions for generating an apprehension and appreciation of the relational interdependence that is, or constitutes, the firm. Importantly, however, not all redesign projects succeed in changing the firm. Indeed, as our story of Durable Products was meant to suggest, many such initiatives fail. Nonetheless, even when the project fails to change the way work is organized in the firm, participation in the redesign process often, but not always, has significant although unintended and unanticipated effects on the participants. Organizational change fails, personal transformation succeeds.

Huising (2007) studied 57 persons participating in organizational change projects on seven teams at five firms; thirty-four team members described themselves as being transformed by the project. These 34 participants shared three experiences during the team project that were not shared by the remaining 23 persons.

First, they experience a disruption from organizational roles and locations. They leave their offices and are then sequestered in a spe-

cial room for the team, asked to engage in work with which they are totally unfamiliar. The work is slow, iterative, with an uncertain goal. The project team has no idea what they are doing or why; thus, they cannot assess the progress. Without the familiar routines, with a different organization of time, located in a different place, without a staff to supervise, the team members are adrift.

"In almost any other position he could have given me I think I would have been able, after 26 years (tenure), to hit the ground running or at least walking pretty fast. This particular role, I looked at it and said, well what do we do tomorrow? I really didn't know. Twenty-six years of going up in an organization, learning, accumulating experience, and then all of a sudden someone goes okay you are over here now and it's a new world."

Although this happens to many team members, only some become deeply immersed in the project. Immersion in the project offers new intellectual, personal and professional resources. Team members become acquainted with and eventually connected to others in a new occupational community. They do not begin with a view of where they are going, indeed they are usually ignorant of other ways of doing business or arranging the firm's work. Membership on the project team becomes a source of reeducation, where the participants are introduced to the history, rhetoric, metaphors, and stories of organizational redesign, but also with the history, rhetoric and texts of rational management but now from a critical perspective. This does not happen all at once, nor as we have said, always. Similarly, the disruption from ordinary work also does not happen always or all at once. Team members go to conferences, visit other firms, collect literature, read and discuss alternative organizational designs. As team members spend more and more time on the project, less and less time—and sometimes none at all—on their usual work, they learn that there is a large and thriving community that is reorganizing firms through the idea of process rather than function. As they meet people doing this work in other firms, the idea of redesign becomes real rather than theoretical. They begin to realize the potential not only for the organization to change but for their own careers.

"You could make a career, like Jane (an individual at another company), of going around and applying this across different pieces of the business."

Third, and most important, the team develops a map—a physical representation or diarama—of the organization: who does what,

who hands off work to whom, what offices need to check in on a client's order, where lines of supply and authority begin and end. By constructing a physical representation of the work flows in the organization, the team members develop a vision of the organization as whole rather than from their previously compartmentalized locations or functions.

"Until you have stared into the face of the scope, scale, and complexity of the business... and really got a sense of all of that, I don't think process really makes sense to you, because all you really see is your function. All you really see is this is the spreadsheet of the day, or this is the problem of the moment, or this is the issue of the week."

"If you think about some traditional manufacturing you can see the work... We have 3 000 people in one building that do one thing—move information. And one of the issues with this is that you can't see it... It sits in computers and sits in people's heads and until we got it on the walls and drew it out explicitly we could not see the problems and the disconnects."

Finally, the team members who experience dislocation, immersion in a new community, and see the organization as a system or entity begin to describe the organization as a means rather than an end itself, as a human construction made by their own activities.

"So what are we doing? We are really filling customer orders; however we have it broken down into smaller pieces and we give each one of those pieces to someone we are calling a department manager. These structures (departments) that we put in place some time in the past have become real in peoples' minds and we think there is a difference between someone who works in department A and someone who works in department B."

"The very first week I was here I had to expedite an order. I told them I needed to take it to the customer now. They said, 'well, you can't.' I said, 'why can't I?' They said, 'well, we're implementing this new computer system and you don't have the packing document or something.' I said, 'well, let me explain it to you this way. I can and here's how I'm going to and here's what I'll do later to try to make you feel better about your paper work, but no, I can.' These guys just stood there with their mouths open. I told them, 'I'll come back and I'll apologize later for being abrupt but I've got to go.' And they're like, 'you can't take that part.' I came back and I explained to them later why I did what I did. I say, we can do anything we want. We made it up. We'll make it up some more... can't is just a state of mind."

Everyday life is experienced, most often, as patterned, relatively fixed, and predictably obdurate, just the way things are. Of course, the way things are changes over time, slowly, but so slo-

wly that we often do not notice, or we forget or overlook the changes that have taken place. Through these project experiences, however, employees come to understand the reified nature of the organization, that it is a crystallization of actions that are continuing, fluid, changing all the time, the product of human action. For sociologists and other social scientists, explaining that organizations and institutions are human constructions is uttering a banal truism. However, for the project team members, the recognition of the organization as socially constructed was a revelation, a transformative experience, cognitively liberating. Realizing that the organizations around us are our own construction suggests the potential to reconstruct and rearrange the organization in fundamental ways and thus provides a basis to challenge the status quo. Thus, through organizational redesign projects, organizationally embedded actors develop a sociological imagination becoming through this process sociological citizens.

Discussion

Consider the sequence in which we presented these three examples. First, in the case of Brian Jones, we offer the example of a single employee who performs his responsibilities in ways that distinguish him from his colleagues and supervisors. He takes on work beyond the narrow boundaries of his role; he appropriates ideas, materials, and the detritus he finds around him to respond to requests for help. He works by trial and error rather than following rituals and recipes; he challenges the professional jurisdictions his colleagues ritually police. He acts as a mobile facilitator among the various constituencies in the university—research scientists, students, administrators, and his formal colleagues in environmental, health and safety services. Because it is a university with a strong culture of collaborative decision-making, the hierarchical privileges and constraints that often impede individual initiative are muted. The loose-coupling of the system enables the individual to perform his role differently, but the story offers little explanation as to how he came to work this particular way. We can show how Brian Jones is different but not why he is.

In the second example, Brazilian Attorney Generals also function as mobile, ambidextrous problem solvers, simultaneously facilitating environmental protection, social welfare, and economic

development while investigating charges of illegal action. During their investigations, some Attorney Generals discover the complex web of economic and social conditions that generate the problem that gives rise to the illegalities (e.g. squatters without housing, water or sanitation who poach from others) and the economic and legal constraints that impede easy solutions. They experience the interconnected, nested relations that constitute the social problem. Because the Attorney Generals have been charged with the obligation to both enforce the law and *"to defend society and democratic values"*, they can justify addressing underlying problems rather than focusing solely on the precipitant illegal behavior that invited their attention. Because they are organizationally insulated from politics, they can mobilize resources from diverse constituencies. Unlike Brian Jones, however, they form a community of professionals with a collective mandate and thus can share information, experience, and tactics across cases to build both local and more general solutions. This difference between Brian Jones and the Brazilian Attorney Generals suggests the beginning of an explanation for why some actors become sociological citizens: participation in a process that offers diverse perspectives on the same situation and a network of others with whom this kaleidoscopic perspective is shared and developed.

The third example, the process redesign teams, provides an illustration of how such currently unconventional practices may be more systematically produced and thus provides hints of the specific conditions for developing sociological citizenship. Although process design teams often do not produce fundamental change within the firm, the experience of dedicated 'deconstruction' of the organization sometimes produces persons who can no longer see the organization as they previously did: as a necessary, impenetrable, naturalized object. Rather, the firm is now understood as the outcome of human decisions, indecisions, trial and error, and just plain "muddling through" (Lindblom, 1959). Although this third example suggests the conditions, only partially hinted at in the first two examples, under which the sociological citizen may be more likely to emerge, our interest in this paper lies primarily in identifying the phenomenon rather than elaborating a causal model. Our three examples suggest, very gently, that the phenomenon we observe should be differentially prevalent and performed under different conditions, conditions that would vary by the degree of self-conscious reflection on the organization of work and role perfor-

mances. This is, as is the conception of the sociological citizen itself, a hypothesis for future research.

In sum, we suggest that (1) the sociological citizen apprehends the relational interdependence that constitutes his lifeworld, and (2) uses this systemic perspective to meet occupational and professional obligations. Apprehending what seems like inescapable, inevitable interconnectedness, the sociological citizen realizes that whatever the current configuration of that world, it is the outcome of human actions, connections, links among persons and things. As a consequence, sociological citizens experience a sense of freedom to try things, experiment, intervene in organizations and arrangements where others would hesitate. They do not ask for permission to do the things they do. They are enabled by the awareness of human capacity as they may be simultaneously appreciating the constraints (on themselves and others) of the web of embedded relationships. The common bureaucratic structures that enable work to be coordinated across vast numbers of persons, and distances of space and time nonetheless often blunt our interpretive and rational capacities, what Garfinkel (1964) called our ethnomethodological intuitions, so that these native understandings have to be either liberated or relearned. Where others fail to act, the sociological citizen is enabled and endowed by that web of constraining associations, which provide the material and symbolic resources for intervention and reconstruction. In other words, by recognizing one's location in an extended network of associations (Latour, 2005), a sociological citizen has an extended, rather than constricted, set of opportunities (resources, schemas, persons) with which to fashion solutions to local problems (Burt, 2004; Granovetter, 1973).

Forgoing for this paper further analysis of the phenomenon, what questions or additional inquiries do these observations provoke? Is this a common or rare phenomenon, and as such what significance might we attach to this phenomenon? These examples arose in the course of unconnected research projects, whose questions and theories derived from different disciplines and professional fields (e.g. management and organizational change, legal regulation of science, labor regulation, civil law enforcement). As such, we cannot make any assessments of the prevalence or distribution of the phenomena. We would require a more systematic sampling of situations to identify the conditions, which generate or produce the sociological citizen.

Is this an emergent empirical phenomenon, something unobserved in the history of sociology, or simply old wine in new bottles? Certainly, we can find descriptions in the literature about professional practices that describe more substantive, less instrumental conceptions of role and self. For the most part, these are normative, aspirational, and inspirational models of professional practice rather than empirical accounts (Schon, 1983; Fried, 1976). In the essays collected posthumously as *Professional Ethics and Civic Morals,* Durkheim (1957, 23-4) did, however, suggest that where we find "individuals who share the same ideas and interests, sentiments and occupations, in which the rest of the population have no part... [where] they feel a mutual attraction, they seek out one another, they enter into relations with one another and form compacts and so, by degrees, become a limited group with recognizable features". It is impossible for them "to live together and have constant dealings without getting a sense of this whole which they create by close association; they cannot help but adhere to this whole, be taken up with it and reckon it to their conduct". Durkheim claims that professional associations can serve as an important source of moral order based specifically upon this ability to apprehend the whole of which the association and its members are a part. Although he elaborates how intermediary organizational forms are important sources of group morality, the workers, managers and attorney generals we describe are acting in ways inconsistent with what has developed as the common morality of their work groups and professions. These may be, however, indicators of newly emergent, perhaps reformist, professional ethics and civic morals. Indeed, we surmise that this is exactly what they are.

Certainly, we can also find examples of trial and error problem solving, bricolage, and satisficing within organizational constraints in the literature on various occupations and workplaces, including management, law enforcement, and lawyering (Bittner, 1967; Skolnick, 1967; Van Maanen, 1974; Silbey, 1980-1981; Lipsky, 1980; Carlile, 2002, 2005). More often than not, however, these descriptions were read as variations from a normative ideal of efficient or rule governed organization, illustrating how the implementation of public policies, bureaucracies, or work organizations display less rigid divisions of labor and unwavering hierarchical control than programmatic or didactic readings of classical sociological theory might suggest (Blau, 1956, 1963; Crozier, 1964). Although the

richly textured empirical accounts provided alternative models of action, they were too often interpreted as deviations from expected, or desired, normative practice.

Recent sociological theorizing and modes of inquiry encourage us to rethink some of the assumptions and conventions that animated research over the twentieth century. These new paradigms and modes of inquiry offer, each in its own way, a less reductionist, less partial, less mechanistic, less idealistic and normative understanding of social action and its aggregation. Whether one deploys varieties of network analysis or actor network theory, engages in cultural analysis, or adopts an institutionalist (Selznick, 1949, 1969) or neo-institutionalist approach (each of which are importantly different), what matters is the effort to get beyond the conceptions of compartmentalized social action by depicting the relational interdependence that had been elided in the earlier 19th and 20th century efforts to produce reliable and valid depictions of "social facts as things". Across these perspectives or analytical tools, the research shows how relatively stable social practices and institutions, from legality (Ewick and Silbey, 1998), scientific authority (Latour, 1987; Knorr-Cetina, 1999; Hilgartner, 2000), research excellence (Lamont, 2008), or love (Swidler, 2001) are produced through discrete, often contradictory, sometimes fleeting transactions and events. From these newer perspectives, what had been deviations from expected models can be reinterpreted as normal, everyday routines that demand explanation, and perhaps even normative legitimacy by virtue of their persistence and ubiquity.

Perhaps in our twentieth century efforts to "*consider* social facts as things", we deluded ourselves into thinking that social facts *are* things; we reified our own inventions and thus were captured by our particular golem (Collins and Pinch, 1998). Perhaps by identifying the sociological citizen as a recognizable form of action, we begin to remedy the limitations of our own professional practices. As social scientists, we often talk about social life in terms that first abstract and then synthesize particular aspects of the myriad activities of life. This is part of our method, after all. We then give a name, e.g. role, status, family, motherhood, law, to these abstractions as if the named phenomena existed independently from the living embodied persons doing, talking, interacting with others and with things. Through our language we suggest independence, homogeneity and generality where upon

closer examination we observe concatenation, heterogeneity and variation. The recent innovations in social theory and research methods focus on the links and associations, the shared, contested and exchanged schemas and cultural repertoires, the non-instrumental as well as programmed aspects of economic and rational organizations. Yes, it is old wine in new bottles because the old bottles failed to make room for what became defined as excess, detritus, or more often, the unexplained variation from the central tendency. The task of many contemporary sociologists, and anthropologists, is to trace the variations in the enactment of what has, in the past, too quickly been excised in our efforts to build general models of action, culture, and society. Providing richly detailed accounts of human action, or complex models of transactions, scholars try to show how "it is through the flow of behavior—or more precisely, social action—that cultural forms [such as law, legality, love, science, production, or management] find articulation" (Geertz, 1973, 17).

If sociologists have finally understood that law enforcement, productive work, and environmental management are produced through a network of relationships among persons and things, including symbolic and normative commitments as well as non-rational and habitual action, should we be surprised that ordinary citizens also make the same observations? While professional sociologists may spend their lives constructing accounts of social processes, they are not alone in "doing sociology". Garfinkel described "the actual methods whereby members of a society doing sociology, lay or professional, make the social structures of everyday activities observable" (Garfinkel, 1964, 250). As we go about our daily lives, we operate on the basis of understandings of how and why people behave as they do, and of how and why things happen. We are constantly testing and revising our practical theories against our observations and experiences, even as we interpret those observed events and experiences in the context of our theories. Garfinkel noted the critical role of such practical theories in generating human connections and exchanges, as well as opportunities for change or resistance. Why shouldn't ordinary citizens make the connections between biography and history, especially if they are not blinded by sociological theories of social forces or conceptions of "social facts as things". If contemporary societies are reflective projects continuously worked and reflected upon (Giddens, 1991), it should not be surprising, and we might expect as societies

become much more reflexive and habituated to our electronic and informational connections, to find increasing cadres of sociological citizens distributed across workplaces, law enforcement agencies, and nations.

Susan SILBEY
Leon and Anne Goldberg Professor of Humanities,
Professor of Sociology and Anthropology at MIT,
ssilbey@mit.edu

Ruthanne HUISING
Assistant Professor in the Desautels Faculty
of Management at McGill University
ruthanne.huising@mcgill.ca

Salo Vinocur COSLOVSKY
Degree in Public Management
from Fundacao Getulio Vargas (Brazil) and PhD candidate
at the Department of Urban Studies and Planning at MIT
salo@mit.edu

RÉFÉRENCES BIBLIOGRAPHIQUES

Bittner E., 1967, "The police on skid row: A study in peacekeeping", *American Sociological Review,* Vol. 32, 600-615.

Blau P., 1956, *Bureaucracy in Modern Society,* New York, Random House.

— 1963, *Dynamics of Bureaucracy,* Chicago, University of Chicago Press.

Burt R. S., 2004, "Structural holes and good ideas", *American Journal of Sociology,* Vol. 110, n° 2, September 2005, 349-399.

Carlile P., 2002, "A pragmatic view of knowledge and boundaries: Boundary objects in new product development", *Organization Science,* vol. 13, n° 4, 442-455.

Carlile P., Carten O., 2005, "Relations in practice: Sorting through practice theories on knowledge sharing in complex organizations", *The Information Society,* vol. 21, n° 2, 91-107.

Choi J. N., 2007, "Change-oriented organizational citizenship behavior: Effects of work environment characteristics and intervening psychological processes", *Journal of Organizational Behavior,* vol. 28, n° 4, 467-484.

Cohen M. D., March J. G., Olsen J. P., 1988, "A garbage can model of organizational choice", *in* J. G. March (ed.), *Decisions and Organizations,* London, Basil Blackwell.

Collins H., Pinch T., 1998, *The Golem: What you should know about Science,* Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

Coslovsky S. V., 2007, "How public prosecutors get to be cause lawyers: The transformation of the Brazilian ministério público", paper presented at the Law & Society Annual Meeting, Berlin.

Crozier M., 1964, *The Bureaucratic Phenomenon,* Chicago, University of Chicago Press.

Damanpour F., 1991, "Organizational innovation: A meta-analysis of effects of determinants and moderators", *The Academy of Management Journal,* vol. 34, n° 3, 555-590.

Durkheim E., 1957, *Professional Ethics and Civic Morals,* trans. by Cornelia Brookfield, London, Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Durkheim E., 1982, *The Rules of Sociological Method and Selected Texts on Sociology and its Method* (Steven Lukes, ed.), New York, Free Press.

Ewick P., Silbey S., 1998, *The Common Place of Law: Stories From Everyday Life,* Chicago, University of Chicago Press.

— 2003, « Narrati Social Structure : Stories of Resistance to legal Authority », American Journal of Sociology, vol. 108, 1328-1372.

Fried Ch., 1976, "The lawyer as friend: The moral foundations of the lawyer-client relationship", *Yale Law Journal,* Vol. 85, 1060-1089.

Fuller J. B., Marler L. E., Hester K., 2006, "Promoting felt responsibility for constructive change and proactive behavior: Exploring aspects of an elaborated model of work design", *Journal of Organizational Behavior,* vol. 27, n° 8, 1089-1120.

Garfinkel H., 1964, "Studies of the routine grounds of everyday activities", *Social Problems,* vol. 11, 225-250.

Geertz C., 1973, "Thick description: Toward an interpretive theory of culture", in *Interpretation of Cultures,* New York, Basic Books, 3-30.

Giddens A., 1991, *Modernity and Self-Identity: Self and Society in the Late Modern Age,* Palo Alto, Stanford University Press.

Goffman E., 1959, *Presentation of Self in Everyday Life,* New York, Anchor Books.

— 1967, *Interaction Rituals,* New York, Pantheon Books.

Granovetter M. S., 1973, "The strength of weak ties", *American Journal of Sociology,* Vol. 78, 1360-1380.

Haines F., Gurney D., 2003, "The shadows of the law: Contemporary approaches to regulation and the problem of regulatory conflict", *Law & Policy,* Vol. 25, n° 4, 353-380.

Hilgartner S., 2000, *Science on Stage,* Palo Alto, Stanford University Press.

Howell J. M., Higgins C. A., 1990, "Champions of technological innovation", *Administrative Science Quarterly,* vol. 35, n° 2, 317-341.

Huising R., 2007, *Working There: Managing Representations and Maintaining Autonomy through Local Presence,* Cambridge, MIT Sloan School of Management.

Knorr-Cetina K., 1999, *Epistemic Cultures,* Cambridge, Harvard University Press.

Krackhardt D., 1990, "Assessing the political landscape: Structure, cognition, and power in organizations", *Administrative Science Quarterly,* vol. 35, n° 2, 342-369.

Latour B., 1987, *Science in Action,* Cambridge, Harvard University Press.

— 2005, *Reassembling the Social,* New York, Oxford University Press.

Lindblom Ch., 1959, "The science of muddling through", *Public Administration Review,* Vol. 19, 79-88.

Lipsky M., 1980, *Street Level Bureaucracy: Dilemmas of the Individual in Public Service,* New York, Russell Sage Foundation.

Merton R. K., 1936, "Unanticipated consequences of purposive social action", *American Sociological Review,* Vol. 1, Issue 6, 894-904.

Mills C. W., 1959, "The sociological imagination", New York, Oxford University Press.

Ohly S., Sonnentag S., Pluntke F., 2006, "Routinization, work characteristics and their relationships with creative and proactive behaviors", *Journal of Organizational Behavior, vol.* 27, n° 3, 257-279.

Sarat A., Scheingold S., 1998, *Cause Lawyering: Political Commitments and Professional Responsibilities,* New York, Oxford University Press.

Schon D. A., 1983, *The Reflective Practitioner: How Professionals Think in Action,* London, Temple Smith.

Scott S. G., Bruce R. A., 1994, "Determinants of innovative behavior: A path model of individual innovation in the workplace", *The Academy of Management Journal,* vol. 37, n° 3, 580.

Selznick P., 1949 (1984), *TVA and the Grass Roots,* Berkeley, University of California Press.

— 1969 (1980), *Law, Society and Industrial Justice,* New Brunswick (NJ), Transaction Books edition.

Silbey S S., 1980-1981, "Case processing in an Attorney general's office", *Law & Society Review,* Vol. 15, n° 3-4, 849-910.

Skolnick J., 1967, *Justice Without Trial,* New York, John Wiley.

De Sousa Santos B., 1992, "Law, state and urban struggle in Recife, Brazil", *Social and Legal Studies,* Vol. 1, 235-255.

— 1995, *Toward a New Common Sense: Law, Science and Politics in the Paradigmatic Transition,* London, Routledge.

Swidler A., 2001, *Talk of Love,* Chicago, University of Chicago Press.

Van Maanen J., 1974, "Working the street: A developmental view of police behavior", *in* H. Jacob (ed.), *The Potential for Reform of Criminal Justice,* Beverly Hills, Calif., Sage, 83-129.