

## The Sociology of Disruption, Disaster and Social Change

In the wake of disruption and disaster, cooperation among members of a collective is refocused on matters of status, membership and the formation of coalitions. In an important contribution to sociological theory, Hendrik Vollmer emphasizes the processes through which disruptions not only affect, but also transform social order. Drawing on Erving Goffman's understanding of framing and the interaction order, as well as from a range of insights from contemporary sociological theory and ethnographic, historical and organizational research, Vollmer addresses the dynamics of disaster and disaster response within the framework of a general theory of disruption and social order. It is proposed that the adjustment of cooperation in favour of coalitionforming strategies is robust in both informal and organized social settings and transcends the 'micro' and 'macro' approaches currently favoured by theorists. Offering a systematic sociological analysis of the impact of disruptiveness, this book investigates how punctuated cooperation precipitates social change.

HENDRIK VOLLMER is Senior Lecturer in Sociology at Bielefeld University. He is Managing Editor of *Zeitschrift für Soziologie*, one of Europe's leading sociological journals, and the author of numerous articles on sociological and organizational theory.





# The Sociology of Disruption, Disaster and Social Change

Punctuated Cooperation

Hendrik Vollmer





> CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS Cambridge, New York, Melbourne, Madrid, Cape Town, Singapore, São Paulo, Delhi, Mexico City

Cambridge University Press The Edinburgh Building, Cambridge CB2 8RU, UK

Published in the United States of America by Cambridge University Press, New York

www.cambridge.org Information on this title: www.cambridge.org/9781107032149

#### © Hendrik Vollmer 2013

This publication is in copyright. Subject to statutory exception and to the provisions of relevant collective licensing agreements, no reproduction of any part may take place without the written permission of Cambridge University Press.

First published 2013

Printed and bound in the United Kingdom by the MPG Books Group

A catalogue record for this publication is available from the British Library

Library of Congress Cataloguing in Publication data
Vollmer, Hendrik, 1972—
The sociology of disruption, disaster and social change: punctuated cooperation / Hendrik Vollmer.
pages cm
Includes bibliographical references and index.

ISBN 978-1-107-03214-9 (hardback) 1. Social change. 2. Disasters – Social aspects. I. Title. HM831.V65 2013 303.4 – dc23 2012050473

ISBN 978-1-107-03214-9 Hardback

Cambridge University Press has no responsibility for the persistence or accuracy of URLs for external or third-party internet websites referred to in this publication, and does not guarantee that any content on such websites is, or will remain, accurate or appropriate.



## Contents

	List	t of figures and tables	page vii
		face and acknowledgments	ix
		G	1
1	Confronting disruptions: the nexus of social situations		
	1.1	Events and experts	4
	1.2	Social scientists facing disruptions	7
		Crises and catastrophes	9
		Punctuated equilibrium	12
		Rules and exceptions	15
		Tracing trauma	18
		The nexus of social situations	21
		Framing disruptions	24
	1.9	Conclusion	26
2	Fra	ming situations, responding to disruptions	28
	2.1	The framing concept	29
	2.2	Participants	33
		Disruptions	38
	2.4	Responses	43
	2.5	Keys	47
		Signs	50
		Symbols	51
		Resources	52
	2.6	Practical sense and punctuated cooperation	56
	2.7	Framing, strategies and fields	62
	2.8	Conclusion	67
3	The social order of punctuated cooperation		
		Containing participants	71
	3.2		77
		Engrossment	78
		Rekeying	79
		Practical sense and private deliberations	82
		Emergent context	85
		Transcendence	87
	3.3	Endogeneity and selectivity	90
	3.4		95
	3.5	Towards change in strategies and fields	102
	3.6	Conclusion	106

v



#### vi Contents

4	Organizational stress, failure and succession			
	4.1	Formally organized cooperation	108	
		Formal expectations	109	
		Keys	113	
		Upkeying and downkeying	118	
	4.2	Upkeying and downkeying organizational stress	120	
		Organizational stress and emergent order	123	
		Threat-rigidity effects	125	
		Rekeying punctuated cooperation	126	
	4.3	'Nothing succeeds like succession'	129	
		Socializing newcomers	130	
		Enter: the successor	132	
		Elementary contingencies	134	
		Keys and coalitions	136	
		The struggle for social capital	138	
	4.4	Framing organizational failure	139	
	4.5	The high-reliability challenge	145	
	4.6	Conspicuous associations	151	
	4.7	Implications for organizational theory	155	
	4.8	Conclusion	159	
5	Violence and warfare			
	5.1	Violent engagements	163	
	5.2	The cohesion and disintegration of military units	169	
	5.3	Hitler's army	174	
	5.4	The multiple normalizations of warfare	179	
	5.5	Redistribution, domination and contention	186	
		Totalizing warfare	187	
		Resistance and revolution	190	
		Contingent dynamics of centralization	192	
	5.6	Associating and stratifying across situations	195	
	5.7	Conclusion	202	
6	Elaborating the theory			
	6.1	Tracing disruptiveness	206	
	6.2	Theorizing change in strategies	213	
	6.3	Successful strategies	217	
	6.4	Punctuated equilibrium and the successes of succession	224	
	6.5	Assembling empirical records	227	
	6.6	Framing the relational	233	
	6.7	Conclusion	235	
	$\mathbf{p}_{\alpha^4}$	owancas	238	
	References Index			
	Ind	ex	269	



## Figures and tables

## **Figures**

<ul><li>6.1 Varieties of disruptiveness</li><li>6.2 Tracing disruptiveness</li><li>6.3 Disruptiveness and beyond</li></ul>	page 207 209 210
Tables	
2.1 Expectations and keys	55
4.1 Formal laminations	115
6.1 Expectations, keys and focus of strategies	216





## Preface and acknowledgments

My engagement with the topic of this investigation began with an intuition which, at that time, appeared to be simple enough: in responding to disruptive events, people award special attention to what other people do. When you do not know what you are facing, when you are uncertain about what to do and what to expect to happen next, following the lead given by others appears to be an almost natural and also somewhat reasonable response. I began to look for sociological intelligence supporting, specifying or, possibly, refuting this intuition.

In an initial collection of empirical material, I was primarily looking at organizations in critical situations, and, more particularly, at military organizations on battlefields, thinking that my general interest in the impact of disruptiveness could most effectively be pursued through an investigation of collectives at war. I was struck early on by how personal relationships among members of the organizations I was studying unequivocally appeared to win precedence over more formal aspects of organizational structures and processes. There appeared to be something structural about this kind of change, as organizations confronting disruptions became aggregations of primary groups, coalitions and networks, working much less like bureaucracies governed through formal rules and regulations. Members seemed to effectively redistribute their attention under disruptive circumstances, withdrawing attention from formal regulations, norms or roles and reinvesting attention into one another. This pattern promised to account for a good amount of the empirical findings. Accordingly, I was hopeful to translate, on this basis, my initial intuition about people's responses to disruptiveness into a more systematic socio-

The present work is the result of a sustained effort to bring about this translation and to accommodate a good deal of empirical intelligence available in prior sociological research about how collectives respond to disruptiveness. I found a wealth of interesting case studies and a multitude of conceptual leads, but ultimately no prior account would have allowed me to trace the effects of disruptiveness from people's

ix



## x Preface and acknowledgments

temporary responses and adjustments to mid- to long-term collective outcomes without an extensive use of theoretical extrapolation. As a consequence, what started out as an attempt to utilize an apparent convergence of observations in order to develop some seemingly obvious conceptual and empirical extensions quickly turned into a wrestling match with various theoretical concepts and approaches, none of which seemed by its own devices to do justice to the topic, to my initial intuition or to the empirical data which I confronted. Most importantly, I seemed utterly unable to systematically relate the individual and structural aspects of how collectives respond to disruptions and to articulate both kinds of aspects within a single sociological framework. As I was struggling with tentative solutions and with various packagings of theoretical and empirical narrative, trying to stick as much as possible to the exploratory style of discussing empirical cases which I had originally envisaged for the project, the result was more and more turning into an exposition of theory. Through all my efforts to address 'bigger' collective outcomes, this theory remained surprisingly 'micro', whether I was exploring single social situations, organizations or collectives in a state of war. Despite an academic training to the contrary, I became stuck with a sociology of disruption, disaster and social change that addresses both the small and big collective outcomes of exposure to disruptiveness in largely microsociological terms. I had not anticipated this and it took me a while to accept it.

Finalizing this text for publication, I have gained some confidence that the kind of sociology which the study has to offer improves on what, to me, has remained a very suggestive but disconcertingly dispersed set of sociological evidence, a scattering of diverse ideas and findings. The run of the project has played havoc with a good share of my academic socialization but it has, somewhat ironically, left my initial intuition intact. Any progress I now feel confident to claim depends on whether the study more robustly spells out the implications of the initial sociological intuition, whether it appropriately qualifies the convergence of empirical indications and, ultimately, on whether it renders the sociological intuition and the systematic issues associated with it more researchable.

Many people have commented on the project over the years and have provided valuable comments and directions. First and foremost, I would like to thank Jörg Bergmann, Bettina Heintz and Alex Preda for seeing this through as a post-doctoral thesis, my 'Habilitation'. Andrew Abbott, Ruth Ayaß, Klaus Dammann, Wolf Dombrowsky, Jens Greve, Thomas Hoebel, Sven Kette, André Kieserling, Volker Kruse, Stefan Kühl, John Levi Martin, Christian Meyer, Sven Oliver Müller, Klaus Nathaus, Ole Pütz, Rainer Schützeichel, Annette Schnabel, Ulrike Schulz, Veronika



## Preface and acknowledgments

vi

Tacke, Hartmann Tyrell, Harrison C. White and Hendrik Wortmann all provided helpful inputs at various points. I greatly benefited from interaction and engaging discussions among colleagues within the interdisciplinary research group Communicating Disaster located at the ZiF Centre for interdisciplinary research, Bielefeld University, for over twelve months in 2010 and 2011. This research group was organized by Jörg Bergmann, Heike Egner and Volker Wulf. Sarah Hitzler and Marén Schorch contributed immensely to making the group work on a day-to-day basis.

Christof Wehrsig read and discussed with me all parts of the manuscript through various stages of the project, and to him I am particularly thankful.

I would like to dedicate this work to Mars, who was born around the time that I started the project and who died two years before I was able to finish it. I miss him.