

Beckert, Jens

**Working Paper**

## The Great Transformation of Embeddedness: Karl Polanyi and the New Economic Sociology

MPIfG Discussion Paper, No. 07/1

**Provided in Cooperation with:**

Max Planck Institute for the Study of Societies (MPIfG), Cologne

*Suggested Citation:* Beckert, Jens (2007) : The Great Transformation of Embeddedness: Karl Polanyi and the New Economic Sociology, MPIfG Discussion Paper, No. 07/1, Max Planck Institute for the Study of Societies, Cologne

This Version is available at:

<https://hdl.handle.net/10419/19938>

**Standard-Nutzungsbedingungen:**

Die Dokumente auf EconStor dürfen zu eigenen wissenschaftlichen Zwecken und zum Privatgebrauch gespeichert und kopiert werden.

Sie dürfen die Dokumente nicht für öffentliche oder kommerzielle Zwecke vervielfältigen, öffentlich ausstellen, öffentlich zugänglich machen, vertreiben oder anderweitig nutzen.

Sofern die Verfasser die Dokumente unter Open-Content-Lizenzen (insbesondere CC-Lizenzen) zur Verfügung gestellt haben sollten, gelten abweichend von diesen Nutzungsbedingungen die in der dort genannten Lizenz gewährten Nutzungsrechte.

**Terms of use:**

*Documents in EconStor may be saved and copied for your personal and scholarly purposes.*

*You are not to copy documents for public or commercial purposes, to exhibit the documents publicly, to make them publicly available on the internet, or to distribute or otherwise use the documents in public.*

*If the documents have been made available under an Open Content Licence (especially Creative Commons Licences), you may exercise further usage rights as specified in the indicated licence.*

MAX-PLANCK-INSTITUT FÜR GESELLSCHAFTSFORSCHUNG  
MAX PLANCK INSTITUTE FOR THE STUDY OF SOCIETIES



MPIfG Discussion Paper 07/1

**The Great Transformation of Embeddedness**

Karl Polanyi and the New Economic Sociology

Jens Beckert



MPIfG Discussion Paper

Jens Beckett

**The Great Transformation of Embeddedness: Karl Polanyi and the New Economic Sociology**

MPIfG Discussion Paper 07/1  
Max-Planck-Institut für Gesellschaftsforschung Köln  
Max Planck Institute for the Study of Societies Cologne  
January 2007

---

© 2007 by the author(s)

MPIfG Discussion Paper | ISSN 0944-2073

MPIfG Discussion Papers are refereed scholarly papers of the kind that are publishable in a peer-reviewed disciplinary journal. Their objective is to contribute to the cumulative improvement of theoretical knowledge. The papers can be ordered from the institute for a small fee (hard copies) or downloaded free of charge (PDF).

**Downloads**

[www.mpifg.de](http://www.mpifg.de)

Go to *Publications / Discussion Papers*

Max-Planck-Institut für Gesellschaftsforschung  
Max Planck Institute for the Study of Societies  
Paulstr. 3 | 50676 Cologne | Germany

Tel. +49 221 2767-0

Fax +49 221 2767-555

[www.mpifg.de](http://www.mpifg.de)

[info@mpifg.de](mailto:info@mpifg.de)

## Abstract

I argue that in its adaptation from Karl Polanyi's *The Great Transformation*, the concept of embeddedness has itself undergone a great transformation. In the process, significant meanings of the concept have vanished, while others have been added. First I explore the different meanings the concept of embeddedness has achieved in the new economic sociology. Then I argue that it is not the embeddedness of economic action that should constitute the vantage point of economic sociology, but rather three coordination problems that actors face in economic exchange: the valuation of goods, competition and the problem of cooperation deriving from the social risks of exchange. I show that by proceeding from these coordination problems economic sociology, economic anthropology and economic history can find common research questions which allow them to enter into dialogue with each other more systematically. In the next section I focus on the social-reformist inclinations of Polanyi's use of the notion of embeddedness and thereby highlight a challenge posed in *The Great Transformation* that was largely not taken up by economic sociologists. Finally, I discuss limitations for developing a macro theory of the economy that result from making embeddedness the core concept of economic sociology.

## Zusammenfassung

Das Discussion Paper beschreibt, wie das von Karl Polanyi in dem Buch *The Great Transformation* angeführte Konzept der Einbettung in seiner Adaption durch die neue Wirtschaftssoziologie selbst eine „große Transformation“ erfuhr: wichtige Bedeutungen des Konzepts verschwanden, andere kamen hinzu. Zunächst werden die unterschiedlichen Bedeutungen des Konzepts der Einbettung in der neuen Wirtschaftssoziologie untersucht. Weiter wird argumentiert, dass nicht die Einbettung wirtschaftlichen Handelns als solche den Ausgangspunkt der Wirtschaftssoziologie bilden sollte, sondern vielmehr drei Koordinationsprobleme, mit denen Akteure in Tauschhandlungen konfrontiert sind: das Problem des Werts von Gütern, das Problem des Wettbewerbs und das Kooperationsproblem, das aus den sozialen Risiken des Tausches entsteht. Es wird gezeigt, dass die Wirtschaftssoziologie, die Wirtschaftsgeschichte und die Wirtschaftsanthropologie ausgehend von diesen Koordinationsproblemen gemeinsame Forschungsfragen entwickeln können, die einen systematischen Dialog über die Disziplinengrenzen hinaus ermöglichen. In der darauf folgenden Darlegung des sozialreformerischen Anliegens Polanyis in *The Great Transformation* wird ein Aspekt des Werkes aufgezeigt, der von der neuen Wirtschaftssoziologie nicht aufgenommen wurde. Abschließend werden Begrenzungen der Entwicklungen einer soziologischen Makrotheorie der Ökonomie diskutiert, die sich aus der Verwendung des Konzepts der Einbettung als Kernbegriff der Wirtschaftssoziologie ergeben.

**Contents**

1	Introduction	5
2	Embeddedness: The ironies of the career of a concept	7
3	Coordination problems in market exchange as the starting point of economic sociology	10
	Three coordination problems	11
	Combining sociological, historical and anthropological perspectives	15
4	Embeddedness and social reform	16
5	Embeddedness and modernity	18
6	Conclusion	21
	References	22

## 1 Introduction

Over the last 25 years, economic sociology has developed into one of the fastest growing fields of sociology and became an important subfield of sociological scholarship (Smelser/Swedberg 2005; Beckert/Zafirovski 2006). This does not mean that sociologists during the postwar era did not study economic phenomena, but they did so either selectively by focusing primarily on issues of the organization of the industrial work process, labor markets and industrial relations, or by focusing on the societal and cultural *effects* of capitalist economies. An example of this is the concentration of critical social theory on issues of alienation and the “colonization of the life world” (Habermas 1981). Class theory was primarily interested in the distributional effects of capitalism and various phenomena of exploitation of the industrial worker. What was lost in these sociological approaches to the economy in the postwar period was the comprehensive study of the social preconditions of capitalist economies and their core institutions, especially markets. This broad approach had been developed by the classical sociological authors in their studies of the economy. For Max Weber, Émile Durkheim and Georg Simmel, the exploration of the institutions of modern capitalism was an important part of their respective social theories, and the neglect of this issue left a void in sociological scholarship during the postwar period.

It is not easy to understand this decline of economic sociology and its re-emergence in the late 1970s, but there is widespread agreement on several contributing factors. On the one hand the decline of sociological interest in the economy is probably related to the “solution” of many of the economic problems that were paramount during the classical era of sociology. Once patterns of stable growth developed in the Western world during the 1950s and 1960s, economic problems became less important for the understanding of social integration. Keynesianism seemed to offer effective political instruments to steer economic growth, which made the fulfillment of “adaptive functions” (Parsons) a problem that appeared to have found an enduring solution in a regime of “embedded liberalism” (Harvey 2005). Moreover, the dominant Parsonsian paradigm of structural functionalism advocated a division of labor in the social sciences which left most aspects of the investigation of economic phenomena to the discipline of economics.<sup>1</sup> Even the later critiques of structural functionalism did not touch this division of labor – at least at first – since the Marxist critiques, conflict theory and interpretative sociology led either to the study of phenomena of distribution and exploitation or, as in the cases of Erving Goffman and Harold Garfinkel, to an orientation which showed little interest in the investigation of economic phenomena.

---

This paper will be published in: Chris Hann/Keith Hart (eds.), *Market and Society: The Great Transformation Today* (forthcoming). I am grateful to the editors and to Akos Rona-Tas for their comments on an earlier version of this paper.

1 The resulting paradigm has been called the “economy and society perspective” (Swedberg 1987; Granovetter 1990).

These developments provide clues as to why economic sociology declined in the post-war era. But why did the field reemerge during the 1980s? First, problems of inflation, increasing rates of unemployment and low growth rates since the 1970s brought economic problems into the focus of societal attention once again. These macroeconomic changes were accompanied by profound transformations on the organizational level, commonly referred to as the end of the post-Fordist production regime. Second, during the 1970s and 1980s sociologists, anthropologists and political scientists “discovered” economic configurations whose success had to be attributed to factors not accounted for in orthodox economic theory: the enormous success of Japan (Dore 1986; Hamilton/Biggart 1992; Yamamura/Streeck 2003), the rise of industrial districts (Trigilia 2006) and the discovery of the informal economy (Hart 1973). Third, the global economic picture started to change significantly in the 1980s because of the pronounced shift to market-oriented economic policies not only in the Western capitalist countries but also in the developing world, especially in Asia and Latin America, and, later, in the transitional countries of the former Soviet bloc. Markets gained in importance relative to political regulation, which dominated the capitalist postwar economies. Though this shift toward markets brought the dominant political orientations closer to the assumptions of orthodox economics, sociologists were sensitized for the social anchoring of economic action and turned to the investigation of markets as the paramount institution of exchange advocated by neoliberalism. After the failure of shock therapy in transition economies, the insight that markets have social and political preconditions also reached policy makers in international organizations like the World Bank, where “social capital,” for instance, became a core policy concept.

In addition to the “real” changes in the economy, changes in the relationship between economics and sociology must be mentioned, too. First and foremost, the 1970s saw an expansion of the economic rational choice approach into substantial fields that were hitherto domains of sociology. The new economic sociology is in part a reaction to this “economic imperialism” and its understanding of action, making the counterclaim that even on economics’ home playing field, i.e. “the economy,” many phenomena can be better understood by approaching them from sociological perspectives. At about the same time, however, new developments took hold within economics which made the discipline itself more sensitive to the institutional preconditions of market exchange. This holds true for information economics, the new institutional economics and, much later, behavioral economics. Sociologists started to address the systematic problems raised by economists from these schools.

Given these transformations, the renewed interest of sociology in investigating core institutions of modern capitalist economies, especially markets, might not be surprising. What is surprising, however, is that the essential concept applied in the new economic sociology is not derived from the classical sociologists Max Weber, Émile Durkheim, Georg Simmel or Karl Marx. Instead, the “founding manifesto” of the new economic sociology, Mark Granovetter’s (1985) seminal article “Economic Action and Social Structure – The Problem of Embeddedness” centers around Karl Polanyi’s concept of

embeddedness. Ever since, this concept has been a focal point of the new economic sociology. Hardly any article associated with the new economic sociology fails to mention “embeddedness” as the core concept indicating a sociological approach to the economy. Few economic sociologists would disagree with the statement “We are all Polanyians now.”

I will argue in this paper that in its adaptation by the new economic sociology, Karl Polanyi’s concept of embeddedness has itself undergone a great transformation. As it has been continually reinterpreted, significant meanings of the concept have vanished, while others have been added. In particular, the social-reformist connotations of the concept have been neglected. In section one, I explore the different meanings the concept of embeddedness has gained in the new economic sociology. In section two, I argue that it is not the embeddedness of economic action as such that should constitute the vantage point of economic sociology, but rather three coordination problems that actors face in economic exchange. It is only by starting from these coordination problems that the *necessity* of embedding economic action becomes theoretically comprehensible. I will argue that by proceeding from these coordination problems, sociological, anthropological and historical approaches to the economy can find common research questions which allow them to enter into more fruitful conversations with each other. In section three, I will focus on the social-reformist inclinations of Polanyi’s use of the notion of embeddedness and thereby highlight the challenge posed in *The Great Transformation* ([1944] 1957) that was largely not taken up by economic sociologists. In section four, I will discuss limitations with regard to the development of a macro theory of the economy that result from making embeddedness the core concept of economic sociology.

## 2 Embeddedness: The ironies of the career of a concept

The career of the concept of embeddedness in the new economic sociology would certainly have come as a surprise to the man who is quoted as its originator.<sup>2</sup> It has been pointed out repeatedly that Polanyi hardly ever used the term (Barber 1995: 401; Krippner 2001: 779), and by no means could one claim that it is a well-defined, central concept in his work. In *The Great Transformation* the term is used only in the chapter on the “Evolution of the Market Pattern.” In the relevant paragraphs Polanyi contrasts the market economy with economic configurations based on reciprocity and redistribution: “Instead of economy being embedded in social relations, social relations are

---

2 Though Karl Polanyi is usually seen as the originator of the concept of embeddedness, it was used earlier by Richard Thurnwald in his study “Die menschliche Gesellschaft” (Thurnwald 1932). Polanyi was familiar with the works of Thurnwald when writing *The Great Transformation* (see Firth 1972).

embedded in the economic system” (Polanyi [1944] 1957: 57). The second use of the term a few pages later also alludes to this contrast:

In the vast ancient systems of redistribution, acts of barter as well as local markets were a usual but not more than a subordinate trait. The same is true where reciprocity rules: Acts of barter are here usually embedded in long-range relations implying trust and confidence, a situation which tends to obliterate the bilateral character of the transaction.  
(Polanyi [1944] 1957: 61)

Evidently the centrality of the concept of embeddedness is an artifact of the *reception* of *The Great Transformation*. For Polanyi himself the core meaning of embeddedness is twofold: First, he sees markets as necessarily limited by institutional regulations which connect them to the moral fabric of society. Unregulated markets cannot be more than a pathological form of organizing the fulfillment of adaptive functions in society and will lead to social anomie. This institutional anchoring of the economy is characteristic of all three types of economic exchange distinguished by Polanyi: reciprocity, redistribution and market. Second, the term embeddedness is not only an analytical term but also alludes to the political or social reformist task of stabilizing a (democratic) organization of society through the institutional regulation of markets, especially in the realms that Polanyi termed fictitious commodities: land, labor and money. Hence the reference point of embeddedness is not the economy as such, but “the larger social systems in which all economies are located” (Barber 1995: 406). In both connotations of the term embeddedness, Polanyi’s assessment of the modern capitalist economy corresponds fully with the approaches of classical sociological theory.

That “embeddedness” should become the central concept of the new economic sociology with reference to the works of Karl Polanyi is ironic given the limited significance the term has in the works of the author himself. This irony, however, is complemented by a second incongruity: The understanding of embeddedness advocated by Mark Granovetter (1985), which led to the widespread use of the term in the new economic sociology, differs fundamentally from the meaning of the term in the work of Karl Polanyi.

Granovetter introduced the notion in direct reference to two debates. These concerned the dispute between substantivists and formalists in economic anthropology (Schneider 1974), and the controversy between two competing concepts of action in sociology: on the one hand, the “undersocialized concept of action,” incorporated from economics, which sees actors as isolated from each other and, on the other hand, the “oversocialized concept of action,” which represents actors’ behavior as being entirely controlled by the social norms in which they have been socialized.

For Granovetter, both concepts of action are flawed. As an alternative, he suggested making the patterns of relationships among actors the core variable for the explanation of economic outcomes. According to Granovetter, economic action is “embedded

in concrete, ongoing systems of social relations” (1985: 487), in other words, in actors’ social networks. This use of Polanyi’s notion of embeddedness promotes a structuralist economic sociology in which economic outcomes are explained by the structural properties of social networks (Granovetter 1973, 2005). Networks pattern market exchange and facilitate collective action. The significance of network structures has been validated in a variety of different research areas, such as the diffusion of information on labor markets (Montgomery 1991; Granovetter 1995), immigrant networks (Portes/Sensenbrenner 1993) and the organization of financial markets (Baker 1984; Uzzi 1999; Mizruchi/Stearns 2001). Proceeding from Granovetter’s programmatic essay, the network approach has become the most influential advance within the new economic sociology.

Yet Granovetter’s linking of embeddedness to the structuralist network approach in economic sociology implies a fundamental transformation of the concept. As Greta Krippner (2001) has argued, Polanyi’s understanding of the embeddedness of the economy is rooted in institutional analysis. For Polanyi, markets are not networks of structurally equivalent producers but “rather fully social institutions, reflecting a complex alchemy of politics, culture, and ideology” (Krippner 2001: 782). The network approach, by contrast, isolates a single aspect of markets – networks of ongoing social relations – “as constituting the proper domain of economic sociology” (ibid.: 799). This is a limited perspective because an exclusive focus on the structure of social relations leads to a neglect of the social content underlying the observed structure. By not taking attributes of actors and institutional rules into account, network analysis fails to explain how the social structure of markets emerges and why networks are structured the way they are (Beckert 2005). Moreover, the network perspective does away with Polanyi’s concern with the stability of social order, by focusing exclusively on the process of market exchange itself and not on the larger social system.

This, however, is not the last irony in the career of the concept of embeddedness. On closer inspection it becomes evident that Granovetter’s focus on network structures gives rise to a further inconsistency, this time with regard to his own intention to provide an alternative to the oversocialized and the undersocialized view of action. Far from providing an alternative within action theory, he does away with a grounding of economic sociology in action theory altogether (Beckert 2003, 2006a). Network structures, rather than social action, become the explanatory variable (Granovetter 2005). Small wonder that institutional economists and rational choice sociologists eagerly took up this notion of embeddedness, since they could readily incorporate it into a rational choice framework (Burt 1992; Lin/Cook/Burt 2001).<sup>3</sup>

---

3 The comedy of errors behind the concept of embeddedness took a final turn a few years ago when Mark Granovetter claimed that he did not even have Karl Polanyi’s work in mind when introducing the notion of embeddedness in his programmatic essay: “I use the term ‘embeddedness’ [in the 1985 article] in a narrower and somewhat different way than Polanyi meant it. The reason is that I was not trying to borrow the term from Polanyi, or to re-appropriate or to reintroduce it. Something more complicated was going on. I have looked back at my old note-

In short, the central position of embeddedness – and, hence Karl Polanyi’s work – in the new economic sociology appear to be the result of cumulative interpretative misunderstandings on several levels.

### 3 Coordination problems in market exchange as the starting point of economic sociology

Despite this confusion the notion of embeddedness has become the core concept of the new economic sociology. This was also possible because the meaning given to the term by Mark Granovetter has not remained the only reading. Sharon Zukin and Paul DiMaggio (1990) elaborated a taxonomy that distinguished between four types of embeddedness. In addition to Granovetter’s “structural embeddedness,” they distinguished between cultural embeddedness, cognitive embeddedness and political embeddedness. This broadening of the concept of embeddedness unquestionably brought it closer to the meaning that can be deduced from *The Great Transformation*. This breadth allowed different sociological approaches to the economy to be brought together under a single heading, which has contributed to the development of the field over the last two decades. To what extent, however, can any notion of embeddedness provide a satisfying starting point for economic sociology?

Following Polanyi, I take it as axiomatic that the embeddedness of economic exchange makes economic and social integration possible: The attempt to establish a system of self-regulating markets based on the commodification of the “fictitious commodities” land, labor and money produced the dehumanizing social conditions that Polanyi held responsible for the social and political instabilities he witnessed in his lifetime. The analytical – and, as I shall argue later, also the political – challenge is to identify the social preconditions for the organization of the economy that allow the fulfillment of economic functions to be combined with the realization of a humane social and political order.

No critique of the notion of embeddedness as the initial concept of the new economic sociology can deny “the indissoluble connection of the actor with his or her social surrounding” (Beckert 2003: 796). However, one can question whether sociology should *start* from this notion as its entry point into the field of the economy. My position is that “embeddedness” characterizes a general answer to specific problems without identifying the underlying problems themselves.<sup>4</sup> By starting from the embeddedness of economic

---

books and found that I used the term embeddedness in some of my early notes, before I ever read Polanyi” (Granovetter et al. 2004: 113).

4 Cf. Dobbin (2004). Rather than proceeding from a set of problems, Dobbin’s approach proceeds from a set of social mechanisms that resolve underlying problems.

action we are putting the cart before the horse. The first proper step would be to identify the problems that can actually be solved by an approach focusing on the embeddedness of economic action. I suggest that we identify these problems and make *them* the analytical starting point of economic sociology. The problems to be resolved in market exchange are found not only in contemporary, highly developed capitalist economies but also in pre-industrial market exchange. Since sociologists have largely ignored such societies, the approach I am advocating invites collaboration with anthropologists and historians; in this respect it is fully consistent with the multidisciplinary interests of Karl Polanyi.

If the strict assumptions underlying neoclassical economic theory are relaxed, the embedding of economic action needs to be viewed in the light of three problems of social coordination that actors face in market exchange. General Equilibrium Theory posits that markets can stabilize without being “embedded” because exchange allows for individual utility maximization based on fixed and exogenously given preferences and no actor has an interest in changing the equilibrium result. Once the assumption of perfect markets is given up, however, the problem of the social order of exchange re-emerges (Latsis 1972), and it is only by the formation of robust expectations with regard to the actions of relevant “alter egos,” i.e. the reduction of the social uncertainties entailed in market exchange, that stable markets become possible. The reduction of uncertainty is an indispensable precondition for the emergence and operation of market economies (Beckert 1996). Market actors need “stable worlds” (Fligstein 2001) or “calculability” (Weber 1978) in order for role sets to be reproduced. Embeddedness is the mysterious substance which provides this stability in market exchange.

### Three coordination problems

The three coordination problems actors face in market exchange are the problem of value, the problem of competition and the problem of cooperation.<sup>5</sup>

---

5 An additional social precondition for the emergence of stable markets is the social legitimation of the market exchange of a certain good. Historically, markets have been subjected to numerous limitations in terms of their location, their duration and the goods they are legally allowed to trade (Braudel [1979] 1985; Polanyi [1944] 1957; Walzer 1983; Weber [1922] 1978). The prohibition of trade in human beings (e.g. slavery or adoption), organs or certain substances (e.g. illegal drugs) are but a few examples of such limitations. Clearly there is no unilinear historical process by which markets become ultimately legitimate mechanisms for the exchange of all goods. Illegal markets face the same coordination problems that other markets face. Actors on illegal markets must find different solutions to these coordination problems, however, which makes illegal markets even more precarious.

### *Value*

The problem of value can be defined as the “difficulties that market participants have in forming clear subjective values for goods in the market” (Koçak 2003: 8). Only if buyers are able to “discriminate between the worth of goods or services that confront them in the market” and sellers are able to reliably demonstrate “the value of goods they bring to the market” (ibid.: 5f.) can market exchange take place. The basis for this is the cognitive process of commensuration, in which actors rank products according to their contribution to the fulfillment of a need and thus provide the basis for attaching value to a product in relation to others.<sup>6</sup> This is to some extent a technical process if standards are defined to distinguish different qualities of commodities and the contribution of a commodity to resolve a technically defined task. However, in large parts this process of valuation is social in character. The emergence of a “market for whale-watching” on Canada’s west coast, for instance, depended on cultural transformations which changed the way whales are valued in Western culture. While whales were perceived for centuries as feared behemoths – a perception most dramatically described by Melville – this perception began to change from the 1950s onward to the point where whales are seen today as a threatened species that symbolize the value of freedom. Only on the basis of this change in perception did it become possible for the watching – and not the hunting! – of whales to become a valued commodity for which people are willing to pay money (Lawrence/Phillips 2004). In the case of the market for wine, similar social processes lie behind the possibility of differentiating a product that is perceived by outsiders – or “non-experts” – as largely homogenous. Assigning vastly different values to wine based on the grapes used, the producer, the location of the winery, the year of production, the type of bottle used and the evaluations of third parties is a complex process without which this market would not exist at all. The “quality markers” constituting the reputation of a wine must be established in communicative processes involving producers, consumers, traders and intermediaries, especially wine critics. Through these processes the social uncertainty inherent in the product is reduced and consumers can develop confidence in the “value” of a wine despite the fact they cannot classify its quality based on its sensual characteristics.

Valuation processes are social in character in a second sense. Value can be based on the recognized contribution of the good or service to the positioning of its owner on the social ladder and thereby contribute to the definition of the owner’s social identity. Products constitute and express membership of specific life-worlds. The classic treatment of this phenomenon is Thorstein Veblen’s ([1899] 1973) discussion of “conspicuous consumption.” But it holds true, of course, in a much more general sense: Products are located in a social landscape which allows the owners of goods to be positioned and, conversely, to form social identities based on market choices. Only through such

---

6 I do not attempt to develop a theory of market prices here. Understanding why actors think of a product as being valuable and as having more or less value compared to another good is only one element of price formation.

socially based processes of the subjective valuation of goods can stable markets emerge. Hence markets must be socially and culturally embedded to be feasible. In the case of valuation, the embeddedness of economic action is a necessary condition for classifying the material world in terms of the relative value of the products offered, i.e. for creating motives for product demand. A sociological theory of markets will aim to understand how the mechanisms of classification emerge and work (Bowker/Star 2000).

It is obvious that the study of processes of valuation is a field in which sociological, historical and anthropological perspectives meet. The historical perspective highlights the processes of change in the valuation of goods. For example: Viviana Zelizer (1979), in her study of the emergence of the life insurance industry in the United States during the nineteenth century, reveals the long process before potential buyers of life insurance overcame their resistance to the product. At the outset of the industry, life insurance was seen by potential customers as morally corrupting since it involved a gamble with God and provided a premium for the death of another person. It was only by taking this cultural resistance into account that a change in marketing strategies could be achieved: the meaning of the product was reframed, and potential customers started to value life insurance. Economic anthropology has investigated such phenomena as the social base of measurement systems (Gudeman 2001: 12), the dependence of the value of goods on their meaning as symbolic representations of social status (Geertz 1973), and the cultural bases of the demand for products (Douglas/Isherwood 1979; Appadurai 1986; Graeber 2001; Hart/Hann forthcoming).

### *Competition*

The second coordination problem actors face derives from competition. From the economist's standpoint, markets are based on competition. But sellers can only make a profit if markets are not perfect in the economic sense. If markets were perfect, marginal utility would equal marginal costs and the incentive to produce for the market would vanish. Profits emerge when markets are imperfect (Chamberlin 1933; Knight [1921] 1985; Robinson 1933). Therefore, market actors attempt to create market structures that provide protection from pure price competition. A power-driven "market struggle" (Weber [1922] 1978) ensues in which actors try to restrain competition or use existing regulations to their advantage. At the same time, market actors experiencing disadvantages from existing market regulations attempt to challenge incumbents by trying to change the rules of competition (Fligstein 2001). The state plays a major role in these market struggles by laying down ground rules, for instance in competition law or intellectual property law, and by granting subsidies or collecting tariffs. Political embeddedness as well as market differentiation based on the "singularization of the good" (Callon/Méadel/Rabeharisoa 2002: 201) and processes of network closure are mechanisms aimed at resolving this coordination problem. This is a second indication that markets can only emerge through their embeddedness in non-economic social and political contexts.

Again, the investigation of these market struggles will profit from a close collaboration between sociologists, historians and anthropologists. In the Middle Ages, guilds had the function of protecting established producers from unwanted competition. The rise of John D. Rockefeller in the oil industry in the late nineteenth century can be described as the result of a strategy of eliminating competition. Rockefeller created a monopoly by taking over the refineries owned by competitors. The government reacted by introducing antitrust legislation leading to the dissolution of the Standard Oil Company (Hohensee 2003: 78). Closing certain labor market segments to persons on the basis of their race, gender, caste, ethnicity, union membership etc. also serves to protect defined labor market groups from competition. Clifford Geertz (1963: 32ff.) showed how competition in a Javanese bazaar takes place between buyer and seller rather than between sellers because no fixed prices exist. Here it is the lack of an institutional provision which inhibits the type of competition usually associated with market exchange. Stephen Gudeman (forthcoming) cites examples from anthropological research showing how market exchange is regulated by communal bonds as well as social networks and how these bonds restrict the trade of certain goods or trade between certain actors.

Competition and its moderation through regulation, entry barriers or product differentiation reflects a fundamental coordination problem for market exchange. It allows market exchange to be understood as a political and social struggle over institutional regulation and “blocking action” (White 1992), pointing to the embeddedness of economic action as a *resolution* to a specific problem market actors face.

### *Cooperation*

The third problem of coordination that actors confront in market exchange is the problem of cooperation.<sup>7</sup> It arises from the asymmetric distribution of information regarding price, product quality and the possible opportunism of exchange partners in the light of incomplete contracts. Exchange relations are inherently risky undertakings. The resolution of the social risks of exchange, notably that of “defection,” is a crucial precondition for the emergence of stable markets. In addition to social networks, clientelistic relationships, reputation systems, formal warranties and branding, mechanisms such as trust, social norms, power, network closure and emotions all help to resolve this coordination problem (Beckert 2006b). While trust, reputation and institutional safeguards have been extensively discussed as forms of embeddedness in the new economic sociology, it is the systematic problem itself which provides the vantage point from which the cultural and institutional embeddedness of markets can be explained.

---

7 The distinction between competition and cooperation as two distinct coordination problems does not imply that competition does not involve cooperation between competitors. The solution to collective action problems is a form of cooperation. The distinction refers to the structuring of competition on the one hand and the social risks entailed in the exchange process on the other.

Again, proceeding from the coordination problem illustrates the commensurability of sociological, historical and anthropological approaches. For example, from a historical perspective Hartmut Berghoff (2005) has explored the origins of the credit reporting and rating agencies in the nineteenth century in the United States and Europe. Modern credit markets could only emerge when institutional solutions had been found to the problem of assessing the risks of credit. The historical investigation shows how the establishment of standards of creditworthiness emerged and altered as social and economic conditions changed and new technological and mathematical possibilities arose. Starting from interpersonal relationships in tightly knit religious networks, the instruments became increasingly formal up to the point where creditworthiness today is established through scoring systems. The very same problem has been investigated in a contemporary empirical case study by Alya Guseva and Akos Rona-Tas (2001), who examine the establishment of credit card markets in Eastern European countries. The research shows the specific solutions credit card companies find when operating in an environment in which potential credit card holders have no documented credit history. In economic anthropology, Keith Hart (1988: 179), among others, investigated practices of lending in the informal economy of a migrant community in Ghana, identifying the mechanisms by which traders assess the trustworthiness of their clients. All of this research shows how the potentially devastating problems stemming from the asymmetric distribution of information and the freedom of choice of ego and alter ego are resolved through the connection of market exchange with the institutional, cultural and social contexts in which this exchange takes place.<sup>8</sup>

### Combining sociological, historical and anthropological perspectives

Identifying the three coordination problems makes the cultural, political, structural and cognitive embeddedness of market relations comprehensible in terms of the actual problems market actors confront. The embeddedness of market exchange is not the vantage point of economic sociology. Instead, it reflects social conditions that help actors in addressing underlying problems of coordination. This approach comes closer to Polanyi's conceptualization of embeddedness. It allows for a much broader perspective that does not have to limit itself to just one type of embeddedness but can investigate the actual solutions market actors find for the identified coordination problems as a combination of all four types of embeddedness and their mutual interdependencies. This corresponds to Polanyi's view that we should see markets as social institutions enmeshed in politics, culture and ideology (Krippner 2001: 782).

---

8 Many other examples of the study of this coordination problem in market exchange and of the investigation of the specific mechanisms by which it is resolved could be cited from the three fields (Kollock 1994; Braudel [1979] 1985). Of course the social and institutional context sometimes works to hinder the solution of cooperation problems. The argument is only that the solution to the problems cannot be analyzed in purely individualistic terms.

The closer interaction between sociological, historical and anthropological scholarship on economic exchange also corresponds to the Polanyian perspective. The plea for increased cooperation is not meant to reinforce disciplinary lines, but rather to improve the empirical understanding of economic exchange by enlarging the theoretical and empirical scope of scholarship in all three disciplines. How? First, by systematically studying the historical variance of solutions to the identified coordination problems and the historical genesis of current solutions. Second, by identifying and studying the large pool of alternative solutions to the coordination problems, which not only sharpens the understanding of solutions found in a specific situation but also heightens people's awareness of the cultural specificity and contingency of particular solutions. The comparative and historical perspective makes it possible to identify specificities of modernity and its variances in the organization of the economy in a non-functionalist way. Third, by applying theoretical concepts developed in one of the disciplines to empirical fields that get less attention in the discipline in which the concept originates. An example would be the concepts of gift-giving, reciprocity and classification as important analytical concepts in anthropology. Despite their origins in sociology (Durkheim, Mauss), they were long neglected in economic sociology. Recently, however, they have been successfully applied to the analysis of economic exchange by economic sociologists (Godbut/Caillé 1998; Steiner 2004; Healy 2006; Adloff/Mau 2006).

Proceeding from the three coordination problems also enables us to connect economic sociology systematically with economics. Value, competition and cooperation have been subject to extensive research in economics, especially during the last thirty years. What distinguishes a sociological – or anthropological, or historical – approach to the economy from an economic approach is not the questions asked but rather the answers given. The most profound difference – though this crosses disciplinary lines – is either seeing economic action from a normative perspective as contained in the universe of rational actors and efficient economic institutions, or understanding the economy empirically as a cultural and political phenomenon from its dialectic interrelation with other societal spheres (see also Gudeman, forthcoming). Which of these perspectives one takes, however, is not simply a matter of taste. The coordination problems point to fundamental uncertainty for intentionally rational economic actors that impedes the maximization decisions presumed in orthodox economic models and makes the embeddedness of the economy a precondition for its functioning (Beckert 1996).

#### **4 Embeddedness and social reform**

I argued in the previous sections that there are two shortcomings in the use of embeddedness in the new economic sociology. The first difficulty is specific to Mark Granovetter's (1985) influential conceptualization, which restricts embeddedness to the investigation of social network structures. The second, more general limitation is that embeddedness

is used as a starting point and not seen in its connection to the particular coordination problems market actors face. However, even if embeddedness is redefined to include the cultural, cognitive and political contexts in which economic action takes place and is understood as a response to the three underlying coordination problems, another crucial challenge posed by Karl Polanyi would still not be taken up. In *The Great Transformation* Polanyi did not aim to understand the functioning of market exchange in order to explain the social preconditions for market efficiency; he was concerned with what happens to social order and political freedom when economic exchange is organized chiefly through self-regulating markets. This unease is evident throughout *The Great Transformation*, but is most directly stated in the last chapter of the book.

It follows that a sociological theory of the economy that claims Karl Polanyi as its inspirational source cannot be limited to the investigation of the social and political preconditions for the efficient fulfillment of economic functions, but must also pay attention to the effects of the organization of the economic system on society at large. Firms, for example, have increased leverage to exit existing national regulatory regimes. How does this affect the ability of nation-states to organize social solidarity? What impact does the increasing insecurity of employees due to new employment regimes have on family structures? How does the expansion of markets effect social inequality, working conditions and local communities? How are actors responding to the increasing uncertainties they face due to the marketization of “fictitious commodities”? Whatever answers one gives to these questions, they must be part of an economic sociology – and economic anthropology – which analyzes adaptive functions as part of the much larger question of the social integration of society. For Polanyi social order is precarious (Streeck 2006: 8f.). The embeddedness of market exchange does not result from markets themselves or some other resource floating in society. It is the unstable result of social and political struggles, an outcome that has to be shielded by means of deliberate political engagement from the danger of an “institutional separation of society into an economic and political sphere” (Polanyi 1957: 71). The “double movement” is not an automatic response to the devastating effects of self-regulating markets but rather the result of political intervention in markets in the light of their social consequences. The “re-embedding” advocated by Polanyi implied a substantial political authority over the economy as a result of political and social engagement. In this sense Polanyi followed in the footsteps of the works of economic sociologists from the classical period (1890 to 1920), especially Émile Durkheim and Max Weber, whose scholarly work was also written to provide a scientific basis for social reform.

This reading of *The Great Transformation* as a social theory concerned with the question of social integration under conditions of political freedom is not widely accepted in the new economic sociology. Instead, the embeddedness of economic relations is seen as a constitutive element of *all* economies that can be taken as fact and is *only to be discerned* through sociological analysis. To the extent that the embeddedness of market exchange is seen as something to be established deliberately, it is the efficiency perspective that

dominates. Embeddedness is then reduced to the optimal design of network structures for economic gain or of efficient economic institutions (Williamson 1985; Burt 1992).

## 5 Embeddedness and modernity

I argued in section two that economic sociology, economic anthropology and economic history can find a common ground for the analysis of markets by proceeding from three coordination problems that have to be addressed wherever markets are found. This perspective does have certain limitations, however, which brings me back to the debate between substantivists and formalists in economic anthropology. For Karl Polanyi the embeddedness of economic exchange applied to modern societies as well and this perspective is shared by today's economic sociology. To quote Mark Granovetter:

I assert that the level of embeddedness of economic behavior is lower in non-market societies than it is claimed by substantivists and development theorists, and it has changed less with 'modernization' than they believe; but I argue also that this level has always been and continues to be more substantial than is allowed for by formalists and economists.  
(Granovetter 1985: 483)

The trouble with this perspective is that it does not help us to discriminate between traditional and modern economies, or between different types of market economies. In stark contrast to theories of functional differentiation, the new economic sociology highlights phenomena that demonstrate structural similarities between traditional and modern capitalist economies. It shows, for example, that particularistic networks remain paramount in the highly sophisticated market exchanges of today's capitalism (Portes/Sensenbrenner 1993; DiMaggio/Louch 1998). "Blocking action" aimed at restricting competitors (White 1992) is as much a feature of today's economies as it was during the time of the medieval guilds. Economic rationality has been deconstructed and shown to be determined by cognitive scripts that are culturally anchored (Dobbin 2001; Beckert 2002). The rhetorical *mana* of concepts like "outsourcing," "diversification" or "shareholder value" is seen as structurally similar to the power of totems. Such management concepts serve as orientations for action based on the *belief* in their rational outcomes. On closer inspection, however, they are hardly more rational than magical beliefs.

The dominant narrative of economic sociologists is thus one of continuity. Such a perspective on the economy is appealing against the backdrop of modernization theories that see social networks, particularistic exchange and magical beliefs exclusively as elements of pre-modern economies that have vanished in the course of rationalization. It is definitely enlightening to examine the cultural underpinnings of the notion of rationality and to call into question the ontologization that characterizes this concept

in much of economic theory. This is also a valuable corrective to the agenda of classical sociology, including mid-twentieth century economic sociology, that sought to identify the distinctive characteristics of modernity in opposition to those of earlier economic formations (Parsons/Smelser [1956] 1984).

The appeal of Karl Polanyi for the new economic sociology might stem from the fact that his social theory does not imply a linear concept of development of the sort found in Marx, Weber, Durkheim and Parsons. Embeddedness is *not* a characteristic that separates pre-modern economies from modern ones.<sup>9</sup> Based on the notion of a “double movement,” social change is conceptualized as a dynamic process of oscillation between embedding, disembedding and reembedding. Thus “all economies are embedded” (Barber 1995).<sup>10</sup> However, “embeddedness” does not provide a theoretical perspective informing us about the *specific* characteristics of the embeddedness of modern capitalist economies. The strong emphasis on similarities of economic systems across time and space, based on the notion of embeddedness, impedes the development of conceptual tools to address differences between economic configurations and, in particular, the specificity of the organization of modern capitalist economies.

This leaves us with an economic sociology that is unspecific with regard to the structural changes taking place in the organization of the economy with the development of modern capitalism. After all: All economies are embedded. Given the fact that the new economic sociology started from a very strong anti-Parsonsian sentiment in American sociology in general, the allure of the notion of embeddedness is understandable. It has allowed for a concentration on meso and micro level processes of economic organization and relieved sociologists from the task of addressing socioeconomic development at the macro level. This limitation is regrettable, however, because it excludes the possibility of analyzing changing forms of embeddedness from the premises of a sociological macro theory. I am not arguing for a return to the teleological errors of the past (Joas 1992: 218ff.). But we need a historical perspective if we are to understand the *specific* ways in which economic action is embedded in institutions and social structures of modern societies. We also need to identify the (normative) implications of such changes. Pierre Bourdieu’s work on the transformation of peasant society in Algeria provides a fine example (Bourdieu 1963). He showed how the logic of calculation wins over the logic of the household in the process of modernization, leading to social dislocation. It is not that modernization leads to disembedding in the sense of making networks and social institutions irrelevant, but structural changes devalue specific forms of embeddedness and force actors into new modes of social organization. The traditional *habitus* of the peasant clashes with the rational *habitus* demanded by capitalist society.

---

9 This line of argument is also followed by Stephen Gudeman (forthcoming) when he emphasizes the dialectical relationship between necessity and contingency.

10 It is true that Polanyi draws attention to the increasing role of the state in the organization of economic exchange (Block 2003: 281). Nonetheless, the dominant reading of Polanyi’s work in the new economic sociology singles out the concepts of embeddedness and double movement and shows little interest in a macrosociological theory of modernity.

A second example concerning the systematic changes of embeddedness in modern societies refers to cooperation, one of the coordination problems discussed in section two. Trust is a crucial facilitator of cooperation since market actors must take risks when engaging in exchange (Gambetta 1988; Möllering 2006). Trust itself depends on social and institutional contexts that encourage the willingness to trust by improving the possibility of assessing the trustworthiness of the trusted party (Beckert 2005). Trust plays a role in economic exchange in both traditional and modern economies, but this observation should not prevent us from identifying structural differences in the ways in which trust is established.

Anthony Giddens (1990: 100ff.) distinguishes four ways of organizing the integration of exchange in pre-modern societies. The first is kinship. Among relatives, one can usually be sure that the parties involved fulfill their obligations, regardless of individual advantage. The second is integration within a narrowly circumscribed geographic context, typically the local community. Third, religious cosmologies supply moral and practical interpretations of personal and social life and of the natural environment (ibid.: 103). The options of actors are regulated by religious stipulations that allow reactions to cooperative moves to be anticipated. Fourth, Giddens (ibid.: 104) cites tradition as a means of structuring the future by extrapolating from the patterns of action demonstrated in the past. Tradition is closely connected with routine and habit, limiting the range of anticipated options available to exchange partners.

The development of modern capitalist societies, however, tends to destroy the contexts of trust that support cooperation in exchange in traditional societies. Following Giddens, modern societies are characterized by an increasing time–space distanciation of economic exchange and the loss of traditional contexts of action. These changed macrosocial conditions necessitate the development of new forms of embeddedness that are able to support trust between exchange partners. Lynne Zucker (1986) has described this development for nineteenth-century America and shown the structural changes that characterize this development. She identifies a process where the sources of pre-industrial trust were increasingly disrupted by high rates of immigration, internal migration and an increase in transactions across group boundaries and great geographic distance (Zucker 1986: 54). These changed macrosocial conditions led to a push to develop formal mechanisms for the production of trust, mainly through the establishment of formal institutions. The spread of new forms of standardization that were regulated by formal organizations, the increase in surveillance on the company level, the rise of the professions and of intermediaries like rating agencies can all be read as institutional responses to the changed conditions.

This observed increase in formalization of the bases of trust in modern economies does not *exclude* the continued existence of tight networks of interpersonal relations or cooperation based on religious beliefs. However, a structural change in the form of embeddedness of exchange relations occurred in nineteenth-century America as a response to a changing macrosocial situation. A comparative perspective shows, how-

ever, that the dissolution of traditional social relations does not automatically lead to efficient institutional forms of this kind. Keith Hart's (Hart 1988) ethnographic description of economic relations among migrants living in the slums of Accra (Ghana) demonstrates unresolved trust issues in their exchange relations that ultimately lead to extremely high transaction costs and unsteady economic exchange. Trust emerges in particularistic friendship relations, but its generalization fails (Hart 1988: 190ff.).

These few examples suffice to show that historical analysis of the phenomenon of trustworthiness makes it possible to identify and theorize systematic elements of modernization processes. Historical analysis of the economy is a key component of general theories of social change. The comparative approach is directed at the historically specific uncertainties actors face in economic exchange and at their particular reactions. This way a comparative perspective can direct our attention to the plurality of possible responses to macrosocial changes and also to possible failures to establish efficient solutions, thus avoiding the traps of teleological claims.

## 6 Conclusion

Based on the works of Karl Polanyi the notion of embeddedness has become the core concept of the new economic sociology. I have argued in this paper that the reading of embeddedness in the new economic sociology shows a "great transformation" of the concept that does not do full justice to the meanings it had for Polanyi. This holds especially true for the reduction of embeddedness to networks of social relations. But the more encompassing understanding developed by Sharon Zukin and Paul DiMaggio (1990) also leaves out the normative and social reformist concerns that formed the intellectual background of *The Great Transformation*. The way the new economic sociology has made use of the concept of embeddedness has, however, two further limitations. First, it does not address the coordination problems actors in economic contexts must resolve, which I have identified to be the problems of value, competition and cooperation. To start from these problems provides a systematic vantage point for economic sociology and a basis for closer collaboration between sociological, anthropological and historical approaches to the economy. Second, taking embeddedness as a foundational concept directs research in economic sociology to the meso and microlevel and neglects processes of macrosocial change which were paramount in the investigation of economic phenomena by classical sociologists. For an understanding of the relationship between markets and society, an understanding of modernization processes and their effects on the organization of the economy remains indispensable.

## References

- Adloff, Frank/Steffen Mau, 2006: Giving Social Ties: Reciprocity in Modern Society. In: *Archives Européennes de Sociologie* XLVII, 93–123.
- Appadurai, Arjun (ed.), 1986: *The Social Life of Things: Commodities in Cultural Perspective*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Baker, Wayne, 1984: The Social Structure of a National Securities Market. In: *American Journal of Sociology* 89, 775–811.
- Barber, Benjamin, 1995: All Economies are “Embedded”: The Career of a Concept, and Beyond. In: *Social Research* 62, 387–413.
- Beckert, Jens, 1996: What Is Sociological about Economic Sociology? Uncertainty and the Embeddedness of Economic Action. In: *Theory and Society* 25, 803–840.
- , 2002: Von Fröschen, Unternehmensstrategien und anderen Totems: Die soziologische Herausforderung der ökonomischen Institutionentheorie. In: Andrea Maurer/Michael Schmid (eds.), *Neuer Institutionalismus: Zur soziologischen Erklärung von Organisation, Moral und Vertrauen*. Frankfurt a.M.: Campus, 133–147.
- , 2003: Economic Sociology and Embeddedness: How Shall We Conceptualize Economic Action? In: *Journal of Economic Issues* 37, 769–787.
- , 2005: Soziologische Netzwerkanalyse. In: Dirk Käsler (ed.), *Aktuelle Theorien der Soziologie: Von Shmuel N. Eisenstadt bis zur Postmoderne*. München: Beck, 286–312.
- , 2006a: Interpenetration versus Embeddedness: The Premature Dismissal of Talcott Parsons in the New Economic Sociology. In: *American Journal of Economics and Sociology* 65, 161–188.
- , 2006b: Was tun? Die emotionale Konstruktion von Zuversicht bei Entscheidungen unter Ungewissheit. In: Arno Scherzberg (ed.), *Kluges Entscheiden: Disziplinäre Grundlagen und interdisziplinäre Verknüpfungen*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 123–141.
- Beckert, Jens/Milan Zafirovski (eds.), 2006: *International Encyclopedia of Economic Sociology*. London: Routledge.
- Berghoff, Hartmut, 2005: Markterschließung und Risikomanagement. In: *Vierteljahrschrift für Sozial- und Wirtschaftsgeschichte* 92, 141–162.
- Block, Fred, 2003: Karl Polanyi and the Writing of “The Great Transformation.” In: *Theory and Society* 32, 275–306.
- Bourdieu, Pierre, 1963: *Travail et Travailleurs en Algérie: Etude Sociologique*. Paris: Mouton.
- Bowker, Geoffrey C./Susan Leigh Star, 2000: *Sorting Things Out: Classification and its Consequences*. Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Braudel, Fernand, [1979] 1985: *Civilization and Capitalism: 15th–18th Century*. 3 Volumes. London: Fontana.
- Burt, Ronald, 1992: *Structural Holes: The Social Structure of Competition*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Callon, Michel/Cécile Méadel/Vololona Rabeharisoa, 2002: The Economy of Qualities. In: *Economy and Society* 31, 194–217.
- Chamberlin, Edward, 1933: *The Theory of Monopolistic Competition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- DiMaggio, Paul/Hugh Louch, 1998: Socially Embedded Consumer Transactions: For What Kinds of Purchases Do People Most Often Use Networks? In: *American Sociological Review* 63, 619–637.
- Dobbin, Frank, 2001: *How Institutional Economics Is Killing Microeconomics*. Princeton University.
- , 2004: The Sociological View of the Economy. In: Frank Dobbin (eds.), *The New Economic Sociology: A Reader*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1–46.
- Dore, Ronald, 1986: *Flexible Rigidities*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Douglas, Mary/Baron Isherwood, 1979: *The World of Goods: Towards an Anthropology of Consumption*. London: Routledge.
- Firth, Raymond, 1972: Methodological Issues in Economic Anthropology. In: *Man* 7, 467–475.

- Gambetta, Diego 1988: Can We Trust Trust? In: Diego Gambetta (ed.), *Trust: Making and Breaking Cooperative Relations*. New York: Basil Blackwell, 213–238.
- Geertz, Clifford, 1963: *Peddlers and Princes: Social Development and Economic Change in Two Indonesian Towns*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- , 1973: Deep Play: Notes on a Balinese Cockfight. In: Clifford Geertz (eds.), *The Interpretation of Cultures*. New York: Basic Books.
- Giddens, Anthony, 1990: *The Consequences of Modernity*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Godbut, Jacques/Alain Caillé, 1998: *The World of the Gift*. Montréal: McGill-Queen's University Press.
- Graeber, David, 2001: *Toward an Anthropological Theory of Value*. New York: Palgrave.
- Granovetter, Mark, 1973: The Strength of Weak Ties. In: *American Journal of Sociology* 78, 1360–1380.
- , 1985: Economic Action and Social Structure: The Problem of Embeddedness. In: *American Journal of Sociology* 91, 481–510.
- , 1990: The Old and the New Economic Sociology: A History and an Agenda. In: Roger Friedland/A.F. Robertson (eds.), *Beyond the Marketplace: Rethinking Economy and Society*. New York: Aldine de Gruyter, 89–112.
- , 1995: *Getting a Job: A Study of Contacts and Careers*. Second edition. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- , 2005: The Impact of Social Structure on Economic Outcomes. In: *Journal of Economic Perspectives* 19, 33–50.
- Granovetter, Mark, et al., 2004: Polanyi Symposium: A Conversation on Embeddedness. In: *Socio-Economic Review* 2, 109–135.
- Gudeman, Stephen, 2001: *The Anthropology of Economy*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- , forthcoming: Necessity or Contingency: Mutuality or Market. In: Chris Hann/Keith Hart (eds.) *Market and Society: The Great Transformation Today*.
- Guseva, Alya/Akos Rona-Tas, 2001: Uncertainty, Risk, and Trust: Russian and American Credit Markets Compared. In: *American Sociological Review* 66, 623–646.
- Habermas, Jürgen, 1981: *Theorie des kommunikativen Handelns*. Frankfurt a.M.: Suhrkamp.
- Hamilton, Gary G./Nicole Woolsey Biggart, 1992: Market, Culture, and Authority: A Comparative Analysis of Management and Organization in the Far East. In: Mark Granovetter/Richard Swedberg (eds.), *The Sociology of Economic Life*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 181–221.
- Hart, Keith, 1973: Informal Income Opportunities and Urban Employment in Ghana. In: *The Journal of Modern African Studies* 11, 61–89.
- , 1988: Kinship, Contract, and Trust: The Economic Organization of Migrants in an African City Slum. In: Diego Gambetta (eds.), *Trust: Making and Breaking Cooperative Relations*. New York: Basil Blackwell, 176–193.
- Hart, Keith/Chris Hann, forthcoming: A Short History of Economic Anthropology. In Keith Hart/Chris Hann (eds.), *Market and Society: The Great Transformation Today*.
- Harvey, David, 2005: *A Brief History of Neoliberalism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Healy, Kieran, 2006: *Last Best Gifts: Altruism and the Market for Human Blood and Organs*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Hohensee, Jens, 2003: God's Oil Country. In: *Die Zeit*, 20 March 2003, 78.
- Knight, Frank H., [1921] 1985: *Risk, Uncertainty, and Profit*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Koçak, Özgecan, 2003: *Social Orders of Exchange: Effects and Origins of Social Order in Exchange Markets*. Dissertation. Stanford: Stanford University.
- Kollock, Peter, 1994: The Emergence of Exchange Structures: An Experimental Study of Uncertainty, Commitment, and Trust. In: *American Journal of Sociology* 100, 313–345.
- Krippner, Greta, 2001: The Elusive Market. Embeddedness and the Paradigm of Economic Sociology. In: *Theory and Society* 30, 775–810.
- Latsis, Spiro, 1972: Situational Determinism in Economics. In: *British Journal of Philosophy of Science* 23, 207–245.

- Lawrence, Thomas B./Nelson Phillips, 2004: From Moby Dick to Free Willy: Macro-Cultural Discourse and Institutional Entrepreneurship in Emerging Institutional Fields. In: *Organization* 11, 689–711.
- Lin, Nan/Karen Cook/Ronald S. Burt. (eds.), 2001: *Social Capital: Theory and Research*. New York: de Gruyter.
- Mizruchi, Mark/Linda Stearns, 2001: Getting Deals Done: The Use of Social Networks in Bank Decision-Making. In: *American Sociological Review* 66, 647–671.
- Möllering, Guido, 2006: *Trust: Reason, Routine, Reflexivity*. Oxford: Elsevier.
- Montgomery, James D., 1991: Social Networks and Labor Market Outcomes: Toward an Economic Analysis. In: *American Economic Review* 81, 1408–1418.
- Parsons, Talcott/Neil Smelser, [1956] 1984: *Economy and Society: A Study in the Integration of Economic and Social Theory*. London: Routledge.
- Polanyi, Karl, [1944] 1957: *The Great Transformation*. Boston: Beacon Press.
- , 1957: The Economy as an Instituted Process. In: Karl Polanyi/Conrad M. Arensberg/Harry W. Pearson (eds.), *Trade and Market in the Early Empires*. New York: Free Press, 243–270.
- Portes, Alejandro/Julia Sensenbrenner, 1993: Embeddedness and Immigration: Notes on the Determinants of Economic Action. In: *American Journal of Sociology* 98, 1320–1350.
- Robinson, Joan, 1933: *The Economics of Imperfect Competition*. London: MacMillan.
- Schneider, Harold, 1974: *Economic Man: The Anthropology of Economics*. New York: Free Press.
- Smelser, Neil/Richard Swedberg (eds.), 2005: *Handbook of Economic Sociology*. New York and Princeton: Russell Sage Foundation and Princeton University Press.
- Steiner, Philippe, 2004: Le don d'organes: une affaire de famille? In: *Annales. Histoire, Sciences Sociales* 59, 255–283.
- Streeck, Wolfgang, 2006: *Wirtschaft und Moral: Facetten eines anscheinend unvermeidlichen Themas*. Unpublished manuscript. Cologne: Max Planck Institute for the Study of Societies.
- Swedberg, Richard, 1987: Economic Sociology: Past and Present. In: *Current Sociology* 35, 1–221.
- Thurnwald, Richard, 1932: *Die menschliche Gesellschaft in ihren ethno-soziologischen Grundlagen*, Vol. 3: *Werden, Wandel und Gestaltung der Wirtschaft im Lichte der Völkerforschung*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
- Uzzi, Brian, 1999: Embeddedness in the Making of Financial Capital: How Social Relations and Networks Benefit Firms Seeking Finance. In: *American Sociological Review* 64, 481–505.
- Veblen, Thorstein, [1899] 1973: *The Theory of the Leisure Class*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Walzer, Michael, 1983: *Spheres of Justice: A Defense of Pluralism and Equality*. New York: Basic Books.
- Weber, Max, [1922] 1978: *Economy and Society*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- White, Harrison, 1992: *Identity and Control*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Williamson, Oliver, 1985: *The Economic Institutions of Capitalism*. New York: Free Press.
- Yamamura, Kozo/Wolfgang Streeck (eds.), 2003: *The End of Diversity*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Zelizer, Viviana, 1979: *Morals and Markets: The Development of Life Insurance in the United States*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Zucker, Lynne, 1986: The Production of Trust: Institutional Sources of Economic Structure, 1840–1920. In: Barry Staw/Larry L. Cummings (eds.), *Research in Organizational Behavior*, Vol. 7. Boulder, CO: JAI Press, 53–111.
- Zukin, Sharon/Paul DiMaggio, 1990: Introduction. In: Paul DiMaggio/Sharon Zukin (eds.), *Structures of Capital: The Social Organization of the Economy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1–36.

## Recent Titles in the Publication Series of the MPIfG

### MPIfG Discussion Papers

DP06/9  
P. Aspers  
**Designing for the Other:  
Using Knowledge to Upgrade  
Manufacturing in the Garment  
Industry**

DP 06/8  
P. Manow, H. Döring  
**Electoral and Mechanical  
Causes of European Parliament  
and Council Divisions: Divided  
Government European Style?**

DP 06/7  
R. Mayntz  
**Einladung zum Schattenboxen:  
Die Soziologie und die  
moderne Biologie**

DP 06/6  
J. Berger  
**Warum sind einige Länder so  
viel reicher als andere?  
Zur institutionellen  
Erklärung von Entwicklungs-  
unterschieden**

DP 06/5  
S. Avdagic  
**One Path or Several?  
Understanding the Varied  
Development of Tripartism in  
New European Capitalisms**

DP 06/4  
H. Döring  
**The Composition of the  
College of Commissioners:  
Patterns of Delegation**

### MPIfG Working Papers

WP 06/7  
C. Woll  
**Trade Policy Lobbying in the  
European Union: Who Captures  
Whom?**

WP 06/6  
S. Burkhart, P. Manow  
**Was bringt die  
Föderalismusreform?  
Wahrscheinliche  
Effekte der geänderten  
Zustimmungspflicht**

WP 06/5  
G. Möllering  
**Das Aufheben von  
Ungewissheit als Kern des  
Vertrauens: Just do it?**

WP 06/4  
J. Beckert  
**Sind Unternehmen sozial  
verantwortlich?**

WP 06/3  
A. Broscheid, D. Coen  
**Lobbying Systems in the  
European Union:  
A Quantitative Study**

WP 06/2  
F. W. Scharpf  
**Nicht genutzte Chancen der  
Föderalismusreform**

WP 06/1  
S. Ganghof  
**The Politics of Tax Structure**

### MPIfG Books

J. Beckert, B. Ebbinghaus,  
A. Hassel, P. Manow (Hg.)  
**Transformationen des  
Kapitalismus. Festschrift für  
Wolfgang Streeck zum  
sechzigsten Geburtstag**  
Campus, 2006

S. Hiß  
**Warum übernehmen Unter-  
nehmen gesellschaftliche  
Verantwortung? Ein sozio-  
logischer Erklärungsversuch**  
Campus, 2006

J. Beyer  
**Pfadabhängigkeit: Über  
institutionelle Kontinuität,  
anfällige Stabilität und  
fundamentalen Wandel**  
Campus, 2006

B. Ebbinghaus  
**Reforming Early Retirement in  
Europe, Japan and the USA**  
Oxford University Press, 2006

C. Crouch, W. Streeck (eds.)  
**The Diversity of Democracy:  
Corporatism, Social Order  
and Political Conflict**  
Edward Elgar, 2006

G. Möllering  
**Trust: Reason, Routine,  
Reflexivity**  
Elsevier, 2006

### Ordering Information

*MPIfG Discussion Papers*  
Order printed copies from the MPIfG (you will be billed) or download PDF file from the MPIfG website (free).

*MPIfG Working Papers*  
Online at the MPIfG website.

*MPIfG Books*  
At bookstores; abstracts on the MPIfG website.

[www.mpifg.de](http://www.mpifg.de)  
Go to *Publications*.

### New Titles

Consult our website for the most complete and up-to-date information about MPIfG publications and publications by MPIfG researchers. To sign up for newsletters and mailings, please go to *Service* on the MPIfG website. Upon request to [info@mpifg.de](mailto:info@mpifg.de), we will be happy to send you our Recent Publications brochure.

### ERPA

MPIfG Discussion Papers and MPIfG Working Papers in the field of European integration research are included in the *European Research Papers Archive (ERPA)* which offers full-text search options: <http://eiop.or.at/erpa>.