On Democratic Organizing and Organization Theory

Julie Battilana
Harvard University

Christine M. Beckman
University of California, Santa Barbara

Julie Yen
Boston University

Forthcoming, ***Administrative Science Quarterly***, June 2025

Corresponding author: Julie Yen, Boston University, Rafik B. Hariri Building, 595 Commonwealth Avenue, Boston, MA 02215
Email: julieyen@bu.edu

Abstract

As threats to democracy endanger the rights and freedoms of people around the world, scholars are increasingly interrogating the role that organizations play in shaping democratic and authoritarian societies. Just as societies can be more or less democratic, so, too, can organizations. This essay, in honor of *ASQ*'s 70th volume, argues for a deeper focus in organizational research on the extent to which organizations themselves are democratic and the outcomes associated with these varied models of organizing. First, we provide a framework for considering the extent to which organizations are democratically organized, accounting for the varied ways in which workers can participate in their organizations. Second, we call for research on the outcomes associated with democratic organizing at both the organizational and societal levels. We build from research arguing that the extent to which workers participate in organizational decision making can spill over to impact their expectations of and participation in civic life. Moving forward, we argue it is critical to recognize that questions of democracy and authoritarianism concern not only the political contexts in which organizations are embedded but also how organizations themselves are structured and contribute to society.

Keywords: organizational theory, democracy, democratic organizing, worker participation, power

By many measures, democracy is in decline. In 2024, the world was nearly divided, with 91 countries classified as democracies and 88 as autocracies (Nord et al., 2024). In recent years, democracy has faced increasing headwinds. The number of countries in which political rights and civil liberties are diminishing is higher than the number in which they are improving, and a growing proportion of the world's population lives in authoritarian states (Freedom House, 2024; Nord et al., 2024). These challenges are not new (Snyder, 2017). The 1920s and 1930s, for example, saw European democracies collapse into authoritarianism, while the Soviet Union spread its own authoritarian model across Eastern Europe. Today, as authoritarianism resurges, questions about how democracy is eroded, maintained, and rebuilt are taking on renewed urgency.

Democracy, as Abraham Lincoln (1863) famously characterized it, is "government of the people, by the people, for the people."[1] In its ideal form, democracy places power in the hands of citizens, treating them as equals and ensuring their participation in regular, free, and fair elections (Levitsky and Ziblatt, 2018; Nord et al., 2024). Beyond elections, democracy upholds citizens' civil liberties and guarantees their equal rights and opportunities to engage in political processes (Fuerstein, 2024). In contrast, authoritarianism concentrates state power in the hands of a single party or figure, threatens civil liberties, weakens institutions, and represses citizens (Gerschewski, 2013; Levitsky and Ziblatt, 2018; Adler et al., 2023).

In this essay, we take as a starting point that upholding and enhancing democratic society is essential to safeguarding individual rights and freedoms. As philosopher Philip Pettit (2014:

[1] There are many definitions of democracy, and democracy has many dimensions that are the subject of extensive scholarship and debate in disciplines such as political science and political philosophy. The Varieties of Democracy project, for example, "distinguish[es] between multiple core principles of democracy: electoral, liberal, majoritarian, consensual, participatory, and deliberative" (Nord et al., 2024: 9). Following Fuerstein (2024: 27), we draw on a broad understanding of democracy as "a system of government in which the authority to exercise power lies with all those subject to it ('the people') and should serve 'the people' considered as equals."

xxiv) observed, metaphorically, democracy enables us to "look others in the eye without reason for fear" and to live as free people. Furthermore, research highlights the significant contributions of democratic regimes to social progress. Certainly, the effects of individual democratic regimes can vary widely, and democracy is not inevitably a force for good. But its overall track record is impressive: Compared to authoritarian alternatives, democracies have engaged less often in war, advanced minority rights, reduced ethnic favoritism, and been associated with better health outcomes, greater life satisfaction, and economic prosperity (Acemoglu et al., 2019; Fuerstein, 2024).

Despite the contributions of democracy, economic, social, political, and technological forces are challenging its stability and contributing to the rise of authoritarianism. Economic inequality and stagnant living standards have fueled widespread social discontent and resentment, eroding trust in democratic institutions (Stiglitz, 2012; Piketty, 2014, 2020; Brown, 2019). Political polarization, amplified by misinformation and the exploitation of identity politics, has further undermined the civic foundations of democracy (Levitsky and Ziblatt, 2018; Sunstein, 2018; Lamont, 2023). At the same time, digital technologies have empowered authoritarian regimes to monitor and repress citizens while enabling the proliferation of disinformation that destabilizes democratic deliberation (Bennett and Livingston, 2018; Bradshaw and Howard, 2019; McKay and Tenove, 2021).

In this context, recent scholarship has called for greater engagement with the role of organizations in shaping the decline and resilience of both democracy and authoritarianism (Haveman, 2022; Adler et al., 2023). As organizational scholars, we have a keen interest in how organizations—key pillars of modern society—actively shape the functioning of the societies in which they are embedded. Many organizations play a critical role in protecting, maintaining, and

enhancing democracy; for example, a wide range of organizations support election infrastructure, and advocacy organizations seek to protect civil liberties. But as wealth and power become more concentrated, as has happened in many democratic societies in recent decades, those with the greatest resources increasingly use both corporate and political organizations to wield disproportionate political influence through a variety of activities, including lobbying and political campaign donations (Mills, 1956; Useem, 1986; Barley, 2010; Hacker and Pierson, 2010; Walker and Rea, 2014; Winkler, 2018; Cagé, 2020; Nyberg, 2021; Zavyalova, 2025). Taken together, these dynamics reveal that organizations are not passive actors but, rather, active contributors in shaping democracy's foundations.

Beyond organizations' active and direct role in reinforcing or undermining democratic society, individuals' experiences in organizations shape their beliefs about and expectations for democratic values and norms. The spillover hypothesis, influentially articulated by the political theorist Carole Pateman (1970), posits that the experience of democratic participation at work may increase participation in broader political democracy. According to this hypothesis, workplace participation has educative effects; in other words, it may help individuals develop skills and beliefs that foster civic and political participation (Pateman, 1970; Rybnikova, 2022). Along these lines, research suggests a link between workers' experiences of voice and participation in organizations and a range of outcomes, including their civic attitudes and their engagement in political and civic activities like voting and volunteering (Elden, 1981; Milliken et al., 2015; Budd, Lamare, and Timming, 2018; Wu and Paluck, 2020; Budd and Lamare, 2021; Rybnikova, 2022; Wu et al., 2024).

Scholars have also suggested that when workers experience workplaces as systems in which their voices carry little to no weight, they may come to accept similar dynamics in the

broader political arena, such that non-democratic organizations may contribute to normalizing authoritarian governance (Anderson, 2017; Ferreras, Battilana, and Méda, 2022). This argument suggests that the distribution of decision-making power within organizations has not only organizational but also societal implications. Indeed, proponents of democratic organizing have argued that "democratizing the workplace has beneficial effects on political democracy" (Frega, Herzog, and Neuhäuser, 2019: 2; see also Brenkert, 1992). Yet, we have much more to learn about the complex relationship between workers' experiences in (non-)democratic organizations and their broader political attitudes and behaviors.

Non-democratic ways of organizing have been accepted as the norm since the rise of large-scale organizations (Perrow, 1991; Anderson, 2017). At the same time, more-democratic forms of organizing that structurally guarantee workers an equal right to participate in the governance of their organizations, such as worker cooperatives and codetermination systems, have long existed. To better understand democratic organizing and its consequences, we need to direct our attention to these contexts, building on decades of prior research on the varied forms of worker participation in organizations (Rothschild-Whitt, 1979; Heller et al., 1998; Wilkinson et al., 2010; Atzeni, 2012).

In this essay, we outline an agenda for future research to investigate how organizations can be structured in more- or less-democratic ways and the implications of (non-)democratic organizing for both organizational and societal outcomes. By exploring how democratic principles can be embedded in organizational design, we aim to chart a path for research that bridges organization studies with the urgent societal imperative to uphold and enhance democracy.

The Spectrum of Democratic Organizing

Research shows that there is a gap between workers' desire to have a say in what happens in their organizations and the voice they actually experience (Freeman and Rogers, 1999; Kochan et al., 2019). Furthermore, the COVID-19 pandemic and subsequent economic instability catalyzed new support for employee activism, union organizing, and legislative proposals that aimed to increase workers' participation in corporate governance (Davis, 2021; Kochan et al., 2023). For example, highly publicized unionization drives at companies like Amazon and Google (Schiffer, 2021; Tarasov, 2022), as well as strike actions by auto workers, nurses, screenwriters, actors, and others (Isidore, 2024), reflect a resurgence of workers organizing to have a greater say in their working lives. The past decade has also seen movement toward legislative changes that intended to empower workers to participate in corporate governance in places such as France (Aubert and Bernheim, 2021) and the United States (Williams, 2018)—changes that would build on longstanding traditions of worker representation in corporate governance in places like Germany and Scandinavia (Turner, 1991). Along with concerns related to rising authoritarianism (see the discussion curated by Michael Lounsbury and Nelson Phillips in Adler et al., 2023), these shifting conditions have sparked a new wave of research and writing on democratic organizing, including in the field of organization studies (Davis, 2021; Battilana, Yen et al., 2022; Ferreras, Battilana, and Méda, 2022; Gilbert et al., 2023; Weber, Unterrainer, and Jønsson, 2023).

Next, we briefly discuss the history of non-democratic forms of organizing, as well as the diversity of democratic forms that exist today. We then outline considerations for assessing more- and less-democratic forms of organizing, emphasizing the strength of workers' right to participate in organizational decision making.

The Historical Dominance of Non-Democratic Forms of Organizing

For the past century, organizations in which decision-making power is concentrated in the hands of a limited group of top managers and shareholder representatives have been dominant. To

explain this dominance, scholars have focused on the economic efficiency of such forms of organizing (Coase, 1937; Weber, 1947; Ouchi, 1980; Williamson, 1981), their alignment with basic human psychological drives toward status orderings (Magee and Galinsky, 2008; Gruenfeld and Tiedens, 2010; Pfeffer, 2013), and organizational legitimacy considerations (Meyer and Rowan, 1977; DiMaggio and Powell, 1983). Agency theory, too, justifies structuring corporate governance primarily to protect shareholders' interests (Jensen and Meckling, 1976), overlooking the broader responsibilities of companies to other stakeholders (Stout, 2013; Veldman and Willmott, 2016). Because the concentration of decision-making power at the top (a non-democratic model) has become the default structure for organizing work across most contexts (Perrow, 1991; Anderson, 2017), workers in many organizations lack the right to participate in decisions that greatly affect their lives and well-being (Brenkert, 1992; Foley and Polanyi, 2006; Landemore and Ferreras, 2016; Ferreras, 2017).

Since the Industrial Revolution, social scientists have been concerned with the extensive control that owners of capital and their representatives wield over workers. For example, foundational thinkers (e.g., Durkheim, 1893; Marx, 1906; Polanyi, 1944) were deeply concerned with the societal implications of the alienation, exploitation, and commodification of factory workers, who had to sell their labor to capital owners to survive but had no say on critical topics such as safety, work hours, and pay. From this "fundamental inequality" of capitalism flows the disempowerment of workers (Adler, 2019: 32; Ferreras, 2017). Furthermore, the growth of business enterprises spurred the development of bureaucracy (Chandler, 1977), which relied on the principles of instrumental rationality, impartiality, and domination (Weber, 1947; Monteiro and Adler, 2021). Bureaucracy reinforced hierarchical and often authoritarian control of workers by owners and top managers (Perrow, 1991; Anderson, 2017). This approach has normalized

workplaces as authoritarian spaces, systematically excluding workers' voices from meaningful governance (Landemore and Ferreras, 2016; Anderson, 2017; Ferreras, Battilana, and Méda, 2022).

Despite the dominance of non-democratic models, organizations have long experimented with alternative, more-democratic ways of organizing, such as cooperatives, unions, works councils, and codetermination, that ensure workers' participation in governance (Rothschild-Whitt, 1979; Turner, 1991; Heller et al., 1998; Wilkinson et al., 2010; Atzeni, 2012; Rubinstein and McCarthy, 2016). We turn to these next.

The Variety of Democratic Forms of Organizing

A critical difference between non-democratic and more-democratic forms of organizing lies in the extent to which decision-making power is concentrated in a small group of decision makers or more democratically shared among organizational members (Battilana and Casciaro, 2021). Workers' equal right and ability to participate in decision making is thus an essential criterion in assessing the level of democratization in an organization. We argue that this critical dimension of democratic organizing—the strength of workers' participation—merits special attention in the study of how democratic organizing works and its consequences, and we identify four additional dimensions along which democratic organizing can vary. Table 1 summarizes these five dimensions.

[INSERT TABLE 1 ABOUT HERE]

Workers' participation can range in strength from weak to strong; weak participation is informal and at the discretion of organizational leaders, whereas strong participation indicates that workers' participation in decision making is structurally guaranteed through formal governance systems. When workers' participation is weak, it is consultative, meaning that

workers can express their views, but their input is not binding. For example, this is the case when workers exercise voice through the proverbial comment box that management uses to solicit their ideas. When participation is strong, it is embedded in an organization's design and structure. This is the case, for example, when workers in a worker-owned cooperative collectively make organizational decisions and when unions or works councils have a guaranteed right to participate in certain types of decisions.

Research in recent decades has focused predominantly on weaker forms of worker participation. For instance, research on worker voice, which is by definition informal and discretionary, explores what happens when workers share their views with the aim of bringing about improvement or change (for reviews, see Morrison, 2014, 2023). This work on weak forms of participation tends to draw on psychological approaches, often focusing on the predictors of voice (Liang, Farh, and Farh, 2012; Morrison, 2023) and exploring how the exercise of voice impacts individual- and group-level outcomes such as the risks and rewards for workers who speak up (Burris, 2012), workers' status (Bain et al., 2021), psychological empowerment (Seibert, Wang, and Courtright, 2011), and unit performance (Detert et al., 2013).

Research on internal social activism also explores how workers speak up and advocate for change in organizations, even in the absence of a guaranteed right to participate in decision making (for reviews, see Briscoe and Gupta, 2016; Heucher et al., 2024). This research investigates how workers collectively organize around social issues such as gender equity or minority rights, and it often traces the processes by which employee activists advance change despite lacking formal decision-making authority on those issues (e.g., Meyerson and Scully, 1995; Kellogg, 2009, 2012; DeCelles, Sonenshein, and King, 2020; DeJordy et al., 2020; Buchter, 2021; Kessinger, 2024). While broader in scope, these forms of participation generally

remain consultative, meaning that workers can raise concerns and advocate for change, but their power to affect decisions remains informal and thereby limited.

Scholars have also examined settings in which workers' participation in decision making is stronger, i.e., formally guaranteed. Research has documented some organizations' structural experiments with self-managing teams and decentralized decision making (Barker, 1993; Lee and Edmondson, 2017; Lee, 2024) and has shown that decentralized forms of organizing can increase workers' autonomy and decision rights. In these contexts, the organizational structure ensures that workers have a significant degree of autonomy to make decisions related to their own work roles. Other research has examined organizations that go further by guaranteeing workers or their representatives the ability to exercise power via the organization's system of governance, as is the case in cooperatives and codetermination systems (Rothschild and Whitt, 1986; Young-Hyman, Magne, and Kruse, 2023). These organizations typically grant workers participation in a wide range of organizational decisions. For example, codetermination, which is prevalent in countries including Germany, Austria, Denmark, Norway, and Sweden, grants workers formal representation on corporate boards, and workers' representatives then vote on strategic decisions that affect them, such as pay ratios and CEO selection (McGaughey, 2015; Scholz and Vitols, 2019; Jäger, Noy, and Schoefer, 2022).

Arguably, the strength of worker participation (from discretionary to structurally guaranteed) is the most important element of democratic organizing, as it determines whether workers have the formal right to exercise power in their organizations (Frega, Herzog, and Neuhäuser, 2019). Although we discuss a continuum of participation from weak to strong, many scholars would argue that a threshold of structurally guaranteed participation is necessary for an organization to be considered democratic. For example, scholars have defined "workplace

democracy" and "organizational democracy" as involving "widely and evenly distribute[d] . . . governance rights among workers" (Young-Hyman, Magne, and Kruse, 2023: 1353) and "broad-based, and institutionalized employee participation that is not occasional in nature" (Weber, Unterrainer, and Jønsson, 2023: 1). As we continue to study worker participation in its many forms, focusing more on whether participation is weak or strong can help sharpen our understanding of how the strength of participation shapes different outcomes.

At the same time, organizations can also vary along several other dimensions that shape the nature of worker participation in decision making (Dachler and Wilpert, 1978; Heller et al., 1998; Wilkinson et al., 2010). We identify four additional dimensions that are important to the study of democratic organizing: scope of decision making, representation, hierarchy, and financial ownership.

First, the scope of workers' participation refers to whether workers influence narrow, task-specific decisions or broader, strategic ones. Workers' participation is narrow when they participate only in decision making related to their own tasks or daily work, such as when workers have a say in whether to install new equipment on a factory line or when they can choose how to structure their own work hours. Studies that have focused on a relatively narrow scope include those examining self-managing teams and decentralized decision making, which increase workers' autonomy and strengthen local decision rights (Barker, 1993; Lee and Edmondson, 2017; Lee, 2024). A broad scope extends workers' participation to a wide range of organizational strategic decisions, such as determining whether to lay off workers or adopt environmentally sustainable production methods. Examples of research on a relatively broader scope would include studies of cooperatives and codetermination. The broader the scope, the greater the potential for workers to shape organizations' strategic direction.

Second, workers' participation in decision making can be either direct or indirect. Direct participation occurs, for example, in worker cooperatives and self-managing teams in which each individual directly votes or otherwise participates in decision making. Indirect participation happens through the selection of representatives. For example, in most labor unions, workers elect union leaders who advocate for their rights. Direct and indirect participation can both be democratic decision-making processes, each offering an avenue for workers to express their voices and influence outcomes.

Third, democratic forms of organizing may be more or less hierarchical. Though democracy is often associated with flatness, and authoritarianism is often associated with tall, hierarchical structures, democracy and hierarchy are distinct constructs (Battilana, Yen et al., 2022). On the one hand, democratic bureaucracy, which combines participation and hierarchical authority structures, is possible (Monteiro and Adler, 2021), as exemplified in codetermination systems and unions. On the other hand, some democratic organizations eschew hierarchical authority structures and embrace flatness; in collectivist organizations, for example, authority is shared by the collective and defined by egalitarianism (Rothschild-Whitt, 1979). But less hierarchy does not guarantee strong worker participation; organizations can be non-hierarchical and have weak participation. This is the case in many startups, which may be flatter organizations in which workers can exercise a lot of voice but do not ultimately have a binding influence on decision making (Turco, 2016).

Fourth, democratic organizations vary in whether they incorporate an element of financial ownership. In worker-owned cooperatives, workers become decision makers because they own shares of the cooperative firm. Regardless of the size of each worker's share, the principle of one person, one vote is usually the norm, giving workers an equitable stake in both the financial

outcomes and the strategic direction of the organization. In firms with an employee stock ownership plan, workers may hold shares but often lack substantive decision-making power because the total stake they own is not significant enough to give them more than a marginal presence in the general assembly of shareholders. These examples highlight the distinction between financial ownership and participatory governance (Ben-Ner and Jones, 1995). Though interest in worker ownership is rising (Blasi, Freeman, and Kruse, 2013; Dudley and Rouen, 2021), much of the research on this topic has focused on ownership as a way to redistribute financial resources (which is an important concern), without considering its implications for democratic organizing.

Thus, while democratic organizing always entails workers' participation in decision making (with some threshold of strong or structurally guaranteed participation necessary for an organization to be considered a workplace democracy), the other four dimensions are also important to explore when studying democratic organizing. Together, these dimensions can lead to many forms of organizing, with some being more democratic than others. For example, workers can consult on (weak participation) or have the structural right to decide on (strong participation) everything from the type of coffee in the break room to the mission statement, and they can decide on these topics directly or through representatives, in flat or tall organizations, and whether or not they own shares in the organization. In other words, scope of decision making (narrow to broad), representation (direct/indirect), hierarchy (flat to tall), and financial ownership (none to full) on their own do not necessarily correspond to greater or lesser degrees of democracy. Instead, these elements can be combined with varying levels of strength of workers' participation in decision making, resulting in diverse forms of organizing that can be more or less

democratic. These dimensions, summarized in Table 1, provide a clear set of considerations for future research on democratic organizing.

Exploring the Internal Workings of Democratic Organizing

We have much more to learn about the internal workings of various democratic forms of organizing, especially how organizations can create and sustain democratic governance structures and processes over time. Democratic forms of organizing are often critiqued for their tendency to become less democratic, though a recent review of qualitative studies showed that it is possible for democratic organizations to maintain and in some cases even rebuild democratic practices (Unterrainer et al., 2022). Questions regarding the sustainability of democratic organizing make it critical to understand which types of participation are most sustainable and how democratic forms may evolve (see, for example, Bretos and Errasti, 2017; Bourlier-Bargues, Gond, and Valiorgue, 2024; Lee and Young-Hyman, 2025). For instance, when and how do organizations move across the spectrum from weak to strong participation, or back again? Compared to weak forms of participation, are strong forms more resistant to change? And what roles do the other dimensions of democratic organizing play in sustaining participation? These are not static systems, so the mechanisms enabling their sustainability are important to explore.

Challenges Associated with Conflict Management

Better understanding how to sustain democratic organizing requires understanding how to manage its challenges. Foundational work in organization theory tells us that organizations are political coalitions of members with often-conflicting goals (Parker Follett, 1942; March, 1962; Cyert and March, 1963). Moreover, the challenge of managing intra-organizational conflict is especially salient in the literature on democratic organizing (Jackall, 1984; Darr, 1999; Slade Shantz et al., 2020). If unmanaged, excessive conflict can contribute to decision gridlock and

even threaten organizational survival (Polletta, 2002; Harrison and Freeman, 2004). This potential for gridlock raises questions about the potential tensions between workers' participation, on the one hand, and speed and efficiency in solving critical problems, on the other. How might organizations foster deliberation and participation and also make timely and efficient decisions?

Organizational research suggests that organizational structures and culture that support deliberation can help organizations navigate the conflict inherent in democratic decision making. Research on several forms of democratic organizing finds that mandatory meetings, formal processes and roles, and rituals facilitate the resolution of conflict (Ashforth and Reingen, 2014; Battilana et al., 2015). Similarly, Lee (2024) found that embedding authority in formal, task-based roles rather than in individuals promotes more-egalitarian decision making.

The development and fostering of a deliberative culture is also critical for democratic organizing. Deliberation—a process of argument and persuasion through which diverse interests are formed into collective agendas—is a key mechanism for resolving conflict and reaching consensus in democratic settings (Cohen, 1989; Fung, 2005; Dryzek et al., 2019; Herzog, 2024). Effective deliberation relies on an organizational culture that enables people to use the voice rights they have, to navigate the challenges of conflict and compromise, and to collaborate constructively (Battilana, Fuerstein, and Lee, 2018). Taken together, this scholarship suggests that both (formal) structures and (informal) culture help organizations to contain conflict, manage it productively, and sustain democratic organizing.

Challenges Associated with Scaling

Another common concern with democratic organizing is that it is difficult to scale, especially when participation is direct (Rothschild and Whitt, 1986; Whyte and Whyte, 1988; Massa and O'Mahony, 2021). The rise of technologies like digital platforms (Davis, 2016; Davis and Sinha,

2021) offers new possibilities for extending the scale and scope of democratic decision making, as such platforms can be used to facilitate more people's direct participation in decision making on a wide range of topics. Some research has explored how companies use digital technologies to elicit employee voice (Turco, 2016), but we can also learn from other settings in which people use digital platforms and networks to facilitate participative decision making among a range of stakeholders. These settings include open source communities that experience the development of formal governance systems with democratic mechanisms (O'Mahony and Ferraro, 2007), online networks of self-organized activists (Massa and O'Mahony, 2021), democratically organized freelancers (Charles, Ferreras, and Lamine, 2020), platform-based communities in the gig economy, including platform cooperatives (Schor, 2020), and social innovation challenges that engage multiple stakeholders in tackling social problems (Mair and Gegenhuber, 2021; Fayard, 2024).

Many of these efforts at community organizing through digital platforms stand in contrast to hierarchical forms of organization, but that does not necessarily mean that these are democratic forms of organizing. For example, although the self-organized activists studied by Massa and O'Mahony (2021) are distributed in an online community, a participation architecture emerges that partitions activists such that ultimate control still resides in a small group of experts. In contrast, in the open source community studied by O'Mahony and Ferraro (2007), democratic elements, such as being able to amend the constitution as well as voting to elect and recall a leader, provide individuals with more-equal and stronger rights of participation. These examples suggest it would be fruitful to examine platform and community organizing more explicitly through the lens of democratic organizing (rather than as forms of decentralization, which may or may not be democratic; see Reineke, Katila, and Eisenhardt, 2025). It will also be

important to consider the range of ways that people can participate in digital platforms, such as through creating, acknowledging, liking, and commenting. How might these new forms of social participation shape and intersect with more-traditional ways of participating at work and in our communities?

In addition, it would be useful to explore the technologies underlying some of this organizing, such as blockchain technologies that support cryptocurrencies—technologies that have been touted as "democratizing," while simultaneously being described as dangerous. For example, decentralized autonomous organizations (DAOs) rely on blockchain as a governance mechanism to coordinate and facilitate collaboration through voting rather than through a central authority (Lumineau, Wang, and Schilke, 2021). Yet, the promise of DAOs for democratic organizing is still mostly theoretical, as tokens by which voting shares are determined can be concentrated in the hands of a few people and have been subject to fraud and hacking (Chayka, 2022; Liu, 2022). Instead of looking at such technological changes as either the solution to all problems or the source of all evils, we need more research: studies that explore the implementation of these tools, investigate how they may enable stronger and broader participation, and consider how they may be used to control workers, undermine participation, or consolidate authority (Kellogg, Valentine, and Christin, 2020). This work will require careful, nuanced research investigating the systems in which people use and interact with technologies (Anthony, Bechky, and Fayard, 2023).

In examining the challenges and opportunities of scaling democratic organizing, we also ought to learn from, and complement, research in political science that has explored large-scale participation of citizens and communities. For example, the work of Nobel laureate Elinor Ostrom highlights how local knowledge, community participation, and the development of

institutional arrangements enable the management of common resources (without relying on top-down regulation or authority; see Ostrom, 1990). In addition, citizen assemblies—an important innovation in the civic realm—are increasingly used across the world both at the community and national levels to enable citizens to more directly participate in shaping the future of democracy (Fournier, 2011; Landemore, 2020). These assemblies have been used to gather citizens with the mandate to make recommendations and collective decisions on critical topics like public budgeting (Wright, 2010; Wu et al., 2024), marriage equality, and climate change (Landemore, 2020: xiv–xv).

Citizen assemblies also present another context in which to study the use of technology (Landemore, 2021). For example, algorithms have been developed to select participants for such assemblies (Flanigan et al., 2021), and digital platforms have been used to facilitate large-scale participation. In Taiwan, for instance, the government worked with a civic tech community called g0v (Gov Zero) to develop a deliberation process that enabled citizens to participate in key government decisions via an online discussion platform (Horton, 2018). Hélène Landemore (2020), a political scientist who studies these citizen assemblies, put it this way: Such initiatives show that another form of democracy, a more participative one, is still possible, and they may have important learnings for other forms of democratic organizing.

Thus, in addition to advocating for research on the varied dimensions associated with democratic organizing, we call for future scholarship on how to manage the challenges that often arise in sustaining democratic organizing, including managing conflict and scaling participation. We advocate particular focus on the roles of organizational structures and culture and of new technologies in these processes. Next, we turn to the organizational and societal outcomes associated with (non-)democratic organizing.

Outcomes Associated with Democratic and Non-Democratic Organizing

Democratic organizing is unlikely to produce uniformly better or worse outcomes; instead, its effects on different goals are likely to vary in diverse and context-dependent ways. In some cases, participation supports organizational goals like providing welfare services, generating renewable energy, and spurring local development, as well as broader emancipatory goals like the political empowerment of citizens (e.g., Blanco and León, 2017; Galera, 2017; Bauwens, Huybrechts, and Dufays, 2020). In other instances, participation supports traditional organizational goals like profit maximization or financial efficiency (e.g., Mazmanian and Beckman, 2018). Democratic organizing may also simultaneously serve multiple goals, such as balancing individual empowerment with organizational efficiency. Thus, we need to examine not only how and where democratic organizing manifests but also the mechanisms and conditions that shape its influence on individual, organizational, and societal outcomes.

Organizational Consequences of Democratic Organizing

Prior research shows that empowering workers to participate in decision making enhances psychological empowerment, trust, legitimacy, and commitment, which fosters a greater sense of ownership and accountability (Seibert, Wang, and Courtright, 2011; Battilana, Fuerstein, and Lee, 2018). Workplace participation can also improve workers' psychological well-being and job satisfaction, offering a powerful counterbalance to the alienation and disempowerment that workers often experience in traditional workplaces (Weber, Unterrainer, and Höge, 2020; Lovejoy et al., 2021; Fox et al., 2022). These findings indicate that participation is critical in and of itself, beyond any purported influence on performance or firm-level outcomes; well-being, empowerment, and engagement carry great benefits for people. To add nuance and extend our

understanding of these outcomes, we need a more systematic examination of how the variable dimensions of workers' participation (e.g., strength and scope of decision making) shape whether these benefits of participation are realized. Furthermore, asking these questions may help to normalize the importance of outcomes such as well-being, empowerment, and engagement without requiring a business case that these outcomes support organizational performance (see Kaplan, 2020).

In addition to associating democratic organizing with empowered and more-committed workers, research has associated it with higher levels of productivity and better decision making. Young-Hyman, Magne, and Kruse (2023) found that in knowledge-intensive industries, workplace democracies are more productive compared to traditional organizations. This finding is consistent with research showing that diversity, democracy, and voice can all benefit learning, decision making, and unit performance (Ely and Thomas, 2001, 2020; Edmondson, 2003; Hong and Page, 2004; Morrison, 2011; Detert et al., 2013; Gerlsbeck and Herzog, 2020). It is also critical to uncover pathways through which workers' voice can be successfully implemented when their participation is consultative (Satterstrom, Kerrissey, and DiBenigno, 2021) and to investigate how variation along the other dimensions of democratic organizing (i.e., scope, representation, hierarchy, ownership) shapes outcomes like productivity, innovation, and the quality of decision making. For example, when does indirect representation improve decision making, and when are direct forms of participation more beneficial?

There is also a need to explore the relationship between democratic organizing and equal rights and opportunities in organizations. Political democracy is not only about participation. In the words of political theorist Wendy Brown (2019: 24), "democracy is moored by equality," and in its ideal form, democracy involves the full participation of *all* citizens and the equal protection

of fundamental rights and civil liberties. Just as minority groups are not always protected in political democracies, we cannot assume that democratic organizing without careful attention to equality will protect the interests of minorities in organizations. As a wealth of existing research on inequality in organizations already shows, organizations—even those that are more oriented to participation—often reproduce inequalities and power imbalances (Amis, Mair, and Munir, 2020). Research has shown that cooperatives can reproduce demographically based inequalities (Meyers and Vallas, 2016), and recent research in a flat organization dominated by men found that women may not see themselves as represented, fitting in, or having voice within the organization (Hurst, Lee, and Frake, 2024).

This research points to the importance of formal structures that enable and ensure the equal participation and the protection of all voices; without them, democratic processes can be used to undermine the rights and interests of minority groups or those who challenge authority (Freeman, 1970; Bourlier-Bargues, Gond, and Valiorgue, 2024). Future research ought to further investigate the conditions under which different types of democratic organizations and different organizing practices promote or inhibit equitable opportunities and outcomes.

Future research will also need to investigate how various kinds of worker participation shape which goals organizations adopt. In keeping with organization scholars' increasing focus on social innovation, sustainability, and the pursuit of multiple objectives (Battilana and Lee, 2014; Bansal and Song, 2017; Vedula et al., 2022; Beckman et al., 2023), we see an opportunity to examine the relationship between democratic organizing and an organization's social and environmental impact. Some research suggests that democratic organizations will further social aims. For example, Tracey, Phillips, and Haugh (2005) described how community enterprises, which have democratic governance structures, behave in socially responsible ways (see also

Mair, Wolf, and Seelos, 2016; Galera, 2017). But while some have argued that empowering workers will encourage firms to embrace goals beyond financial performance and efficiency (Rothschild, 2009; Davis, 2021; Ferreras, Battilana, and Méda, 2022), others worry about conditions under which empowering workers may have the opposite effect. For instance, there may be scenarios in which empowering workers to participate in strategic decisions with broad scope will aid in the pursuit of environmental protection, such as when workers live near a factory and have an interest in curbing pollution. Yet, there may be other situations in which workers may resist or slow the implementation of environmental solutions, such as when transitioning to more-sustainable practices may threaten their jobs or their identities. Instead of speculating on what is likely to happen, we should tackle these issues in a rigorous and systematic way. Future research will thus need to further examine when participation engenders the adoption of social or environmental aims alongside financial ones. This research will need to account not only for organizational dynamics but also for the role of the institutional context.

In considering the pursuit of social and environmental aims, another important question to investigate is whether, or under which conditions, democratic organizations are better or worse at managing the tensions and tradeoffs inherent in the pursuit of multiple objectives (Kaplan, 2019; Battilana, Obloj et al., 2022). As discussed above, political theorists have argued that democratic participation and deliberation can help to integrate multiple and conflicting goals in decision making (Landemore, 2012; Dryzek et al., 2019). These ideas may also apply in the pursuit of multiple organizational goals, but more research is needed to deepen our understanding (Battilana, Fuerstein, and Lee, 2018). In particular, we need additional comparative work contrasting more- and less-democratic forms of organizing (see Young-Hyman, 2017; Berti and Pitelis, 2022; Young-Hyman, Magne, and Kruse, 2023, for examples).

Finally, although we have focused on workers' participation, organizations have many different stakeholders who may also participate in organizational decision making, such as community members, suppliers, customers, shareholders, and governments (Crane, Matten, and Moon, 2004; Parmar et al., 2010). For example, some organizations are participating in multistakeholder initiatives on issues like corporate social responsibility and labor standards (Fung, 2003; Scherer and Palazzo, 2011; Huber and Schormair, 2021; Reinecke and Donaghey, 2021) or have created a board seat for a representative of the environment (Kaminski, 2022; Rose, 2024). In considering what happens when democratic organizations incorporate the voices of more types of stakeholders, we ought to consider whether we observe different outcomes, including those beyond the organization, such as societal benefits like civic wealth creation (Lumpkin and Bacq, 2019).

Societal Consequences of Democratic Organizing

The implications of (non-)democratic organizing extend far beyond the organization itself, influencing societal norms, values, behaviors, and other institutions. As discussed above, political theorists have long argued that the experience of participating in workplace democracy can spill over into broader civic engagement because workers who engage in participatory governance at work are more likely to develop the skills, confidence, and expectations necessary for active citizenship (Pateman, 1970). Research offers some support for this hypothesis, finding that greater employee voice and control at work are associated with higher rates of political participation, voting, participation in demonstrations and boycotts, engagement in local communities, and civic behavior (Milliken et al., 2015; Budd, Lamare, and Timming, 2018; Budd and Lamare, 2021; Geurkink, Akkerman, and Sluiter, 2022; Rybnikova, 2022). When workers are given greater local voice, they have less deference to generalized authority and are

more civically engaged (Wu and Paluck, 2020; Wu et al., 2024). Although this work includes Wu's recent field experiments demonstrating causality, methodological challenges such as reverse causality and the challenge of conducting longitudinal studies remain a concern (Kim, 2021). In addition, it would be useful to more systematically investigate how different dimensions and varying degrees of democratic organizing shape political and civic behavior (i.e., weak vs. strong participation, narrow vs. broad scope, direct vs. indirect representation, tall vs. flat hierarchy, complete vs. no ownership). For example, Palmieri (2024) investigated the effect of financial ownership on voting in presidential elections.

A preliminary examination of this research suggests that even weak and narrow participation can have positive societal spillovers. For instance, Milliken et al. (2015) discussed connections between employee voice, a weak form of participation, and active engagement in community. Lopes, Lagoa, and Calapez (2014) found an association between workers' autonomy over their own work tasks, a narrow scope of participation, and their participation in volunteer, political, and trade union activities. In a meta-analysis, Weber, Unterrainer, and Höge (2020) found that individuals' direct participation in decision making (regardless of its strength) was associated with their civic and democratic orientations. The authors speculated that direct participation, even if it is not structurally guaranteed, may be particularly important because personally experiencing direct participation may engender the feelings of autonomy and mastery most relevant to the spillover effects theorized by Pateman (1970). If structural bases of participation are indirect or not felt by employees—as may sometimes be the case, for example, in representative codetermination systems or unions—these spillover effects may not be as pronounced. At the same time, strong and broad participation may still be important in shaping whether workers' suggestions are actually implemented, the durability of workers' participation,

and other organizational and societal outcomes. Recent work shows how working in cooperatives, which exemplify strong participation, can foster civic engagement both in and outside of work (Schlachter and Ársælsson, 2024). In a review, Kim (2021) found that many existing studies do not measure participation in decision making at the organizational level (broad scope), and when they do, they often collapse measures of narrow and broad scope into a single scale. More-nuanced and comparative research is needed to better understand the mechanisms at play and their implications.

Future research will also benefit from comparative studies across various political regimes and forms of capitalism, across different legal and regulatory contexts, and across time (Esping-Andersen, 1990; Soskice, 1999; Hall and Soskice, 2001). Many of the studies on the spillover effects of democratic organizing have been conducted in Western democracies, especially in Europe (e.g., Budd, Lamare, and Timming, 2018), but a few studies have been conducted in authoritarian contexts (Wu and Paluck, 2020; Wu et al., 2024). According to these studies, positive spillover effects, such as more civic engagement and less deference to authority, are observed as a result of workplace participation in both democratic and authoritarian societal contexts (even when workplace participation is relatively weak and narrow). Can such effects be sustained over time in an authoritarian context, or are they destined to be ephemeral, given that participation rights could easily be taken away if they threaten the authoritarian government (Zavyalova, 2025)? Investigating these questions across contexts will be particularly helpful in enabling us to connect organizational and societal dynamics and to better understand the conditions under which democratic organizing can contribute to the enhancement of democracy.

In addition to democratic outcomes, a societal outcome worthy of particular focus is how democratic organizing shapes broader patterns of inequality. Many scholars argue that non-

democratic organizations have significantly contributed to democracy's decline by exacerbating economic inequality through wage disparities, exploitative labor practices, and the prioritization of financial value (Lin and Tomaskovic-Devey, 2013; Piketty, 2014; Cobb, 2016; Fligstein and Goldstein, 2022; Haveman, 2022). We know that organizations shape the distribution of wealth and power in society (Tomaskovic-Devey and Avent-Holt, 2019; Amis, Mair, and Munir, 2020) and that inequality is exacerbated when organizations use their resources to influence regulations and governance in ways that reinforce their power (e.g., Hacker and Pierson, 2010; Walker and Rea, 2014; Winkler, 2018). This raises interesting questions about whether the turn to democratic forms of organizing can reduce systemic inequalities and promote inclusive growth. For example, worker-owned cooperatives have been shown to reduce wage disparities within organizations and foster community development (Rothschild, 2009; Young-Hyman, Magne, and Kruse, 2023). Future research can consider how democratic organizing may intersect with labor market structures such as firm size and employment concentration (e.g., Davis and Cobb, 2010; Cobb and Lin, 2017; Cobb and Stevens, 2017) and organizational practices such as hiring and evaluation (e.g., Amis, Mair, and Munir, 2020; Abraham, Botelho, and Lamont-Dobbin, 2024) to shape wages and inequality.

Conclusion: Studying Real Utopias

As we write these lines, the challenges facing democratic societies around the world are increasingly salient and urgent. People live in increasingly authoritarian contexts. Political polarization continues to rise. Wealth and power are being deployed to further the interests of those at the top, reduce the voices of those near the bottom, and increase inequality. Not to mention that the threats and impacts of climate change are rapidly intensifying. And amid these

crises, companies and governments are rolling back commitments to sustainability, workers' autonomy, and diversity, equity, and inclusion—commitments that were on the rise only a few years ago.

What do these circumstances mean for workers' participation and for democratic organizing? We know that leaders in non-democratic organizations can roll back popular practices over workers' vociferous objections, as has been the case with recent reversals of remote work policies (Elliott, 2024; Eaton, 2025). Experience shows that even when novel policies and practices have documented benefits for workers and organizations, top managers ultimately use their discretion to retract them (Kim, Bailyn, and Kolb, 2017; Kelly and Moen, 2020; Yen, 2024). Moreover, some organizations today are reasserting control over workers and blocking their expressions of voice, in some cases seeking to reform cultures that had previously encouraged employee voice and dissent (Kessinger, 2024). High-profile technology companies, for example, have actively sought to suppress the discussion of political topics and have increased monitoring and censorship on internal platforms (Isaac, Conger, and Frenkel, 2025).

These past lessons and evolving circumstances suggest a troubling pattern: When workers lack strong participation rights in decision making, policies and practices that support workers may be short-lived, and top managers ultimately have control over whether workers can participate in shaping their organizations. Even though both weak (consultative) and strong (structurally guaranteed) forms are associated with beneficial outcomes, weak participation alone may be insufficient to reliably generate positive outcomes over the long run—precisely because participation that is not structurally guaranteed can easily be taken away. The precarity of workers' participation in today's world raises questions that are difficult to study, but we should not shy away from the challenge.

We close this essay with a reminder that alternative ways of organizing social life and systems may not be widespread, but they already exist and can teach us critical lessons that can help us envision and implement novel approaches to pressing organizational and societal problems (Gümüsay and Reinecke, 2024; Lechterman and Mair, 2024). In a world in which non-democratic forms of organizing dominate, focusing more of our attention on varied forms of democratic organizing—longstanding ones like cooperatives, unions, and codetermination, as well as innovations in other domains like open source software and citizen assemblies—can broaden our imagination of what is possible. Such studies of what Wright (2010) has called "real utopias"—alternative settings and methods of organizing that can inform a transition to a fairer, more sustainable, and more democratic society—are essential because they highlight possible pathways for change and thereby challenge the assumptions underpinning existing systems. By studying democratic organizing, scholars can identify mechanisms and conditions that may contribute to more effective, equitable, and sustainable systems of governance, advancing both theoretical knowledge and practical insights.

As we face the rise of authoritarianism, resistance is critical and can take many forms. It requires agitation and coordination against the forces that threaten democracy and seek to erode individual rights and freedoms. Organizations and organizing within professional and other communities are essential to that resistance. Our argument here has been that the study of real utopias like democratic forms of organizing can also play a critical role in shaping our future—by informing our understanding of the innovations to which more communities and societies may one day turn (Battilana and Kimsey, 2017). In other words, effective resistance requires not only knowing what we stand against but also developing a shared understanding of the plausible alternatives to which we aspire.

Acknowledgments
We thank András Tilcsik and our anonymous reviewers for their guidance. We are grateful to Paul Adler, Tiziana Casciaro, Frank Dobbin, Anne-Laure Fayard, Isabelle Ferreras, Michael Fuerstein, Lisa Herzog, Leszek Krol, Ryann Noe, Siobhan O'Mahony, Lakshmi Ramarajan, and Elliot Stoller for their generous feedback and thoughtful insights. This essay also benefited from input from participants of the Scandinavian Consortium for Organizational Research and the CalO2 conference. All errors are our own.

REFERENCES

Abraham, M., T. L. Botelho, and G. Lamont-Dobbin
2024 "The (re)production of inequality in evaluations: A unifying framework outlining the drivers of gender and racial differences in evaluative outcomes." Research in Organizational Behavior, 44. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.riob.2024.100207

Acemoglu, D., S. Naidu, P. Restrepo, and J. A. Robinson
2019 "Democracy does cause growth." Journal of Political Economy, 127: 47–100.

Adler, P. S.
2019 The 99 Percent Economy: How Democratic Socialism Can Overcome the Crises of Capitalism. Oxford University Press.

Adler, P. S., A. Adly, D. E. Armanios, J. Battilana, Z. Bodrožić, S. Clegg, G. F. Davis, et al.
2023 "Authoritarianism, populism, and the global retreat of democracy: A curated discussion." Journal of Management Inquiry, 32: 3–20.

Amis, J. M., J. Mair, and K. A. Munir
2020 "The organizational reproduction of inequality." Academy of Management Annals, 14: 195–230.

Anderson, E.
2017 Private Government: How Employers Rule Our Lives (and Why We Don't Talk About It). Princeton University Press.

Anthony, C., B. A. Bechky, and A.-L. Fayard
2023 "'Collaborating' with AI: Taking a system view to explore the future of work." Organization Science, 34: 1672–1694.

Ashforth, B. E., and P. H. Reingen
2014 "Functions of dysfunction: Managing the dynamics of an organizational duality in a natural food cooperative." Administrative Science Quarterly, 59: 474–516.

Atzeni, M. (Ed.)
2012 Alternative Work Organizations. Palgrave Macmillan.

Aubert, N., and P. Bernheim
2021 "What the PACTE law changes for employee savings and participation?" Bankers Markets & Investors: An Academic and Professional Review, 163: 43–49.

Bain, K., T. A. Kreps, N. L. Meikle, and E. R. Tenney
2021 "Amplifying voice in organizations." Academy of Management Journal, 64: 1288–1312.

Bansal, P., and H.-C. Song
2017 "Similar but not the same: Differentiating corporate sustainability from corporate responsibility." Academy of Management Annals, 11: 105–149.

Barker, J. R.
1993 "Tightening the iron cage: Concertive control in self-managing teams." Administrative Science Quarterly, 38: 408–437.

Barley, S. R.
2010 "Building an institutional field to corral a government: A case to set an agenda for organization studies." Organization Studies, 31: 777–805.

Battilana, J., and T. Casciaro
2021 Power for All: How It Really Works and Why It's Everyone's Business. Simon and Schuster.

Battilana, J., M. Fuerstein, and M. Lee
2018 "New prospects for organizational democracy? How the joint pursuit of social and financial goals challenges traditional organizational designs." In S. Rangan (ed.), Capitalism Beyond Mutuality? Perspectives Integrating Philosophy and Social Science: 256–288. Oxford University Press.

Battilana, J., and M. Kimsey
2017 "Should you agitate, innovate, or orchestrate?" Stanford Social Innovation Review. https://ssir.org/articles/entry/should_you_agitate_innovate_or_orchestrate

Battilana, J., and M. Lee
2014 "Advancing research on hybrid organizing—Insights from the study of social enterprises." Academy of Management Annals, 8: 397–441.

Battilana, J., T. Obloj, A.-C. Pache, and M. Sengul
2022 "Beyond shareholder value maximization: Accounting for financial/social trade-offs in dual-purpose companies." Academy of Management Review, 47: 237–258.

Battilana, J., M. Sengul, A.-C. Pache, and J. Model
2015 "Harnessing productive tensions in hybrid organizations: The case of work integration social enterprises." Academy of Management Journal, 58: 1658–1685.

Battilana, J., J. Yen, I. Ferreras, and L. Ramarajan
2022 "Democratizing work: Redistributing power in organizations for a democratic and sustainable future." Organization Theory, 3: 1–21.

Bauwens, T., B. Huybrechts, and F. Dufays
2020 "Understanding the diverse scaling strategies of social enterprises as hybrid organizations: The case of renewable energy cooperatives." Organization & Environment, 33: 195–219.

Beckman, C. M., J. Rosen, J. Estrada-Miller, and G. Painter

2023 “The social innovation trap: Critical insights into an emerging field.” Academy of Management Annals, 17: 684–709.

Ben-Ner, A., and D. C. Jones
1995 “Employee participation, ownership, and productivity: A theoretical framework.” Industrial Relations: A Journal of Economy and Society, 34: 532–554.

Bennett, W. L., and S. Livingston
2018 “The disinformation order: Disruptive communication and the decline of democratic institutions.” European Journal of Communication, 33: 122–139.

Berti, M., and C. Pitelis
2022 “Open team production, the new cooperative firm, and hybrid advantage.” Academy of Management Review, 47: 309–330.

Blanco, I., and M. León
2017 “Social innovation, reciprocity and contentious politics: Facing the socio-urban crisis in Ciutat Meridiana, Barcelona.” Urban Studies, 54: 2172–2188.

Blasi, J. R., R. B. Freeman, and D. Kruse
2013 The Citizen’s Share: Putting Ownership Back into Democracy. Yale University Press.

Bourlier-Bargues, E., J.-P. Gond, and B. Valiorgue
2024 “Fast and spurious: How executives capture governance structures to prevent cooperativization.” Human Relations, 77: 455–483.

Bradshaw, S., and P. N. Howard
2019 The Global Disinformation Order: 2019 Global Inventory of Organised Social Media Manipulation. University of Oxford Computational Propaganda Research Project.

Brenkert, G. G.
1992 “Freedom, participation and corporations: The issue of corporate (economic) democracy.” Business Ethics Quarterly, 2: 251–269.

Bretos, I., and A. Errasti
2017 “Challenges and opportunities for the regeneration of multinational worker cooperatives: Lessons from the Mondragon Corporation—a case study of the Fagor Ederlan Group.” Organization, 24: 154–173.

Briscoe, F., and A. Gupta
2016 “Social activism in and around organizations.” Academy of Management Annals, 10: 671–727.

Brown, W.
2019 In the Ruins of Neoliberalism: The Rise of Antidemocratic Politics in the West. Columbia University Press.

Buchter, L.
2021 “Escaping the ellipsis of diversity: Insider activists’ use of implementation resources to influence organization policy.” Administrative Science Quarterly, 66: 521–565.

Budd, J. W., and J. R. Lamare
2021 “Worker voice and political participation in civil society.” In K. F. Zimmermann (ed.), Handbook of Labor, Human Resources and Population Economics: 1–20. Springer International Publishing.

Budd, J. W., J. R. Lamare, and A. R. Timming
2018 “Learning about democracy at work: Cross-national evidence on individual employee voice influencing political participation in civil society.” ILR Review, 71: 956–985.

Burris, E.
2012 “The risks and rewards of speaking up: Managerial responses to employee voice.” Academy of Management Journal, 55: 851–875.

Cagé, J.
2020 The Price of Democracy: How Money Shapes Politics and What to Do about It. Harvard University Press.

Chandler, A. D.
1977 The Visible Hand: The Managerial Revolution in American Business. Belknap.

Charles, J., I. Ferreras, and A. Lamine
2020 “A freelancers’ cooperative as a case of democratic institutional experimentation for better work: A case study of SMart-Belgium.” Transfer: European Review of Labour and Research, 26: 157–174.

Chayka, K.
2022 “The promise of DAOs, the latest craze in crypto.” The New Yorker, January 28. https://www.newyorker.com/culture/infinite-scroll/the-promise-of-daos-the-latest-craze-in-crypto

Coase, R. H.
1937 “The nature of the firm.” Economica, 4: 386–405.

Cobb, J. A.
2016 “How firms shape income inequality: Stakeholder power, executive decision making, and the structuring of employment relationships.” Academy of Management Review, 41: 324–348.

Cobb, J. A., and K.-H. Lin
2017 “Growing apart: The changing firm-size wage premium and its inequality consequences.” Organization Science, 28: 429–446.

Cobb, J. A., and F. G. Stevens

2017 “These unequal states: Corporate organization and income inequality in the United States.” Administrative Science Quarterly, 62: 304–340.

Cohen, J.
1989 “Deliberation and democratic legitimacy.” In A. Hamlin and P. Petit (eds.), The Good Polity: 17–34. Basil Blackwell.

Crane, A., D. Matten, and J. Moon
2004 “Stakeholders as citizens? Rethinking rights, participation, and democracy.” Journal of Business Ethics, 53: 107–122.

Cyert, R. M., and J. G. March
1963 A Behavioral Theory of the Firm. Prentice Hall.

Dachler, H. P., and B. Wilpert
1978 “Conceptual dimensions and boundaries of participation in organizations: A critical evaluation.” Administrative Science Quarterly, 23: 1–39.

Darr, A.
1999 “Conflict and conflict resolution in a cooperative: The case of the Nir Taxi Station.” Human Relations, 52: 279–301.

Davis, G. F.
2016 “Can an economy survive without corporations? Technology and robust organizational alternatives.” Academy of Management Perspectives, 30: 129–140.

Davis, G. F.
2021 “Corporate purpose needs democracy.” Journal of Management Studies, 58: 902–913.

Davis, G. F., and J. A. Cobb
2010 “Corporations and economic inequality around the world: The paradox of hierarchy.” Research in Organizational Behavior, 30: 35–53.

Davis, G. F., and A. Sinha
2021 “Varieties of Uberization: How technology and institutions change the organization(s) of late capitalism.” Organization Theory, 2: 1–17.

DeCelles, K. A., S. Sonenshein, and B. G. King
2020 “Examining anger’s immobilizing effect on institutional insiders’ action intentions in social movements.” Administrative Science Quarterly, 65: 847–886.

DeJordy, R., M. Scully, M. J. Ventresca, and W. E. D. Creed
2020 “Inhabited ecosystems: Propelling transformative social change between and through organizations.” Administrative Science Quarterly, 65: 943–971.

Detert, J., E. Burris, D. Harrison, and S. Martin

2013 “Voice flows to and around leaders: Understanding when units are helped or hurt by employee voice.” Administrative Science Quarterly, 58: 624–668.

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

Dryzek, J. S., A. Bächtiger, S. Chambers, J. Cohen, J. N. Druckman, A. Felicetti, J. S. Fishkin, et al.
2019 “The crisis of democracy and the science of deliberation.” Science, 363: 1144–1146.

Dudley, T., and E. Rouen
2021 “The big benefits of employee ownership.” Harvard Business Review, May 13. https://hbr.org/2021/05/the-big-benefits-of-employee-ownership

Durkheim, E.
1893 The Division of Labor in Society. Free Press.

Eaton, K.
2025 “Nearly half of remote workers would consider quitting if given a return-to-office mandate.” Inc., January 16. https://www.inc.com/kit-eaton/nearly-half-of-remote-workers-would-consider-quitting-if-given-a-return-to-office-mandates/91108294

Edmondson, A. C.
2003 “Speaking up in the operating room: How team leaders promote learning in interdisciplinary action teams.” Journal of Management Studies, 40: 1419–1452.

Elden, J. M.
1981 “Political efficacy at work: The connection between more autonomous forms of workplace organization and a more participatory politics.” American Political Science Review, 75: 43–58.

Elliott, B.
2024 “Return-to-office mandates: How to lose your best performers.” MIT Sloan Management Review. https://sloanreview.mit.edu/article/return-to-office-mandates-how-to-lose-your-best-performers/

Ely, R. J., and D. A. Thomas
2001 “Cultural diversity at work: The effects of diversity perspectives on work group processes and outcomes.” Administrative Science Quarterly, 46: 229–273.

Ely, R. J., and D. A. Thomas
2020 “Getting serious about diversity: Enough already with the business case.” Harvard Business Review, November 1. https://hbr.org/2020/11/getting-serious-about-diversity-enough-already-with-the-business-case

Esping-Andersen, G.
1990 The Three Worlds of Welfare Capitalism. Princeton University Press.

Fayard, A.-L.
2024 "Making time for social innovation: How to interweave clock time and event time in open social innovation to nurture idea generation and social impact." Organization Science, 35: 1131–1156.

Ferreras, I.
2017 Firms as Political Entities: Saving Democracy Through Economic Bicameralism. Cambridge University Press.

Ferreras, I., J. Battilana, and D. Méda
2022 Democratize Work: The Case for Reorganizing the Economy. (M. Richmond Mouillot, trans.). University of Chicago Press.

Flanigan, B., P. Gölz, A. Gupta, B. Hennig, and A. D. Procaccia
2021 "Fair algorithms for selecting citizens' assemblies." Nature, 596: 548–552.

Fligstein, N., and A. Goldstein
2022 "The legacy of shareholder value capitalism." Annual Review of Sociology, 48: 193–211.

Foley, J. R., and M. Polanyi
2006 "Workplace democracy: Why bother?" Economic and Industrial Democracy, 27: 173–191.

Fournier, P.
2011 When Citizens Decide: Lessons from Citizen Assemblies on Electoral Reform. Oxford University Press.

Fox, K. E., S. T. Johnson, L. F. Berkman, M. Sianoja, Y. Soh, L. D. Kubzansky, and E. L. Kelly
2022 "Organisational- and group-level workplace interventions and their effect on multiple domains of worker well-being: A systematic review." Work & Stress, 36: 30–59.

Freedom House
2024 Freedom in the World 2024: The Mounting Damage of Flawed Elections and Armed Conflict. https://freedomhouse.org/sites/default/files/2024-02/FIW_2024_DigitalBooklet.pdf

Freeman, J.
1970 "The tyranny of structurelessness." Women's Studies Quarterly, 41: 231–246.

Freeman, R. B., and J. Rogers
1999 What Workers Want. Cornell University Press.

Frega, R., L. Herzog, and C. Neuhäuser
2019 "Workplace democracy—The recent debate." Philosophy Compass, 14: e12574.

Fuerstein, M.
2024 Experiments in Living Together: How Democracy Drives Social Progress. Oxford University Press.

Fung, A.
2003 "Deliberative democracy and international labor standards." Governance, 16: 51–71.

Fung, A.
2005 "Deliberation before the revolution: Toward an ethics of deliberative democracy in an unjust world." Political Theory, 33: 397–419.

Galera, G.
2017 "Social and solidarity co-operatives: An international perspective." In J. Michie, J. R. Blasi, and C. Borzaga (eds.), The Oxford Handbook of Mutual, Co-Operative, and Co-Owned Business Vol. 1: 171–183. Oxford University Press.

Gerlsbeck, F., and L. Herzog
2020 "The epistemic potentials of workplace democracy." Review of Social Economy, 78: 307–330.

Gerschewski, J.
2013 "The three pillars of stability: Legitimation, repression, and co-optation in autocratic regimes." Democratization, 20: 13–38.

Geurkink, B., A. Akkerman, and R. Sluiter
2022 "Political participation and workplace voice: The spillover of suppression by supervisors." Political Studies, 70: 327–347.

Gilbert, D., A. Rasche, M. Schormair, and A. Singer
2023 "Guest editors' introduction: The challenges and prospects of deliberative democracy for corporate sustainability and responsibility." Business Ethics Quarterly, 33: 1–25.

Gruenfeld, D. H., and L. Z. Tiedens
2010 "Organizational preferences and their consequences." In S. T. Fiske, D. Gilbert, and G. Lindzey (eds.), Handbook of Social Psychology. John Wiley & Sons.

Gümüsay, A. A., and J. Reinecke
2024 "Imagining desirable futures: A call for prospective theorizing with speculative rigour." Organization Theory, 5: 1–23.

Hacker, J. S., and P. Pierson
2010 Winner-Take-All Politics: How Washington Made the Rich Richer—and Turned Its Back on the Middle Class. Simon & Schuster.

Hall, P., and D. Soskice

2001 “An introduction to varieties of capitalism.” In B. Hancké (ed.), Debating Varieties of Capitalism: A Reader. Oxford University Press.

Harrison, J. S., and R. E. Freeman
2004 “Is organizational democracy worth the effort?” Academy of Management Executive (1993–2005), 18: 49–53.

Haveman, H. A.
2022 The Power of Organizations: A New Approach to Organizational Theory. Princeton University Press.

Heller, F., E. Pusic, G. Strauss, and B. Wilpert
1998 Organizational Participation: Myth and Reality, 1st ed. Oxford University Press.

Herzog, L.
2024 Citizen Knowledge: Markets, Experts, and the Infrastructure of Democracy. Oxford Academic.

Heucher, K., E. Alt, S. Soderstrom, M. Scully, and A. Glavas
2024 “Catalyzing action on social and environmental challenges: An integrative review of insider social change agents.” Academy of Management Annals, 18: 295–347.

Hong, L., and S. E. Page
2004 “Groups of diverse problem solvers can outperform groups of high-ability problem solvers.” Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, 101: 16385–16389.

Horton, C.
2018 “The simple but ingenious system Taiwan uses to crowdsource its laws.” MIT Technology Review. https://www.technologyreview.com/2018/08/21/240284/the-simple-but-ingenious-system-taiwan-uses-to-crowdsource-its-laws/

Huber, K., and M. J. L. Schormair
2021 “Progressive and conservative firms in multistakeholder initiatives: Tracing the construction of political CSR identities within the Accord on Fire and Building Safety in Bangladesh.” Business & Society, 60: 454–495.

Hurst, R., S. (R.) Lee, and J. Frake
2024 “The effect of flatter hierarchy on applicant pool gender diversity: Evidence from experiments.” Strategic Management Journal, 45: 1446–1484.

Isaac, M., K. Conger, and S. Frenkel
2025 “With tampons and code, Silicon Valley workers quietly protest tech’s rightward shift.” The New York Times, January 29. https://www.nytimes.com/2025/01/29/technology/tampons-silicon-valley-workers-protest.html

Isidore, C.

2024 “2023 was year of the strike. Here’s what could be ahead in 2024.” CNN, February 21. https://www.cnn.com/2024/02/21/business/2023-strike-summary/index.html

Jackall, R.
1984 “Paradoxes of collective work: A study of the Cheeseboard, Berkeley, California.” In R. Jackall and H. Levin (eds.), Worker Cooperatives in America: 109–137. University of California Press.

Jäger, S., S. Noy, and B. Schoefer
2022 “Codetermination and power in the workplace.” Economic Policy Institute, March 23. https://www.epi.org/unequalpower/publications/codetermination-and-power-in-the-workplace/

Jensen, M. C., and W. H. Meckling
1976 “Theory of the firm: Managerial behavior, agency costs and ownership structure.” Journal of Financial Economics, 3: 305–360.

Kaminski, I.
2022 “Eco beauty company ‘appoints nature’ to its board of directors.” The Guardian, September 22. https://www.theguardian.com/environment/2022/sep/22/eco-beauty-company-faith-in-nature-board-directors

Kaplan, S.
2019 The 360° Corporation: From Stakeholder Trade-Offs to Transformation. Stanford University Press.

Kaplan, S.
2020 “Beyond the business case for social responsibility.” Academy of Management Discoveries, 6: 1–4.

Kellogg, K. C.
2009 “Operating room: Relational spaces and microinstitutional change in surgery.” American Journal of Sociology, 115: 657–711.

Kellogg, K. C.
2012 “Making the cut: Using status-based countertactics to block social movement implementation and microinstitutional change in surgery.” Organization Science, 23: 1546–1570.

Kellogg, K. C., M. A. Valentine, and A. Christin
2020 “Algorithms at work: The new contested terrain of control.” Academy of Management Annals, 14: 366–410.

Kelly, E. L., and P. Moen
2020 Overload: How Good Jobs Went Bad and What We Can Do About It. Princeton University Press.

Kessinger, R.

2024 “Speaking Up, Speaking Out, and Making Movements: How Employee Activists Raise Social, Political, and Moral Concerns at Work.” Doctoral dissertation, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

Kim, H., L. Bailyn, and D. M. Kolb
2017 “Revisiting the dual agenda: Why companies miss the point if they retract flexible work arrangements during bad times.” In S. Lewis, D. Anderson, C. Lyonette, N. Payne, and S. Wood (eds.), Work-Life Balance in Times of Recession, Austerity and Beyond: 165–179. Routledge, Taylor & Francis Group.

Kim, J.
2021 “Democratic spillover from workplace into politics: What are we measuring and how?” Advances in Industrial and Labor Relations, Vol. 26: 145–176. Emerald Publishing Limited.

Kochan, T. A., J. R. Fine, K. Bronfenbrenner, S. Naidu, J. Barnes, Y. Diaz-Linhart, J. Kallas, et al.
2023 “An overview of US workers’ current organizing efforts and collective actions.” Work and Occupations, 50: 335–350.

Kochan, T. A., D. Yang, W. T. Kimball, and E. L. Kelly
2019 “Worker voice in America: Is there a gap between what workers expect and what they experience?” ILR Review, 72: 3–38.

Lamont, M.
2023 Seeing Others: How Recognition Works—and How It Can Heal a Divided World. Atria.

Landemore, H.
2012 Democratic Reason: Politics, Collective Intelligence, and the Rule of the Many. Princeton University Press.

Landemore, H.
2020 Open Democracy: Reinventing Popular Rule for the Twenty-First Century. Princeton University Press.

Landemore, H.
2021 “Open democracy and digital technologies.” In L. Bernholz, H. Landemore, and R. Reich (eds.), Digital Technology and Democratic Theory. University of Chicago Press.

Landemore, H., and I. Ferreras
2016 “In defense of workplace democracy: Towards a justification of the firm-state analogy.” Political Theory, 44: 53–81.

Lechterman, T. M., and J. Mair
2024 “Social enterprises as agents of social justice: A Rawlsian perspective on institutional capacity.” Organization Studies, 45: 1301–1323.

Lee, M. Y.
2024 “Enacting decentralized authority: The practices and limits of moving beyond hierarchy.” Administrative Science Quarterly, 69: 791–833.

Lee, M. Y., and A. C. Edmondson
2017 “Self-managing organizations: Exploring the limits of less-hierarchical organizing.” Research in Organizational Behavior, 37: 35–58.

Lee, M. Y., and T. Young-Hyman
2025 “Durable decentralization: Enabling temporary centralization while preserving commitments to decentralization.” Unpublished manuscript, INSEAD and University of Pittsburgh.

Levitsky, S., and D. Ziblatt
2018 How Democracies Die. Broadway Books.

Liang, J., C. I. C. Farh, and J.-L. Farh
2012 “Psychological antecedents of promotive and prohibitive voice: A two-wave examination.” Academy of Management Journal, 55: 71–92.

Lin, K.-H., and D. Tomaskovic-Devey
2013 “Financialization and U.S. income inequality, 1970–2008.” American Journal of Sociology, 118: 1284–1329.

Lincoln, A.
1863 “Gettysburg address delivered at Gettysburg, PA.” Library of Congress Digital Collections. https://www.loc.gov/resource/rbpe.24404500/

Liu, A.
2022 “What DAOs can learn from holacracies & decades of corporate governance research.” Northzone, September 23. https://medium.com/northzone/what-daos-can-learn-from-holacracies-decades-of-corporate-governance-research-1be5dbfa4612

Lopes, H., S. Lagoa, and T. Calapez
2014 “Declining autonomy at work in the EU and its effect on civic behavior.” Economic and Industrial Democracy, 35: 341–366.

Lovejoy, M., E. L. Kelly, L. D. Kubzansky, and L. F. Berkman
2021 “Work redesign for the 21st century: Promising strategies for enhancing worker well-being.” American Journal of Public Health, 111: 1787–1795.

Lumineau, F., W. Wang, and O. Schilke
2021 “Blockchain governance—A new way of organizing collaborations?” Organization Science, 32: 500–521.

Lumpkin, G. T., and S. Bacq

2019 “Civic wealth creation: A new view of stakeholder engagement and societal impact.” Academy of Management Perspectives, 33: 383–404.

Magee, J., and A. Galinsky
2008 “Social hierarchy: The self-reinforcing nature of power and status.” Academy of Management Annals, 2: 351–398.

Mair, J., and T. Gegenhuber
2021 “Open social innovation.” Stanford Social Innovation Review, Fall: 26–33.

Mair, J., M. Wolf, and C. Seelos
2016 “Scaffolding: A process of transforming patterns of inequality in small-scale societies.” Academy of Management Journal, 59: 2021–2044.

March, J. G.
1962 “The business firm as a political coalition.” The Journal of Politics, 24: 662–678.

Marx, K.
1906 Capital: A Critique of Political Economy. Modern Library.

Massa, F. G., and S. O’Mahony
2021 “Order from chaos: How networked activists self-organize by creating a participation architecture.” Administrative Science Quarterly, 66: 1037–1083.

Mazmanian, M., and C. M. Beckman
2018 “‘Making’ your numbers: Engendering organizational control through a ritual of quantification.” Organization Science, 29: 357–379.

McGaughey, E.
2015 “The codetermination bargains: The history of German corporate and labour law.” Law, Society and Economy Working Papers, London School of Economics and Political Science.

McKay, S., and C. Tenove
2021 “Disinformation as a threat to deliberative democracy.” Political Research Quarterly, 74: 703–717.

Meyer, J. W., and B. Rowan
1977 “Institutionalized organizations: Formal structure as myth and ceremony.” American Journal of Sociology, 83: 340–363.

Meyers, J. S. M., and S. P. Vallas
2016 “Diversity regimes in worker cooperatives: Workplace inequality under conditions of worker control.” The Sociological Quarterly, 57: 98–128.

Meyerson, D. E., and M. A. Scully

1995 “Tempered radicalism and the politics of ambivalence and change.” Organization Science, 6: 585–600.

Milliken, F., C. Schipani, N. Bishara, and A. Prado
2015 “Linking workplace practices to community engagement: The case for encouraging employee voice.” Academy of Management Perspectives, 29: 405–421.

Mills, C. W.
1956 The Power Elite. Oxford University Press.

Monteiro, P., and P. S. Adler
2021 “Bureaucracy for the 21st century: Clarifying and expanding our view of bureaucratic organization.” Academy of Management Annals, 16: 427–475.

Morrison, E. W.
2011 “Employee voice behavior: Integration and directions for future research.” Academy of Management Annals, 5: 373–412.

Morrison, E. W.
2014 “Employee voice and silence.” Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior, 1: 173–197.

Morrison, E. W.
2023 “Employee voice and silence: Taking stock a decade later.” Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior, 10: 79–107.

Nord, M., M. Lundstedt, D. Altman, F. Angiolillo, C. Borella, T. Fernandes, L. Gastaldi, et al.
2024 Democracy Report 2024: Democracy Winning and Losing at the Ballot. University of Gothenburg, V-Dem Institute. https://v-dem.net/documents/44/v-dem_dr2024_highres.pdf

Nyberg, D.
2021 “Corporations, politics, and democracy: Corporate political activities as political corruption.” Organization Theory, 2: 1–24.

O’Mahony, S., and F. Ferraro
2007 “The emergence of governance in an open source community.” Academy of Management Journal, 50: 1079–1106.

Ostrom, E.
1990 Governing the Commons. Cambridge University Press.

Ouchi, W. G.
1980 “Markets, bureaucracies, and clans.” Administrative Science Quarterly, 25: 129–141.

Palmieri, M. L.

2024 “Retheorizing workplace spillover theory: Does an economic-based pathway exist?” International Review of Applied Economics, 1–23. https://doi.org/10.1080/02692171.2024.2406354

Parker Follett, M.
1942 Dynamic Administration: The Collected Papers of Mary Parker Follett, 2nd ed. (E. M. Fox and L. Urwick, eds.) The Camelot Press Ltd.

Parmar, B. L., R. E. Freeman, J. S. Harrison, A. C. Wicks, L. Purnell, and S. De Colle
2010 “Stakeholder theory: The state of the art.” Academy of Management Annals, 4: 403–445.

Pateman, C.
1970 Participation and Democratic Theory. Cambridge University Press.

Perrow, C.
1991 “A society of organizations.” Theory and Society, 20: 725–762.

Pettit, P.
2014 Just Freedom: A Moral Compass for a Complex World. W.W. Norton & Company.

Pfeffer, J.
2013 “You’re still the same: Why theories of power hold over time and across contexts.” Academy of Management Perspectives, 27: 269–280.

Piketty, T.
2014 Capital in the Twenty-First Century. Harvard University Press.

Piketty, T.
2020 Capital and Ideology. Harvard University Press.

Polanyi, K.
1944 The Great Transformation: The Political and Economic Origins of Our Time. Beacon Press.

Polletta, F.
2002 Freedom Is an Endless Meeting: Democracy in American Social Movements. University of Chicago Press.

Reinecke, J., and J. Donaghey
2021 “Political CSR at the coalface—The roles and contradictions of multinational corporations in developing workplace dialogue.” Journal of Management Studies, 58: 457–486.

Reineke, P., R. Katila, and K. M. Eisenhardt
2025 “Decentralization in organizations: A revolution or a mirage?” Academy of Management Annals, 19: 298–342.

Rose, S.
2024 “Nature on five boards (and counting . . .) Who’s next?” Medium, February 15. https://natureontheboard.com/nature-on-five-boards-and-counting-whos-next-b00e523f7bd5

Rothschild, J.
2009 “Workers’ cooperatives and social enterprise: A forgotten route to social equity and democracy.” American Behavioral Scientist, 52: 1023–1041.

Rothschild, J., and J. A. Whitt
1986 The Cooperative Workplace: Potentials and Dilemmas of Organizational Democracy and Participation. Cambridge University Press.

Rothschild-Whitt, J.
1979 “The collectivist organization: An alternative to rational-bureaucratic models.” American Sociological Review, 44: 509–527.

Rubinstein, S. A., and J. E. McCarthy
2016 “Union–management partnerships, teacher collaboration, and student performance.” ILR Review, 69: 1114–1132.

Rybnikova, I.
2022 “Spillover effect of workplace democracy: A conceptual revision.” Frontiers in Psychology, 13. doi: 10.3389/fpsyg.2022.933263

Satterstrom, P., M. Kerrissey, and J. DiBenigno
2021 “The voice cultivation process: How team members can help upward voice live on to implementation.” Administrative Science Quarterly, 66: 380–425.

Scherer, A. G., and G. Palazzo
2011 “The new political role of business in a globalized world: A review of a new perspective on CSR and its implications for the firm, governance, and democracy.” Journal of Management Studies, 48: 899–931.

Schiffer, Z.
2021 “Google workers across the globe announce international union alliance to hold Alphabet accountable.” The Verge, January 25. https://www.theverge.com/2021/1/25/22243138/google-union-alphabet-workers-europe-announce-global-alliance

Schlachter, L. H., and K. M. Ársælsson
2024 “Civic work: Making a difference on and off the clock.” American Journal of Sociology, 130: 44–87.

Scholz, R., and S. Vitols
2019 “Board-level codetermination: A driving force for corporate social responsibility in German companies?” European Journal of Industrial Relations, 25: 233–246.

Schor, J.
2020 After the Gig: How the Sharing Economy Got Hijacked and How to Win It Back. University of California Press.

Seibert, S. E., G. Wang, and S. H. Courtright
2011 "Antecedents and consequences of psychological and team empowerment in organizations: A meta-analytic review." Journal of Applied Psychology, 96: 981–1003.

Slade Shantz, A. F., G. M. Kistruck, D. F. Pacheco, and J. W. Webb
2020 "How formal and informal hierarchies shape conflict within cooperatives: A field experiment in Ghana." Academy of Management Journal, 63: 503–529.

Snyder, T.
2017 On Tyranny: Twenty Lessons from the Twentieth Century. Tim Duggan Books.

Soskice, D.
1999 "Divergent production regimes: Coordinated and uncoordinated market economies in the 1980s and 1990s." In H. Kitschelt, P. Lange, G. Marks, and J. D. Stephens (eds.), Continuity and Change in Contemporary Capitalism: 101–164. Cambridge University Press.

Stiglitz, J. E.
2012 The Price of Inequality: How Today's Divided Society Endangers Our Future. W.W. Norton & Co.

Stout, L. A.
2013 "The toxic side effects of shareholder primacy." University of Pennsylvania Law Review, 161: 2003–2023.

Sunstein, C. R.
2018 #Republic: Divided Democracy in the Age of Social Media. Princeton University Press.

Tarasov, K.
2022 "Amazon's first U.S. union faces an uphill battle after historic win at Staten Island warehouse." CNBC, July 21. https://www.cnbc.com/2022/07/21/how-chris-smalls-formed-amazons-first-us-union-and-whats-next.html

Tomaskovic-Devey, D., and D. Avent-Holt
2019 Relational Inequalities: An Organizational Approach. Oxford University Press.

Tracey, P., N. Phillips, and H. Haugh
2005 "Beyond philanthropy: Community enterprise as a basis for corporate citizenship." Journal of Business Ethics, 58: 327–344.

Turco, C. J.
2016 The Conversational Firm: Rethinking Bureaucracy in the Age of Social Media. Columbia University Press.

Turner, L.
1991 Democracy at Work: Changing World Markets and the Future of Labor Unions. Cornell University Press.

Unterrainer, C., W. G. Weber, T. Höge, and S. Hornung
2022 "Organizational and psychological features of successful democratic enterprises: A systematic review of qualitative research." Frontiers in Psychology, 13. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.947559

Useem, M.
1986 The Inner Circle: Large Corporations and the Rise of Business Political Activity in the U.S. and U.K. Oxford University Press.

Vedula, S., C. Doblinger, D. Pacheco, J. G. York, S. Bacq, M. V. Russo, and T. J. Dean
2022 "Entrepreneurship for the public good: A review, critique, and path forward for social and environmental entrepreneurship research." Academy of Management Annals, 16: 391–425.

Veldman, J., and H. Willmott
2016 "The cultural grammar of governance: The UK Code of Corporate Governance, reflexivity, and the limits of 'soft' regulation." Human Relations, 69: 581–603.

Walker, E. T., and C. M. Rea
2014 "The political mobilization of firms and industries." Annual Review of Sociology, 40: 281–304.

Weber, M.
1947 The Theory of Social and Economic Organization. (A. M. Henderson and T. Parsons, eds.) Oxford University Press.

Weber, W. G., C. Unterrainer, and T. Höge
2020 "Psychological research on organisational democracy: A meta-analysis of individual, organisational, and societal outcomes." Applied Psychology, 69: 1009–1071.

Weber, W. G., C. Unterrainer, and T. F. Jønsson
2023 "Editorial: Organizational democracy, organizational participation, and employee ownership: Individual, organizational and societal outcomes." Frontiers in Psychology, 14. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2023.1135138

Whyte, W. F., and K. K. Whyte
1988 Making Mondragón: The Growth and Dynamics of the Worker Cooperative Complex. Cornell University Press.

Wilkinson, A., P. J. Gollan, M. Marchington, and D. Lewin (Eds.)
2010 The Oxford Handbook of Participation in Organizations. Oxford University Press.

Williams, K.
2018 “Elizabeth Warren’s revolutionary plan to reduce income inequality.” Washington Post, August 24. https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/made-by-history/wp/2018/08/24/elizabeth-warrens-revolutionary-plan-to-reduce-income-inequality/

Williamson, O. E.
1981 “The economics of organization: The transaction cost approach.” American Journal of Sociology, 87: 548–577.

Winkler, A.
2018 We the Corporations: How American Businesses Won Their Civil Rights. Liveright Publishing.

Wright, E. O.
2010 Envisioning Real Utopias. Verso Books.

Wu, S. J., K. M. Mai, M. Zhuang, and F. Yi
2024 “A large-scale field experiment on participatory decision-making in China.” Nature Human Behaviour, 8: 2119–2126.

Wu, S. J., and E. L. Paluck
2020 “Participatory practices at work change attitudes and behavior toward societal authority and justice.” Nature Communications, 11: 2–8.

Yen, J.
2024 “Workers and the Pursuit of Social Objectives in Organizations.” Doctoral dissertation, Harvard University.

Young-Hyman, T.
2017 “Cooperating without co-laboring: How formal organizational power moderates cross-functional interaction in project teams.” Administrative Science Quarterly, 62: 179–214.

Young-Hyman, T., N. Magne, and D. Kruse
2023 “A real utopia under what conditions? The economic and social benefits of workplace democracy in knowledge-intensive industries.” Organization Science, 34: 1353–1382.

Zavyalova, A.
2025 “Stigmatization by an authoritarian government: Russian NGOs under the 2012 foreign agents law.” Administrative Science Quarterly, 70: 69–118.

Authors’ Biographies

Julie Battilana is the Alan L. Gleitsman Professor of Social Innovation at Harvard Kennedy School and the Joseph C. Wilson Professor of Business Administration at Harvard Business School. She received her joint Ph.D. in organizational behavior at INSEAD and in economics

and management at the École Normale Supérieure Paris-Saclay. Her research examines the politics of change in organizations and in society.

Christine M. Beckman is a professor in the technology management department at UC Santa Barbara and the editor in chief at *Administrative Science Quarterly*. She received her Ph.D. in organizational behavior from Stanford University. She has studied interorganizational learning and networks, gender and inequality, work and technology, and social innovation and entrepreneurship.

Julie Yen is an assistant professor of management and organizations at Boston University's Questrom School of Business. She received her Ph.D. in organizational behavior from Harvard University. Her research examines how people and organizations pursue social goals, with a focus on workers, inequality, and sustainability.

Table 1. **Dimensions for Consideration in the Study of Democratic Organizing**

	Definition	**Illustrative Examples**
Strength of participation	Worker participation can vary in the extent to which it is structurally guaranteed by the organization's system of governance.	**Weak:** Worker participation is consultative, at the discretion of organizational leaders. **Strong:** Worker participation is formally incorporated into organizational design and, in some cases, structurally guaranteed by the organization's system of governance.
Scope of decision making	Workers can participate in decision making on a range of topics, from narrow to broad.	**Narrow:** Workers have the autonomy to make operational decisions relevant to their role. **Broad:** Workers participate in decision making on strategic issues.
Representation	Worker participation can be direct or indirect.	**Direct:** Workers directly participate in decision-making processes. **Indirect:** Workers elect leaders to represent them in decision-making processes.
Hierarchy	Democratic organizations can vary in the extent to which they are flat or tall.	**Flat:** Fewer levels of organizational hierarchy **Tall:** More levels of organizational hierarchy
Financial ownership	Workers may or may not have a financial stake in the organization, which can vary in size.	**Low:** Workers have no or limited financial ownership. **High:** Workers own most or all of the organization.