

SYLLABUS



MGMT 594 - Seminar in Organizational Theory

Spring 2017 – Wednesdays 9:10-12:00 – Todd 439

sVer 1.2 30 December 2016

Professor: Thomas H. Allison
Electronic Mail: seminar@allison.zendesk.com
Office Address: Todd 440C
Telephone: 5-9807
Office Hours: As Posted or by appointment
Prerequisite: Enrollment is restricted to Ph.D. students.

BEING PUBLISHED IS GREAT; BEING READ IS BETTER.

–J. SLOCUM, 1988

Course Description:

This course has been designed as a review of the classic and to a lesser extent the contemporary literature in the theories of organizations. The questions of interest in this course include (but are not limited to) the following:

- Why are there organizations?
- Why are there so many different kinds of organizations?
- How are organizations designed and structured?
- How do organizations relate to their environments?
- How do organizational level variables influence individual level phenomena?

The primary purpose of the course is to provide students with a broad-based overview of the issues at the organizational level of analysis. At the minimum, students will come out of this course with an understanding of these issues sufficient to start their preparation for comprehensive exams. The second purpose of this course is to acquaint students with the research issues in organizational theory. This purpose will be accomplished by two means. First, you will read a wide variety of articles and students will be expected to be able to critically review these works. Second, students will be required to create a research paper and proposal concerning organizational level phenomena.

Learning Objectives:

By the completion of the seminar, each student should have completed the following:

1. Each student should develop a mental model of the literature in Organization theory, and show an understanding of and appreciation for the key concepts, theories and research streams in Organization theory.
2. Each student should develop an advanced understanding of the major theories, issues, and contributions in the field.
3. Each student should be able to evaluate and critically review academic writings in the field.
4. Each student should develop new ideas and/or approaches that advance some portion of the theory/research in Organizational Theory.
5. Each student should be able to communicate, in oral and written form, knowledge, ideas, critical evaluations, and individual contributions to the Organization Theory literature.



Required Text:

Scott, W.R., & Davis, G.F. 2007. *Organizations and Organizing: Rational, Natural and Open Systems Perspectives*, Pearson. (hereafter S&D).
ISBN: 0131958933 | [Published 2016 by Routledge/Taylor & Francis]
Amazon – Semester Rental: 16.49; Used: from \$20

Optional/Supplementary Text:

Smith, K. G. & Hitt, M.A. (eds). 2005. *Great Minds in Management: The Process of Theory Development*, Oxford University Press. [Available for free download via WSU Libraries]

ASSIGNMENTS & REQUIREMENTS

Assignments and Course Grade Weights:

Discussion Leadership (2 per Semester), Article Summaries (1-3/Week), & Participation	20%
Idea Paper	8%
Conceptual Paper	35%
Research Proposal	10%
Final Exam	27%

To receive a grade of C on the course assignments, students must show at least a broad knowledge of the relevant literature. To receive a B, students must show at least a broad knowledge of the literature, plus an ability to integrate that literature to show linkages, relationships, etc. To receive an A, students must show at least a broad knowledge of the literature, an ability to integrate the literature, and creative insight that is not already present in the literature. **Incomplete grades will be allowed only for extreme emergency circumstances beyond the control or foresight of the student.**

Attendance:

Attendance is a requirement. We only have 14 meetings during the semester. You should not schedule anything during class time. Absences are only acceptable for reasons approved by university policy. In case of such an exigency, please inform me before hand, and arrange for a colleague to present your assigned reading summaries to the class. Unexcused absences will negatively impact your grade.

Article Summaries:

We will spend this class at a table together discussing the literature on organizations. Prior to each class, you are required to read all assigned readings. In addition, you will be assigned a number of articles each class period for which you will 1) be the first in-class discussant, and 2) you will write a one-page summary.



The summaries are due in the “Seminar” group “File Exchange” folder on Blackboard by 9pm Pacific the evening preceding each class. No credit will be given for late work. You are, however, still expected to complete it.

Protip: These summaries are good for Comps. Keep them.

Every submitted article summary MUST be named as is shown below, where 01 is the # of the week, the text after the dash is the filename of the summarized article. Note the leading zero. Name the file per the below + .doc/.docx/.pdf. No other file format will be accepted. Go to the “File Exchange”, click “Add File.” Type in the name using the exact format below. Then, click “Browse My Computer”, select the file, click submit. You will be able to see and download all your colleagues’ submissions in the same “File Exchange” area.

“01 Week – Davis”

“01 Week – Dubin-1”

“01 Week – Dubin-2”

Discussion Leadership:

Each week has a theme that unifies the assigned articles from that week. The Discussion Leader’s job is to find that theme. The discussion leader is expected to find common ground, common issues, and provide a synthesis of all assigned articles. This job will be performed 1) in class, where the discussion leader is expected to a) provide an introduction to the week, b) briefly introduce each article, and c) help the class synthesize the covered literature with closing remarks. The discussion leader is also required to 2) create an overall summary of the week’s readings. This should be ~2 pages. This is to be submitted to the “Seminar” group “File Exchange” on Blackboard by 9pm Pacific the evening preceding each class.

The submitted file MUST be named as shown in the example below (where 01 is the # of the week. Note the leading zero.). Give the file itself this name, AND enter this name in the “Name” field when submitting via the Blackboard File Exchange.

“01 Week Summary”

To earn an “A” for discussion leadership, you must show and communicate a broad knowledge of the week’s literature, an ability to integrate the literature, and creative insight that is not already present in the literature. A summary alone will not earn an “A”.

Participation:

You are expected to be prepared for class, every class. Lack of preparation or failure to diligently perform assigned article summaries/discussion leadership duties will result in a lower final letter grade. In addition to leading the discussion on your weeks and on your assigned articles, you will be expected participate actively in the discussions on all articles. The key source of learning in this course will come from the discussions. As such it is critical that you come to class prepared to make a meaningful contribution to that discussion.

YOU CAN NOT PASS THE COURSE WITHOUT EARNING A “B” OR BETTER ON THE PARTICIPATION CATEGORY.



Written Assignments:

There are three writing assignments. The first has one submission. The second involves three submissions on three separate dates. The third involves two separate submissions. Due dates are listed in the class schedule. All checkpoint and final submissions are due before MIDNIGHT Pacific on the listed date.

Assignments will be completed in Word format and uploaded to the Blackboard drop box. The drop box automatically runs a plagiarism check so be sure that all quotes are marked correctly. I expect full-AMJ/APA/or similar format, full references, and high-quality writing. All work shall be double-spaced, 1 inch margins, 12 point Times New Roman.

You must have at least one class member review your final draft of each assignment. You will attach a statement from the classmate stating that he or she has fulfilled this requirement. No student can review more than 2 other student's work. Assignments submitted without peer review will be returned ungraded.

- 1. Idea Paper:** In this assignment, you will present an idea i.e. identify an area of the literature where, with further conceptual or empirical development, you may be able to make a contribution. There are a wide variety of ways to complete this paper. You can identify a gap in the literature, a previously unexamined relationship, or look at a relationship in a new one.

In other words, you are to find something interesting (see Davis 1971 below). This paper should include relevant literature and focus on a persuasive argument on why your idea is interesting. This paper should not exceed 7 pages, inclusive of references, tables, and figures. If you cannot present your idea persuasively in 7 pages, you have not thought it out clearly enough.

- 2. Conceptual Paper:** Each student will be required to write an original conceptual paper based on the literature covered in this course. The paper should be prepared to be submitted to a national conference and/or for publication in a well-regarded refereed journal. The format should follow the format of the *Academy of Management Review* or similar journal.

The paper should present a conceptual/theoretical framework concerning an organizational level question. The paper must present an underlying theoretical rationale and contain the key elements of a theory as discussed in class i.e. elements, causal linkages among elements, boundary conditions etc. The paper should contain no more than 25-30 pages, inclusive of references, tables, and figures. You should be crafting the paper to be submitted to a journal or a national conference.

Checkpoints:

- 1) 1-Page Summary – must receive instructor approval
- 2) First Draft
- 3) Final Draft



- 3. Research Proposal:** Each student will prepare a research proposal to investigate the ideas you present in the conceptual paper. This paper will answer specific questions regarding the data, data collection, statistical analysis and publication outlets etc. relevant to your paper.¹

You will be given a template later in the term that detail the specific issues you must address in this proposal. As such, be sure to craft your conceptual paper such that you might actually be able to write a research proposal concerning it. A major part of the evaluation of the research proposal will be feasibility. This paper will contain no more than 10 pages of text, inclusive of references, tables, and figures.

Checkpoints:

- 1) First Draft
- 2) Final Draft

Final Exam:

A mini-comps-style final exam will occur in-class, on the last day. Like comps, this is closed-book, closed notes, no internet, no references, no resources. I will offer you four questions, and you will select three to answer in essay format. Typical responses for each essay total 1,000-1,200 words (3,000-3,600 total for all three responses). Some questions will require developing hypotheses and supporting them with theory. You are expected to be conversant in the literature. That means you need to have citations memorized and use them in your essays. Responses that feature no citations will receive a failing grade.²

CORE POLICIES

Late Work:

There is no such thing. Assignments are due at the scheduled date and time.

Academic Integrity:

I assume that all my students are honest and are interested in being evaluated for their own efforts. All assignments in this class are individual assignments. That does mean that you cannot use other class members as resources. Simply make sure that the work is your own. Violations of university academic standards will be punished accordingly. Plagiarism will be punished severely: at minimum, a grade of F in the course.

Disability Accommodation Policy:

Any student in this course who has a disability that may prevent him or her from fully demonstrating his or her abilities should contact me personally as soon as possible so we can discuss appropriate accommodations to ensure full participation and access to education.

¹ **With instructor approval**, you may choose to submit a full empirical paper that operationalizes and measures your hypothesized relationships in lieu of the separate research proposal. With this option, you must submit a first empirical draft in lieu of the First Draft research proposal. You then submit your full empirical paper in lieu of the separate, final draft conceptual paper and proposal.

² It is NOT expected that anyone will memorize references, only citations (name(s) and year).



FULL LIST OF POLICIES

If you have not done so already, please familiarize yourself with WSU's Academic Policies: <http://app.leg.wa.gov/wac/default.aspx?cite=504-26>.

Academic Integrity: Academic integrity will be strongly enforced in this course. Any student caught cheating on any assignment will be given an F grade for the course and will be reported to the Office of Student Conduct. Cheating is defined in the Standards for Student Conduct WAC 504-26-010 (3). It is strongly suggested that you read and understand these definitions.

I encourage you to work with classmates on assignments. However, each student must turn in original work. No copying will be accepted. Students who violate WSU's Standards of Conduct for Students will receive an F as a final grade in this course, will not have the option to withdraw from the course and will be reported to the Office of Student Conduct. Cheating is defined in the Standards for Student Conduct WAC 504-26-010 (3). It is strongly suggested that you read and understand these definitions

Academic integrity is the cornerstone of the university. Any student who attempts to gain an unfair advantage over other students by cheating, will fail the assignment and be reported to the Office of Student Conduct. Cheating is defined in the Standards for Student Conduct WAC 504-26-010 (3).

Assignment Submission: Assignments will be submitted to the designated Blackboard location in the absence of other directions.

Attendance: Participation is a major component of this course and failure to be present will generally negatively impact participation grades. See the "Exams, Make-up Exams" policy for information on policies that apply to missed classes on Examination Dates.

Campus Safety: Classroom and campus safety are of paramount importance at Washington State University, and are the shared responsibility of the entire campus population. WSU urges students to follow the "Alert, Assess, Act" protocol for all types of emergencies and the "Run, Hide, Fight" response for an active shooter incident. Remain ALERT (through direct observation or emergency notification), ASSESS your specific situation, and ACT in the most appropriate way to assure your own safety (and the safety of others if you are able). Please sign up for emergency alerts on your account at MyWSU. For more information on this subject, campus safety, and related topics, please view the FBI's Run, Hide, Fight video and visit the WSU safety portal. Please review the information at the following links to be better prepared: <http://safetyplan.wsu.edu> and <http://oem.wsu.edu/emergencies>

Changes: I reserve the right to alter any part of the syllabus/schedule as necessary to meet the needs of our class. Changes will be announced in class or via the LMS. If you have concerns with announced changes, please speak with me as soon as possible. If you have comments or suggestions for tailoring the course more to your interests or making



improvements on something that just is not working for you, please let me know. The only way you are going to learn is if you are interested in the material.

Class Behavior: Students and faculty each have responsibility for maintaining an appropriate learning environment. Students who fail to adhere to the established code of conduct may be subject to disciplinary action. Faculty have professional responsibility to set reasonable standards and behavioral expectations for their classroom and the obligation to take the appropriate course of action when student behavior substantially interferes with the ability of a faculty member to teach or the ability of other students to learn. Such behaviors can include:

- Making loud and distracting noises
- Audible phone/electronic device usage, including notification sounds and vibration, other than in a bona-fide personal, family, or community emergency
- Exhibiting erratic, irrational behavior
- Persisting in speaking without being recognized
- Behavior that distracts the class from the subject matter or discussion
- Refusal to comply with faculty direction
- Repeatedly leaving and entering the classroom during class without authorization
- Making physical or verbal threats to the faculty member or fellow classmates
- Other behavior prohibited by University Policy (Chapter 504-26 WAC)

Communication: I will communicate any necessary information in class, via e-mail, and the LMS. If you do not check your WSU e-mail account each day, you should have your e-mail forwarded to the account that you do check daily. At a minimum, you should check the LMS weekly. Keep in mind that I rarely respond to e-mails at night or over the weekend.

Entire Agreement & Scope: This syllabus, as modified, is the entire agreement between instructor and student. It represents the instructor's professional obligations and duties, as well as the obligations and procedures the student agrees to by enrolling and remaining in the course. It supersedes any prior syllabus version. Where conflict exists between this syllabus and other course documents or communications, this syllabus shall govern. Communications and statements from the instructor do not supersede this syllabus unless the instructor makes an affirmative statement of such. Where the announced change is at least seven days in the future, instructor will modify the syllabus to reflect said change if possible. This syllabus is subject to the policies, procedures, and regulations of Washington State University, including Title 504 WAC. Where a conflict arises between the syllabus and institutional policy, procedure, or regulations (including applicable state and federal law, as well as judicial orders), instructor and students understand that the higher authority must govern. In the event of the invalidation of any provision of this syllabus, the invalidated provision will be stricken or reformulated; the surviving provisions shall remain in force.

Exams, Final Exam (This policy also applies to Scheduled Quizzes): **Exam dates are published in the course schedule on the first day of the semester.** To preserve exam integrity and validity, no make-up exams will be given, except as specified by academic regulations and with appropriate documentation where applicable. Where these conditions are met, the absence must be for a valid reason as specified in academic regulations 73(a-c), 82, or 83, and this reason must be documented by the student in writing if required by



policy. Student must provide supporting documentation. As is stipulated by academic regulation, anticipated absences must be for a purpose that is (a) compelling to the interests of the University, or (b) compelled by exigent and non-deferrable circumstances. Students must provide as much prior notice of an anticipated absence as is possible and must make arrangements to take the exam *prior* to the absence. Unanticipated absences on exam days require exigent circumstances at the level of a bona-fide emergency and must be substantiated by valid documentation of an actual emergency. No other reason will be acceptable. Where such an absence is excused by university policy, the exam may only be made-up only within 7 calendar days of the student's return to school. The same applies to exams not taken prior to an expected absence where the reason for the absence (i.e. medical) precludes the student having taken the exam prior to the absence. Students arriving to class late on an exam day will only have until the regular exam period ends to complete the exam. WSU Academic Regulations 74-83 govern final examinations. Please note regulation 80: "A student will not be granted special examinations for the purpose of leaving the institution before the close of the semester." If a student requests accommodation of their final exam in this course under regulation 78 and documentation is provided, student may choose to take the exam for this course with any other section taught by the same instructor. Except as provided for by university policy, no other alternate exam times are available under regulation 78.

Feedback: During the semester, I request that you take the time to provide me with any feedback you have about the course. While the university conducts evaluations at the end of each semester, and I make every effort to take these comments on-board, this helps me make *future* classes better. **When you provide me feedback during the class, I am often able to make the class more enjoyable and/or more useful for you.** If you have concerns, problems, ideas, or suggestions relating to the course, readings, assignments, course policies, the course schedule, your instructor, lecture content, lecture style, or any other aspect of the class, please tell me. I would especially like to know about issues that are making your learning experience non-optimal. Please feel free to provide me any such feedback by email or in office hours. I'm looking for frank comments, even if it is critical of the course or something I am doing. I view such comments as evidence of engagement and course participation. All criticism and problems will be taken seriously. Criticism will **never** result in a rebuke or grade penalty.

Grade Disputes: If you feel your grade on any assignment is inaccurate, I provide the following dispute resolution procedure: You may only dispute a grade for the content of the assignment. Your request for re-grading must be in writing, formatted as a formal memo, and substantively indicate why you believe you deserve a higher score. You must base your argument on material from the book, lectures, and other proper course materials. Be *very* specific. Disputes that fail to meet these criteria will be rejected without review. Keep in mind that re-grading will not necessarily increase your score. **I must receive your written dispute within one week of you receiving the grade for the assignment on the LMS.** I will not accept any grade disputes after this deadline. Assignment grade disputes are not considered following the end of classes EXCEPT for in the one week beginning on the day you receive the grade back. The grade dispute procedure is only available for individual assignment and exam grades. For privacy reasons, peer evaluation grades are not subject to dispute; however, the instructor will make reasonable efforts to ensure that peer evaluation grades fairly reflect student attainment of class objectives. *The Grade Dispute policy is*



offered as a courtesy; I reserve the right to end the policy during the semester if this privilege is abused.

End-of-semester letter grades are not covered under the above grade dispute procedure. End-of-semester grades are simply the sum of individual grades received, as adjusted by assignment weights. End of semester grades are only reviewable in cases of clerical error. If you disagree with your overall grade, FIRST email the instructor and clearly describe your claim in all appropriate details. If any answer resulting from this inquiry is not satisfactory, you may ask the instructor for assistance with the academic complaint process that is available under Academic Regulation 120. He will provide contact information for the department administrator or the department head on request.

Grade Monitoring, Grade Entry with Registrar: I expect you to monitor your performance during the semester using the grades reported back to you on the LMS. If you have concerns – for example, your performance is not as good as you would like it to be – they must be brought to me during the semester. If you wait until the end of the semester to seek additional feedback or help, you will have waited too long. Please don't wait.

Final letter grades are assigned by applying the percentage weights listed for each category of assignment to the letter grades assigned to those assignments during the semester. Final letter grades will not be changed once entered with the registrar. Thus, you should ensure that your assignment and exam grades are accurate as is reported to you in the LMS. Check all your grades in the LMS between 5:00 PM Pacific on the first working day after finals week and 12:00 PM (noon) the following day. This is your last chance to be sure all your grades are correct. A final points total will be posted to the LMS by 5:00 Pacific on the first working day after the close of finals week. Students should check their grade at this time as this is the ONLY opportunity to address any grade disputes arising from assignments entered during finals week (including the final exam and semester-project grades). Final grades will be submitted to the Registrar's Office no later than 2:00 p.m. on the second working day after the close of finals week. WSU Policy (Academic Regulation 98) prohibits grade changes for any reason other than clerical error once a grade has been filed: "An instructor may not change a grade after it has been filed with the Registrar, except in the case of clerical error, which the instructor may correct by so certifying to the Registrar."

Late Work, Extra Credit: Neither will be considered. **I do not accept late work**, extra credit work, or—other than documented emergencies—excuses for missed or subpar work.

Students with Disabilities: I am committed to providing assistance to help you be successful in this course. Reasonable accommodations are available for students with a documented disability. If you have a disability and may need accommodations to fully participate in this class, please contact the Access Center (Washington Building 217) to schedule an appointment with an Access Advisor. All accommodations **MUST** be approved through the Access Center. Any accommodation specified by the Access Center, The Office of Student Services, or university administrator with responsibility for disability accommodation is automatically approved for this class. Student may choose to use or not use any accommodation or set of accommodations authorized for him by the Access Center. Additional information is available on the DRC website is www.drc.wsu.edu.



CLASS SCHEDULE/LIST OF READINGS

Readings

The following journals are repeated regularly in this syllabus. Other journal titles will be spelled out as appropriate.

AJS American Journal of Sociology
AMR Academy of Management Review
AMJ Academy of Management Journal
ASR American Sociological Review
ASQ Administrative Science quarterly

WEEK 0: FOUNDATIONAL [READ BEFORE CLASS 1]

1. McGahan, A. M. 2007. Academic Research That Matters to Managers: On Zebras, Dogs, Lemmings, Hammers, and Turnips. *Academy of Management Journal*, 50(4): 748-753.
2. Gulati, R. 2007. Tent Poles, Tribalism, and Boundary Spanning: The Rigor-Relevance Debate in Management Research. *Academy of Management Journal*, 50(4): 775-782.
3. Vermeulen, F. 2007. "I Shall Not Remain Insignificant": Adding a Second Loop to Matter More. *Academy of Management Journal*, 50(4): 754-761.
4. Tushman, M., & O'Reilly, C. 2007. Research and Relevance: Implications of Pasteur's Quadrant for Doctoral Programs and Faculty Development. *Academy of Management Journal*, 50(4): 769-774.
5. Markides, C. 2007. In Search of Ambidextrous Professors. *Academy of Management Journal*, 50(4): 762-768.
6. Greenwood, R., & Miller, D. 2010. Tackling Design Anew: Getting Back to the Heart of Organizational Theory. *The Academy of Management Perspectives*, 24(4): 78-88.



Leader: _____

WEEK 1: THEORY (1/11) - [READ BEFORE CLASS 1]

1. Davis, M. S., 1971, That's Interesting!, *Philosophy of Social Science*, I, 309-344.

Dubin, R., 1978, *Theory Building*, Chap. 1-5, 1-142,

2. Ch 1

3. Ch 2

4. Ch 3

5. Ch 4

6. Ch 5

Stinchcombe, A. L., 1968, *Constructing Social Theories*, Chap. 1 & 2, 3-56

7. Ch 1

8. Ch 2

Optional:

Lewis, M. W. and Grimes, A. J. 'Metatriangulations: Building Theory from Multiple Paradigms', *AMR*, 24, 4, 672-690, 1999.



Leader: _____

WEEK 2: THEORY BUILDING (1/18)

1. Blalock, H. M. (1968), Theory Building and Causal Inferences, in H. M. Blalock and A. B. Blalock (eds.), *Methodology in Social Sciences*, McGraw Hill, New York, 156-198.
2. Bacharach, S. B., 1989, Organizational Theories: Some Criteria for Evaluation, *AMR*, 14 (4), 496-515.
3. Whetten, D. A. 1989, What Constitutes a Theoretical Contribution? *AMR*, 14 (4), 490-495
4. Weick, K. E. 1989, Theory Construction as Disciplined Imagination, *AMR*, 14, 516-531
5. Eisenhardt, K.M. 1991. Better stories and better constructs: The case for rigor and comparative logic. *AMR*, 16: 620-627.
6. Sutton, R. I. & Staw, B. M., What Theory is Not, *ASQ*, 40 371-384, 1995.
7. Weick, K. E. What theory is Not, Theorizing is, *ASQ*, 40, 385-390, 1995.
8. DiMaggio, Paul, 1995. Comments on What Theory is Not *ASQ*, 391-397.



Leader: _____

WEEK 3: RATIONAL, NATURAL, AND OPEN SYSTEMS (1/25) III (287 pp / 9a)

1. Chapter 1 S&D.
2. Selznick, P., 1948, Foundations of the Theory of Organization, ASR, 25-35.
3. Cyert, R.M. and March, J.G. 1963, A Behavioral Theory of the Firm Ch. 2 Antecedents of the Behavioral Theory of the Firm and Ch. 6 A Summary of the Basic Concepts, Prentice Hall. **Chapter 2 AND Chapter 6**
4. Thompson, J.D. 1967, *Organizations in Action*, Ch. 1 Strategies for Studying Organizations, Ch. 2 Rationality in Organizations, Ch. 3 Domains of Organized Action McGraw Hill. **Chapters 1, 2 AND 3**
5. Arrow, K.J. 1974. chap. 1 Rationality: Individual and Social 14-29, chap. 2 Organization and Information 33-44, *The Limits of Organization*, W. W. Norton. **Chapters 1 AND 2**
6. Simon, H.A. 1976 (1945) Chap. 1 Decision Making and Administrative Organization, Chap. 2 Some Problems of Administrative Theory, *Administrative Behavior*, The Free Press (4e). **Chapters 1 AND 2**
7. Jensen, M.C., 1983, Organization Theory and Methodology, *The Accounting Review* 58 (2) 319-339.
8. Ashmos, D. P. & Huber, G. P., 1987, The Systems Paradigm in Organization Theory. Correcting the Record and Suggesting the Future, AMR 12 607-621.
9. Hatch, Mary Jo. 1997. "Histories, Metaphors, and Perspectives in Organizational Theory," in *Organization Theory: Modern, Symbolic and Postmodern Perspectives*, pp. 21- 60.
10. Petelis, C.N., 2007, A Behavioral Resource-Based View of the Firm: The Synergy of Cyert and March (1963) and Penrose (1959), *Organization Science*, 18 (3) 478-490.
11. Gavetti G., Levinthal D., & Ocasio W. 2007. Neo-Carnegie: The Carnegie School's Past, Present, and Reconstructing for the Future, *Organization Science*, 18 (3) 523-536
12. Dosi G. & Marengo L. 2007, On the Evolutionary and Behavioral Theories of Organizations: A Tentative Roadmap, *Organization Science*, 18 (3) 491-502.



Leader: _____

WEEK 4: RATIONAL SYSTEMS MODELS (2/1)

(One page summary of your conceptual paper due)

1. Chapter 2 S&D.
2. Weber, M. Bureaucracy in. Gerth, H. H. and Mill, C. W. From Max Weber: Essays in Sociology 196-244, Oxford University Press 1946.
3. Udy, S. H., 1959. Bureaucracy and Rationality in Weber's Organization Theory: An Empirical Study, ASR 24 791-795.
4. Stinchcombe, A.L. 1963, Bureaucratic and Craft Administration of Production: A Comparative Study, ASQ 4 (1) 168-187.
5. Blau, P.M., Heydebrand, W.V. and Stauffer, R.E., 1966, The Structure of Small Bureaucracies, ASR 31, 179-191.
6. Blau, P.M., 1968, The Hierarchy of Authority in Organizations, AJS 73, 453-467.
7. Hall, R. H., 1968, Professionalization and Bureaucratization ASR 33, 92-104.
8. Adler, P. and Borys, B. 1996. Two types of bureaucracy: Enabling and Coercive. ASQ, pp. 61-89.

Optional:

Strickland, L.H., 1958. "Surveillance and trust." *Journal of Personality*, 26, 2: 200-215.



Leader: _____

WEEK 5: NATURAL AND OPEN SYSTEMS MODELS (2/8)

1. Rousseau, D.M. 1985, Issues of Level in Organizational Research: Multi-level and cross level perspectives, in Staw, B. and Cummings, L., *Research in Organizational Behavior*, V.7, 1-37.
2. Chapter 3 S&D.
3. Chapter 4 S&D.
4. Perrow, C. 1961, The Analysis of Goals in Complex Organizations ASR, 26, 854-66.
5. Barnard, C.I. Cooperation, in Grusky, O. and Miller, G. A. *The Sociology of Organizations*, 84-98, The Free Press, 1981.
6. Katz, D. and Kahn, R. L 1978, Chap. 2 Organizations and the Systems Concept' 17-34, *The Social Psychology of Organizations*, Josey-Bass.
7. Pondy, L. R. and Mitroff, I. I. 1979, Beyond Open System Models of Organization in *Research in Organizational Behavior*,_v1, 3-39 JAI Press.
8. Perrow, C., 1986, Chap. 5 The Institutional School, 157-177, *Complex Organizations* (third edition) Random House.



Leader: _____

WEEK 6: CONTINGENCY THEORY, CONFIGURATIONS, “FIT”, AND ISSUES OF ORGANIZATION DESIGN (2/15)

(Idea paper due)

1. Chapter 5 S&D.
2. Lawrence, P. R and Lorsch, J. W., 1967, Chap. 8, Towards a Contingency Theory of Organization in *Organization and Environment: Managing Differentiation and Integration*, Harvard University Press 185-210.
3. Galbraith, J. 1977, Organization Design, **Chapters 1, 2 AND 3**, Addison Wesley.
4. Van de Ven, A.H. & Drazin, R., 1985, The Concept of Fit in Contingency Theory, in L. Cummings and B. Staw, Research in Organizational Behavior, V7, JAI Press, 333-365.
5. Ginsberg, A. & Venkatraman, N., 1985, Contingency Perspectives on Organizational Strategy, AMR 10 (3)421-434.
6. Pennings, J., 1992, Structural Contingency Theory: A Reappraisal, in, L. Cummings and B. Staw, Research in Organizational Behavior, V14.
7. Doty, H., Glick, W., & Huber, G., 1993. Fit, Equifinality, and Organizational Effectiveness, A Test of Two Configurational Theories, AMJ, 36 (6)1196-1250.
8. Ketchen, D. J., Thomas, J. B., & Snow, C. C. 1993. Organizational configurations and performance: A comparison of theoretical approaches. AMJ, 36: 1278–1313.
9. Doty and Glick (1994) Typologies as a unique form of theory building: toward improved understanding and modeling. AMR, 19, 2, 23-51.

Optional:

Drazin, Robert; Van De Ven, Andrew H. 1985 "Alternative Forms of Fit in Contingency Theory". Administrative Science Quarterly 30 1985: 514-539.

Galbraith, J. 1974, Organization Design: An Information Processing View, *Interfaces*_4 (5) 28-35.



Leader: _____

WEEK 7: VIEWS OF ENVIRONMENTS: ADAPTATION (3/1)

1. Chapter 9 S&D
2. Chapter 10 S&D
3. Aldrich, H. and Pfeffer, J., 1976, Environments of Organizations in Alex Inkeles (ed) *Annual Review of Sociology*, 11, 79-105.
4. Miles, R.E., Snow, C.C., and Pfeffer, J., 1974, Organization-Environment: Concepts and Issues, *Industrial Relations*, 13, 244-264.
5. Aldrich, H., Organizations and Environments 1979, Chap. 5, Prentice Hall.
6. Pfeffer, J. and Salancik, G., 1978, *The External Control of Organizations* Chap. 1 An External Perspective on Organizations and Chap. 3 Social Control of Organizations Harper and Row. **BOTH Chapters 1 AND 3 (Both Chapters in Same FILE).**
7. Hrebiniak, L. & Snow, C., 1980, Industry Differences in Environmental Uncertainty and Organizational Characteristics Related to Uncertainty, *AMJ*, 23 (4), 750-759.
8. Dess, G.G. & Origer, 1987, Nancy K., Environment, Structure and Consensus in Strategy Formulation: A Conceptual Integration, *AMR* 12 (2) 313-330.
9. Keats, B.W. & Hitt, M. A., 1988, A Causal Model of Linkages Among Environmental Dimensions, Macro-Organizational Characteristics and Performance, *AMJ*, 31 (3) 570-598.

Optional:

Milliken, F., 1987, Three Types of Uncertainty about the Environment: State, Effect and Response Uncertainty, *AMR* 12 (1) 313-330.



Leader: _____

WEEK 8: VIEWS OF ENVIRONMENTS: SELECTION (2/22)

(First Draft – Conceptual Paper due)

1. Hannan, M. T. and Freeman, J., 1977, The Population Ecology of Organizations
AJS, 82, 929-964.
2. McKelvey, B. 1979, Comment on the Biological Analog in Organizational Science
ASQ, 24, 488-493.
3. Hannan, M.T. and Freeman, J., Structural Inertia and Organizational Change, 1984,
ASR, 49, 149-164.
4. Astley, W. G., 1985, The Two Ecologies: Microevolutionary and Macroevolutionary
Perspectives on Organizational Change, ASQ, 30, 224-241.
5. Hrebiniak, L. and Joyce, W. 1985. Organizational adaptation: Strategic choice and
environmental determinism. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 30: 336-349.
6. Wholey, D. R. and Brittain, J. W., 1986, Organizational Ecology: Findings and
Implications, AMR, 11, 513-533.
7. Wholey, D. & Brittain, J., 1989, Characterizing Environmental Variation, AMJ, 32,
867-882.
8. Amburgey, T. L. & Rao, H., 1996, Organizational Ecology: Past Present and Future
Directions, AMJ 39, 1265-1286.
9. Hsu, Greta. 2006. "Jack of all trades and master of none: Organizational ecology and
niche width in films. ASQ, pp. 420-450.



Leader: _____

WEEK 9: ORGANIZATIONS AS INSTITUTIONS (3/8)

1. Chapter 13 S&D.
2. (Howard) Hirsch, P., 1975. Organizational Effectiveness and the Institutional Environment, ASQ, 20, 327-344.
3. Meyer, J.M. and Rowan, B., 1977, Institutionalized Organizations: Formal Structure as Myth and Ceremony, AJS, 83, 340-363.
4. Zucker, L., 1977, The Role of Institutionalization in the Persistence of Culture, ASR, 42, 726-743.
5. Rowan, B., 1982, Organizational Structure and the Institutional Environment: The Case of Public Schools, ASQ, 27, 259-279.
6. DiMaggio P.J. and Powell, M.W., 1983, The Iron Cage Revisited: Institutional Isomorphism and Collective Rationality in Organizational Fields, ASR, 48, 147-60.
7. Tolbert, P.S. and Zucker, L.G., 1983, Institutional Sources of Change in the Formal Structure of Organizations: The Diffusion of Civil Service Reform 1880-1935. ASQ, 28, 22-39.
8. Singh, J.V., Tucker, D.J. and House, R.J., 1986, Organizational Legitimacy and the Liability of Newness ASQ, 31, 171-193.
9. Zucker, L. G., 1989, Combining Institutional Theory and Population Ecology: No legitimacy No History, ASR. 54. 542-545.

Optional:

Zucker, L.G & Darby, M.R. 2005, An Evolutionary Approach to Institutions and Social Construction: Process and Structure (S&H).

March 15 - No class – Spring Break



Leader: _____

WEEK 10: NEW INSTITUTIONALISM AND HYBRID PERSPECTIVES (3/22)

(First Draft – Research Proposal Due)

1. Oliver, C., 1991, Strategic Responses to Institutional Processes, AMR 16(1) 145-179.
2. Rao, H. 1994. The Social Construction of Reputation: Certification Contests, Legitimation, and the Survival of Organizations in the American Automobile Industry: 1895-1912, SMJ, 15(S2) 29-44.
3. Haveman, H., 1993, Follow the Leader: Mimetic Isomorphism and Entry into New Markets, ASQ, 38, 593-627.
4. Selznick, P. 1996. Institutionalism 'Old' and 'New', ASQ, 41(2): 270-277.
5. Pollock, T.G. & Rindova, V.P. 2003. Media legitimation effects in the market for initial public offerings. Academy of Management Journal. 46(5): 631-642.
6. Suddaby, R. & Greenwood, R. 2005. Rhetorical Strategies of Legitimacy. Administrative Science Quarterly, 50(1): 35-67.
7. Elsbach, K.D. & Sutton, R.I. 1992. Acquiring organizational legitimacy through illegitimate actions: A marriage of institutional and impression management theories. Academy of Management Journal, 35: 699-738.
8. Elsbach, K.D. 1994. "Building organizational legitimacy in the California cattle industry - The construction and effectiveness of verbal accounts." Administrative Science Quarterly, 39: 57-88.

Optional:

Scott, W., 1987, The Adolescence of Organizational Theory, ASQ, 32, 493-511.

Zucker, L.G. 1987. Institutional theories of organizations. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 13: 443-464.

Scott, W.R., 2005, Institutional Theory: Contributing to a Theoretical Research Program (S&H)



Leader: _____

WEEK 11: ECONOMIC AND POLITICAL/POWER PERSPECTIVES (3/29)

1. Williamson, O. E. 1991. Comparative economic organization: The analysis of discrete structural alternatives. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 36: 269-296. (*transaction cost economics overview*).
2. Ghoshal, S. & Moran, P. 1996. Bad for practice: A critique of the transaction cost theory. *Academy of Management Review*, 21(1): 13-47.
3. Roberts, R.P., & Greenwood, R. 1997. Integrating transaction cost and institutional theories: Toward a constrained–efficiency framework for understanding organization design adoptions. *AMR*, 22: 346-373.
4. Chapter 7 S&D.
5. Chapter 8 S&D.
6. March, J.G. 1962, The Business Firm as a Political Coalition, *Journal of Politics* 24, 662-678.
7. Mechanic, David, 1962, Sources of Power of Lower Participants in Complex Organizations, *ASQ*, Vol. 7, No: 3, pp. 349 - 364.
8. Pfeffer, J. and Salancik, G. R., Organizational Decision Making as a Political Process: The Case of a University Budget, *ASQ*, 21, 135-151, 1974.
9. Brass, D., 1984. Being in the Right Place: A Structural Analysis of Individual Influence in an Organization, *ASQ*, 29, 518-539.

Optional:

Coase, R.H. 1937. The nature of the firm. *Economica*. 4(16): 386-405.

Zald, M., 1970, *Political Economy: A Framework for Comparative Analysis in Power in Organizations*, Vanderbilt University Press.

Hickson, D.J., Hinnings, C.R., Lee, C.A., R.E. Schrenk, and Pennings, J.M. 1971, A Strategic Contingencies Model of Interorganizational Power, *ASQ*, 16, 216-229.

Hinnings, C.R., Hickson, D.J., Pennings, J.N. and R.E. Schrenk, Structural Conditions of Interorganization Power, *ASQ*, 19, 22-44, 1974.

Benson, J.K., 1975, The Interorganizational Network as Political Economy *ASQ*, 20, 229-249.

Pfeffer, J. 1978, *Organizational Design*, Chap. 1 Who Governs 1-30 and Chap. 9 Organizational Design as a Political Process 222-245.

Pfeffer, J., 1981, Chap. 3 Conditions for the Use of Power 67-96, Chap. 4 Sources of Power in Organizations 97-136, in *Power in Organizations*, Pitman.



Leader: _____

WEEK 12: THE ROLE OF STRUCTURE (4/5)

1. Chapter 6 S&D.
2. Chapter 12 S&D.
3. Perrow, C.A., 1967. Framework for the Comparative Analysis of Organizations, ASR, 32, 194-208.
4. Pondy, L.R., 1969. Effects of Size, Complexity and Ownership on Administrative Intensity, ASQ, 14, 47-61.
5. Pugh, D.S., Hickson, D.J., Hinnings, C.R. and Turner, C. 1969. The Context of Organization Structures, ASQ 14, 91-112.
6. Khandwalla, P.N., 1974, Mass Output Orientation of Operations Technology and Organizational Structure, ASQ 19, 74-97.
7. Tung, R.L., 1979, Dimensions of Organizational Environments: An Exploratory Study of Their Impact on Organizational Structure, AMJ 22, 672-693.

Optional:

Blau, P.N., 1970, A Formal Theory of Differentiation in Organizations, ASR 35, 201-218.

Woodward, J., 1965, Industrial Organization: Theory and Practice, Oxford University Press.

Kimberly, J.R., 1976, Organizational Size and the Structuralist Perspective: A Review, Critique, and Proposal, ASQ, 21, 571-591.

Fry, L.M., 1982, Technology-Structure Research: Three Critical Issues, AMJ, 25, 532-552.

Child, J., 1972, Organization Structure, Environment and Performance: The Role of Strategic Choice, *Sociology*, 6, 1-22.



Leader: _____

WEEK 13: SINGULAR AND INTERPRETIVIST VIEWS (4/12)

1. Cohen, M.D., March, J.G. and Olsen, J.P., 1972, A Garbage Can Model of Organizational Choice, ASQ 17, 1-25.
2. Weick, K. 1976, Educational Organizations as Loosely Coupled Systems ASQ 21, 1-19.
3. Podolny, J. & K. Page. 1998. "Network forms of organization," Annual Review of Sociology, 24: 57-76. [See also Ch. 11, pg 291 for more background].
4. Burrell, G. and Morgan, G., 1979, Social Paradigms and Organizational Analysis, Heinemann, Chap. 1-2. **BOTH Chapters 1 AND 2 (Both Chapters in Same FILE).**
5. Morgan, G., Frost, P.J. and Pondy, L. R. 1983, "Organizational Symbolism" in Pondy, L. R , Frost, P.J., Morgan, G., and Dandridge, T. C. (eds) *Organizational Symbolism*_JAI Press, 3-38.
6. Daft, R. L. and Weick, K.E., 1984, Towards Model of Organizations as Interpretation Systems, AMR, 9284-295.
7. Astley, G. 1985, Administrative Science as Socially Constructed Truth, ASQ 30, 497-513.
8. Gray, B., Bougon, M., and Donnellon, A., 1985, Organizations as the Construction and Destruction of Meaning *Journal of Management*.

Optional:

Daft, R. L., 1983, Symbols in Organizations in Pondy, L.R., Frost, P.J., Morgan, G., and Dandridge, T.C. (eds) *Organizational Symbolism*_JAI Press, 199-206.

Smircich, L., Organizations as Shared Meanings 55-65, in Pondy, L.R., Frost, P.J., Norgan, G., and Dandridge, T.C. (eds) *Organizational Symbolism*_JAI Press,

Morgan, G. 1986, Chap. 10 Developing the Art of Organizational Analysis in *Images of Organizations*,_Sage, 321-338.



Leader: _____
WEEK 14: A LAST LOOK (4/19)

(Final Draft – Conceptual Paper and Research Proposal Due)

1. Chapter 14 S&D.
2. March J. G., 2007, The Study of Organizations and Organizing Since 1945. *Organization Studies*, 28(1): 9–19.
3. Scott, W. R., The Mandate is Still Being Honored: In defense of Weber’s Disciples, *ASQ*, 41,163-171, 1996.
4. Astley, W.G. and Van de Ven, A.H., 1983, Central Perspectives and Debates in Organization Theory, *ASQ*, 28, 245-273.
5. Pfeffer, J., 1993, Barriers to Advancement of Organization Science: Paradigm Development as Dependent Variable, *AMR*, 18, 599-620.
6. Jermier, J. M. & Clegg, S. R., 1994, Critical Issues in Organizational Science: A Dialogue, *Organization Science*, 5, 1-13.
7. Zald, M.M., 1993, Organization Studies as a Scientific and Humanistic Enterprise: Towards a Reconceptualization of the Field, *Organization Science*, 4, 513-528.
8. Kilduff, M & Mehra, A., Postmodernism and Organizational Research, *AMR*, 22 (2) 453-481, 1997.
9. Starbuck, W.H., 2007. *Living in Mythical Spaces*. *Organization Studies*, 28, 21–25.
10. Walsh, J., A. Meyer, C.B. Schoonhoven. 2006. “The future for organization theory: Living in and living with changing organizations,” *Organization Science*, 17: 657-671.

Optional:

Boyacigiller, N. & Adler, R., 1991, The Parochial Dinosaur: Organization Science in a Global Context, *AMR*, 16, 262-290.

Starbuck, W., Shouldn’t Organization Theory Emerge from Adolescence?, *Organization*, 10(3): 439-452, 2003

Final exam – 4/26 – Location TBA



APPENDIX

One-Page Article Summaries:

The following format and guidelines are followed by Academy of Management journals and conference divisions; and scholars such as Catherine Daily, Albert A. Cannella Jr., Don Bergh, Javier Gimeno, Bruce Avolio, and Dave Ketchen contributed to these guidelines.

- Introduction
 - Identify a clear research question, with a solid motivation behind it.
 - Is the research question interesting?
 - After reading the introduction, did you find yourself motivated to read further?
- Theory
 - Identify and comment on the articulated theoretical framework.
 - Are the core concepts of the submission clearly defined?
 - Is the logic behind the hypotheses persuasive?
 - Is extant literature appropriately reflected in the submission, or are critical references missing?
 - Do the hypotheses or propositions logically flow from the theory?
- Method (for empirical papers)
 - Discuss appropriateness of the sample and variables for the hypotheses.
 - Is the data collection method consistent with the analytical technique(s) applied?
 - Does the study have internal and external validity?
 - Are the analytical techniques appropriate for the theory and research questions and were they applied appropriately?
- Results (for empirical papers)
 - Discuss whether the results reported in an understandable way.
 - Are there alternative explanations for the results, and if so, are these adequately controlled for in the analyses?
- Contribution
 - Discuss whether the submission make a value-added contribution to existing research.
- Future research
 - Discuss a couple of research questions that can draw on this research.
 - Identify a theoretical framework for each of these questions.
 - Discuss appropriate sample and variables for proposed questions and propositions.
 - What could be some of the implications for theory and practice if these research questions are pursued?