

UNIVERSITY of NORTH TEXAS
COLLEGE OF BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

Management 6820 - Seminar in Organizational Theory
Course Syllabus and Outline
Spring - 2006

Professor: Dr. Grant Miles
Office: 313A Business Administration
Phone: 565-3469
E-mail: miles@cobaf.unt.edu
Office Hours: Wednesday 10:00 am - 1:00 pm and Thursday 11:00 a.m. - 1:00 p.m.
or by appointment

INTRODUCTION:

This seminar, designed for Ph.D students, endeavors to provide a broad based overview of the field of organizational theory. At a minimum, students should come out of this class with an understanding of organizational theory issues sufficient to start their preparation for comprehensive exams. Among the questions of interest in this class are:

- > How do organizations form, grow, and survive over time?
- > Why are there so many different types of organization?
- > How are organizations designed and structured?
- > How do organizations interact with their environments?

No pretense is made that this course will cover all of the issues that are relevant to organizational theory. The field is too broad to even attempt such coverage. Nonetheless, an effort has been made to include both classic writings and contemporary literature so that students will at least get a sense of where to head to answer additional questions.

COURSE OBJECTIVES:

The major objective of this course is to enable seminar members to pursue theory-driven research on organizations. In order to accomplish this goal, the course has been structured so as to:

- * provide a thorough knowledge of the major approaches to studying organizations
- * encourage a critical perspective toward existing research and theory
- * gain both a historical and contemporary understanding of the directions taken by work in organization theory
- * develop your ability to articulate scholarly arguments, both orally and in writing

REQUIRED MATERIALS:

Scott, W.R. 2003. Organizations: Rational, Natural, and Open Systems (5th ed.), Prentice Hall, Englewood Cliffs, NJ

A set of articles and book chapters. One copy of each of the assigned readings will be made available to each student.

METHOD OF INSTRUCTION:

The class will be a seminar format with an emphasis on discussion and critical analysis. Students are expected to have read each week's assignment and be able to make thoughtful contributions regarding the issues addressed in each reading, the strengths and flaws, and the relationship of the reading to the other readings for that week and to other topic areas that have been covered. Students will be assigned responsibility for leading the discussion on each set of readings. I see my role as a participator in this process, not as a final authority on what is a correct or incorrect interpretation of any given reading or topic area.

PERFORMANCE EVALUATION:

Your grade in this course will be based upon the quality of your work in four different areas (discussed in detail below). The weighting of each area will be as follows:

Class participation	25%
Discussion Co-Leader	15%
Participation/Preparation	10%
Book Review (& contrast paper)	15%
Paper	30%
Final Exam	30%

CLASS PARTICIPATION

Participation is evaluated on the basis of your readiness to become involved, the usefulness of your contribution, and the depth/effectiveness of your argument. In addition, the consistency of relevant contributions and degree of improvement over the semester will be noted. Included in this assessment will be your performance as discussant on the articles assigned to you. Please note that the most important element of participation is the quality of the remarks. Simply unleashing a verbal barrage is neither a necessary nor a sufficient condition for a good score.

Discussion Co-Leader - Each student will assume responsibility for coordinating discussion in at least 3 class meetings (dependent on the final number of students). Co-leaders are responsible for leading class discussion on specific articles and, more importantly, providing synthesis and integration of the articles assigned within a given topic area. To assist in this process, a 4-8 page overview of the assigned readings should be prepared in advance of class

and should be distributed to all class members on the day the articles are to be discussed.

The assigned articles will provide the basis for the co-leaders discussion. Each co-leader, however, is encouraged to do outside reading as needed to clarify points in the articles and/or to provide necessary background for the discussion. The format for the discussion is the choice of the co-leaders but is subject to the following constraints:

1. Each article should be discussed. Theoretical articles and/or literature reviews should be discussed as a means of providing a sense of the topic area and where the field was at the time the article was written. Discussion of empirical studies should include identification of the relationships tested, a brief rationale of the hypotheses, a summary and critique of the methods and analysis used to test the hypotheses, and discussion of the results and their implications for future research.
2. Discussion should include some integration/synthesis of the articles in terms of such things as the theory or methodology used and whether there is consistency in findings, propositions, and/or positions across the articles. As well, a summary of what the articles as a whole provide for our understanding of the topic area and the larger field of OT should be included.
3. Questions and comments from the rest of the class should be accepted and encouraged.
4. Each of the co-leaders should play an equal role in the discussion.

Class participation/preparation - Each student should be sufficiently prepared each week so that, if necessary, they could assume the role of co-leader.

You should have read all of the articles and be prepared to offer your own view of the week's readings along the topic lines discussed above. A critical evaluation of the articles should take place before class so that you are prepared to question the view of the discussants and/or provide an alternative interpretation. While not required, you are encouraged to write up a short summary of each reading as well as 2-3 paragraph synthesis of key ideas and connections for each week.

That said, remember that the co-leaders are charged with directing the discussion and must be allowed to get the class back on track when necessary so that all assigned material can be covered.

It is important to recognize that in a doctoral seminar all participants serve the role of teacher. As such, you must be thorough and clear in your contributions and be prepared to justify your conclusions.

BOOK REVIEW:

To provide a more complete coverage than is possible in the time allotted for the course, each student will be required to read one of the books from the list provided below and write a summary/critique of the book. Note that the review should do more than simply summarize the chapters and key ideas. It must critique the work, place it in a context of other theoretical works and identify the contributions made by the book. Look through the book review section in several recent AMRs to get a sense of what a good review should include. While there is no specific page requirement, a good review is likely to be 8-10 pages (double spaced).

In addition, students should get together in teams of 2 or 3 people and jointly write a short (5 pages +/-) paper that compares and contrasts the individual books read. Each person's review, as well as the joint paper, will be copied and distributed to the class so that each student receives exposure to as much material as possible.

Each book will be allotted to only one student on a first come, first served basis so be sure to make your selection as soon as possible. The book reviews are due in class on March 2nd and will be discussed in the following class.

Choose From The Following List

Thompson - Organizations in Action (Dwight)

March and Simon - Organizations (Zhen)

March & Olson - Ambiguity and Choice in Organizations

Pfeffer - Power in Organizations

Pfeffer & Salancik - The External Control of Organizations (Lisa)

Williamson - The Economic Institutions of Capitalism (Patti)

Nelson & Winter - An Evolutionary Theory of Economic Change (Troy)

Hannan & Freeman - Organizational Ecology

Lawrence & Lorsch - Organizations and Environment (Tip)

Katz & Kahn - The Social Psychology of Organizations (Susan)

Burrell & Morgan - Sociological Paradigms and Organizational Analysis

Morgan - Images of Organizations (David)

PAPER

Each student is required to write a paper on an organizational theory topic. This must be an original paper written solely for this class. Recognize that completion of the paper will require a significant amount of time and effort. **DO NOT LEAVE THIS TO THE LAST MINUTE!!!!** Papers may take one of two forms:

Research Proposal: Research proposal papers should identify a researchable question, review the relevant literature, specify a set of hypotheses, and propose a study (with a complete methods section) for testing these hypotheses. The proposal should seek to either reconcile some aspect(s) of conflicting theories or advance a new theory.

Theoretical Paper: Theory papers should be focused either on theoretical synthesis or on the

development of new and/or exploratory conceptual models. They must be clearly and accurately grounded in the relevant literature and should include a set of researchable propositions.

While there are no strict page constraints, it is likely that in either form the paper will require somewhere between 25-40 pages (double-spaced, including title page, abstract, references and tables/figures (if included)). Strict adherence to the APA Style Manual is required.

The core ideas of the paper should be original, important, and provocative and the practical relevance for management science and practice must be clear. The level of quality desired is that which would be considered for acceptance in a Class A journal (e.g. AMJ, AMR, ASQ, etc.). While it is NOT a requirement of the course for you to submit the paper to a journal or conference, you should keep this possibility in mind when working on your paper.

The topic of the paper should be approved by me before you begin work, and a one page statement outlining ideas for the paper is due by Friday, February 24th (I will be happy to accept them earlier). The paper is due in class on April 27th and each student will make a short (~15 minute), conference style presentation of their work in class on May 4th.

ANNOTATED BIBLIOGRAPHY

While not required, it is strongly encouraged that each student create a comprehensive annotated bibliography of the research literature that pertains to their paper topic area. An example of what such a bibliography will include is available for you to examine. The annotated bibliography should be organized to reflect logical typologies, chronologies, etc. appropriate for the topic area and should generally follow the structure of an article in an academic journal. The purpose of the annotated bibliography is to help organize and structure your research and thinking about your paper.

An example of an appropriate bibliography citation is attached for your review. Note that the format of the citation may also be useful for summarizing the articles assigned each week.

FINAL EXAM

A comprehensive final exam will be administered during finals week. This exam will be comparable in format and rigor to a doctoral comprehensive exam . Details of this exam will be discussed in class.

ADA COMPLIANCE

THE COLLEGE OF BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION COMPLIES WITH THE AMERICANS WITH DISABILITIES ACT IN MAKING REASONABLE ACCOMMODATION FOR QUALIFIED STUDENTS WITH DISABILITY.

IF YOU HAVE AN ESTABLISHED DISABILITY AS DEFINED IN THE AMERICANS WITH DISABILITIES ACT AND WOULD LIKE TO REQUEST ACCOMMODATION, PLEASE SEE ME AS SOON AS POSSIBLE. MY OFFICE HOURS AND OFFICE NUMBER ARE SHOWN ON THIS SYLLABUS.

SCHOLASTIC DISHONESTY POLICY:

The UNT Code of Student Conduct and Discipline provides penalties for misconduct by students, including academic dishonesty.

Academic dishonesty includes cheating and plagiarism.

The term “cheating” includes, but is not limited to, (1) use of any unauthorized assistance in taking quizzes, tests or examinations; (2) dependence upon the aid of sources beyond those authorized by the instructor in writing papers, preparing reports, solving problems, or carrying out other assignments; or (3) the acquisition, without permission, of tests or other academic material belonging to a faculty member or staff of the university.

The term “plagiarism” includes, but is not limited to, the use, by paragraph or direct quotation, of the published or unpublished work of another person without full and clear acknowledgment. It also includes the unacknowledged use of materials prepared by another person or agency engaged in the selling of term papers or other academic materials. (Source: Code of Conduct and Discipline at the University of North Texas.)

If you engage in academic dishonesty related to this class, you will receive a failing grade on the test or assignment, and a failing grade in the course. In addition, the case will be referred to the Dean of Students for appropriate disciplinary action. This policy is intended to protect the honest student from unfair competition with unscrupulous individuals who might attempt to gain an advantage through cheating

MGMT 6820 - SEMINAR IN ORGANIZATIONAL THEORY
COURSE OUTLINE* SPRING - 2006

#	Date	TOPIC**	DISCUSSANTS
1	Jan. 19	Introduction and Overview	GEM
2	26	Thoughts on Theory & the Rational View	Patti & Lisa
3	Feb. 2	Natural Systems & Open Systems	Susan & Patti
4	9	Integrative Approaches & Contingency Theory	Zhen & Lisa
5	16	Contingencies - Technology, Size & Environment	Dwight & David
6	23	Contingencies & Effectiveness	Tip & GEM
7	Mar. 2	Power & Politics, Agency Theory	David & GEM
8	9	Transaction Cost Economics (plus discussion of book reports)	Troy & Patti
	16	Spring Break - No Class	
9	23	Institutional Theory	Zhen & Tip
10	30	Resource Dependence & Population Ecology	David & Zhen
11	Apr. 6	Central Debates	Susan & Tip
12	13	Interorganizational Relationships	Troy & Lisa
13	20	Knowledge & Learning	Dwight & Susan
14	27	New Forms and Philosophies	Dwight & Troy
15	May 4	Paper Presentations	
16	TBD	Final Exam	

* Schedule is not absolute. Adjustments may be made as the term progresses. It is your responsibility to be up to date on any announced changes.

** Readings for each week are shown on the following pages.

MGMT 6820 - Seminar in Organizational Theory Reading List - Spring 2006¹

Week 1 - Introduction and Overview

Scott, chapter 1

Astley, W.G. & Van de Ven, A.H. 1983. Central perspectives and debates in organization theory. ASQ, 28: 245-273.

Gioia, D.A. & Pitre, E. 1990. Multiparadigm perspectives on theory building. AMR, 15:584-602.

Additional articles to consider:

Weick, K.E. 1989. Theory construction as disciplined imagination. AMR, 14:516-531.

Whetten, D.A. 1989. What constitutes a theoretical contribution? AMR, 14: 490-495.

Rousseau, D.M. 1985. Issues of level in organizational research: Multi-level and cross level perspectives. In Staw, B. & Cummings, L. Research in Organizational Behavior, 7: 1-35.

Klein, K.J., Dansereau, F., & Hall, R.J. 1994. Level issues in theory development, data collection, and analysis. AMR, 19: 195-229.

Eisenhardt, K.M. 1989. Building theory from case study research. AMR, 14: 532-550.

Sutton, R.I. & Staw, B.M. 1995. What theory is not. ASQ, 40: 371-384.

Weick, K.E. 1995. What theory is not, theorizing is. ASQ, 40: 385-390.

DiMaggio, P.J. 1995. Comments on "What theory is not". ASQ, 40: 391-397.

Bacharach, S. 1989. Organizational Theory: Some criteria for evaluation. AMR, 14: 496-515.

Week 2 - Thoughts on Theory, Rational View

Scott, Chapters 2

Poole, M.S. & Van de Ven, A. 1989. Using paradox to build management and organization theories. AMR, 14: 562-578.

March, J.G. & Simon, H.A. 1958. Cognitive limits on rationality. Chapter 6 from

¹ This reading list is tentative and may be changed during the course of the semester. It is the students responsibility to be aware of any changes announced in class.

Organizations, John Wiley & Sons.

Weber, M. 1946. Bureaucracy. in Gerth, H.H. & Mill, C.W. (eds) From Max Weber: Essays in Sociology. Oxford University Press: 196-244

Udy, S.H. 1959. Bureaucracy and rationality in Weber's organization theory: An empirical study. ASR, 24: 791-795.

Hall, R.B. 1963. The concept of bureaucracy: An empirical assessment. AJS, 69:32-40.

Kalberg, S. 1980. Max Weber's types of rationality: Cornerstones for the analysis of rationalization processes in history. AJS 85:1145-1179.

Additional articles to consider:

Simon, H.A. 1976. Administrative Behavior, The Free Press. (4th edition) See especially chapters 1 & 2.

Stinchcombe, A.L. 1963. Bureaucratic and craft administration of production: A comparative study. ASQ, 4: 168-187.

Hall, R.H. 1968. Professionalization and bureaucratization. ASR, 33:92-104.

Blau, P.M. 1968. The hierarchy of authority in organizations. AJS, 73: 453-467.

Week 3 - Natural Systems and Open Systems

Scott chapters 3 & 4

Barnard, C.I. Cooperation. in Grusky, O. & Miller, G.A. (eds.) The Sociology of Organizations. Free Press: 84-98.

Selznick, P. 1948. Foundation of the theory of organization. ASR, 13: 25-35.

Michels, R. Oligarchy. In Grusky, O. and Miller, G.A. The social psychology of organizations, (37-54), The Free Press, 1981.

Von Bertalanffy, L. 1956. General Systems Theory. in General Systems: Yearbook for the Society for the Advancement of General Systems Theory. 1-10.

Weick, K. 1976. Educational organizations as loosely coupled systems. ASQ, 21: 1-19.

Katz, D. & Kahn, R.L. 1978. The Social Psychology of Organizations. Wiley: 17-34 (Ch. 2).

Additional articles to consider:

Mulej, M., Potocan, V., Zenko, Z. & Kajzer, S. 2004. How to restore Bertalanffian systems thinking. Kybernetes, 33: 48-60.

Boulding, K. 1966. General Systems Theory - The skeleton of science. Management Science. 2: 197-207

Selznick, P. 1957. Leadership in Administration, Harper and Row.

Selznick, P. 1949. TVA and the Grass Roots, University of California Press.

Ulrich, D. and Barney, J.B. 1984. Perspectives in organizations: Resource dependence, efficiency and population. AMR, 9: 471-481.

Weick, K. 1979. The Social Psychology of Organizing, Addison Wesley.

Week 4 - Attempts at Integration and Contingency Views

Lawrence, P.R. & Lorsch, J.W. 1967. Organization and Environment: Managing Differentiation and Integration. Harvard University Press: 185-210 (Ch.8).

Etzioni, A. 1964. Modern Organizations. Prentice Hall: 1-4 & 105-115.

Thompson, J.T. 1967. Organizations in Action. McGraw Hill: 39-50 (Ch. 4).

Donaldson, L. (1996). The normal science of structural contingency theory, Handbook of Organization Studies, pp. 57-77.

Meyer, A.D., Tsui, A.S. and C.R. Hinings 1993. Configurational approaches to organizational analysis. Academy of Management Journal, 36: 1175-1195.

Sillince, J. 2005. A contingency theory of rhetorical congruence. Academy of Management Review. 30: 608-621.

Additional articles to consider:

Amburgey, T. L. & Dacin, M. T. 1994. As the Left Foot Follows the Right? The Dynamics of Strategic and Structural Change. Academy of Management Journal, 37(6): 1427-1452.

Argote, L. 1982. Input uncertainty and organizational coordination in hospital emergency units. ASQ, 27: 420-434.

Child, J. (1972) Organization Structure, Environment and Performance: The Role of Strategic Choice, Sociology, 6, 2-22.

Donaldson, L. (1996) For Positivist Organization Theory, Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, 1-57.

Donaldson, Lex (1995). "Structural contingency theory of organizational adaptation," chapter 2 in *American anti-management theories of organization: a critique of paradigm proliferation*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Ginsberg, A. & Venkatraman, N. (1985) *Contingency Perspectives of Organizational Strategy: A Critical Review of the Empirical Research*. *AMR*, 10(3): 421-434.

Gresov, C. 1989. Exploring fit and misfit with multiple contingencies. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 34: 431-453.

Jarley, P., Fiorito, J. & Delaney, J.T. (1997). A structural contingency approach to bureaucracy and democracy in U.S. national unions, *Academy of Management Journal*, 40, 831-861.

Lawless, M. & Finch, L. (1989) *Choice and Determinism: A Test of Hrebiniak and Joyce's Framework on Strategy-Environment Fit*. *SMJ*, 10, 351-365.

Miles, R.E. and Snow, C.C. 1995. *Fit, Failure & the Hall of Fame*, Free Press.

Miller, D. and Friesen, P. 1984. *Organizations: A Quantum View*, Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall.

Miller, D. 1983. The correlates of entrepreneurship in three types of firms. *Management Science*, 29 (7).

Mintzberg, H. 1981. *Organization Design: Fashion or Fit?* *Harvard Business Review*, 103-116.

Mintzberg, H. 1979. *The Structuring of Organizations*, Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall.

Pennings, J. (1992). Structural contingency theory: A reappraisal. In B.M.Staw & L.L. Cummings (eds.), *Research in organizational behavior*, Vol. 14. Greenwich, CT: JAI, pp. 267-309.

Pondy, L.R. & Mitroff, I.I. 1979. Beyond open system models of organization. in *Research in Organizational Behavior, V.1*. JAI Press: 3-39.

Schoonhoven, C.B. 1981. Problems with contingency theory: Testing assumptions hidden within the language of contingency theory. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 26: 349-377.

Thompson, James D. (1967). Chapters 1-7 in *Organizations in action*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Van de Ven, Andrew H. & Drazin, Robert (1985). The concept of fit in contingency theory. In Larry L. Cummings and Barry Staw (eds.), *Research in organization behavior*, Vol. 7. JAI Press, pp. 333-365.

Week 5 - Specific Contingencies: Technology, Size, Environment & Knowledge

Scott, Chapters 6, 9 & 10

Gailbraith, J. 1974. Organization design: An information processing view. Interfaces. 4: 28-36.

Kimberly, J.R. 1976. Organization size and the structuralist perspective: A review, critique, and proposal. ASQ. 21: 571-597.

Dess, G. and Beard, D. 1984. Dimensions of organizational task environments. ASQ, 29: 52-73.

Smircich, L. & Stubbart, C. (1985) Strategic Management in an Enacted World. AMR, 10(4): 724-736.

Barley, S.R. 1986. Technology as an occasion for structuring: Evidence from observation of CT scanners and the social order of radiology departments. ASQ. 31: 78-108.

Birkinshaw, J., Nobel, R. & Ridderstale, J. (2002). Knowledge as a contingency variable: Do the characteristics of knowledge predict organization structure? Organization Science, 13: 274-289.

Additional articles to consider:

Granovetter, M. 1984. Small is bountiful: Labor markets and establishment size. ASR, 49:323-334.

Fry, L.W. 1982. Technology-Structure research: Three critical issues. AMJ. 25: 532-552.

Bluedorn, Allen C. (1993). Pilgrim's progress: Trends and convergence in research on organizational size and environments. Journal of Management, 19, 163-191.

Anderson, P. and Tushman, M.L. 1990. Technological discontinuities and dominant designs: A cyclical model of technological change. ASQ, 35:604-633.

Tushman, M.L. and Anderson, P. 1986. Technological discontinuities and organizational environments. ASQ, 31: 439-465.

Sharfman, M.P. & Dean, J.W. 1991. Conceptualizing and measuring the organizational environment: A multidimensional approach. JM. 17: 681-700.

Argote, L. 1982. Input uncertainty and organizational coordination in hospital emergency units. ASQ, 27: 420-434.

Week 6 - Contingency (cont) and Organizational Effectiveness

Scott, Ch. 13

Cameron, K.S. (1986). Effectiveness as paradox: Consensus and conflict in conceptions of organizational effectiveness. Management Science, 32, 539-553.

March, J. & Sutton, R. (1997) Organizational Performance as a Dependent Variable. *Organization Science*, 8(6): 698-706.

Waddock, S. & Graves, S. (1997) The Corporate Social Performance-Financial Performance Link. *SMJ*, 18(4): 303-319.

Doty, D.H., Glick, W.H. & Huber, G.P. (1993). Fit, equifinality, and organizational effectiveness: A test of two configurational theories. *Academy of Management Journal*, 36, 1196-1250.

Gresov, C. & Drazin, R. (1997). Equifinality: Functional equivalence in organization design. *Academy of Management Review*, 22, 403-428.

Priem, R.L. & Rosenstein, J. (2000). Is organization theory obvious to practitioners? A test of one established theory. *Organization Science*, 11: 509-524.

Additional articles to consider:

Alvesson, M. & Deetz, S. (1996). Critical theory and postmodern approaches to organizational studies. *Handbook of Organization Studies*, pp. 191-217.

Bharadwaj, S. Varadarajan, P., & Fahy, J. (1993) Sustainable Competitive Advantage in Service Industries: A Conceptual Model and Research Propositions. *Journal of Marketing*, 57: 83-99..6

Cameron, K. & Whetten, D. (1983) *Organizational Effectiveness: A Comparison of Multiple Models*, New York: Academic Press.

Clarkson, M. (1995) A Stakeholder Framework for Analyzing and Evaluating Corporate Social Performance. *AMR*, 20(1): 92-117.

Dess, G. & Robinson, Jr., R. (1984) Measuring Organizational Performance in the Absence of Objective Measures: The Case of the Privately-held Firm and Conglomerate Business Unit. *SMJ*, 5: 265-273.

Egri, C.P. & Pinfield, L.T. (1996). Organizations and the biosphere: Ecologies and environments. *HOS*, pp. 459-483.

Katz, D. & Kahn, R. (1978) *The Social Psychology of Organizations*, New York: John Wiley.

Quinn, R. & Cameron, K. (1983) Organizational Life Cycles and Shifting Criteria of Effectiveness: Some Preliminary Evidence. *Management Science*, 29(1): 33-51.

Rowley, T.J. (1997). Moving beyond dyadic ties: A network theory of stakeholder influences. *Academy of Management Review*, 22, 887-910.

Mitchell, R.K., Agle, B.R. & Wood, D.J. (1997). Toward a theory of stakeholder identification and salience: Defining the principle of who and what really counts. *Academy of Management*

Review, 22, 853-886.

Wood, D. (1991) Corporate Social Performance Revisited. *AMR*, 16(4): 691-718.

Zammuto, R. (1984) A Comparison of Multiple Constituency Models of Organizational Effectiveness. *AMR*, 9(4): 606-616.

Week 7 - Power and Politics, Agency Theory

(To be read as background - See also Scott, Chapter 11)

Hardy, C. & Clegg, S.R. (1996). Some dare call it power, *Handbook of Organization Studies*, pp. 622-641.

Pfeffer, J. (1992). Understanding Power in Organizations. *California Management Review*, 34(2), 29-50.

To be discussed:

Ashcroft, K.L. (2001). Organized dissonance: Feminist bureaucracy as hybrid form. *Academy of Management Journal*, 44(6), 1301-1322.

Brass, D. & Burkhardt, M. (1993) Potential power and power use: An investigation of structure and behavior, *AMJ*, 36(3), 441-470.

Hickson, D., Hinings, C. R., Lee, C.A., Schneck, R.E. & Pennings, J.M. (1971). A strategic contingency theory of intraorganizational power. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 16, 216-229.

Pfeffer, J. & Salancik, G.R. (1974). Organizational decision making as a political process: The case of a university budget. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 19, 135-151.

Fama, Eugene, and Michael C. Jensen (1983). "Separation of ownership and control." *Journal of Law and Economics*, 26: 301-325.

Eisenhardt, K.M. 1989. Agency theory: An assessment and review. *AMR*, 14: 57-74.

Tosi, H.L., Katz, J.P. & Gomez-Mejia, L.R. (1997). Disaggregating the agency contract: The effects of monitoring, incentive alignment, and term in office on agent decision making. *Academy of Management Journal*, 40(3), 584-602.

Additional articles to consider:

Power and Politics:

Barley, S.R. & Kunda, G. (1992). Design and devotion: Surges of rational and normative

- ideologies of control in managerial discourse. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 37, 363-399. (For update, see Abrahamson, AMJ, 1997)
- Calas, M.B. & Smircich, L. (1996). From 'the woman's' point of view: Feminist approaches to organization studies. *Handbook of Organization Studies*, pp. 218-248.
- Clegg, S. (1989) *Radical Revisions: Power, Discipline, and Organizations*. *Organization Studies*, 10(1), 97-115.
- Cook, K.S. 1977. Exchange and Power in Networks of Interorganizational Relations, *Sociological Quarterly*, 18: 62-82.
- Daily, C. & Johnson, J. (1997) Sources of CEO Power and Firm Financial Performance: A Longitudinal Assessment. *Journal of Management*, 23(2): 97-117.
- Emerson, R. (1962) Power-Dependence Relations. *American Sociological Review*, 27, 31-41.
- Finkelstein, S (1992) Power in Top Management Teams: Dimensions, Measurement, and Validation, AMJ, 35(3), 505-538.
- Frost, P.J. et al. 1985. *Reframing Organizational Culture*, London: Sage.
- Gordon, G.G. 1991. Industry determinants of organizational culture, *Academy of Management Review*, 16: 396-415.
- Gresov, C. & Stephens, C. (1993). The context of interunit influence attempts. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 38, 252-276.
- Grimes, A. (1978) Authority, Power, Influence, and Social Control: A Theoretical Synthesis. *AMR*, October, 724-735.
- Hatch, M.J. 1993. The dynamics of organizational culture, *Academy of Management Review*, 18, 657-693.
- Hickson, D.J. et al. 1981. Organization as power, in L.L. Cummings and B.M. Staw (Eds.) *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 3: 151-196.
- Hitt, M.A., Hoskisson, R.E., Johnson, R.A. & Moesel, D. D. (1996). The market for corporate control and firm innovation. *Academy of Management Journal*, 39, 1084-1119.
- Hosmer, L.T. (1995). Trust: The connecting link between organizational theory and philosophical ethics. *Academy of Management Review*, 20, 379-403.
- Lucas, R. 1987. Political-cultural analysis of organizations, *Academy of Management Review*, 12, 144-156.
- Mintzberg, H. (1983) *Power in and around Organizations*, Englewood-Cliffs, NK: Prentice-Hall.

Nutt, P.C. & Backoff, R.W. (1993). Strategic issues as tensions. *Journal of Management Inquiry*, 2, 28-42.

Ocasio, W. (1994) Political Dynamics and the Circulation of Power: CEO Succession in U.S. Industrial Corporations, 1960-1990, *ASQ*, 39, 285-312.

Ouchi, W.G. and Wilkins, A.L. 1985. Organizational culture, *Annual Review of Sociology*, 11: 457-83.

Pfeffer, J. 1981. *Power in Organizations*, Boston, MA: Pitman.

Riley, P. 1983. A structurationist account of political cultures, *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 28, 414-437.

Smircich, L. 1983. Concepts of culture and organizational analysis, *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 28, 339-358.

Agency Theory

Abrahamson, E. & Park, C. (1994) Concealment of Negative Organizational Outcomes: An Agency Theory Perspective. *AMJ*, 37(4), 1302-1334.

Alchian, Armen and Harold Demsetz (1972). "Production, information costs, and economic organization." *American Economic Review*, 62: 777-795.

Bird, A. & Wiersema, M. (1996) Underlying Assumptions of Agency Theory and Implications for Non-U.S. Settings: The Case of Japan. In P. Bamberger, M. Erez, & S. Bacharach's (Eds.) *Research in The Sociology of Organizations*, Greenwich, CT: JAI Press, 14: 149-180.

Davis, Gerald F. and Tracy A. Thompson (1994). "A social movement perspective on corporate control." *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 39: 141-173.

Davis, G.F. 1991. Agents without principles? The spread of the poison pill through the intercorporate network, *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 36: 583-613.

Davis, J., Schoorman, F., & Donaldson, L. (1997) Toward a Stewardship Theory of Management *AMR*, 22(1): 20-47.

Easterbrook, Frank H. and Daniel R. Fischel (1991). "The corporate contract," chapter 1 in *The economic structure of corporate law*. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press.

Gomez-Mejia, L.R. & Balkin, D.B. 1992. Determinants of faculty pay: An agency theory perspective. *AMJ*, 35: 921-955.

Jenson, M.C. and Mecklin, W.H. (1976). Theory of the firm: Managerial behavior, agency costs, and ownership structure. *Journal of Financial Economics*, 3: 305-360.

Lyons, B. & Mehta, J. (1997) Contracts, Opportunism, and Trust: Self-Interest and Social Orientation. *Cambridge Journal of Economics*, 21: 239-257.

Oviatt, B. (1988) Agency and Transaction Cost Perspectives on the Manager-Shareholder Relationship: Incentives for Congruent Interests. *AMR*, 13(2), 214-226.

Perrow, C. 1986. *Complex Organizations: A Critical Essay*, Chapter 7 on Economic Theories of Organization, 219-257.

Week 8 - Transaction Cost Economics

(To be read as background)

Barney, J.B. & Hesterly, W. (1996). Organizational economics: Understanding the relationship between organizations and economic analysis, *Handbook of Organization Studies*, pp. 115-147.

Scott, Chapter 7

To be discussed:

Williamson, O.E. 1981. The economics of organization: the transaction cost approach. *AJS*, 87: 548-577.

Williamson, Oliver E. (1991). Comparative economic organization: The analysis of discrete structural alternatives. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 36 (2), 269-296.

Ghoshal, S. & Moran, P. (1996). Bad for practice: A critique of the transaction cost theory. *Academy of Management Review*, 21(1), 13-47.

(These next 2 are a critique and rejoinder of the article above)

Williamson, O.E. (1996). Economic organization: The case for Candor. *Academy of Management Review*, 21(1), 48-57.

Moran, P. & Ghoshal, S. (1996). Theories of economic organization: The case for realism and balance. *Academy of Management Review*, 21(1), 58-72.

Masters, J. K., Miles, G., D'Souza, D. & Orr, J. P. 2004. Risk Propensity, Trust, and Transaction Costs in Relational Contracting. *Journal of Business Strategies*, 21: 47-68.

Masters, J. K. & Miles, G. 2002. Predicting The Use Of External Labor Arrangements: A Test Of The Transaction Costs Perspective. *Academy of Management Journal*, 45: 431-443.

Additional articles to consider:

Armour, H.O. and D.J. Teece. 1978. Organization structure and economic performance: A test of the multi-divisional hypotheses. *Bell Journal of Economics*, 9: 106-122.

- Buckley, P. & Chapman, M. (1997) The Perception and Measurement of Transaction Costs. *Cambridge Journal of Economics*, 21: 127-145.
- Coase, R. H. (1937). The nature of the firm. *Economica*, 4, 386-405.
- Donaldson, Lex (1990). The ethereal hand: Organizational economics and management theory. *Academy of Management Review*, 15 (3), 369-381.
- Eccles, R. 1987. Review of the economic institutions of capitalism, *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 4: 602-605.
- Jones, Gareth R. (1987). Organization-client transactions and organizational governance, *Academy of Mgt Journal*, 30, 197-218.
- Lazerson, Mark (1995). "A new phoenix? Modern putting-out in the Modena knitwear industry." *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 40: 34-59.
- Leblebici, H. (1985) Transactions and Organizational Forms: A Re-analysis. *Organization Studies*, 6(2), 97-115.
- Ouchi, W.G. 1977. Review of Markets and Hierarchies. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 540-544.
- Perrow, Charles (1981). "Markets, hierarchies and hegemony." In Andrew Van de Ven and William F. Joyce (eds.), *Organizational design*. New York: Wiley.
- Robins, James A. (1993 Summer). Organization as Strategy: Restructuring production in the film industry. *Strategic Management Journal*, 14(Special Issue), 103-118..Set 12:
- Rousseau, D. & Parks, J. (1993) The Contracts of Individuals and Organizations. In L. Cummings & B. Staw's (eds) *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 15, Greenwich, CT: JAI Press, 1-43.
- Rumelt, R., Shendel, D., & Teece, D. (Eds., 1991) Special Issue of SMJ, *Fundamental Research Issues in Strategy and Economics*, 12(Winter): 1-156.
- Shane, S. (1994) The Effect of National Culture on the Choice between Licensing and Direct Foreign Investment. *SMJ*, 15: 627-642
- Shelanski, H. & Klein, P. (1995) Empirical Work in Transaction Cost Economics. *Journal of Law, Economics and Organization*, 11(April)..11
- Spence, A.M. 1975. The economics of internal organization: An introduction. *Bell Journal of Economics*, 6(1): 163-172.
- Walker, G. and Poppo, L. (1991) Profit Centers, Single-Source Suppliers, and Transaction Costs, *ASQ*, 36, 66-87.

Williamson, O.E. 1993. Opportunism and its critics. Managerial and Decision Economics, 14: 97-107.

Williamson, O.E. 1996. Economic organization: The case for candor. AMR, 21: 48-57.

Williamson, O. (1988) The Logic of Economic Organization. Journal of Law, Economics and Organization, 4(Spring): 65-93.

Williamson, O.E. 1975. Markets and Hierarchies: Analysis and Antitrust Implications, Free Press.

Williamson, O.E. 1979. Transaction Cost Economics: The Governance of Contractual Relations. Journal of Law and Economics, 22: 233-261.

Williamson, O.E. 1985. The Economic Institutions of Capitalism. New York: The Free Press, Chapters 1-4. p. 15-102.

Williamson, O.E. 1994. Transaction cost economics and organization theory. In N. Smelser and R. Swedberg (Eds.), Handbook of Economic Sociology, 77-107, Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.

Williamson, O.W. and W.G. Ouchi. 1982. The markets and hierarchies and visible hand perspectives. In Van de Ven, A.H. and W. Joyce (Eds.), Perspectives on Organization Design and Behavior, 387-406.

Williamson, Oliver E. (1983). Markets and Hierarchies: Analysis and Antitrust Implications. New York: Free Press.

Week 9 - Institutional Theory

To be read as background:

Tolbert, P.S. and Zucker, L. 1996. The Institutionalization of institutional theory. In S.R. Clegg, C. Hardy and W. Nord (Eds.), Handbook of Organizational Studies, 175-190, London, Sage.

Scott, Chapter 7

Readings to be discussed:

Meyer, J.W. & Rowan, B. 1977. Institutionalized organizations: Formal structure as myth and ceremony. AJS, 83: 340-363.

DiMaggio, P.J. & Powell, W.W. 1983. The iron cage revisited: Institutional isomorphism and collective rationality in organizational fields. ASR, 48: 147-160.

Scott, W.R. 1987. The adolescence of institutional theory. ASQ, 32: 493-511.

Deephouse, D. (1996) Does Isomorphism Legitimate? *AMJ*, 39(4): 1024-1039.

Roberts, P.W. & Greenwood, R. 1997. Integrating transaction cost and institutional theories: Toward a constrained-efficiency framework for understanding organizational design adoption. *AMR*, 22(2): 346-373.

Schofer, E. & Meyer, J.W. 2005. The worldwide expansion of higher education in the twentieth century. *American Sociological Review*, 70: 898-920.

Additional articles to consider:

Burns, Lawton R. and Douglas R. Wholey (1993). "Adoption and abandonment of matrix management programs: effects of organizational characteristics and interorganizational networks." *Academy of Management Journal*, 36: 106-138.

Davis, Gerald F., Kristina A. Diekmann, and Catherine H. Tinsley (1994). "The decline and fall of the conglomerate firm in the 1980s: a study in the de-institutionalization of an organizational form." *American Sociological Review*, 59: 547-570.

DiMaggio, P.J. and Powell, W.W. 1991. Introduction. In Powell, W.W. and DiMaggio, P.J. (Eds) *The new institutionalism in organizational analysis*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 1-38.

DiMaggio, P.J. 1988. Interest and agency in institutional theory. In Zucker, L. (Ed.) *Institutional Patterns and Organizations: Culture and Environment*, Cambridge: Ballinger,

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.

Haveman, H. (1993) Follow the Leader: Mimetic Isomorphism and Entry into New Markets, *ASQ*, 38, 593-627.

Henisz, W. Zelner, B. & Guillen, M. 2005. The worldwide diffusion of market-oriented infrastructure reform, 1977-1999. *American Journal of Sociology*, 70: 871-897.

Ingram, Paul, & Simons, Tal (1995). Institutional and Resource Dependence determinants of responsiveness to work-family issues. *Academy of Management Journal*, 38, 1466-1482.

Jennings, P. & Zanbergen, P. (1995) Ecologically Sustainable Organizations: An Institutional Approach. *AMR*, 20(4), 1015-1052.

Leblebici, Huseyin, Gerald R. Salancik, Anne Copay, and Tom King. (1991). "Institutional Change and the Transformation of Interorganizational Fields: An Organizational History of the U.S. Radio Broadcasting Industry." *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 36:333-63.

- Levitt, B. & Nass, C. (1989). The lid on the garbage can: Institutional constraints on decision making in the technical core of college-text publishers. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 34, 190-207.
- Nelson, B. J. & Barley, S. R. (1997). For love or money? Commodification and the construction of an occupational mandate. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 42, 619-653.
- Oliver, Christine (1991). Strategic responses to institutional pressures. *Academy of Management Review*, 16, 145-179.
- Palmer, D.A., Jennings, P.D., & Zhou, X. 1993. Late adoption of the multidivisional form by large U.S. corporations: Institutional, political, and economic accounts. *ASQ*, 38: 100-131.
- Powell, W.W. 1991. Expanding the scope of institutional analysis. In Powell, W.W. and DiMaggio, P.J. (Eds) *The new institutionalism in organizational analysis*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 183-203.
- Scott, W.R. 1995. *Institutions and Organizations*, Sage: Thousand Oaks, CA,
- Suchman, M. (1995) *Managing Legitimacy: Strategic and Institutional Approaches*. *AMR*, 20(3): 571-610.
- 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.
- Zucker, L.G. 1987. Institutional theories of organization. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 13: 443-464.
- Zucker, L. 1983. Organizations as institutions. In Bacharach, S. (Ed.), *Research in the Sociology of Organizations*, 2, Greenwich: JAI Press.
- Zucker, L. (Ed.) 1988. *Institutional Patterns and Organizations: Culture and Environment*, Cambridge: Ballinger.
- Zucker, L.G. 1977. The role of institutionalization in cultural persistence. *ASR*, 42: 726-743.

Week 10 - Resource Dependence & Population Ecology

To be read as background:

Amburgey, T.L. and Rao, H. 1996. Organizational ecology: Past, present, and future directions. *Academy of Management Journal*, 39(5): 1265-1286.

Readings to be discussed:

Pfeffer, J. & Salancik, G.R. 1978. The external control of organizations. Harper & Row:

Chapters 1, and 3.

Hillman, A.J. & Dalziel, T. 2003. Boards of directors and firm performance: Integrating agency and resource dependence perspectives. Academy of Management Review, 28(3): 383-396.

Miles, G., Preece, S.B. & Baetz, M. 1999. Dangers of Dependence: The Impact of Strategic Alliance use by Small Technology-Based Firms. Journal of Small Business Management, 37(2): 20 - 29.

Hannan, M.T. & Freeman, J. 1977. The population ecology of organizations. AJS. 82: 929-964.

Hannan, M.T. and Freeman, J. 1984 Structural inertia and organizational change. ASR, 49:149-164.

Haveman, H.A. 1992. Between a rock and a hard place: Organizational change and performance under conditions of fundamental environmental transformation. ASQ, 37: 48-75.

Dobrev, S. Kim, T & Carroll, G. 2002. The evolution of organizational niches: U.S. automobile manufacturers, 1885-1981. Administrative Science Quarterly, 47(2): 233-264.

Additional articles to consider:

Resource Dependence

Aldrich, H.E. 1976. Resource dependence and interorganizational relations: Local employment service officers and social service sector organizations. Administration and Society, 7: 419-454.

Andrews, S.B. 1995. Review of "Structural Holes: The Social Structure of Competition". Administrative Science Quarterly, 40(2): 355-358.

Greening, Daniel W., & Gray, Barbara (1994). Testing a model of organizational response to social and political issues. Academy of Management Journal, 37, 467-498.

Krackhardt, D. 1995. Review of "Structural Holes: The Social Structure of Competition". Administrative Science Quarterly, 40(2): 350-354.

Mizruchi, Mark S. (1989). "Similarity of political behavior among large American corporations." American Journal of Sociology, 95: 401-424.

Pfeffer, J, and H. Leblebici. 1972. Executive recruitment and the development of interfirm organizations. Administrative Science Quarterly, 17: 382-394.

Pfeffer, J. 1972. Merger as a Response to Organizational Interdependence. Administrative Science Quarterly, 17: 382-394.

Pfeffer, J. 1973. Size, composition and function of hospital boards of directors: A study of

organization-environment linkage. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 1973, 18: 44-461.

Pfeffer, J. 1982. *Organizations and Organization Theory*. Cambridge: Ballinger. Ch. 5, pp. 192-207. (A short summary of resource dependence theory).

Pfeffer, J. and P. Nowak. 1976. Joint ventures and interorganizational interdependence. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 21: 398-418.

Pfeffer, Jeffrey. (1987). "A resource dependence perspective on interorganizational relations." In Mark S. Mizruchi and Michael Schwartz, *Intercorporate relations: the structural analysis of business*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Population Ecology

Aldrich, H.E. and Pfeffer, J. 1976. Environments of organizations. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 2: 79-105.

Amburgey, T.A., Kelly, D., and Barnett, W.P. 1993. Resetting the clock: The dynamics of organizational change and failure. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 38: 51-73.

Astley, W.G 1985. The Two Ecologies: Population and Community Perspectives on Organizational Evolution, *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 30: 224-241.

Barnett, W. (1997) The Dynamics of Competitive Intensity. *ASQ*, 42: 128-160.

Baum, J. 1996. Organizational Ecology. In S.R. Clegg, C. Hardy and W. Nord (Eds.), *Handbook of Organizational Studies*, London, Sage.

Boeker, W. (1991) Organizational Strategy: An Ecological Perspective, *AMJ*, 34(3), 613-635.

Carroll, G. 1984. Organizational Ecology, *Annual Review of Sociology*, 10: 71-93.

Carroll, G.R. 1985. Concentration and Specialization: Dynamics of Niche Width in Populations of Organizations, *American Journal of Sociology*, 90(6): 1262-1283.

Carroll, G.R. and Hannan, M.T. 1989. Density dependence in the evolution of populations of newspaper organizations, *American Sociological Review*, 54: 524-541.

Carroll, G.R. and Hannan, M.T. 1989. On using institutional theory in studying organizational populations. *American Sociological Review*, 54: 545-548.

Gimeno, J., Folta, T., Cooper, A., & Woo, C. (1997) Survival of the Fittest? Entrepreneurial Human Capital and the Persistence of Underperforming Firms. *ASQ*, 42: 750-783.

Hannan, M.T., Carroll, G. R., Dundon, E. A., and Torres, J. C. 1995. Organizational evolution in a multinational context: Entries of automobile manufacturers in Belgium, Britain, France, Germany, and Italy. *American Sociological Review*, 60: 509-528.

Baum, J.A.C. and Powell, W.W. 1995. Cultivating an institutional ecology of organizations: Comment on Hannan, Carroll, Dundon, and Torres. *American Sociological Review*, 60, 1995: 529-538.

Hannan, M.T. and Carroll, G.R. 1995. Theory building and cheap talk about legitimation: Reply to Baum and Powell. *American Sociological Review*, 60, 1995: 539-544.

Hannan, M.T. and Freeman, J. 1989. Organizational Ecology, Harvard University Press.

Kelly, D. & Amburgey, T. (1991) Organizational Inertia and Momentum: A Dynamic Model of Strategic Change. *AMJ*, 34(3): 591-612

Lomi, A. (1995) The Population Ecology of Organizational Founding: Location Dependence and Unobserved Heterogeneity. *ASQ*, 40, 111-144.

McKelvey, B. and H.E. Aldrich. 1983. Populations, natural science, and applied organizational science. *Administrative Science Quarterly*. 28: 101-128.

Singh, J.V. and Lumsden, C.J. 1990. Theory and research in organizational ecology, *Annual Review of Sociology*, 16: 161-195.

Usher, J. & Evans, M. (1996) Life and Death along Gasoline Alley: Darwinian and Lamarkian Processes in a Differentiating Population. *AMJ*, 39(5): 1428-1466.

Zammuto, R. (1988) Organizational Adaptation: Some Implications of Organizational Ecology for Strategic Choice. *Journal of Management Studies*, 25(2), 105-120..9

Zucker, L. G. 1989. Combining institutional theory and population ecology: No legitimacy, no history. *American Sociological Review*, 54: 542-545.

Young, R.C. 1988. Is population ecology a useful paradigm for the study of organizations? *AJS*, 94: 1-24.

Freeman, J. Hannan, M.T. 1989. Setting the record straight on organizational ecology: Rebuttal to Young. *AJS*, 95: 425-439.

Brittain, J. & Wholey, D.R. 1989. Assessing organizational ecology as sociological theory: Comment on Young. *AJS*, 95: 439-444.

Young, R.C. 1989. Reply to Freeman and Hannan and Brittain and Wholey. *AJS*, 95: 444-445.

Week 11 - Central Debates

Astley, W.G. & Van de Ven, A.H. 1983. Central perspectives and debates in organization theory. *ASQ*, 28: 245-273.

Gioia, D. A. & Pitre, E. 1990. Multiparadigm Perspectives on Theory Building. Academy of Management Review, 15: 584-603.

Pfeffer, J. 1993. Barriers to the advance of organizational science: Paradigm development as a dependent variable. AMR, 18: 599-620

Hinings, C.R. & Greenwood, R. 2002. Disconnects and consequences in organization theory? Administrative Science Quarterly, 47(3): 411-421.

Bartunek, J.M. 2002. The proper place of organizational scholarship: A comment on Hinings and Greenwood. Administrative Science Quarterly, 47(3): 422-427.

Clegg, S.R. 2002. "Lives in the balance"; A comment on Hinings and Greenwood's "Disconnects and consequences in organization theory?" Administrative Science Quarterly, 47(3): 428-441.

Pearce, J.L. 2004. Presidential address: What do we know and how do we really know it? Academy of Management Review, 29(2): 175-179.

Additional articles to consider.

Burrell, G. & Morgan, G. 1979. Sociological paradigms and organizational analysis. London: Heinemann.

Bowring, M.A. 2000. De/Constructing Theory: A look at the institutional theory that positivism built. Journal of Management Inquiry, 9: 258-270.

Cannella, A & Paetzold, R. 1994. Pfeffer's barriers to the advance of organizational science: A rejoinder. AMR, 19: 331-341.

Connel, A. & Nord, W. 1996. The bloodless coup: The infiltration of organization science by uncertainty and values. Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, 32: 407-427.

Hybels, R.C. 1995. On legitimacy, legitimation, and organizations: A critical review and integrative theoretical model. Academy of Management Proceedings, 241-245.

Reed, M. 1996. Organizational theorizing: A historically contested terrain. In Clegg, Hardy & Nord (eds.) Handbook of Organization Studies. Sage, London, UK. 31-56.

Thornton, P.H. and Tuma, N.B. 1995. The problem of boundaries in contemporary research on organizations. Academy of Management Proceedings, 276-280.

Weiss, R.M. 2000. Taking science out of organization science: How would postmodernism reconstruct the analysis of organizations. Organization Science, 11: 709-731.

Deetz, S. 2000. Putting the community into organizational science: Exploring the construction of knowledge claims. Organization Science, 11: 732-738.

Week 12 - Interorganizational Relationships: New Forms and Philosophies

Levine, S. & White, P. 1960. Exchange as a Conceptual Framework for the Study of Interorganizational Relationships. *ASQ*, 5, 583-601.

Ring, P.S. & Van de Ven, A.H, 1994. Developmental processes of cooperative interorganizational relationships. *AMR*, 19: 90-118.

Park, S.H. 1996. Managing an interorganizational network: A framework of the institutional mechanism for network control. *Organization Studies*, 17: 795-824.

Uzzi, B. 1997. Social structure and competition in interfirm networks: The paradox of embeddedness. *ASQ*, 42: 35-67.

Zeng, M. & Chen, X. 2003. Achieving cooperation in multiparty alliances: A social dilemma approach to partnership management. *AMR*, 28: 587-605.

de Rond, M & Bouchikhi, H. 2004. On the dialectics of strategic alliances. *Organization Science*, 15: 56-69.

Additional articles to consider.

Abrahamson, E. & Fombrun, C.J. 1992. Forging the iron cage: Interorganizational networks and the production of macro-culture. *Journal of Organization Studies*, 29: 175-194.

Astley, G. and Fombrun, C. 1983. Collective strategy: Social ecology of organizational environments, *Academy of Management Review*, 8: 576-587.

Auster, E. 1994. Macro and strategic perspectives on interorganizational linkages: A comparative analysis and review with suggestions for reorientation. In P. Shrivastava, A.S. Huff and J.E. Dutton (Eds.) *Advances in Strategic Management*, Vol. 10B, Greenwich, CT: JAI Press, 3-40.

Benson, J. 1975. The interorganizational network as a political economy, *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 20, 229-249.

Buchko, A. (1994) Barriers to Strategic Transformation: Interorganizational Networks and Institutional Forces. In P. Shrivastava, A. Huff, & J. Dutton's (eds) *Advances in Strategic Management*, 10(B), Greenwich, CT: JAI Press, 81-106. + Commentary by D. Dougherty, 107-111.

Burt, R., Christman, K., & Kilburn, H. (1980) Testing a Structural Theory of Corporate Cooptation: Interorganizational Directorate Ties as a Strategy for Avoiding Market Constraints on Profits. *American Sociological Review*, 45, 821-841.

Dacin, M. T. and Oliver, C. The legitimacy of strategic alliances: An institutional perspective.

Working paper.

Galaskiewicz, J. 1985. Interorganizational Relations, *Annual Review of Sociology*, 11: 281-304.

Geletkanycz, M. & Hambrick, D. (1997) The External Ties of Top Executives: Implications for Strategic Choice and Performance. *ASQ*, 42: 654-681.

Gulati, R. (1998) Alliances and Networks. *SMJ*, 19: 293-317.

Hazen, M.A. 1994. A radical humanist perspective of interorganizational relationships. *Human Relations*, 47: 393-415.

Khanna, T., Gulati, R., & Nohria, N. (1998) The Dynamics of Learning Alliances: Competition, Cooperation, and Relative Scope. *SMJ*, 19: 193-210.

Miles, R.E., Miles, G. and Snow, C.C. 1996. Good for practice: An integrated theory of the value of alternative organizational forms. Working Paper

Miles, R.E. & Creed, W.E.D. 1995. Organizational forms and managerial philosophies: A descriptive and analytical review. In Staw, B. (ed) *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 17: 333-372.

Miles, R.E. and Snow, C.C. 1995. The new network firm: A spherical structure built on a human investment philosophy. *Organizational Dynamics*, 23: 4-18.

Miles, R.E. & Snow, C.C. 1992. Causes of failure in network organizations. *California Management Review*, 34: 53-72.

Mizruchi, M. & Galaskiewicz, J. (1994) Networks of Interorganizational Relations. In S. Wasserman, & J. Glaskiewicz's (eds) *Advances in Social Network Analysis*, Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Nooteboom, B. 2000. Institutions and forms of co-ordination in innovation systems. *Organization Studies*, 21: 915-939.

Oliver, C. 1990. Determinants of interorganizational relationships: Integration and future directions. *AMR*, 15: 241-265.

Osborn, R.N. 1997. The institutionalization and evolutionary dynamics of interorganizational alliances and networks. *AMJ*, 40: 261-279.

Powell, W.W. and Smith-Doerr, L. 1994. Networks and economic life. In N. Smelser and R. Swedberg (Eds.), *Handbook of Economic Sociology*, 368-402, Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.

Powell, W., Koput, K., & Smith-Doerr, L. (1996) Interorganizational Collaboration and the Locus of Innovation: Networks of Learning in Biotechnology. *ASQ*, 41: 116-145.

Powell, W.W. 1990. Neither markets nor hierarchy: Network forms of organization. In Staw, B. & Cummings, L. (eds.) Research in Organizational Behavior, 12: 295-336.

Provan, K.G. and Milward, H.B. 1995. A preliminary theory of interorganizational network effectiveness: A comparative study of four community mental health systems, Administrative Science Quarterly, 40, 1-33.

Ring, P.S. and Van de Ven, A. 1992. Structuring cooperative relationships between organizations, Strategic Management Journal, 13, 483-498.

Van de Ven, A.H. and Walker, G. 1984. The dynamics of interorganizational coordination, Administrative Science Quarterly, 29, 598-621.

Whetten, D.A. 1981. Interorganizational Relations: A Review of the Field, Journal of Higher Education, 52: 1-28.

Zaheer, A. & Venkatraman, N. (1995) Relational Governance as an Interorganizational Strategy: An Empirical Test of the Role of Trust in Economic Exchange. SMJ, 16, 373-392..12

Zeitz, G. 1980. Interorganizational Dialectics, Administrative Science Quarterly, 25: 72-88.

Week 13 - Learning and Knowledge

Background:

AME package reviewing impact of Argyris and Schon's *Organizational Learning*

To be discussed:

Cohen, W.M. & Levinthal, D.A. 1990. Absorptive capacity: A new perspective on learning and innovation. ASQ, 35: 128-152.

Huber, G.P. 1991. Organizational learning: The contributing processes and the literatures. Organization Science, 2: 89-115.

Nonaka, I. 1994. A dynamic theory of organizational knowledge creation. Organization Science, 5: 14-37.

Tsai, W. 2001. Knowledge transfer in intraorganizational networks: Effects of network position and absorptive capacity on business unit innovation and performance. AMJ, 44: 996-1004.

Owen-Smith, J. & Powell, W.W. 2004. Knowledge networks as channels and conduits: The effects of spillovers in the Boston biotechnology community. Organization Science, 15: 5-21.

Holmqvist, M. 2004. Experiential learning process of exploitation and exploration within and between organizations: An empirical study of product development. Organization Science, 15: 70-81.

Additional articles to consider:

Kim, D.H. 1993. The link between individual and organizational learning. Sloan Management Review, 35: 37-50.

Kraatz, M.S. 1998. Learning by association? Interorganizational networks and adaptation to environmental change. AMJ, 41: 621-643.

Levitt, B. & March, J.G. 1988. Organizational learning. In Scott, W.R. & Blake, J. (eds.) Annual Review of Sociology, 14: 319-340.

Miles, G., Miles, R. E., Perrone, V. & Edvennson, L. 1998. Some conceptual and research barriers to the utilization of knowledge. California Management Review, 40: 281-288.

Sitkin, S.B., Sutcliffe, K.M., & Schroeder, R.G. 1994. Distinguishing control from learning in total quality management: A contingency perspective. AMR, 19: 537-564

Week 14 - Emerging Issues, New Forms

Miles, R.E., Snow, C.C., Mathews, J.A., Miles, G. & Coleman, H.J. 1997. Organizing in the knowledge age: Anticipating the cellular form. Academy of Management Executive, 11: 7-19.

Miles, G., Miles, R. E., Perrone, V. & Edvennson, L. 1998. Some conceptual and research barriers to the utilization of knowledge. California Management Review, 40: 281-288.

Kaser, P.A.W. & Miles, R.E. 2002. Understanding knowledge activists' successes and failures. Long Range Planning, 35:9-28.

Inkpen, A.C. & Currall, S.C. 2004. The coevolution of trust, control, and learning in joint ventures. Organization Science, 15: 586-599.

Fulk, J., Heino, R., Flanagan, A.J., Monge, P.R. & Bar, F. 2004. A test of the individual action model for organizational information commons. Organization Science. 15: 569-585.

Miles, R.E., Miles, G. & Snow, C.C. 2006. Collaborative Entrepreneurship: A Business Model for Continuous Innovation. Organizational Dynamics, 35(1):

Additional articles to consider:

Huxham, C. & Vangen, S. 2000. Leadership in the shaping and implementation of collaboration agendas: How things happen in a (not quite) joined-up world. Academy of Management Journal, 43:1159-1175.

Miles, R. E., Snow, C.C. & Miles, G. 2000. The Future.org. Long Range Planning, 33: 300-321.

Jap, S.D. 2001. "Pie sharing" in complex collaboration contexts. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 38: 86-99.

Miles, G., Miles, R.E. & Snow, C.C. 2000. Wealth creation and entrepreneurial strategies: Process, meta-capabilities and barriers. Paper presented at the 20th annual Strategic Management Society Conference, Vancouver, B.C. Canada.

Miles, R.E., Miles, G. & Snow, C.C. (2005) Collaborative Entrepreneurship: How groups of networked firms use continuous innovation to create economic wealth. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Schwartz, F. N. 1989. Management women and the new facts of life. Harvard Business Review, January-February.

Snow, C.C., Miles, R.E. & Miles, G. 2005. A Configurational Approach to the Integration of Strategy and Organization Research. Strategic Organization, 3: 431-439.