

MGT 6315 - Organizational Theory Change

Fall 2024 Syllabus, Section 161, CRN 15457

Instructor Information

Ajith Venugopal
Email: ajith.venugopal@tamiu.edu

Ajith Venugopal, Ph.D.
Assistant Professor
Email: ajith.venugopal@tamiu.edu
Office: WHTC 222B
Office Hours:
MTWR 10:00 a.m. to 11:30 a.m.
Office Phone: 956.326.2527

Times and Location

W 6pm-8:45pm in Bullock Hall 208

Course Description

This course will include the following topics: absorptive capacity theory, actor-network theory, agency theory, control theory, diffusion of innovations theory, game theory, knowledge-based theory, organizational ecology theory, resource-based theory, social network theory, transaction cost theory.
Prerequisite: Consent of the instructor and the Graduate Advisor.
Intl Business&Tech Studies Department, Sanchez School of Business

Program Learning Outcomes

- Evaluate organizational theories.
- Synthesis Organizational theories.
- Produce high quality research paper.

Student Learning Outcomes

1. To provide students with a broad overview of classic research in the discipline.
2. To become aware of and involved in the major debates that are ongoing in the journals today.
3. To become familiar with the multiple and often competing theoretical perspectives in the field.

Important Dates

Visit the Academic Calendar ([tamiu.edu](https://www.tamiu.edu)) (<https://www.tamiu.edu/academiccalendar/>) page to view the term's important dates.

Other Course Materials

List of General Reference Books



- Aldrich, H. E. Organizations and Environments. Englewood Cliffs NJ: Prentice Hall, 1979.
- Chandler, Alfred D. Jr. The Visible Hand: The Managerial Revolution in American Business. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1977.
- Child, John. Organization. New York NY: Harper & Row, 1987.
- Fligstein, N. 2001. The Architecture of Markets: An Economic Sociology of Twenty-First-Century Capitalist Societies. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Fligstein, N. 1990. The Transformation of Corporate Control. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Galbraith, J. Designing Complex Organizations. Reading MA: Addison-Wesley, 1973.
- Gouldner, Alvin W. For Sociology. London: Penguin Books, 1973.
- Lawrence, Paul and Jay Lorsch. Organization and Environment. Homewood IL: Irwin, 1968.
- March, J.G., and Simon, H.A. Organizations. New York N: Wiley, 1958.
- Mintzberg, Henry. The Structuring of Organizations. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall, 1979.
- Morgan, G. 1986. Images of Organization. Sage Publications, 1986.
- Perrow, Charles. Complex Organizations: A Critical Essay. 3rd ed. New York NY: Random House, 1968.
- Perrow, Charles. Organizational Analysis: A Sociological View. London: Tavistock, 1970.
- Pfeffer, Jeffrey. Power in Organizations. Marshfield, MA: Pittman, 1982.
- Pfeffer, Jeffrey. Organizations and Organization Theory. Boston: Pittman, 1982.
- Pfeffer, Jeffrey, and Gerald Salancik. The External Control of Organization: A Resource Dependence Perspective. New York, NY: Harper & Row, 1978.
- Powell, W. W. & DiMaggio, P. J. 1991. The New Institutionalism in Organizational Analysis. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Scott, Richard W. Organizations, Rational, Natural, and Open Systems. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall, 1981.
- Silverman, David. The Theory of Organization: A Sociological Framework. New York: Basic Books, 1971.
- Thompson, J.D. Organizations in Action. NY: McGraw Hill, 1967.
- Weick, Karl. The Social Psychology of Organizing. Reading MA: Addison-Wesley, 1979.
- Williamson, O. 1975. Markets and Hierarchies: Analysis and Anti-trust Implications. New York: Free Press.

Readings

Pre-readings

You have to complete the following readings within the first month of the course (before September 26th).

- Bartunek, Rynes, and Ireland. 2006 What Makes Management Research Interesting, and Why Does It Matter? *Academy of Management Journal* 49(1): 9-15.
- Glick, Miller, and Cardinal. 2007 Making a life in the field of organizational science *Journal of Organizational Behavior* 28(7): 817-835.
- Jauch, L. R., & Wall, J. L. (1989). What they do when they get your manuscript: A survey of Academy of Management Reviewer practices. *Academy of Management Journal*, 32(1), 157-173.
- Lepak, D. (2009). Editor's comments: What is good reviewing? *Academy of Management Review*, 34(3), 375-381.
- Harrison, D. (2002). From the editors: Obligations and obfuscations in the review process. *Academy of Management Journal*, 45(6), 1079-1084.
- Hempel, P. S. (2014). The developmental reviewer. *Management and Organization Review*, 10(2), 175-181

Session 1: Introduction and Overview (August 26th, 2024)

No Summary and synthesis are required for this session

Required

- Whetten, D. A. (1989). What constitutes a theoretical contribution? *Academy of Management Review*, 14(4), 490-495.
- Sutton, R. I., & Staw, B. M. (1995). What Theory is not? *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 371-384.
- Weick, K. E. (1995). What Theory is not, theorizing is. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 40(3), 385-390.
- Bacharach, S. B. (1989). Organizational theories: Some criteria for evaluation. *Academy of Management Review*, 14(4), 496-515.
- Shapira, Z. (2011). "I have got a theory paper—Do you?": Conceptual, empirical, and theoretical contributions to knowledge in the organizational sciences. *Organization Science*, 22(5), 1312-1321.
- Perrow, C. 1973. The short and glorious history of organization theory. *Organizational Dynamics*, Summer: 5-12.
- Astley, W.G. & Van de Ven, A. H. 1983. Central perspectives and debates in organizational Theory. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 28: 245-273.
- Augier, M., March, J.G., & Sullivan, B.N. 2005. Notes on the evolution of a research community: Organization studies in Anglophone North America, 1945-2000. *Organization Science*, 16(1): 85-95.
- Lounsbury, M., & Beckman, C. M. 2015. Celebrating organization theory. *Journal of Management Studies*, 52(2): 288-308.
- Hambrick, D. C. (2007). The field of management's devotion to Theory: Too much of a good thing? *Academy of Management Journal*, 50(6), 1346-1352.

Recommended

- Stern, R. N. and Barley, S. R. 1996 Organizations and social systems: Organization theory's neglected mandate. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 41: 146-162.
- Scott, W. R. 1996. The mandate is still being honest In defense of Weber's disciples. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 41: 163-171.
- Hinings, C.R. & Greenwood, R. Disconnects and consequences in organization theory. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 47(3): 411-421.
- Pfeffer, J. 1985. Organizations and organization theory. In G. Lindzey & E. Aronson(Eds.) *The Handbook of Social Psychology*, 3rd ed., New York: Random House, 1985.
- Blau, J. R. 1996. Organizations as overlapping jurisdictions: Restoring reason in organizational account. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 41: 172-179.
- Davis, G. F. & Powell, W. W. 1993. Organization-environment relations. In H.C. Triandis, M.D. Dunnette, & L. M. Hough. (Eds.) *Handbook of Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, 2nd ed., vol. 3, Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.
- Thompson, J. D. 1967. *Organization in action*. New York: McGraw Hill, Chapter 1-5.
- Scott, R. W. 1992. *Organizations: Rational, natural, and open systems*. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice Hall, Chapter 1,2,3.
- Canella, A.A. & Paetzold, R.L. 1994. Pfeffer's barriers to the advance of organization science: A rejoinder. *Academy of Management Review*, 19: 331-341.

Session 2: Structure, Technology, and Size (September 2nd, 2024)

a. Technology

- Lawrence, P. R. & Lorsch, J. W. 1967. Differentiation and integration in complex organizations. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 12: 1-47.
- Sine, W. D., Mitsuhashi, H. & Kirsch, D. A. 2006. Revisiting Burns and Stalker: Formal structure and new venture performance in emerging economic sectors. *Academy of Management Journal*, 49: 121-132.
- Miller, C.C., Glick, W. H., Wang, Y., & Huber, G.P. 1991. Understanding technology-structure relationships: Theory development and meta-analytic theory testing. *Academy of Management Journal*, 34(2): 370-399.

b. Size

- Beyer, J. & Trice, H. 1979. A re-examination of the relations between Size and various components of organizational complexity. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 24: 48-64.

Developing the Academic Writer-Session 1 (No prior reading, summaries, and synthesis)

Discussion of best practices based on the following resources will be ongoing. We will continue this discussion in each session.

Pollock, T. G. (2021). *How to use storytelling in your academic writing: Techniques for engaging readers and successfully navigating the writing and publishing processes*. Edward Elgar Publishing.

Minto, B. (2009). *The pyramid principle: logic in writing and thinking*. Pearson Education.

Huff, A. S. (2009). *Designing research for publication*. Sage.

Goodson, P. (2023). *Becoming an academic writer: 50 exercises for paced, productive, and powerful writing*. Sage Publications.

Barney, J. (2018). Editor's comments: Positioning a theory paper for publication. *Academy of Management Review*, 43(3), 345-348.

Cornelissen, J. (2017). Editor's comments: Developing propositions, a process model, or a typology? Addressing the challenges of writing Theory without a boilerplate. *Academy of Management Review*, 42(1), 1-9.

Lange, D., & Pfarrer, M. D. (2017). Editors' comments: Sense and structure—The core building blocks of an AMR article. *Academy of Management Review*, 42(3), 407-416.

Ragins, B. R. (Ed.). (2012). Editor's comments: Reflections on the craft of clear writing. *Academy of Management Review*, 37(4), 493-501.

Colquitt, J. A., & George, G. (2011). Publishing in AMJ—part 1: topic choice. *Academy of Management Journal*, 54(3), 432-435.

Bono, J. E., & McNamara, G. (2011). Publishing in AMJ—part 2: Research design. *Academy of Management Journal*, 54(4), 657-660.

Grant, A. M., & Pollock, T. G. (2011). Publishing in AMJ—Part 3: Setting the hook. *Academy of Management Journal*, 54(5), 873-879.

Sparrowe, R. T., & Mayer, K. J. (2011). Publishing in AMJ—part 4: Grounding hypotheses. *Academy of Management Journal*, 54(6), 1098-1102.

Zhang, Y., & Shaw, J. D. (2012). Publishing in AMJ—Part 5: Crafting the methods and results. *Academy of Management Journal*, 55(1), 8-12.

Recommended

Adler, P. S. & Borys, B. 1996. Two types of bureaucracy: Enabling and coercive. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 41: 61-89.

Argyris, C. 1973. Peter Blau. In G. Salaman & K. Thompson, (Eds.) *People and Organizations*, London: Longman, p. 76-89.

Blau, P. M. 1970. A formal theory of differentiation in organizations. *American Sociological Review*, 35(2): 201-218.

Burns, T. 1977. mechanistic and organismic structure. In D. S. Pugh (Ed.) *Organization Theory*, London: Penguin, p. 43-55.

Ch. 1. Why Bureaucracy?

Ch. 4. The Neo-Weberian model: Decision making, conflict, and Technology.

Child, J. 1973. Predicting and understanding organization structure. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 18: 168-185.

Fry, L. W. 1982. Technology-structure research: Three critical issues. *Academy of Management Journal*. 25: 532-552.

Galbraith, J. 1973. *Designing complex organizations*, Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley, p. 1-66.

Gooding, R. Z. & Wager, J. A. 1985. A meta-analytic review of the relationship between size and performance. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 30: 462-481.

Harvey, E. 1968. Technology and structure of organizations. *American Sociological Review*, 33: 247-259.

Huber, G.P. 1984. The nature and design of postindustrial organizations. *Management Science*, 30: 928-951.

Jones, G. R. 1984. Task visibility, free riding, and shrinking: Explaining the effect of structure and Technology on employee behavior. *Academy of Management Review*, 9: 684-696.

March, J. G. & Simon, H. A. 1958 *Organizations*, New York: Wiley. P. 34-47.

Ouchi, W. G. 1977. The relationship between organizational structure and organizational control. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 22: 9-113.

Perrow, C. *Complex organizations*, New York: Random House.

- Pugh, D. S. & Hickson, D. J. The comparative study of organizations. In Salaman, G. & Thompson, K. (Eds.) *People and Organization*, London: Longman, p. 50-66.
- Pugh, D. S. 1981. Rejoinder to Starbucks. In a Van de Ven & W. F. Joyce (Eds.) *Perspectives on Organizational Design and Behavior*, New York: John Wiley, p.199-203.
- Pugh, D. S. 1981. The Aston program of research: Retrospect and prospect. In A. Van de Ven & W. F. Joyce (Eds.) *Perspectives on Organizational Design and Behavior*, New York: John Wiley, p. 135-166.
- Ranson, S., Hinings, B. & Greenwood, R. 1980. The structuring of organizational structures. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 35 1-17.
- Roberts, K.H. & Grabowski, M. 1996. Organizations, Technology, and Structuring. In Clegg, S.R., Hardy, C., & Nord, W.R. (Eds.) *Handbook of Organization Studies*. Sage.
- Rousseau, D. M. 1979. Assessment of Technology in Organizations: Closed versus open systems approaches. *Academy of Management Review*, 4: 531-542.
- Starbuck, W. 1981. A trip to view the elephant and rattlesnake in the garden of Aston. In A. Van de Ven & W. F. Joyce (Eds.) *Perspectives on Organizational Design and Behavior*, New York: John Wiley, p. 167-198.
- Weber, M. 1964. *The Theory of economic and social organization*. London: Macmillan, p. 324-336.

Session 3: Environment (September 11th, 2024)

Required

- Child, J. 1972. Organizational structure, environment, and performance: The role of strategic choice. *Sociology*, 6: 1-22.
- Milliken, F. J. 1987. Three types of uncertainty about environment: State, effect, and response uncertainty. *Academy of Management Review*, 12: 133-143.
- Smircich, L. & Stubbart, C. 1985. Strategic management in an enacted world. *Academy of Management Review*, 10: 724-736.
- Castrogiovanni, G. 1991. Environmental munificence: A theoretical assessment. *Academy of Management Review*, 16: 542-565.
- Boyd, B. K., Dess, G. G., Rasheed, M.A. 1993. Divergence between archival and perceptual measures of environment: Causes and consequences. *Academy of Management Review*, 18: 204-226.

Developing the Academic Writer-Session 2 (No prior reading, summaries, and synthesis)

Recommended

- Bourgeois, L. J. 3, McAllister, D. W., & Mitchell, T. R. 1978. The effects of different organizational environments upon decisions about organizational structure. *Academy of Management Journal*, 21: 508-514.
- Pfeffer, J. 1988. A resource dependence on intercorporate relations. In M. Mizruchi and M. Schwatz (Eds.) *Intercorporate Relations*, 25-55, Cambridge.
- Miller, D. 1983. The correlates of entrepreneurship in three types of firms. *Management Science*, 29:7.
- Lawrence, P. & Lorsch, J. 1968. *Organization and environment*. Homewood IL: Irwin. P. 8-17, 23-53, 84-108, 133-140, and 151-158.
- Bluedorn, A. C. 1993. Pilgrim's progress: Trends and convergence in research on organization size and environments. *Journal of Management*, 9: 163-191.

Session 4: Contingency Theory and Resource Dependence Theory (September 18th, 2024)

Contingency theory

- Schoonhoven, C. B. 1981. Problems with contingency theory: Testing assumptions hidden within the language of contingency "theory." *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 26(3): 349-377.
- Van de Ven, A. H., & Drazin, R. 1985. Alternative forms of fit in contingency theory. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 30: 514-539.
- Donaldson, L. 2001. Controversies in contingency theory. Ch 5: 125-157. *In the Contingency Theory of Organizations*. Sage Press.

Resource Dependency Theory



Pfeffer, J. 1982. *Organization and Organization Theory*. Boston: Pitman. Pp. 192-204.

Emerson, R.M. 1962. Power-dependence relations. *American Sociological Review*, 27: 31-41.

Hillman, A.J. Withers, M.C. & Collins, B.J.... (2009). Resource Dependence Theory: A Review. *Journal of Management*, 35(6) 1404–1427

Tyler Wry, J. Adam Cobb & Howard E. Aldrich (2013): More than a Metaphor: Assessing the Historical Legacy of Resource Dependence and its Contemporary Promise as a Theory of Environmental Complexity, *The Academy of Management Annals*, 7:1, 439-486.

Developing the Academic Writer-Session 3 (No prior reading, summaries, and synthesis)

Recommended (Contingency Theory)

Donaldson, Lex, 1999. The normal science of structural contingency theory. In Clegg, S. and Hardy, C. (eds.) *Studying Organization*, Sage Publications, Inc., pp. 51-70.

Donaldson, Lex. 1987. Strategy and structural adjustment to regain fit and performance: In defence of contingency theory. *Journal of Management Studies*, 24: 1-24.

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.

Pfeffer, J. 1982. *Organizations and organizational Theory*. Boston: Pitman. P. 147-162.

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

Tosi, H. L., & Slocum, J. M. 1984. Contingency theory: Some suggested directions. *Journal of Management*, 10: 9-26.

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: 1427-1452.

Donaldson, Lex 1996. *For positivist organization theory: Proving the hardcore*. Sage Publications, Inc.

Scott, W.R. 1998. Organizations: Rational, Natural and Open Systems. (Chapters 8 and 9 address some of the issues that Donaldson refers to in his work).

Van de Ven, A.H., and Drazin, R. 1985. The concept of fit in contingency theory. In L.L. Cummings and B.M. Staw (Eds.) *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 7: 333-365.

Pennings, J. M. 1992. Structural contingency theory: A reappraisal. In B. M. Staw & L.L. Cummings, *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 14: 267-309. Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

Jarley, P. et al. 1997. A structural contingency approach to bureaucracy and democracy in US national unions. *Academy of Management Journal*, 40:831-861

Recommended (Resource Dependence Theory)

Pfeffer, J. & Salancik, G. 1978. *The External Control of Organizations: A Resource Dependence Perspective*. New York: Harper & Row, p. 43-54, 62-78, 113-115, 123-128, 131-139, 143-154, 161-165, 167, 175-181, and 258-262.

Casciaro, T, & Piskorski, M, J. 2005. Power Imbalance, Mutual Dependence, and Constraint Absorption:

A Closer Look at Resource Dependence Theory. (<http://web.ebscohost.com/ehost/viewarticle/?data=dGJyMPPp44rp2%2fdV0%2bnjisfk5le46bZMt6eyUbCk63nn5Kx95uXxjL6urUuvpbB1rq2eUbirt1Kur55Zy5zyit%2fk8Xnh6ueH7N%2fiVauntEi1q69Jr62wPurX7H%2b72%2bw%2b4ti7evLepIzf3btZzJzfhruntky1rLJPtpzkh%2fdj34y73POE6srjkPIA&hid=107>)

Administrative Science Quarterly, 50(2): 167-199.

Session 5: Population Ecology Theory (September 25th, 2024)

Required

Hannan, M.& Freeman, J. 1977. The population ecology of organizations. *American Journal of Sociology*, 82: 929-964.

Hannan, M. & Freeman, J. 1984. Structural inertia and organizational change. *American Sociological Review*, 49: 149-164.

Carroll, G. R. 1985. Concentration and specialization: Dynamics of niche width in populations of organizations. *American Journal of Sociology*, 90 (6): 1262-1283.

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

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

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

Developing the Academic Writer-Session 4 (No prior reading, summaries, and synthesis)

Recommended

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

Astley, W. G. 1985. The two ecologies: population and community perspectives on organizational evolution. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 30: 224-241.

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

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

Carroll, G. R. 1984. The specialist strategy. *California Management Review*, 3: 126-137.

Carroll, G. and Swaminathan, A. 2000. Why the Microbrewery Movement? Organizational Dynamics of Resource Partitioning in the US Brewing Industry. *American Journal of Sociology*, 106:715-762.

Dobrev, S.D. & Kim, T.Y. 2006. Positioning among Organizations in a Population: Moves between Market Segments and the Evolution of Industry Structure. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 51(2): 230-261.

Hannan, M. T. & 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. & Freeman, J. 1989. *Organizational Ecology*, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, Ch. 1-6., p. 3-144.

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

Hsu, G. 2006. Jacks of all trades and masters of none: Audiences' reactions to spanning genres in feature film production. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 51: 420-450.

Hsu, G. and Hannan, M.T. 2005. Identities, genres, and organizational forms. *Organization Science* 16: 474-90.

Singh, J. V. & Lumsden, C. J. 1990. Organizational ecology. *Annual Review of Sociology*. 161-195.

Singh, J. V. 1990. Review of organizational ecology by Hannan and Freeman, *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 35 (2): 416-420.

Session 6: Transaction Cost Theory (October 2nd, 2024)

Required

Coase, R. H. 1937. *The nature of the firm. Economics*, 4: 386-405.

Please read the following easy-to-read summary of Coase's ideas. That should inform your summary of the above article. However, I do not expect a summary of it from anyone.

Coase's Theory of the Firm. 2017. Economist. July 27th. <https://www.economist.com/news/economics-brief/21725542-if-markets-are-so-good-directing-resources-why-do-companies-exist-first-our> (<https://www.economist.com/news/economics-brief/21725542-if-markets-are-so-good-directing-resources-why-do-companies-exist-first-our/>)

Williamson, O. E. 1979. Transaction cost economics: The governance of contractual relations. *Journal of Law and Economics*, 22: 233-261.

You can read the book review instead of the book.

Alchian, A.A. & Woodward, S. 1988. The firm is dead; long live the firm: A review of Oliver E. Williamson's. The economic institutions of capitalism. *Journal of Economic Literature*, 26:165-179. (Summary expected).

Geyskens, I. Steenkamp, J.E.M., and Kumar, N. 2006. Make, buy or ally: A transaction cost theory meta-analysis. *Academy of Management Journal*, 49(3): 519-543.

Cuypers, I. R., Hennart, J. F., Silverman, B. S., & Ertug, G. (2021). Transaction cost theory: Past progress, current challenges, and suggestions for the future. *Academy of Management Annals*, 15(1), 111-150.

The following is a set and should be treated as one unit. The summary can focus on the main article and not so much on the rejoinders.

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

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

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

Developing the Academic Writer-Session 5 (No prior reading, summaries, and synthesis)

Recommended

Perrow, C.B. 1986. *Economic Theories of Organization," Theory and Society* 15, 11-45); reprinted in Structures of Capital, S. Zukin and P. DiMaggio (eds.), Cambridge University Press, 1990, 121-52.

Alchian, A. A. & Demsetz, H. 1972. Production, information costs, and economic organization. *American Economic Review*, 62(5): 777-795.

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

Robins, J.A. 1987. Organizational economics: Notes on the use of transaction cost theory in the study of organizations. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 32:68-86

Hennart, J. 1993. Explaining the swollen middle: Why most transactions are a mix of 'market' and 'hierarchy.' *Organization Science*, 4: 529-547.

Spence, A. M. 1975. The economics of internal organization: An introduction. *Bell Journal of Economics*, 6(1): 163-172.

Williamson, O. E. & Ouchi, W. G. 1981. The markets and hierarchies program of research: origins, implications, prospect. In A. Van de Ven & W. F. Joyce (Eds.) *Perspectives on Organizational Design and Behavior*. New York: John Wiley, p. 347-406.

Williamson, O. E. 1985. *The economic institutions of capitalism*. New York: The FreePress, Chapters 1-4, p. 15-102.

Williamson, O. E. 1982. The economics of organization: The transaction cost approach. *American Journal of Sociology*, 87 (3): 548-577.

Jones, G. R. 1998. *Don't throw the baby away with the bathwater*: A positive interpretation of transaction cost theory. Working paper.

Klein, P. G. & Shelanski, H. A. 1994. *Empirical research in transaction cost economics: A survey and assessment*. Business and Public Policy Working Paper 60, Hass School of Business, University of California, Berkeley.

Tsang, E.W.K. 2006. Behavioral assumptions and theory development: The case of transaction cost economics. *Strategic Management Journal*, 27(11): 999-1012.

Session 7: Agency Theory (October 9th, 2024)

Required

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

Eisenhardt, K. M. 1989. Agency Theory: An assessment and review. *Academy of Management Review*, 14: 57-74.

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

Ferraro, F., Pfeffer, J., & Sutton, R.I. 2005. Economics language and assumptions: How theories can become self-fulfilling. *Academy of Management Review*, 30(1): 8-24.

Wiseman RM and Gomez-Mejia LR (1998) A behavioral agency model of managerial risk taking. *Academy of Management Review* 23(1): 133-153.

V.K. Garg, A. Rasheed, & R.L. Priem. Explaining franchisors' choices of organization forms within franchise systems. *Strategic Organization*. 2005. 3(2): 185-217.

Developing the Academic Writer-Session 6 (No prior reading, summaries, and synthesis)

Recommended

Levinthal, D. 1988. A survey of agency models of organizations. *Journal of Economic Behavior and Organization*, 9: 153-185.

Fama, E. F. & Jensen, M. C. 1983. Separation of ownership and control. *Journal of Law and Economics*. 26: 301-325.

Hendry, J. 2002. The principal's other problems: Honest incompetence and the specification of objectives. *Academy of Management Review*, 27(1): 98-113.

Jensen, M.C. & Warner, J. B. 1988. The distribution of power among corporate managers, shareholders, and directors. *Journal of Financial Economics*. 20:

Fligstein, N. & Freeland, R. 1995. Theoretical and comparative perspectives on corporate organization. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 21: 21-43.

Session 8: Institutional Theory (October 16th, 2024)

Required

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

Mizruchi, M. S., & Fein, L. G. 1999. The social constitution of organizational knowledge: A study of the uses of coercive, mimetic and normative isomorphism. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 44: 653-683.

Oakes, L. S., Townley, B. & Cooper, D.J. 1998. Business planning as pedagogy: Language and control in a changing institutional field. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 43: 257-292.

Sherer, P. D. & Lee, K. 2003. Institutional change in large law firms: A resource dependency and institutional perspective. *Academy of Management Journal*, 45: 102-119.

Vaccaro, A. & Palazzo, G. 2015. Values against violence: Institutional change in societies dominated by organized crime. *Academy of Management Journal*, 58(4): 1075-1101.

Oliver, C. 1991. Strategic responses to institutional processes. *Academy of Management Review*, 16: 145-179.

The following two are concise articles. There is no need to summarize or present them. Nevertheless, we will be discussing them. So please make sure that you read them.

Munir, K. A. 2015. A Loss of Power in Institutional Theory. *Journal of Management Inquiry*, 24(1): 90-92.

Suddaby, R. 2015. Can Institutional Theory Be Critical? *Journal of Management Inquiry*, 24(1): 93-95.

Developing the Academic Writer-Session 7 (No prior reading, summaries, and synthesis)

Recommended Readings (If you decide to pursue this topic further)

The "Big 2" must read:

Meyer, J. & Rowan, B. 1977. Institutionalized organizations: Formal structure as

Myth and ceremony. *American Journal of Sociology*, 83 (2): 340-363.

Granovetter, M. 1985. Economic action and social structure: The problem of embeddedness. *American Journal of Sociology*, 3: 481-510.

More internal discussion about institutional Theory:

Hirsch, P. & Lounsbury, M. 2015. Toward a More Critical and "Powerful" Institutionalism. *Journal of Management Inquiry*, 24(1): 96-99.

Geppert, M. 2015. Reflections on the Methods of How We Present and Compare the Political Contents of Our Research: A Prerequisite for Critical Institutional Research.

Journal of Management Inquiry, 24(1): 101-104.

Willmott, H. 2015. Why Institutional Theory Cannot Be Critical. *Journal of Management Inquiry*, 24(1): 105-111.

Other great papers:

Amburgey, T. A., Dacin, T. & Singh, J. V. 1996. Learning races, patent races, and capital races: Strategic interactions and embeddedness within organizational fields. *Advances in Strategic Management*, Joel Baum & Jane Dutton (Eds.) 13: 303-322.

Baum, J. A. C. & Oliver, C. 1992. Institutional embeddedness and the dynamics of organizational populations. *American Sociological Review*, 57: 540-559.

DiMaggio, P. J. 1988. Interest and agency in institutional Theory. In Zucker, L. (Ed.) *Institutional Patterns and Organizations: Culture and Environment*, Cambridge: Ballinger, 3-21.

Haunschild, P. R., & Miner, A. S. 1997. Modes of interorganizational imitation: The effects of outcome salience and uncertainty. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 42: 472-500.

Haveman, H. A. 1993. Follow the leader: Mimetic isomorphism and entry into new markets. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 38: 593-627.

Oliver, C. 1996. *The Institutional embeddedness of economic activity*. *Advances in Strategic Management*, Joel Baum & Jane Dutton (Eds.), Volume 13. P. J. (Eds.) *The New Institutionalism in Organizational Analysis*, Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 1-38.

Powell, W. W. 1991. Expanding the scope of institutional analysis. In Powell, W. W. & DiMaggio, P. J. (Eds.) *The New Institutionalism in Organizational Analysis*, Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 183-203.

Reddy, N. M., & Rao, M. V. H. 1990. The industrial market as an interfirm organization. *Journal of Management Studies*, 1990, 27: 43-59.

Rowley, T. D. & Krackhardt, D. 2000. Redundant governance structures: An analysis of structural and relational embeddedness in the steel and semiconductor industries, *Strategic Management Journal*, 21:369-386.

Scott, W. R. 1995. *Institutions and Organizations*, Sage: Thousand Oaks, CA, Chapters 1,2,3.

Staw, B. M., & Epstein, L. D. 2000. What bandwagons bring: Effects of popular management techniques on Corporate performance, reputation, and CEO pay, *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 45: 523-556.

Stearns, Linda Brewster, and Kenneth Allan. 1996. Economic behavior in institutional environments: The corporate merger wave of the 1980s. *American Sociological Review*, 61: 699-718.

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

Uzzi, B. 1996. The sources and consequences of embeddedness for the economic performance of organizations: The network effect. *American Sociological Review*, 61: 674-698.

Uzzi, B. 1997. Social structure and competition in interfirm networks: The paradox of embeddedness. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 42: 35-68.

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

Zukin, S. & DiMaggio, P. 1990. Structures of capital: *The social organization of the economy*. New York: Cambridge University Press, Chapters 1 and 2.

Session 9: Organizational Embeddedness (October 23rd, 2024)

Required

Granovetter, M. 1985. Economic action and social structure: The problem of embeddedness. *American Journal of Sociology*, 3: 481-510.

Oliver, C. 1996. *The Institutional embeddedness of economic activity*. *Advances in Strategic Management*, Joel Baum & Jane Dutton (Eds.), Volume 13.

Uzzi, B. 1997. Social structure and competition in interfirm networks: The paradox of embeddedness. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 42: 35-68.

Uzzi, B and Lancaster, R.. 2004. "Embeddedness and the Price of Legal Services in the Large Law Firm Market." *American Sociological Review*, 69: 319-344

Rao, H., Davis, G. F., & Ward, A. 2000. Embeddedness, social identity, and mobility: Why firms leave the NASDAQ and join the New York Stock Exchange, *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 45: 268-292.

Developing the Academic Writer-Session 8 (No prior reading, summaries, and synthesis)**Recommended**

- Zukin, S. & DiMaggio, P. 1990. *Structures of capital: The social organization of the economy*. New York: Cambridge University Press, Chapters 1 and 2.
- Uzzi, B. 1996. The sources and consequences of embeddedness for the economic performance of organizations: The network effect. *American Sociological Review*, 61: 674-698.
- Amburgey, T. A., Dacin, T. & Singh, J. V. 1996. Learning races, patent races, and capital races: Strategic interactions and embeddedness within organizational fields. *Advances in Strategic Management*, Joel Baum & Jane Dutton (Eds.) 13: 303-322.
- Reddy, N. M., & Rao, M. V. H. 1990. The industrial market as an interfirm organization. *Journal of Management Studies*, 1990, 27: 43-59.
- Portes, A. & Sensenbrenner, J. 1993. "Embeddedness and immigration: Notes on the social determinants of economic action." *American Journal of Sociology*, 98: 1320-1350.
- Moran, P. 2005. Structural vs. relational embeddedness: Social capital and managerial performance. *Strategic Management Journal*, 26: 1129-1151.
- Gimeno, J. 2004. Competition within and between networks: The contingent effect of competitive embeddedness on alliance formation. *Academy of Management Journal*, 47(6):820-842.
- Gnyawali, D. R. & Madhavan, R. 2001. Cooperative networks and competitive dynamics: A structural embeddedness perspective. *Academy of Management Review*, 26(3): 431-445.
- Baum, J. A. C. & Oliver, C. 1992. Institutional embeddedness and the dynamics of organizational populations. *American Sociological Review*, 57: 540-559.
- Uzzi, B. & Gillespie, J.J. 2002. Knowledge spillover in corporate financing networks: embeddedness and the firm's debt performance. *Strategic Management Journal*, 23:595-618.
- Rowley, T. D. & Krackhardt, D. 2000. Redundant governance structures: An analysis of structural and relational embeddedness in the steel and semiconductor industries, *Strategic Management Journal*, 21:369-386.

Session 10: Organizational Change (October 23rd, 2024)**Required**

- Gersick, C. J. (1991). Revolutionary change theories: A multilevel exploration of the punctuated equilibrium paradigm. *Academy of Management Review*, 16(1), 10-36.
- Battilana, J., & Casciaro, T. (2012). Change agents, networks, and institutions: A contingency theory of organizational change. *Academy of Management Journal*, 55(2), 381-398.
- Lüscher, L. S., & Lewis, M. W. (2008). Organizational change and managerial sensemaking: Working through paradox. *Academy of Management Journal*, 51(2), 221-240.
- Oreg, S., & Berson, Y. (2019). Leaders' impact on organizational change: Bridging theoretical and methodological chasms. *Academy of Management Annals*, 13(1), 272-307.
- Pettigrew, A. M., Woodman, R. W., & Cameron, K. S. (2001). Studying organizational change and development: Challenges for future research. *Academy of Management Journal*, 44(4), 697-713.

Developing the Academic Writer-Session 9 (No prior reading, summaries, and synthesis)**Recommended**

- Lord, R. G., Dinh, J. E., & Hoffman, E. L. (2015). A quantum approach to time and organizational change. *Academy of Management Review*, 40(2), 263-290.
- Tina Dacin, M., Goodstein, J., & Richard Scott, W. (2002). Institutional Theory and institutional change: Introduction to the special research forum. *Academy of Management Journal*, 45(1), 45-56.
- D.A. Nadler and M.L. Tushman, 1989. "Organizational Frame Bending: Principles for

Managing Reorientation," *Academy of Management Executive*, 3:194-204.

M. Tyre and W. Orlikowski, 1994. "Windows of Opportunity: Temporal Patterns of Technological Adaptation in Organizations," *Organization Science*. Volume 5(1): 98-118.

Session 11: Behavioral Theory of the Firm and Organizational Learning (October 30th, 2024)

Required

Gavetti, G., Greve, H.R., Levintal, D.A., & Ocasio, W. 2012. The behavioral Theory of the firm: Assessment and prospects. *Academy of Management Annals*. 6(1): 1-40.

Argote, L., & Greve, H. R. (2007). A behavioral theory of the firm—40 years and counting: Introduction and impact. *Organization Science*, 18(3), 337-349.

Westphal, J. D., & Zaja Greve, H. 1998. Performance, Aspirations, and Risky Organizational Change. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, Vol. 43 (1): 58-86.

c, E. J. (2013). A behavioral theory of corporate governance: Explicating the mechanisms of socially situated and socially constituted agency. *Academy of Management Annals*, 7(1), 607-661.

March, J. G. (1991). Exploration and exploitation in organizational learning. *Organization Science*, 2(1), 71-87.

Levitt, B. & March, J. G. 1988. Organizational Learning. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 14:319-340.

Developing the Academic Writer-Session 10 (No prior reading, summaries, and synthesis)

Recommended

March, J.G., & Simon, H.A. 1958. *Organizations*, Chapter 6

Cyert, R.M., & March, J.G. 1963. Chapter 7: A summary of basic concepts. From: A behavioral theory of the firm

Cyert, R., & March, J. (2015). Behavioral Theory of the firm. In *Organizational Behavior 2* (pp. 60-77). Routledge.

Levinthal, D. A. (1997). Adaptation on rugged landscapes. *Management Science*, 43(7), 934-950.

Gavetti, G. (2005). Cognition and hierarchy: Rethinking the microfoundations of capabilities' development. *Organization Science*, 16(6), 599-617.

Cohen, M. D., March, J. G., & Olsen, J. P. (1972). A garbage can model of organizational choice. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 1-25.

Session 12: Stakeholder Theory (November 6th, 2024)

Required

Parmar, B. L., Freeman, R. E., Harrison, J. S., Wicks, A. C., Purnell, L., & De Colle, S. (2010). Stakeholder theory: The state of the art. *Academy of Management Annals*, 4(1), 403-445.

Laplume, A. O., Sonpar, K., & Litz, R. A. (2008). Stakeholder theory: Reviewing a theory that moves us. *Journal of management*, 34(6), 1152-1189.

Donaldson, T. (1999). Making stakeholder theory whole. *Academy of Management Review*, 24(2), 237-241.

Freeman, R. E. (1999). Divergent stakeholder theory. *Academy of Management Review*, 24(2), 233-236.

Phillips, R., Freeman, R. E., & Wicks, A. C. (2003). What stakeholder theory is not. *Business Ethics Quarterly*, 13(4), 479-502.

Developing the Academic Writer-Session 10 (No prior reading, summaries, and synthesis)

Recommended

Jawahar, I. M., & McLaughlin, G. L. (2018). Toward a descriptive stakeholder theory: An organizational life cycle approach. In *Business Ethics and Strategy, Volumes I and II* (pp. 381-398). Routledge.

Reynolds, S.J., Schultz, F.C., & Hekman, D.R. 2006. Stakeholder theory and managerial decision-making: Constraints and implications of balancing stakeholder interests. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 64, 285-301.

Brown, P. & Perry, S. 1994. Removing the financial performance halo from Fortune's "most admired" companies. *Academy of Management Journal*, 37: 1347-1359.

Zollo, M. & Coda, V. 2009. Toward an integrated theory of strategy. Paper presented at the Academy of Management meeting, Chicago.

McWilliams, A., Siegel, D.S. & Wright, P.M. 2006. Corporate social responsibility: Strategic implications. *Journal of Management Studies*, 43: 1-18.

Pirson, M, & Malhotra, D. 2008. Unconventional insights for managing stakeholder trust. *Sloan Management Review*, 49 (4): 43-50.

Feldman, S. P. (2007). Moral Business Cultures: The Keys to Creating and Maintaining Them. *Organizational Dynamics*, 36(2), 156-170.

Duska, R. (1997). The whys of business. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 16, 1401-1409.

Handy, Charles. "What's the purpose of business." HBR

Friedman, Milton. "The social responsibility of business is to increase its profits."

Kaul, A., & Luo, J. (2018). An economic case for CSR: The comparative efficiency of for-profit firms in meeting consumer demand for social goods. *Strategic Management Journal*, 39(6), 1650-1677.

Session 12: Other Important Theories/Perspectives (November 13th, 2024)

No Synthesis required

1. Interorganizational Relations

Oliver, C. (1990). Determinants of interorganizational relationships: Integration and future directions. *Academy of Management Review*, 15(2), 241-265.

Gulati, R., & Gargiulo, M. (1999). Where do interorganizational networks come from? *American journal of sociology*, 104(5), 1439-1493.

1. Paradox Theory

Poole, M. S., & Van de Ven, A. H. (1989). Using paradox to build management and organization theories. *Academy of Management Review*, 14(4), 562-578.

Smith, W. K., & Lewis, M. W. (2011). Toward a theory of paradox: A dynamic equilibrium model of organizing. *Academy of management Review*, 36(2), 381-403.

1. Complexity Theory

Anderson, P. (1999). Perspective: Complexity theory and organization science. *Organization Science*, 10(3), 216-232.

Developing the Academic Writer-Session 10 (No prior reading, summaries, and synthesis)

Session 13: Other Important Theories/Perspectives (November 20th, 2024)

No Synthesis required

1. Prospect Theory

Holmes Jr, R. M., Bromiley, P., Devers, C. E., Holcomb, T. R., & McGuire, J. B. (2011). Management theory applications of prospect theory: Accomplishments, challenges, and opportunities. *Journal of Management*, 37(4), 1069-1107.

1. Signaling Theory

Connelly, B. L., Certo, S. T., Ireland, R. D., & Reutzel, C. R. (2011). Signaling theory: A review and assessment. *Journal of management*, 37(1), 39-67.

1. Sensemaking and Enactment

Daft, R. L., & Weick, K. E. (1984). Toward a model of organizations as interpretation systems. *Academy of Management Review*, 9(2), 284-295.

1. Attention Based View

Ocasio, W. (1997). Towards an attention-based view of the firm. *Strategic management*, 18(S1), 187-206.

1. Organizational Theory in the Era of Anthropocene

Banerjee, S. B., & Arjaliès, D. L. (2021). Celebrating the end of enlightenment: Organization theory in the age of the Anthropocene and Gaia (and why neither is the solution to our ecological crisis). *Organization Theory*, 2(4), 26317877211036714.

Session 14: Future of Organizational Theory (December 4th, 2024)

No Summary and Synthesis required

Whetten, D. A., Felin, T., & King, B. G. (2009). The practice of Theory borrowing in organizational studies: Current issues and future directions. *Journal of Management*, 35(3), 537-563.

Zaheer, S., Albert, S., & Zaheer, A. (1999). Time scales and organizational Theory. *Academy of Management Review*, 24(4), 725-741.

Pfeffer, J. (1993). Barriers to the advance of organizational science: Paradigm development as a dependent variable. *Academy of Management Review*, 18(4), 599-620.

Davis, G. F., & Marquis, C. (2005). Prospects for organization theory in the early twenty-first century: Institutional fields and mechanisms. *Organization Science*, 16(4), 332-343.

Meyer, A. D., Gaba, V., & Colwell, K. A. (2005). Organizing far from equilibrium: Nonlinear change in organizational fields. *Organization Science*, 16(5), 456-473.

Thompson, M. (2011). Ontological shift or ontological drift? Reality claims, epistemological frameworks, and theory generation in organization studies. *Academy of Management Review*, 36(4), 754-773.

Grading Criteria

GRADE	PERCENTAGE
A	91-100
B	80-90.9
C	70-79.9
D	60-69.9
F	Below 60

Description of Grading Components

1. Article summaries and discussion questions (15%)

Students are responsible for providing a written summary of one or more readings for each session. "Cut and copying" from the article is only permissible for displaying models. The summaries should include insights as well as constructive critiques of Theory and methodology. In addition, each one is expected to submit at least two discussion questions based on the readings for a session. These questions will form the basis of our class discussions. The discussion questions should be submitted at least one day before the class.

Evaluating Papers

The following list of questions might help you evaluate the content, quality, and contributions of the papers you read in this course:

1. What is the paper about – what is the author's purpose in writing (e.g., to help solve problems of practitioners, to understand a phenomenon better, get tenure (??)?
2. If the reading is concerned with solving the problems of practitioners, what is its first premise and logical argument? Are the category of problems to which it is addressed clearly specified?
3. If the paper is concerned with describing a phenomenon or construct:
 - (a) What is the theory?
 - (b) What drives the theory?
 - (c) Does the Theory have internal logical internal consistency?

- (d) What is the usefulness of the theory? Does it explain an important phenomenon? Does it provide a basis for practical application? Does it reconcile important issues, conflicting opinions, or conflicting prior research? How so?
4. With respect to the empirical studies:
- (a) What motivated the study (i.e., claims, findings, events, available data)? Is the research important? To theory?
- (b) Is the research problem clearly defined and stated? Are the theoretical constructs operationally appropriate?
- (c) How are the alternative explanations controlled (e.g., homogeneous sampling, multiple regression, and matching)?
- (d) Is the research design appropriate? Is the mode of observation/data collection (e.g., experiment, questionnaire, interview, secondary data sources such as Compustat, Proxy statements) appropriate given the nature of the research problem?
- (e) Are the statistical methods appropriate?
- (f) Is the analysis complete?
- (g) Are the interpretation and conclusions consistent with the evidence presented? Are implications for theory and/or managerial practice made explicit?
1. What are important questions that still need to be answered to understand the object of study further?

Article summaries should be from two to three pages (double-spaced) in length, typed, and will have the following format:

- (a) Title of reading: complete title and citation.
- (b) Summarized by student's name.
- (c) Purpose of reading
- (d) Theoretical argument
- (e) Methodology
- (f) Results and conclusions

Students should bring copies of their summaries to class for the other students and the professors. These summaries will constitute a valuable study and reference aid as you prepare for the final exam and comprehensive exam.

2. Synthesis Paper (15 points)

To encourage you to stay on top of the readings, you will need to submit a concise synthesis (approximately two pages, double-spaced) of the material. Concentrate on pinpointing and summarizing the central themes and significant issues presented in that week's readings. How do the readings connect? What profound questions and novel insights emerge? How do these readings compare with what we have studied before? You have considerable flexibility in this assignment. Just demonstrate that you have done the reading and that you understand—or are making an effort to understand—the content. Ultimately, I was hoping you could show me that you are actively engaging with the readings.

3. Research Paper, Review and Presentation (40%)

Every student in the seminar must write a paper of about 20-25 pages, adhering to the AMR/AMJ formatting and style guidelines. The objective is to produce a quality paper that can be submitted to the Academy of Management Conference (or the appropriate professional conference for your field) and subsequently improve it so that you can submit it to a top journal in your field. The choice of topic should draw upon and extend Organizational Theory and subject to my approval. You have the following options:

1. Empirical Project Proposal: This should include an abstract, theoretical framework, hypotheses, research design, and a discussion of the expected contributions. Please note that there is no requirement for data collection or analysis at this stage, which will be addressed after the course is completed.
2. Complete Empirical Paper: similar to the proposal outlined in (1), but with the addition of data collection, analysis, and a discussion of the results. This option is considerably more challenging, so it is advisable to choose this path only if you already have access to data, know a faculty member who can provide data (many of us have some), or have a strong prospect of quickly obtaining the necessary data. Due to the added workload of data collection and analysis, you are not required to conduct all the analyses that a full paper would typically entail. That can be done later.

3. Theory Paper: modeled after the theory papers you will encounter in our readings (especially those in the Academy of Management Review), this assignment requires a clear problem statement, a review of existing literature, the development of a new perspective, approach, Theory, or framework (which may or may not include specific propositions), and a conclusion that discusses potential strategies for empirical research.
1. Literature Review Paper (based on topics of organizational Theory): A Literature Review Paper involves a comprehensive synthesis and analysis of existing research on a particular topic or field of study. The purpose of this type of paper is to identify key themes, trends, gaps, and debates within the literature, providing a critical evaluation of the current state of knowledge. The paper typically includes an introduction that outlines the research question or focus, a detailed review of relevant studies, theories, and findings, and a discussion section that highlights the implications of the reviewed literature. The conclusion may suggest directions for future research or how the reviewed literature contributes to understanding the broader topic. The goal is to demonstrate a deep understanding of the existing research landscape and to provide a clear, organized overview that informs and guides further study in the area.

Paper Review. As part of this course, we will participate in a peer review process where you will anonymously review each other's papers. Consequently, there will be several interim submissions, with the final paper due during the exam period. The required deliverables are as follows:

1. Submit Research Proposal-September 18th
2. Submit Draft of the Paper -November 20th
3. Submit Reviews- December 2nd
4. Submit letter of response to reviewers- December 4th
5. Final Paper and Presentation- December 4th

4. Exam (30%)

Students are also required to complete a take-home exam. The purpose of the exam is to see how well students have been able to master the Theory and research in the field. You will take the exam on November 26th via email, and it is due December 8th at 11:59 p.m. (emailed to me as an attachment).

Article summaries and discussion questions	15%
Synthesis Paper	15%
Research Paper, Review and Presentation	40%
Exam	30%

Schedule of Topics and Assignments

Day	Date	Agenda/Topic	Reading(s)	Due
Wed	8/28	Introduction and Overview		
Wed	9/4	Structure, Technology, and Size		
Wed	9/11	Environment		
Wed	9/18	Contingency Theory and Resource Dependence Theory		
Wed	9/25	Population Ecology Theory		
Wed	10/2	Transaction Cost Theory		
Wed	10/9	Agency Theory		
Wed	10/16	Institutional Theory		
Wed	10/23	Organizational Embeddedness		
Wed	10/30	Organizational Change		
Wed	11/6	Behavioral Theory of the Firm and Organizational Learning		
Wed	11/13	Stakeholder Theory		
Wed	11/20	Other Important Theories/Perspectives		
Wed	11/27	Other Important Theories/Perspectives		
Wed	12/4	Future of Organizational Theory		

University/College Policies

Please see the University Policies below.

COVID-19 Related Policies

If you have tested positive for COVID-19, please refer to the Student Handbook, Appendix A (Attendance Rule) for instructions.

Required Class Attendance

Students are expected to attend every class in person (or virtually, if the class is online) and to complete all assignments. If you cannot attend class, it is your responsibility to communicate absences with your professors. The faculty member will decide if your excuse is valid and thus may provide lecture materials of the class. According to University policy, acceptable reasons for an absence, which cannot affect a student's grade, include:

- Participation in an authorized University activity.
- Death or major illness in a student's immediate family.
- Illness of a dependent family member.
- Participation in legal proceedings or administrative procedures that require a student's presence.
- Religious holy day.
- Illness that is too severe or contagious for the student to attend class.
- Required participation in military duties.
- Mandatory admission interviews for professional or graduate school which cannot be rescheduled.

Students are responsible for providing satisfactory evidence to faculty members within seven calendar days of their absence and return to class. They must substantiate the reason for the absence. If the absence is excused, faculty members must either provide students with the opportunity to make up the exam or other work missed, or provide a satisfactory alternative to complete the exam or other work missed within 30 calendar days from the date of absence. Students who miss class due to a University-sponsored activity are responsible for identifying their absences to their instructors with as much advance notice as possible.

Classroom Behavior (applies to online or Face-to-Face Classes)

TAMIU encourages classroom discussion and academic debate as an essential intellectual activity. It is essential that students learn to express and defend their beliefs, but it is also essential that they learn to listen and respond respectfully to others whose beliefs they may not share. The University will always tolerate different, unorthodox, and unpopular points of view, but it will not tolerate condescending or insulting remarks. When students verbally abuse or ridicule and intimidate others whose views they do not agree with, they subvert the free exchange of ideas that should characterize a university classroom. If their actions are deemed by the professor to be disruptive, they will be subject to appropriate disciplinary action (please refer to Student Handbook Article 4).

TAMIU Honor Code: Plagiarism and Cheating

As a TAMIU student, you are bound by the TAMIU Honor Code to conduct yourself ethically in all your activities as a TAMIU student and to report violations of the Honor Code. Please read carefully the Student Handbook Article 7 and Article 10 available at <https://www.tamtu.edu/scce/studenthandbook.shtml> (<https://www.tamtu.edu/scce/studenthandbook.shtml/>).

We are committed to strict enforcement of the Honor Code. Violations of the Honor Code tend to involve claiming work that is not one's own, most commonly plagiarism in written assignments and any form of cheating on exams and other types of assignments.

Plagiarism is the presentation of someone else's work as your own. It occurs when you:

1. Borrow someone else's facts, ideas, or opinions and put them entirely in your own words. You must acknowledge that these thoughts are not your own by immediately citing the source in your paper. Failure to do this is plagiarism.
2. Borrow someone else's words (short phrases, clauses, or sentences), you must enclose the copied words in quotation marks as well as citing the source. Failure to do this is plagiarism.
3. Present someone else's paper or exam (stolen, borrowed, or bought) as your own. You have committed a clearly intentional form of intellectual theft and have put your academic future in jeopardy. This is the worst form of plagiarism.

Here is another explanation from the 2020, seventh edition of the Manual of The American Psychological Association (APA):

"Plagiarism is the act of presenting the words, idea, or images of another as your own; it denies authors or creators of content the credit they are due. Whether deliberate or unintentional, plagiarism violates ethical standards in scholarship" (p. 254). This same principle applies to the illicit use of AI.

Plagiarism: Researchers do not claim the words and ideas of another as their own; they give credit where credit is due. Quotations marks should be used to indicate the exact words of another. Each time you paraphrase another author (i.e., summarize a passage or rearrange the order of a sentence

and change some of the words), you need to credit the source in the text. The key element of this principle is that authors do not present the work of another as if it were their own words. This can extend to ideas as well as written words. If authors model a study after one done by someone else, the originating author should be given credit. If the rationale for a study was suggested in the discussion section of someone else's article, the person should be given credit. Given the free exchange of ideas, which is very important for the health of intellectual discourse, authors may not know where an idea for a study originated. If authors do know, however, they should acknowledge the source; this includes personal communications (p. 11). For guidance on proper documentation, consult the Academic Success Center or a recommended guide to documentation and research such as the Manual of the APA or the MLA Handbook for Writers of Research Papers. If you still have doubts concerning proper documentation, seek advice from your instructor prior to submitting a final draft.

TAMIU has penalties for plagiarism and cheating.

- **Penalties for Plagiarism:** Should a faculty member discover that a student has committed plagiarism, the student should receive a grade of 'F' in that course and the matter will be referred to the Honor Council for possible disciplinary action. The faculty member, however, may elect to give freshmen and sophomore students a "zero" for the assignment and to allow them to revise the assignment up to a grade of "F" (50%) if they believe that the student plagiarized out of ignorance or carelessness and not out of an attempt to deceive in order to earn an unmerited grade; the instructor must still report the offense to the Honor Council. This option should not be available to juniors, seniors, or graduate students, who cannot reasonably claim ignorance of documentation rules as an excuse. For repeat offenders in undergraduate courses or for an offender in any graduate course, the penalty for plagiarism is likely to include suspension or expulsion from the university.
 - *Caution:* Be very careful what you upload to Turnitin or send to your professor for evaluation. Whatever you upload for evaluation will be considered your final, approved draft. If it is plagiarized, you will be held responsible. The excuse that "it was only a draft" will not be accepted.
 - *Caution:* Also, do not share your electronic files with others. If you do, you are responsible for the possible consequences. If another student takes your file of a paper and changes the name to his or her name and submits it and you also submit the paper, we will hold both of you responsible for plagiarism. It is impossible for us to know with certainty who wrote the paper and who stole it. And, of course, we cannot know if there was collusion between you and the other student in the matter.
- **Penalties for Cheating:** Should a faculty member discover a student cheating on an exam or quiz or other class project, the student should receive a "zero" for the assignment and not be allowed to make the assignment up. The incident should be reported to the chair of the department and to the Honor Council. If the cheating is extensive, however, or if the assignment constitutes a major grade for the course (e.g., a final exam), or if the student has cheated in the past, the student should receive an "F" in the course, and the matter should be referred to the Honor Council. Additional penalties, including suspension or expulsion from the university may be imposed. Under no circumstances should a student who deserves an "F" in the course be allowed to withdraw from the course with a "W."
 - *Caution:* Chat groups that start off as "study groups" can easily devolve into "cheating groups." Be very careful not to join or remain any chat group if it begins to discuss specific information about exams or assignments that are meant to require individual work. If you are a member of such a group and it begins to cheat, you will be held responsible along with all the other members of the group. The TAMIU Honor Code requires that you report any such instances of cheating.
- **Student Right of Appeal:** Faculty will notify students immediately via the student's TAMIU e-mail account that they have submitted plagiarized work. Students have the right to appeal a faculty member's charge of academic dishonesty by notifying the TAMIU Honor Council of their intent to appeal as long as the notification of appeal comes within 10 business days of the faculty member's e-mail message to the student and/or the Office of Student Conduct and Community Engagement. The Student Handbook provides more details.

Use of Work in Two or More Courses

You may not submit work completed in one course for a grade in a second course unless you receive explicit permission to do so by the instructor of the second course. In general, you should get credit for a work product only once.

AI Policies

Your instructor will provide you with their personal policy on the use of AI in the classroom setting and associated coursework.

TAMIU E-Mail and SafeZone

Personal Announcements sent to students through TAMIU E-mail (tamiu.edu or dusty email) are the official means of communicating course and university business with students and faculty –not the U.S. Mail and no other e-mail addresses. Students and faculty must check their TAMIU e-mail accounts regularly, if not daily. Not having seen an important TAMIU e-mail or message from a faculty member, chair, or dean is not accepted as an excuse for failure to take important action.

Students, faculty, and staff are encouraged to download the SafeZone app, which is a free mobile app for all University faculty, staff, and students. SafeZone allows you to: report safety concerns (24/7), get connected with mental health professionals, activate location sharing with authorities, and anonymously report incidents. Go to <https://www.tamiu.edu/adminis/police/safezone/index.shtml> for more information.

Copyright Restrictions

The Copyright Act of 1976 grants to copyright owners the exclusive right to reproduce their works and distribute copies of their work. Works that receive copyright protection include published works such as a textbook. Copying a textbook without permission from the owner of the copyright

may constitute copyright infringement. Civil and criminal penalties may be assessed for copyright infringement. Civil penalties include damages up to \$100,000; criminal penalties include a fine up to \$250,000 and imprisonment. Copyright laws do not allow students and professors to make photocopies of copyrighted materials, but you may copy a limited portion of a work, such as article from a journal or a chapter from a book for your own personal academic use or, in the case of a professor, for personal, limited classroom use. In general, the extent of your copying should not suggest that the purpose or the effect of your copying is to avoid paying for the materials. And, of course, you may not sell these copies for a profit. Thus, students who copy textbooks to avoid buying them or professors who provide photocopies of textbooks to enable students to save money are violating the law.

Students with Disabilities

Texas A&M International University seeks to provide reasonable accommodations for all qualified persons with disabilities. This University will adhere to all applicable federal, state, and local laws, regulations and guidelines with respect to providing reasonable accommodations as required to afford equal education opportunity. It is the student's responsibility to register with the Office of Student Counseling and Disability Services located in Student Center 126. This office will contact the faculty member to recommend specific, reasonable accommodations. Faculty are prohibited from making accommodations based solely on communications from students. They may make accommodations only when provided documentation by the Student Counseling and Disability Services office.

Student Attendance and Leave of Absence (LOA) Policy

As part of our efforts to assist and encourage all students towards graduation, TAMIU provides LOA's for students, including pregnant/parenting students, in accordance with the Attendance Rule (Section 3.07) and the Student LOA Rule (Section 3.08), which includes the "Leave of Absence Request" form. Both rules can be found in the TAMIU Student Handbook (URL: <http://www.tamiau.edu/studentaffairs/StudentHandbook1.shtml> (<http://www.tamiau.edu/studentaffairs/StudentHandbook1.shtml/>)).

Pregnant and Parenting Students

Under Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972, harassment based on sex, including harassment because of pregnancy or related conditions, is prohibited. A pregnant/parenting student must be granted an absence for as long as the student's physician deems the absence medically necessary. It is a violation of Title IX to ask for documentation relative to the pregnant/parenting student's status beyond what would be required for other medical conditions. If a student would like to file a complaint for discrimination due to his or her pregnant/parenting status, please contact the TAMIU Title IX Coordinator (Lorissa M. Cortez, 5201 University Boulevard, KLM 159B, Laredo, TX 78041, TitleIX@tamiau.edu, 956.326.2857) and/or the Office of Civil Rights (Dallas Office, U.S. Department of Education, 1999 Bryan Street, Suite 1620, Dallas, TX 75201-6810, 214.661.9600). You can also report it on TAMIU's anonymous electronic reporting site: <https://www.tamiau.edu/reportit> (<https://www.tamiau.edu/reportit/>).

TAMIU advises a pregnant/parenting student to notify their professor once the student is aware that accommodations for such will be necessary. It is recommended that the student and professor develop a reasonable plan for the student's completion of missed coursework or assignments. The Office of Equal Opportunity and Diversity (Lorissa M. Cortez, lorissam.cortez@tamiau.edu) can assist the student and professor in working out the reasonable accommodations. For other questions or concerns regarding Title IX compliance related to pregnant/parenting students at the University, contact the Title IX Coordinator. In the event that a student will need a leave of absence for a substantial period of time, TAMIU urges the student to consider a Leave of Absence (LOA) as outlined in the TAMIU Student Handbook. As part of our efforts to assist and encourage all students towards graduation, TAMIU provides LOA's for students, including pregnant/parenting students, in accordance with the Attendance Rule and the Student LOA Rule. Both rules can be found in the TAMIU Student Handbook (<https://www.tamiau.edu/scce/studenthandbook.shtml> (<https://www.tamiau.edu/scce/studenthandbook.shtml/>)).

Anti-Discrimination/Title IX

TAMIU does not discriminate or permit harassment against any individual on the basis of race, color, sex, religion, national origin, age, disability, genetic information, veteran status, sexual orientation or gender identity in admissions, educational programs, or employment. If you would like to file a complaint relative to Title IX or any civil rights violation, please contact the TAMIU Director of Equal Opportunity and Diversity/Title IX Coordinator, Lorissa M. Cortez, 5201 University Boulevard, Killam Library 159B, Laredo, TX 78041, TitleIX@tamiau.edu, 956.326.2857, via the anonymous electronic reporting website, ReportIt, at <https://www.tamiau.edu/reportit> (<https://www.tamiau.edu/reportit/>), and/or the Office of Civil Rights (Dallas Office), U.S. Department of Education, 1999 Bryan Street, Suite 1620, Dallas, TX 75201-6810, 214.661.9600.

Incompletes

Students who are unable to complete a course should withdraw from the course before the final date for withdrawal and receive a "W." To qualify for an "incomplete" and thus have the opportunity to complete the course at a later date, a student must meet the following criteria:

1. The student must have completed 90% of the course work assigned before the final date for withdrawing from a course with a "W", and the student must be passing the course;
2. The student cannot complete the course because an accident, an illness, or a traumatic personal or family event occurred after the final date for withdrawal from a course;
3. The student must sign an "Incomplete Grade Contract" and secure signatures of approval from the professor and the college dean.

4. The student must agree to complete the missing course work before the end of the next long semester; failure to meet this deadline will cause the "I" to automatically be converted to an "F"; extensions to this deadline may be granted by the dean of the college. This is the general policy regarding the circumstances under which an "incomplete" may be granted, but under exceptional circumstances, a student may receive an incomplete who does not meet all of the criteria above if the faculty member, department chair, and dean recommend it.

WIN Contracts

The Department of Biology and Chemistry does not permit WIN contracts. For other departments within the college, WIN Contracts are offered only under exceptional circumstances and are limited to graduating seniors. Only courses offered by full-time TAMU faculty or TAMU instructors are eligible to be contracted for the WIN requirement. However, a WIN contract for a course taught by an adjunct may be approved, with special permission from the department chair and dean. Students must seek approval before beginning any work for the WIN Contract. No student will contract more than one course per semester. Summer WIN Contracts must continue through both summer sessions.

Student Responsibility for Dropping a Course

It is the responsibility of the student to drop the course before the final date for withdrawal from a course. Faculty members, in fact, may not drop a student from a course without getting the approval of their department chair and dean.

Independent Study Course

Independent Study (IS) courses are offered only under exceptional circumstances. Required courses intended to build academic skills may not be taken as IS (e.g., clinical supervision and internships). No student will take more than one IS course per semester. Moreover, IS courses are limited to seniors and graduate students. Summer IS course must continue through both summer sessions.

Grade Changes & Appeals

Faculty are authorized to change final grades only when they have committed a computational error or an error in recording a grade, and they must receive the approval of their department chairs and the dean to change the grade. As part of that approval, they must attach a detailed explanation of the reason for the mistake. Only in rare cases would another reason be entertained as legitimate for a grade change. A student who is unhappy with his or her grade on an assignment must discuss the situation with the faculty member teaching the course. If students believe that they have been graded unfairly, they have the right to appeal the grade using a grade appeal process in the Student Handbook and in the Faculty Handbook.

Final Examination

All courses in all colleges must include a comprehensive exam or performance and be given on the date and time specified by the Academic Calendar and the Final Exam schedule published by the Registrar's Office. In the College of Arts & Sciences all final exams must contain a written component. The written component should comprise at least 20% of the final exam grade. Exceptions to this policy must receive the approval of the department chair and the dean at the beginning of the semester.

Mental Health and Well-Being

The university aims to provide students with essential knowledge and tools to understand and support mental health. As part of our commitment to your well-being, we offer access to Telus Health, a service available 24/7/365 via chat, phone, or webinar. Scan the QR code to download the app and explore the resources available to you for guidance and support whenever you need it. The Telus app is available to download directly from TELUS (tamui.edu) (<https://www.tamui.edu/counseling/telus/>) or from the Apple App Store and Google Play.