

Doctoral Seminar in Organization Theory

Spring 2014

David Lepak

Janice Levin Building

Thursdays – 12-4:00

Room - TBD

School of Management and Labor Relations

Office Hours: By appointment

Phone: (848) 445-1389

E-mail: lepak@smlr.rutgers.edu

COURSE DESCRIPTION:

The primary objective of this doctoral seminar is to survey the major theoretical perspectives and issues studied in organization theory (OT) research related to topics such as how organizations form, survive and grow, interact with each other, recruit and process members, gain and manage resources, and deal with problems both internal and external.

In each class session we will examine both important historical contributions and more recent treatments of the topic for the day. Each session may contain both theoretical and empirical contributions. While sessions may differ somewhat in their execution, each session will generally begin with a more general discussion of the components and boundaries of the week's topic. This discussion will be followed by a more in-depth exploration of the articles assigned for the week. Students will be assigned to lead each week's discussion, and will, in consultation with me, develop questions that will guide and structure each week's class. Every member of the class should be prepared to develop their own framework of understanding the multiple strands of organization theory. The expectation in this class is that each of us will develop the critical skills necessary to evaluate many different kinds of research, and that each of us will leave the class able to contribute significantly to the on-going conversations among organization theorists and draw from organization theories in our own research interests.

COURSE REQUIREMENTS:

Participation (10%): As with most doctoral seminars, the quality of the course is directly related to the quality of class discussion. Consequently, class participation will be graded on each student's degree of quality contribution toward class discussions. To ensure an informed discussion, students are expected to come to class prepared to discuss (not simply summarize) each article. Each week there will be a specified list of required readings (the required readings are marked with a '*' in the readings list). A list of suggested/additional readings is provided each week for those students interested in pursuing a topic in more detail. Students are encouraged, although not required, to read beyond the assigned readings and to bring to the class's attention research that informs and explores the day's issues. In preparing for class discussion, you may want to ask yourself some of the following questions:

- What is interesting about this article?
- What are the underlying assumptions of this article? Of this theory?
- What are the interesting research questions in this area of research?

- What are the strengths and weaknesses of the conceptual arguments? And of this theory?
- What are the strengths and weaknesses of the methodological approach used to test the research questions in this article? (if applicable)
- How does this article fit in with other articles on the topic?
- If you were doing research in the same content area as the article, what would you do next or differently?

In addition, for each class session discussion leaders/class facilitators will be assigned to help clarify key concepts, identify controversial or interesting issues, point out additional articles of particular relevance, and so on. Though all students are strongly encouraged to come to class with questions and issues to discuss, it is the role of the facilitator to prepare 2 or 3 critical questions per article for discussion. However, it is **NOT** the role of the facilitator to lead the entire discussion -- all students are expected to participate equally. We will determine who will be the facilitators for each class during the first class session. Depending on class size, students will be expected to lead 2-3 class sessions.

Examination (45%): There will be one examination at the end of the course during the last scheduled class period that will emphasize the themes, trends, issues, and the like that are highlighted throughout the readings and class discussions. There will be two or three questions to be answered over a three-hour period. Answers will be graded on: (a) quality of insight brought to the question; (b) incorporation of relevant theory and research; and (c) integration across topic areas.

Research Paper (45%): Each student will investigate a topic of his/her choice and write a high quality research paper that integrates past research and theory with new ideas about an issue. Originality, thoroughness, and scholarly thinking are the most important criteria for the research paper. These papers may involve data analysis or a conceptual contribution to the literature. Whatever the nature of the research paper, it must be of top-notch quality; this is an opportunity to develop a paper that is of publishable quality. All papers should be written in a format and structure suitable for submission to the top management journals (*Academy of Management Review, Academy of Management Journal, Administrative Science Quarterly, Journal of Management, Journal of Applied Psychology, Organization Science, Personnel Psychology, Strategic Management Journal* etc.) and should not exceed 30 pages.

Required Materials:

Scott, W.R. 2002. Organizations: Rational, Natural and Open Systems, 5th Edition.

Course Schedule

Date	Topic
3/27	Introduction
4/3	Overview of Theoretical Perspectives What is Good Theory?
	<i>Rational Closed</i>
4/10	Closed System Models
	<i>Rational Open</i>
4/17	Contingency Theory Decision Making
4/24	Economics Approaches: Transaction Cost Economics / Agency Theory
	<i>Natural Open</i>
5/1	Power / Resource Dependency Theory
5/8	Institutional Theory
5/15	Sensemaking and Enactment
5/22	<i>Closed book examination</i>
<i>TBD</i>	<i>Final Draft of Research Paper</i>

Course Readings

Week 2 April 3	Overview of Theoretical Perspectives What is Good Theory?	
-------------------	--	--

Overview of Theoretical Perspectives

*Scott, W.R. 2002. Chapters 1 – 4. Organizations: Rational, Natural and Open Systems, 5th Edition.

*Donaldson, L. 1995. Chapters 1 and 2. American Anti-Management Theories of Organization. 1st Edition. (pp. 1-41).

What is good theory

*Whetten, D.A. 1989. What constitutes a theoretical contribution? Academy of Management Review, 14 (4):490-495.

*Bacharach, S.B., 1989. Organizational Theories: Some criteria for evaluation. Academy of Management Review, 14 (4): 496-515.

*Kilduff, M. 2006. Editor's comments: Publishing theory. Academy of Management Review, 31 (2): 252-255.

*LePine, J.A. & Wilcox-King, A., 2010. Developing novel theoretical insight from reviews of existing theory and research. Academy of Management Review, 35 (4): 506-509.

*Colquitt, J.A., Zapata-Phelan, C.P. 2007. Trends in theory building and theory testing: A five-decade study of the academy of management Journal. Academy of Management Journal, 50, 6, 1281-1303.

Corley, K.G., & Gioia, D.A., 2011, Building theory about theory building: What constitutes a theoretical contribution. Academy of Management Review, 36, 1, 12-32.

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

Van de Ven, A.H., 1989. Nothing is quite so practical as a good theory. Academy of Management Review, 14 (4): 486-489.

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

Weick, K.E., 2002. Puzzles in Organizational learning: An exercise in disciplined imagination. British Journal of Management, 13, S7-S17.

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.

Week 3 April 10	Closed Systems Models	
--------------------	-----------------------	--

*Weber, M. 1924. Legitimate Authority and Bureaucracy. In D. S. Pugh (ed.), Organization Theory: Selected Readings. (pp. 3-15). London England: Penguin Books.

*Fayol, H. 1916. General Principles of Management. In D. S. Pugh (ed.), Organization Theory: Selected Readings. (pp. 181-202). London England: Penguin Books.

*Taylor, F.W., 1912. Scientific Management. In D. S. Pugh (ed.), Organization Theory: Selected Readings. (pp. 203-222). London England: Penguin Books.

*Mayo, E. 1949. Hawthorne and the Western Electric Company. In D. S. Pugh (ed.), Organization Theory: Selected Readings. (pp. 345-357). London England: Penguin Books.

*McGregor, D. 1960. Theory X and Theory Y. In D. S. Pugh (ed.), Organization Theory: Selected Readings. (pp. 358-374). London England: Penguin Books.

*Locke, E.A. 1982. The ideas of Frederick W. Taylor: An evaluation. Academy of Management Review, Vol. 7: 14-24.

*Wrege, C.D., & Perroni, A.G., 1974. Taylor's pig-tale: A historical analysis of Frederick W. Taylor's pig-iron experiment. Academy of Management Journal, 17: 6-27.

Blau, P. 1963. Critical Comments on Weber's View of Authority. American Political Science Review, 57:305-316.

Barnard, C.I. 1938. The Functions of the Executive. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press. pages 82-123, 139-184.

Roethlisberger, F.J. & Dickson, W.J. 1939. Management and the Worker. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press. Chapters 1, 17, 21-25

Roy, 1952. Banana Time: Job Satisfaction and Informal Interaction. AJS

Scott. W.R. 2002. Chapters 2. in Organizations: Rational, Natural and Open Systems, 5th Edition.

Taylor, F.W. 1916. Principles of Scientific Management, 30-49; 58-97; 118-144

Weber, M. Economy and Society 1978 pp.212-254, 956-975

Week 4 April 17	Contingency Theory Decision Making	Pick 1 new papers
--------------------	---------------------------------------	--------------------------

Contingency Theory Required

*RECENT PAPER TO BE FOUND

*Burns, T., & Stalker, G.M. 1961. The Management of Innovation. London: Tavistock Publications. (pp 96-125).

*Thompson, J.D., 1967. The structure of complex organization. In D. S. Pugh (ed.), Organization Theory: Selected Readings. (pp. 29-43). London England: Penguin Books.

*Lawrence, P.R., & Lorsch, J.W. 1967. Differentiation and integration in complex organizations. Administrative Science Quarterly, 12: 1-47.

*Sine, W.D., Mitsuhashi, H. & Krisch, D.A. 2006. Revisiting Burns and Stalker: Formal structure and new venture performance in emerging economic sectors. Academy of Management Journal, 49: 121-132.

Decision Making Required

*Cohen, M.D., March, J.G., & Olsen, J.P. 1972. A garbage can model of organizational choice. Administrative Science Quarterly, 17: 1-25.

*Bendor, J., Moe, T.M. & Shotts, K.W. 2001. Recycling the garbage can: An assessment of the research program. American Political Science Review, 95: 169-190.

*Olsen, J.P. 2001. Garbage can, new institutionalism and the study of politics. American Political Science Review, 95: 191-198.

*Lundblom, C.E. 1959. The science of 'muddling through'. Public Administration Review, 19 (2): 79-88.

Contingency theory – additional readings

Aldrich, 1972. Technology and Organizational Structure: A Reexamination of the findings of the Aston Group. Administrative Science Quarterly

Blau, P. 1970, A Formal Theory of Differentiation in Organizations. American Sociological Review, 35: 201-218.

Child, J. 1972. Organizational structure, environment and performance: The role of strategic choice. Sociology, 6: 1-22.

Donaldson, L. 1996. The normal science of structural contingency theory. In S. R. Clegg, C. Hardy & W. R. Nord (eds.), Handbook of Organization Studies, pp.57-76. London: Sage.

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

Galbraith, J. 1973. Designing complex organizations. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Galbraith, J.R. 1977. Organization design: An information processing view. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

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

Hickson, D.J., Hinings, C.A., Schenk, R.E., & Pennings, J.M. 1971. A strategic contingencies theory of intraorganizational power. Administrative Science Quarterly, 16: 216-229.

Hickson, Pugh and Pheysey 1969. "Operations Technology and Organization Structure: An Empirical Reappraisal" Administrative Science Quarterly.

Kimberly, J. 1976. Organizational size and the structuralist perspective. Administrative Science Quarterly, 21: 571-597.

Lawrence, P.R., & Lorsch, J.W. 1967. Organization and environment. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School.

Perrow, C.R. 1967. "A Framework for Comparative Organizational Analysis" American Sociological Review, 32: 194-208.

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

Siggelkow, N. 2002. Evolution toward fit. Administrative Science Quarterly, 47: 125-159.

Trist, E.L., & Bamforth, K.W. 1951. Social and psychological consequences of the longwall method of coal-getting. Human Relations, 4: 3-28.

Van de Ven, A.H., & Drazin, R. 1985. The concept of fit in contingency theory. Research in Organizational Behavior, 7: 333-365.

Tushman, M.L. 1979. Work characteristics and subunit communication structure: A contingency analysis. Administrative Science Quarterly, 24: 82-97.

Woodward, 1965 Industrial Organization Introduction, Chapters 4 and 5

Decision Making Additional Readings

Allen, H.T., 1966. An empirical Test of choice and decision postulates in the Cyert-March Behavioral Theory of the firm. Administrative Science Quarterly, 11: 2-11.

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.

Padgett, J.F. 1980. Managing garbage can hierarchies. Administrative Science Quarterly, 25: 583-604.

March, J.G., & Simon, H.A. 1958. Organizations, Chapters 5-7.

Simon – Administrative Behavior

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

Week 5 April 24	Organizational Economics - Transaction Cost Economics / Agency Theory	<i>Pick 1 new paper</i>
--------------------	---	--------------------------------

*RECENT PAPER TO BE FOUND

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

*Williamson, O. 1981. The Economics of Organization: The Transaction Cost Approach. American Journal of Sociology, 87: 548-577.

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

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

*Donaldson, L. 1995. Chapter 6. American Anti-Management Theories of Organization. 1st Edition. (pp. 164-201).

Alchian, A.A., & Demsetz, H. 1972. Production, information cost, and economic organization. American Economic Review, 62: 777-795.

Donaldson, L. 1990. The ethereal hand: Organizational economics and management theory. Academy of Management Review, 15: 369-381.

Carpenter, M.A., Pollock, T.G. & Leary, M.M. 2003. "Governance, the Experience of Principals and Agents, and Global Strategic Intent: Testing a Model of Reasoned Risk Taking." Strategic Management Journal, 24: 803-820.

Fama, E.F. & Jensen, M.L. 1983. Separation of Ownership from Control. Journal of Law and Economics, 26: 301-325.

Ghoshal, S. 2005. Bad Management Theories are Destroying Good Management Practice. Academy of Management Learning and Education, 4: 75-91.

Jensen and Meckling 1976. "Theory of the Firm: Managerial Behavior, agency costs, and Ownership Structure" Journal of Financial Economics, 3: 305-360.

Kosnik, R.D. 1987. Greenmail: A study of board performance in corporate governance. *ASQ*, 32: 163-185.

Lee, P.M., & O'Neill, H.M. 2003. "Ownership structures and R&D investments of U.S. and Japanese firms: Agency and stewardship perspectives." *Academy of Management Journal*, 46: 212-225.

Wiseman, R. M., & Gomez-Mejia, L. R. 1998. "A behavioral agency model of risk taking." *Academy of Management Review*, 25: 133-152.

Week 6 May 1	Power / Resource Dependency Theory	Pick 1 new papers
-----------------	------------------------------------	--------------------------

***RECENT PAPER TO BE FOUND**

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

*Hickson, D.J., Hinings, C.A., Schenk, R.E., & Pennings, J.M. 1971. A strategic contingencies theory of intraorganizational power. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 16: 216-229.

*Pfeffer, J., & Salancik, G.R. 1978. *The external control of organizations*. New York: Harper & Row. Chapters 1, 3, & 6.

*Pfeffer, J., & Davis-Blake, A. 1987. Understanding organizational wage structures: A resource dependence approach. *Academy of Management Journal*, 437-455.

*Donaldson, L. 1995. Chapter 5. *American Anti-Management Theories of Organization*. 1st Edition. (pp. 129-163).

Baker, W.E. 1990. Market networks and corporate behavior. *American Journal of Sociology*, 96: 589-625.

Casciaro, T. & Piskorski, M.J. 2005. Power imbalance, mutual dependence and constraint absorption: A closer look at resource dependence theory. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 50: 167-199.

Child, J. 1972. Organizational structure, environment and performance: The role of strategic choice. *Sociology*, 6: 1-22.

Pfeffer, J. 1981. Chapter 4. Power in Organizations. Cambridge, MA: Ballinger Publishing Company. ((p. 97-136)

Boyd, B. 1990. Corporate linkages and organizational environment: A test of the resource dependence model. *Strategic Management Journal*, 11: 419-430.

Hayward, M.L.A. and Boeker. W. 1998 "Power and Conflicts of interest in Professional Firms: Evidence from Investment Banking" *Administrative Science Quarterly* 43: 1-22.

Palmer; D. Barber, B.M., Zhou, X. & Soysal, Y. 1995. "The Friendly and Predatory Acquisition of Large U.S. Corporations in the 1960s: The Other Contested Terrain." *American Sociological Review*, 60: 469-499.

Pfeffer, J. 1987. A resource dependence perspective on intercorporate relations. In M.S. Mizruchi & M. Schwartz (Eds.), *Intercorporate relations: The structural analysis of business*, pp. 25-55. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Week 7 May 8	Institutional Theory	Pick 2 new papers
-----------------	----------------------	--------------------------

***2 RECENT PAPERS TO BE FOUND**

*Meyer and Rowan, 1977. "Institutionalized Organizations: Formal Structure as Myth and Ceremony" *American Journal of Sociology*, 83: 340-63.

*DiMaggio and Powell 1983. The Iron Cage Revisited: Institutional isomorphism and collective rationality in organizational fields. *American Sociological Review*, 48: 147-160.

*Tolbert and Zucker 1983. Institutional Sources of Change in the Formal Structure of Organizations: The Diffusion of Civil Service Reform, 1880-1935. *Administrative Science Quarterly* 22-39.

*Donaldson, L. 1995. Chapters 4. in American Anti-Management Theories of Organization. 1st Edition. (pp. 79-128).

Covaleski, M.A., & Dirsmith, M. 1988. An institutional perspective on the rise, social transformation, and fall of a university budget category. ASQ, 33: 562-587.

Davis, G.F., Diekmann, K.A., & Tinsley C.H. 1994. The decline and fall of the conglomerate firm in the 1980s: The deinstitutionalization of an organizational form. ASR, 59: 547-570.

DiMaggio, P.J. & Powell, W.W., 1991. "Introduction" in W.W. Powell and P.J. DiMaggio (Eds.) The New Institutionalism In Organizational Analysis. Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press: 1-38.

Fligstein, N. 1991. "The structural transformation of American industry: An institutional account of the causes of diversification in the largest firms, 1919-1979" in W.W. Powell and P.J. DiMaggio (Eds.) The New Institutionalism In Organizational Analysis. Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press: 311-336.

Greenwood, Royston, & Hinings, C. R. 1996. Understanding Radical Organizational Change: Bringing together the Old and the New Institutionalism. The Academy of Management Review, 21: 1022-1054.

Hargadon and Douglas 2001. "When Innovations Meet Institutions: Edison and the Design of the Electric Light." ASQ, 46: 476-501.

Hirsch, P.M. & Lounsbury, M. 1991. "Ending the family quarrel: Toward a reconciliation of the "old" and "new" institutionalisms. American Behavioral Scientist, 40(4): 406-418.

Kraatz, M. and Zajac, E. 1996. "Exploring the Limits of the New Institutionalism: The Causes and Consequences of Illegitimate Change." American Sociological Review, 61: 812-836.

Leblebici, H. Salancik, G.R. Copay, A. and King, T. 1991. "Institutional Change and the Transformation of Inter-Organizational Fields: An Organizational History of the U.S. Radio Broadcasting Industry." Administrative Science Quarterly, 36: 333-363.

Lounsbury, M. 2001. Institutional sources of practice variation: Staffing college and university recycling programs. Administrative Science Quarterly, 46: 29-56.

Mezias, S.J. 1990. An institutional model of organizational practice: Financial reporting at the Fortune 200. ASQ, 35: 431-457.

Powell. 1991. "Expanding the Scope of Institutional Analysis" The New Institutionalism

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

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

Scott, W.R., & Meyer, J.W. 1983. The organization of societal sectors. In *Organizational environments: Ritual and rationality*, pp. 129-154. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Selznick, P. 1996. Institutionalism "new" and "old". Administrative Science Quarterly, 270-277.

Zajac, E.J. & Westphal, J.D. 2004a. The Social construction of market value: Institutionalization and learning perspectives on stock market reactions. American Sociological Review, 69: 433-457.

Zajac, E.J. & Westphal, J.D. 2004b. Should sociological theories venture into "economic territory?" Yes! American Sociological Review, 69: 466-471.

Zucker, L.G. 1977. The role of institutionalization in cultural persistence. American Sociological Review, 42: 726-743.

Zuckerman, E.W. 2004. Towards the social construction of an interdisciplinary turf war. American Sociological Review, 69: 458-465.

Week 12	Sensemaking and Enactment	
---------	---------------------------	--

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

*Abolafia, M.Y., & Kilduff, M. 1988. Enacting market crisis: The social construction of a speculative bubble. Administrative Science Quarterly, 33: 177-193.

*Weick, K.E. 1993. The collapse of sensemaking in organizations: The mann gulch disaster. Administrative Science Quarterly, 38: 628-652.

*Gioia, D.A., Schultz, M., & Corley, K.G., 2000. Organizational Identity, Image, and adaptive instability. Academy of Management Review, 25, 1, 63-81.

*Porac, J., Thomas, H., Wilson, F., Paton, D. & Kanfer, A. 1995. Rivalry and the industry model of Scottish knitwear producers. Administrative Science Quarterly. 40(2): 203-227.

*Weick, Karl. 1995. Sensemaking in organizations. Sage Publications. (*Chapters TBD*).

Garud, R., and Rappa, M.A. 1994. A socio-cognitive model of technology evolution: The case of cochlear implants. Organization Science. 5: 344-362.

Hall, R.I. (1976). A system pathology of an organization: The rise and fall of the old Saturday Evening Post. Administrative Science Quarterly, 18: 279-290.

Heimer, C.A. 1985. Allocating information costs in a negotiated information order: Interorganizational constraints on decision making in Norwegian oil insurance. Administrative Science Quarterly, 30: 395-417.

Kilduff, M., Funk, J.L., & Mehra, A. 1997. Engineering identity in a Japanese factory. Organization Science, 8: 579-592.

McCarthy, J.D., & Zald, M.N. 1977. Resource mobilization and social movements: A partial theory. *AJS*, 82: 1212-1241.

Meyer, A.D. 1982. Adapting to environmental jolts. Administrative Science Quarterly, 27: 515-537.

Orton, J.D., & Weick, K.E. 1990. Loosely coupled systems: A reconceptualization. *AMR*, 15: 203-223.

Stewart Ranson; Bob Hinings; Royston Greenwood. 1980. The Structuring of Organizational Structures Administrative Science Quarterly, 25: 1-17.

Thomas, J.B., Clark, S.M., & Gioia, D.A. 1993. Strategic sensemaking and organizational performance: Linkages among scanning, interpretation, action, and outcomes. Academy of Management Journal. 36(2): 239-270.

Walsh, James P. 1995. Managerial and organizational cognition: Notes from a trip down memory lane. Organization Science. 6(3): 280-321.

Weick, K.E. 1976. Educational organizations as loosely coupled systems. Administrative Science Quarterly, 21: 1-19.

Weick, K.E. 1990. Technology as equivoque: Sensemaking in new technologies. In P.S. Goodman & L.S. Sproull (Eds.), *Technology and Organizations*, pp. 1-44. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Week 9	<i>In-class Examination</i>	
May 22		

Recommended Books

DiMaggio & Powell, 1991. The New Institutionalism in Organization Analysis
Scott, W.R. 1995. Institutions and Organizations.
Weick, 1995. Sensemaking in Organizations.
Pfeffer & Salancik, 1978. The External Control of Organizations
Burt, 1992. Structural Holes
Kilduff & Tsai, 2003. Social Networks and Organizations
Cyert & March, 1963. A Behavioral Theory of the Firm
March & Simon, 1958 Organizations
Thompson, 1967, Organizations in Action
Aldrich, 1999. Organizations Evolving
Smelser & Swedberg, 1994, Handbook of Economic Sociology
Blau, 1964. Exchange and Power in Social Life
Coleman, 1990. Foundations of Social Capital
Pfeffer, 1997, New Directions for Organization Theory
Perrow, 1986, Complex Organizations.
Smith & Hitt, 2005, Great Minds in Management

Additional Topics

Comparative Structure

- *Scott. W.R. 2002. Chapters 9 and 10. in Organizations: Rational, Natural and Open Systems, 5th Edition.
- *Hall, H.H., 2002. Chapters 3 and 4. Organizations, Structures, Processes, and Outcomes. 8th Edition.
- *Pugh, D.S., 1973. The measurement of Organization Structures: Does context determine form? In D. S. Pugh (ed.), Organization Theory: Selected Readings. (pp. 44-63). London England: Penguin Books.
- *Donaldson, L. 1995. Chapters 7-8. in American Anti-Management Theories of Organization. 1st Edition. (pp. 202-232).

Environment

- *Scott. W.R. 2002. Chapters 6, 7, and 8. in Organizations: Rational, Natural and Open Systems, 5th Edition.
- *Hall Chapter 10
- *Dess & Beard
- *Granovetter, M.S. 1985. Economic action and social structure: The problem of embeddedness. *American Journal of Sociology*. 91: 481-510.
- *Uzzi, B. 1996. The sources and consequences of embeddedness for the economic performance of organizations: The network effect. *American Sociological Review*, 61: 674-698.

Organizational Ecology

- *Hannan, M.T., & Freeman, J. 1977. The population ecology of organizations. *American Journal of Sociology*, 82: 929-964.
- *Hannan, M.T., & Freeman, J. 1984. Structural inertia and organizational change. *American Sociological Review*, 49: 149-164.
- *Young, R.C. 1988. Is population ecology a useful paradigm for the study of organizations? *American Journal of Sociology*, 94: 1-24.
- *Freeman, J., & Hannan, M.T. 1989. Setting the record straight on organizational ecology: Rebuttal to Young. *American Journal of Sociology*, 85: 425-439.
- *Donaldson, L. 1995. Chapter 3. in *American Anti-Management Theories of Organization*. 1st Edition. (pp. 42-78).
- Amburgey, T.L. Kelley, D. and Barnett, W.P. 1993. "Resetting the Clock: The Dynamics of Organizational Change and Failure. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 38: 51-73.

- Barnett and Carroll 1995. Modeling Internal Organizational Change. Annual Review of Sociology 21: 217-236.
- Barnett, W.P. 1997. The dynamics of competitive intensity. ASQ, 42: 128-160.
- Barnett, W.P., & Carroll, G.R. 1987. Competition and mutualism among early telephone companies. Administrative Science Quarterly, 32: 400-421.
- Brittain, J., & Wholey, D.R. 1989. Assessing organizational ecology as sociological theory: Comment on Young. American Journal of Sociology, 85: 439-444.
- Bruderl and Schussler 1990. "Organizational Mortality: The Liabilities of Newness and Adolescence" Administrative Science Quarterly 35: 530-47.
- Carroll, G.R., & Hannan, M.T. 1989. Density delay in the evolution of organizational populations: A model and five empirical tests. Administrative Science Quarterly, 34: 411-430.
- 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.
- Delacroix, J., Swaminathan, A., & Solt, M.E. 1989. Density dependence versus population dynamics: An ecological study of failings in the California Wine Industry. American Sociological Review, 54: 245-262.
- Dobrev, S.D., Kim, T.Y., & Carroll, G.R. 2003. Shifting gears, shifting niches: Organizational inertia and change in the evolution of the U.S. automobile industry, 1885-1981. Organization Science, 14: 264-282.
- Hannan, M.T., & Freeman, J. 1989. *Organizational ecology*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Haunschild, P.R., & Sullivan, B.N. 2002. Learning from complexity: Effects of prior accidents and incidents on airlines' learning. Administrative Science Quarterly 47: 609-643.
- Ingram, P., & Baum, J.A. 1997. Chain affiliation and the failure of Manhattan hotels, 1898-1980. Administrative Science Quarterly, 42: 68-102
- Miner, A.S., Amburgey, T.L. & Stearns, T.M. 1990. "Interorganizational linkages and population dynamics: Buffering and transformational shields." Administrative Science Quarterly, 35: 689-713.
- Singh, J.V., & Lumsden, C.J. 1990. Theory and research in organizational ecology. Annual Review of Sociology, 16: 161-195.
- Wade, J.B. 1996. A Community Level Analysis of Sources and Rates of Technological Variation in the Microprocessor Market." AMJ 39:1218-1244.

The Art of Reviewign and Writing Theory

- *Lepak, D.P, 2009. What is good reviewing. Academy of Management Review, 34, 3: 375-381.
- *Wilcox-King, A., Lepak, D.P., 2011. Mythbuding – what we hear and what we've learned about AMR. Academy of Managemnt Review, 36, 2, 207-214.
- *Harrison, D., 2002. Obligations and obfuscations in the review process. Academy of Management Journal. 48, p1079-1084
- *Bedeian, A.G., 2004. Peer review and the social construction of knowledge in the management discipline. Academy of Management Learning and Education. 3, 198-216
- *Ketchen, D. 2002. Some candid thoughts on the publication process. Journal of Management, 28, p585-590

Issues and Perspectives

- *Felin, R. & Foss, N.J. 2009. Social reality, the boundaries of self-fulfilling prophecy, and economics. Organization Science, 20 (3): 654-668.
- *Ferraro, F., Pfeffer, J., & Sutton, R.I. 2009. How and why theories matter: A comment on Felin and Foss (2009). Organization Science, 20 (3) 69-675.
- *Felin, R. & Foss, N.J. 2009. Performativity of Theory, Arbitrary Conventions, and Possible worlds: A reality check. . Organization Science, 20 (3): 678.
- *Whetten, D.A., Felin, T., & King, B.G., 2009. The practice of theory borrowing in orgnaizaional studies: Current issues and future directions. Journal of Management, 35 (3): 537-563
- *Felin, T., & Hesterly, W.S., 2007. The knowledge-based view, nested heterogeneity, and new value creation: Philosophical considerations on the locus of knowledge. Academy of Managemetn Review, 32 (1): 195-218.

