

**THE UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA AT GREENSBORO**  
**The Bryan School of Business and Economics**  
**Department of Management**  
**Fall 2024**  
**TUESDAY 8:00-9:30/10:00PM**

**COURSE NUMBER:** BUS 720  
**COURSE TITLE:** Seminar in Organization Theory  
**CREDITS:** 3:3  
**PREREQUISITES:** None  
**FOR WHOM PLANNED:** PhD Students in The Bryan School

**INSTRUCTOR INFORMATION:**

**Professor:** Dr. Moses Acquaaah  
**Office:** 364 Bryan Building  
**Telephone:** 336-334-5305 (Office)  
336-334-5691 (Dept. of Management Office)  
**Email Address:** [acquaaah@uncg.edu](mailto:acquaaah@uncg.edu)  
**Office Hours:** By Appointment

---

## **GENERAL COURSE MATERIALS AND READINGS**

Articles and book selections that I will provide you, or that are readily available to you online.

### ***Books***

1. Scott, W.R. & Davis, G.F. (2007). *Organizations & Organizing: Rational, Natural and Open System Perspectives*, 1st Edition. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Prentice Hall.
2. Pfeffer, J. (1997). *New Directions for Organization Theory: Problems and Prospects*. Oxford University Press. Chapters 1 and 9.
3. North, D. (1990). *Institutions, Institutional Change and Economic Performance*. New York: Norton.
4. Greenwood, R., Oliver, C., Lawrence, T. B., & Meyer, R. E. (2017). *The SAGE Handbook of Organizational Institutionalism*. London, U.K.: SAGE Publications.
5. Smith, K. G., & Hitt, M. A. (2005). *Great Minds in Management: The Process of Theory Development*. Oxford, U.K.: Oxford University Press.
6. Pfeffer, J., & Salancik, G.R. (2003). *The external control of organizations: A Resource Dependence Perspective*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

## CATALOG DESCRIPTION

Examines the theory and research related to organizations, including theories that cross micro/macro boundaries and represent novel contributions from organizational perspectives; the history and development of research on organizations.

## COURSE DESCRIPTION

**“Science, like all creative activity, is exploration, gambling, and adventure. It does not lend itself very well to neat blueprints, detailed road maps, and central planning. Perhaps that’s why it’s fun.”<sup>1</sup> (Herb Simon, 1964).**

Organization theory is a multi-disciplinary field that spans several social science disciplines (e.g., sociology, education, political science, economics, psychology, etc.). It covers approaches that explain how organizations emerge, survive and grow, interact with each other, recruit and process members, gain and manage resources, and deal with both internal and external challenges. The primary objective of this Ph.D. seminar is to introduce and survey the major theoretical paradigms and perspectives studied in organization theory (OT) research. Students will be exposed to diverse approaches or strand of OT research, which they will be asked to interrogate and compare. The course will be organized as a doctoral seminar. Our principal activities will include critical discussion of assigned articles and how these can inform our own nascent and ongoing research interests. Students must be prepared to develop their own framework of understanding the multiple strands of organization theory. The expectation is that each student will develop the critical skills necessary to evaluate different kinds of research, and that each student will leave the class able to contribute significantly to the on-going conversations among organization theorists.

## STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES

Upon successful completion of this course students will be able to:

1. Analyze and differentiate the central perspectives of organizational theory.
2. Examine the development of organizational theory as a field of study.
3. Apply theoretical perspectives in organization theory to develop an appropriate research design for evaluating issues confronting organizations.
4. Evaluate and critique current analytical techniques used in the study of organizations.

---

<sup>1</sup>Simon, H. A. 1964. Approaching the theory of management. In H. Koontz (Ed.), *Toward a unified theory of management*: 73-85. New York: McGraw-Hill.

## TEACHING METHODS AND ASSIGNMENTS FOR ACHIEVING LEARNING OUTCOMES

### 1. Research Proposal (40%) (SLOs1, 2, 3, & 4)

The research proposal provides each student the opportunity to conceive and plan a study on some issue within the domain of the course. This will include original research proposal focusing on the topical areas in the course or utilizing one or more of the theoretical perspectives discussed in the course. The research project could also be a replication and extension of an empirical paper using one of the theoretical perspectives discussed in the course. When completed, the research proposal should become the basis of a conference paper, publishable paper, or the foundation for dissertation research. It should be aimed at either adding new knowledge to the organization theory field or bring a new perspective to existing findings.

**Format:** This research proposal should adhere to the format and submission guidelines provided by the Academy of Management Journal (<https://aom.org/research/publishing-with-aom/author-resources/editorial-style-guides>), and should be organized as follows:

1. An abstract, which must be 100 words or less.
2. An **“Introduction”** section where you identify the existing “conversation” you are joining, what is missing from this conversation, how you intend to fill that gap(s), and your contribution to the literature. If your first two pages do not clearly explain your point, and why it is important, most readers will lose interest – especially reviewers.
3. A **“Theory”** section where you review the literature needed to put your contribution into perspective. Then develop, explain, and justify your unique contribution. A complete theory would include three main elements – *what causes what, why and how, and under what conditions*:
  - a. *What causes what?* An empirically falsifiable predictions (or hypotheses), with independent and dependent variables that are clearly articulated and defined.
  - b. *Why and how?* A logical and internally consistent causal mechanism, which provides a bridge or a process through which the assumptions and boundary conditions provided in part (c) below will lead naturally to the predictions (hypotheses) provided in part (a) above.
  - c. *Under what conditions?* A clear statement of the bare minimum set of assumptions and boundary conditions that must be fulfilled for the causal mechanism in part (b) above to apply, and for the prediction in part (a) above to be derived.
  - d. Provide a conceptual diagram of your model, indicating the causal relationships among the constructs.
  - e. Provide your paper’s contribution to the literature. Because it is nearly impossible to develop a complete, new, full-blown, or paradigm-shifting

theory in the space you will have, you may prefer to aim for making a smaller “bite-sized” contribution to theory, such as:

- i. Articulating a theory’s hidden assumptions or boundary constraints.
  - ii. Examining interesting special cases, where more and/or stronger predictions can be derived under additional assumptions or boundary constraints.
  - iii. Finding inconsistencies within a theory.
  - iv. Articulating previously overlooked points of inconsistency between theories.
  - v. Introducing a new construct or variable.
  - vi. Questioning an existing conceptual construct or variable.
  - vii. Deriving new predictions from an old theory (or theories).
  - viii. Synthesizing multiple theories, where the combined whole differs from the sum of the parts – i.e., interaction effects, where the combination of theories generates new and different predictions.
  - ix. Extending a theory, by considering the consequences of relaxing restrictive assumptions or boundary constraints.
  - x. Importing theories, constructs, or variables across levels of analysis.
4. A “**Methodology**” section in which you describe a research design that would be appropriate for testing your research question(s) or idea(s), using data that could realistically be collected, organized, and analyzed within a one-year time horizon (considering the financial constraints, data access constraints, and time constraints on a typical doctoral student). Although this section will most likely consider *how* and *where* you might collect data, it is nevertheless possible that the relevant data might be readily available (e.g., in public databases or in data sets already collected by other researchers), in which case you are strongly encouraged to go ahead and perform the actual data analysis and report the results in the paper, in a separate “**Results**” section.
  5. Length: Less is more. You have specified page limits (20 pages inclusive of everything) that will push you to be very concise – this can be a special challenge.

**Schedule.** You should start thinking about your topic early in the semester, and you should discuss your initial thoughts with me, so I can point you towards related work. If your desired topic is covered late in the semester, you will need to read ahead to get started. This research proposal will probably require you to do additional reading beyond what I have provided in the syllabus. To help you structure and pace your work on the research proposal, you must submit work-in-progress outcomes as outlined below:

1. The research proposal topic must be tentatively approved by me by **11:59pm on 9/17/2024**, via e-mail.
2. First draft of the research proposal must be submitted to Canvas by **11:59pm on 10/22/2024**. I will provide brief developmental feedback on the draft. This draft will constitute 5% (out of the 40%) grade for the final proposal.
3. The completed final research proposal is due by **11:59p.m. on Monday, 11/26/2024**. Submit the final research proposal to Canvas. This will constitute 35% (out of the 40%) grade for the final proposal.

There will be no incomplete grades given except in special circumstances. Students are advised to consult me before thinking about using the special circumstances provision to request for an Incomplete grade. If you want to further develop and polish the research proposal, you are encouraged to do so after the end of the semester, but this additional work will NOT be graded by using the “incomplete” grade to extend the deadline for the semester’s project.

## **2. Topics Discussion Leadership (20%) (SLOs 1, 2, & 4)**

Doctoral seminars in management are based on discussions, so it is critical for students to learn how to lead a discussion session on a topic. This skill is essential for presenting existing ideas, creating an environment for developing new ideas and learning how to teach effectively. We will be discussing eight (8) major topics in the course, so I have randomly formed three (3) Discussion Groups of three (3) or four (4) students in the class and each group would be responsible for leading **TWO** of the synchronous sessions as Session Leaders starting on **9/3/2024** (See Topical Outline and Course Schedule). I expect every member of the group to be involved in leading the discussion of the readings. You will find your Discussion Group membership by going to **People → Discussion Groups** in Canvas. The Session Leaders must focus on the readings designated as “**Required Readings**”, however, to gain a deeper understanding of the topic, they may have to read some of the “**Further Readings**”. I will be leading the first synchronous session in discussing the readings on “**Overview of Organization Theory & Building Theory in Organization Studies**” on **8/20/2024**. The Session Leaders should assume that every student in the class has read the articles designated as “*Required Readings*” for that session, so their role is primarily to generate discussion, not to provide a lecture or a summary. Thus, the role of the Session Leader is to create an engaging environment which facilitates participation, sharing of ideas, the generation of novel research questions, and the integration of the ideas in the papers under the topic. Some of the questions the Session Leaders may consider and get the class to discuss the topics include (but not limited to) the following:

- (a) Why is this topic important from a theoretical and/or practical perspective?
- (b) What is the historical development and status of the topic?
- (c) Why is the theory involved so important in understanding this topic?
- (d) What are the similarities and differences in the stories, theoretical perspectives, approaches, methods, and conclusions derived from the articles?
- (e) What are the issues, challenges and dilemmas raised in the readings?
- (f) What do you see as the future directions of this topic?

The Session Leaders would be required to submit the materials they would be using in leading the discussions (e.g., PowerPoint slides or handouts) to Canvas by **6:00p.m. on the day of the session**. The assessment of the discussion leadership will be based on the Session Leaders’ level of understanding of the readings in the assigned topics and their ability to engage the class in discussing the topics.

I have created discussion Forums for each of the topics in Canvas (See Pinned Discussions) to encourage discussions of the readings before and after the Synchronous Sessions.

### **3. Paper Reviews and Critiques (20%) (SLOs 1, 2, & 4)**

Over the course of the semester, you will be reading a lot of articles. You will be required to submit **two** published paper reviews from the list of articles from the “*Required Readings*” we will discuss in the class. In reviewing a paper, your job is to identify the extent of the paper’s contribution.

You may consider the following basic structure for the paper reviews/critiques:

1. Identify the gap(s) in the literature that the paper addresses. Is there a gap the paper fills, and is the gap interesting and important? Are there ways that the gap could be better or more-clearly identified?
2. Identify how the paper fill the gap(s). Is the theoretical claim in the paper compelling and logically consistent? That is, do you buy the theory proposed? Why or why not? Are there ways that the theory might be strengthened or is there another theory that is more appropriate?
3. What are the major findings of the paper? What contribution does the paper’s findings make to the literature in the area?
4. For empirical papers — In addition to the three (3) points above, identify the extent to which the statistical methodology used in the paper provides a compelling test of the theory. Is the empirical context appropriate to test the theory? Are the theoretical constructs well matched to the empirical variables? Do you believe that the empirical results provide evidence that tends to support the theory? What might you have done to improve the empirical test?

You may select any **two** papers you wish (from two different sessions except the sessions your group is assigned to lead) to write your reviews/critiques. Your reviews should be 1-2 pages (single-spaced and font size 11 and above) and they are due at **11:59 pm on the day before the synchronous session for that specific topic**. For example, if you select a paper to be discussed during Synchronous Session 2 (Behavioral Decision Making (Carnegie School) & Organizational Learning), then that paper’s review/critique is due at **11:59pm on Monday, 9/2/2024**. You must submit the review (in Word document) to me via Canvas and all your classmates via email. Late papers will not be accepted. I will use the date stamp in Canvas to determine when the assignment was submitted.

### **4. Online Class Participation in Paper Discussions (20%) (SLOs 2, 3 & 4)**

The quality of learning in a doctoral seminar depends on the interactions of the students in the class. Consequently, you would be required take an active role in participating in

the discussion of the reading materials in the online synchronous portion of the course. You must read all the assigned articles that are designated “*Required Readings*” and be prepared to discuss the salient issues in the articles. Try to dig deeper into the articles and ask questions like:

- (a) What is missing?
- (b) What relevant questions are not answered?
- (c) What are the article’s broader implications?
- (d) What assumptions does this perspective make about people? Firms? Markets/Industries?
- (e) How tenable are those assumptions?
- (f) You might also want to compare the articles discussing a topic on the questions above: How are these articles similar or different?
- (g) What studies should be done to develop theory in the area under discussion?

The award of class participation points would be based on the quality of the contribution to the online discussions. I will provide class participation points during each of the synchronous discussions of the readings.

## EVALUATION AND GRADING

Students will be evaluated as follows:

<b>Assignment</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
Research Proposal (Initial Draft & Final Paper)	40
Topics Discussion Leadership	20
Paper Reviews and Critiques	20
Online Class Participation	20
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>100</b>

The following grading scale will be used in this course:

<b>Percentage</b>	<b>Grade</b>
94 – 100	A
90 – 93.99	A-
86 – 89.99	B+
82 – 85.99	B
78 – 81.99	B-
70 – 77.99	C
< 70	F

## ACADEMIC INTEGRITY POLICY

All submitted assignments must be accompanied by the statement “I have abided by UNCG Academic Integrity Policy on this assignment” and the student’s signature and date. For more information on the UNCG Academic Integrity Policy go to: <https://drive.google.com/file/d/0B0rFGGhJvbDHUEXSZmFFaWFmb00/view>.

### Generative Artificial Intelligence (GAI) Use

Students are invited to use GAI platforms to help prepare for assignments and projects (e.g., to help with brainstorming or to see what a completed essay might look like). I also welcome you to use GAI tools to help revise and edit your work (e.g., to help identify flaws in reasoning, spot confusing or underdeveloped paragraphs, or to simply fix citations). When submitting work, students must clearly identify any writing, text, or media generated by GAI. This can be done in a variety of ways. In this course, parts of essays generated by GAI should appear in a different colored font, and the relationship between those sections and student contributions should be discussed in cover letters that accompany the essay submission. (Adapted from the University of Iowa)

## FINAL EXAMINATION

There would be no final examination. Students will submit a final research proposal.

## ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS

### Synchronous Sessions

There will be seven (7) synchronous sessions where we will meet to discuss the assigned topic for the previous week (except Synchronous Session 1). For example, in the Synchronous Session 2, Week 3 (September 3, 2024), we will be discussing Week 2’s topic – ***Behavioral Decision Making (Carnegie School) & Organizational Learning***. Please read the required readings materials in detail so that we will be able to have an informative discussion of the topics. Because, the synchronous sessions are considered live class sessions, I would request that during the synchronous sessions all students activate their videos just like we are physically in a classroom.

### Email Policy

UNCG requires that students use their university email address to communicate with the university, so use your UNCG email address to communicate with me and check that email regularly.



## TOPICAL OUTLINE AND COURSE SCHEDULE

Week	Date	Topic	Discussion Group	Assignment & Deliverables
1	8/20	<b>Synchronous Session 1</b> Overview of Organization Theory & Building Theory in Organization Studies	All	Complete the required readings for Week 1 before the class.
2	8/27	Behavioral Decision Making (BDM) (Carnegie School) & Organizational Learning (OL)		Complete the required readings for BDM & OL.
3	9/3	<b>Synchronous Session 2</b> Behavioral Decision Making (Carnegie School) & Organizational Learning	1	<i>Paper Reviews/Critique</i> Due on Monday, <b>9/2/24 at 11:59 pm</b>
4	9/10	Contingency Theory		Complete the required readings for Contingency Theory.
5	9/17	<b>Synchronous Session 3</b>  Contingency Theory	2	<i>Paper Reviews/Critique</i> Due on Monday, <b>9/16/24 at 11:59 pm</b>  <i>Deadline to Submit Research Proposal Topic for Approval</i> <b>9/17/2024 by 11:59pm</b>
6	9/24	Institutional Theory		Complete the required readings for Institutional Theory
7	10/1	<b>Synchronous Session 4</b>  Institutional Theory	3	<i>Paper Reviews/Critique</i> Due on Monday,

				<b>9/30/24 at 11:59 pm</b>
8	10/8	Resource Dependency Theory		Complete the required readings for Resource Dependency Theory.
9	10/15	<b>Synchronous Session 5</b> Resource Dependency Theory	1	<i>Paper Reviews/Critique</i> Due on Monday, <b>10/14/24 at 11:59 pm</b>
10	10/22	Organizational Ecology		Complete the required readings for Organizational Ecology.  <i>First Draft of Research Proposal</i> Due at <b>10/22/2024 by 11:59 pm</b>
11	10/29	<b>Synchronous Session 6</b> Organizational Ecology	2	<i>Paper Reviews/Critique</i> Due on Monday, <b>10/28/24 at 11:59 pm</b>
12	11/5	Organizational Networks and Social Capital		Complete the required readings for Organizational Networks & Social Capital.
13	11/12	<b>Synchronous Session 7</b> Organizational Networks and Social Capital	3	<i>Paper Reviews/Critique</i> Due on Monday, <b>11/11/24 at 11:59 pm</b>
14	11/19	Work on Final Research Proposal		
15	11/26	Final Research Proposal Due		Final Research Proposal Due at <b>11/26/24 by 11:59 pm</b>

## READING LIST

For students who have an interest in any topic, I am happy to provide further reading recommendations.

### Week 1A: Introduction and Overview of Organization Theory

#### *Required Readings:*

1. Scott, W. R. & Davis, G. F. (2007). Chapter 1: "The subject is organizations; The Verb is Organizing", pp. 1-34.
2. Pfeffer, J. 1993. Barriers to the advance of organizational science: Paradigm development as a dependent variable. *Academy of Management Review*, 18: 599-620.
3. Barley, S. 2016. 60th Anniversary Essay: Ruminations on how we became a mystery house and how we might get out. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 61(1) 1-8.
4. Lounsbury, M., & Beckman, C. M. 2015. Celebrating organization theory. *Journal of Management Studies*, 52(2): 288-308.

#### *Further Reading*

- Scott, W. R. 2004. Reflections on a half-century of organizational sociology. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 30: 1-21.
- 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.
- Pfeffer, J. 1997. *New directions for organization theory: Problems and prospects*. Oxford University Press. Chapters 1 and 9.

### Week 1B: Building Theory in Organization Studies

#### *Required Readings:*

1. Whetten, D. A. (1989). What constitutes a theoretical contribution? *Academy of Management Review*, 14(4): 490-495.
2. Bartunek, J.M., Rynes, S., & Ireland, R. D. (2006). What Makes Management Research Interesting, and Why Does It Matter? *Academy of Management Journal*, 49(1): 9-15
3. Sudabny, R. (2014). Editor's comment: Why Theory? *Academy of Management Review*, 39(4): 407-411.
4. Sutton, R. I., & Staw, B. M. (1995). What theory is not. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 40(3): 371-384.

#### *Further Reading*

- Suddaby, R., Hardy, C. & Huy, Q.N. 2011. Where are the new theories of organization? *Academy of Management Review*, 36(2): 236-246.
- 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.

## **Weeks 2 & 3: Behavioral Decision Making (Carnegie School) & Organizational Learning**

### *Required Readings:*

1. Cohen, M.D., March, J.G., & Olsen, J.P. 1972. A garbage can model of organizational choice. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 17: 1-25.
2. Levitt, B. & March, J. G. 1988. Organizational Learning. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 14:319-340.
3. March, J. G. 1991. Exploration and Exploitation in Organizational Learning. *Organization Science*, 2(1):71-87.
4. Easterby-Smith, M., Crossan, M., & Nicolini, D. (2000). Organizational Learning: Debates Past, Present and Future. *Journal of Management Studies*, 37(6):783-796.

### *Further Readings:*

- Levinthal, D. A. & Rerup, C. 2006. Crossing an apparent chasm: bridging mindful and less-mindful perspectives on organizational learning. *Organization Science*, 17(4): 502-513.
- Fiol, C. M., & Lyles, M. A. (1985). Organizational Learning. *Academy of Management Review*, 10(4): 803-813.

## **Weeks 4 & 5: Contingency Theory**

### *Required Readings*

1. Van de Ven, A. H., Ganco, M., & Hinings, C. R. (2013) Returning to the Frontier of Contingency Theory of Organizational and Institutional Designs. *The Academy of Management Annals*, 7:1, 393-440.
2. Lawrence, P.R., & Lorsch, J.W. (1967). Differentiation and integration in complex organizations. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 12: 1-47.
3. Schoonhoven, C.B. (1981). Problems with contingency theory: Testing assumptions hidden within the language of contingency theory. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 26(3):349-377.
4. Yasai-Ardekani, M., & Nystrom, P. (1996). Designs for Environmental Scanning Systems: Tests of a Contingency Theory. *Management Science*, 42(2): 187-204.

#### Further Readings:

- Child, J. (1972). Organizational structure, environment and performance: The role of strategic choice. *Sociology*, 6(1):1-22.
- Birkinshaw, J., Nobel, R., & Ridderstråle, J. (2002) Knowledge as a Contingency Variable: Do the Characteristics of Knowledge Predict Organization Structure? *Organization Science*, 13(3):274-289.
- 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.
- Payne, G.T. (2006). Examining configurations and firm performance in a suboptimal equifinality context. *Organization Science*, 17(6): 756-770.

### Weeks 6 & 7: Institutional Theory

#### Required Readings

1. Scott, W. R. (1987). The Adolescence of Institutional Theory. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 32:493-511.
2. Meyer, J. W., and Rowan, (1977). Institutionalized organizations: Formal structure as myth and Ceremony. *American Journal of Sociology*, 83: 340-363
3. DiMaggio, P.J. and W.W. Powell. 1983. The iron cage revisited: Institutional isomorphism and collective rationality in organizational fields. *American Sociological Review*, 48(2), 147-160.
4. Marquis, C., & Raynard, M. (2015). Institutional Strategies in Emerging Markets. *The Academy of Management Annals*, 9(1): 291-335.

#### Further Readings:

- Meyer, J. W. (2017). Reflections on Institutional Theories of Organizations. In Greenwood, R., C. Oliver, T. B. Lawrence, & R. E. Meyer, (Eds). *The SAGE Handbook of Organizational Institutionalism*. London, U.K.: SAGE Publications (Chapter 32; pp. 831 - 852).
- North, D. (1990). *Institutions, Institutional change and economic performance*. New York: Norton.
- Peng, M. W. (2003). Institutional transitions and strategic choices. *Academy of Management Review*, 28(2): 275-296.
- Dacin, M. T., Goldstein, Scott, W. R. (2002). Institutional Theory and Institutional Change: Introduction to the Special Research Forum. *Academy of Management Journal*, 45(1): 45-56.
- Scott, W. R. (2005). Institutional Theory: Contributing to a theoretical research paradigm. In K. G. Smith and M. A. Hitt (Eds.). *Great Minds in Management: the process of theory development*. Oxford, U.K.: Oxford University Press (Chapter 22; pp. 460-484).

## **Weeks 8 & 9: Resource Dependency Theory**

### *Required Readings*

1. Pfeffer, J., & Salancik, G.R. (2003). The external control of organizations: A Resource Dependence Perspective. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press. Introduction to the Classic Edition (pp. xi-xxix).
2. Casciaro, T., & Mikolaj, J.P. (2005). Power imbalance, mutual dependence, and constraint absorption: A closer look at resource dependence theory. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 50: 167-199.
3. Wry, T., Cobb, J. A., & Aldrich, H. E. (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): 441-488.
4. Hillman, A.J., Shropshire, C., & Cannella, A.A. (2007). Organizational predictors of women on corporate boards. *Academy of Management Journal*, 50(4): 941-952.

### *Further Readings*

- Emerson, R.M. (1962). Power-dependence relations. *American Sociological Review*, 27: 31-41.
- Pfeffer, J., & Salancik, G.R. (2003). The external control of organizations: A Resource Dependence Perspective. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press. Chapters 1-3.
- Salancik, G. R., & Pfeffer, J. (1974). The Bases and Use of Power in Organizational Decision Making: The Case of a University. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 19: 453-473.
- Pfeffer, J., & Salancik, G. R. (1974). Organizational Decision Making as a Political Process: The Case of a University Budget. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 19: 135-151.
- Davis, G. F. & Cobb, J. A. (2010). Resource Dependence Theory: Past and Future. *Research in the Sociology of Organizations*, 28: 21-42.

## **Weeks 10 & 11: Organizational Ecology**

### *Required Readings*

1. Hannan, M.T., & Freeman, J. (1977). The population ecology of organizations. *American Journal of Sociology*, 82: 929-964.
2. Hannan, M.T., & Freeman, J. (1984). Structural inertia and organizational change. *American Sociological Review*, 49: 149-164.

3. Young, R.C. 1988. Is population ecology a useful paradigm for the study of organizations? *American Journal of Sociology*, 94: 1-24.
4. 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.

#### *Further Readings*

- Hannan, M. T., & Freeman, J. *Organizational ecology* (Ch. 1: Organizations and social structure, pp. 3-27.) Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Hannan, M. T., & Freeman, J. *Organizational ecology* (Ch. 2: Theoretical background, pp. 28-44.) Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- 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.
- Freeman, J., & Hannan, M.T. (1989). Setting the record straight on organizational ecology: Rebuttal to Young. *American Journal of Sociology*, 95: 425-439.
- Brittain, J., & Wholey, D.R. (1989). Assessing organizational ecology as sociological theory: Comment on Young. *American Journal of Sociology*, 95: 439-444.
- Singh, J.V., & Lumsden, C.J. (1990). Theory and research in organizational ecology. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 16: 161-195.

### **Weeks 12 & 13: Organizational Networks and Social Capital**

#### *Required Readings*

1. Granovetter, M.S. (1985). Economic action and social structure: The problem of embeddedness. *American Journal of Sociology*, 91: 481-510.
2. Uzzi, B. (1997). Social structure and competition in interfirm networks: The paradox of embeddedness. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 42: 35-67.
3. Adler, P.S., & Kwon, S. (2002). Social capital: Prospects for a new concept. *Academy of Management Review*, 27: 17-40.
4. Acquaah, M. (2007). Managerial social capital, strategic orientation, and organizational performance in an emerging economy. *Strategic Management Journal*, 28: 1235-1255.

#### *Further Readings*

- Granovetter, M.S. (1973). The strength of weak ties. *American Journal of Sociology*, 78 (6):1360-1380.

- Coleman, J.S. (1988). Social capital in the creation of human capital. *American Journal of Sociology*, 94: s95-s121.
- Uzzi, B. (1996). The sources and consequences of embeddedness for the economic performance of organizations: The network effect. *American Sociological Review*, 61: 674-698.
- Portes, A. & Sensenbrenner, J. (1993). Embeddedness and immigration: Notes on the social determinants of economic action. *American Journal of Sociology*, 98: 1320-1350.
- Jensen, M. 2003. —The role of network resources in market entry: commercial banks' entry into investment banking, 1991-1997. *Administrative Science Quarterly* 48: 466-497.
- Nahapiet, J. & Ghoshal, S. (1998). Social Capital, Intellectual Capital, and the Organizational Advantage. *Academy of Management Review*, 23(2): 242-266.
- Kwon, S. & Adler, P. S. (2014). Social capital: Maturation of a field of research. *Academy of Management Review*, 39(4): 412-422.
- Moran, P. (2005). Structural vs. Relational Embeddedness: Social Capital and Managerial Performance. *Strategic Management Journal*, 26(12): 1129-1151.