

Organizational Theory
BUS 87201-PhD Seminar
Spring 2022: Fridays from 10am-noon (Hybrid)
NVC 9-215, Zoom [Link](#)

[Jared L. Peifer](#), PhD

Associate Professor

Baruch College, Paul Narendra Loomba Department of Management

Newman Vertical Campus: 9-261

Office hours: Email me <jpeifer@baruch.cuny.edu> and we'll find a time to meet.

Course Description

This is a doctoral seminar in organization theory. The purpose of the class is to familiarize aspiring researchers with the major bodies of thought in the field. The course covers both classic and contemporary writings. It is intended to help you develop a schema for understanding organizations and organization-environment relations. Through this course students should develop a sensibility that allows them to understand organizations as distinct entities and not just as collections of individuals.

Buy this book

- Scott, W. Richard and Gerald F. Davis (2007). *Organizations and Organizing: Rational, Natural, and Open System Perspectives*. New York: Taylor and Francis. (ISBN-13: 978-0131958937). **Note, previous versions of this text with only Scott as the author are NOT acceptable.*

The remaining articles and book chapters are available from the library or can be retrieved from eReserve.

https://guides.newman.baruch.cuny.edu/er.php?course_id=84025

password: peifer87201

Course Schedule

	Date	Topic
1	1/28 F2F	<p>Introduction</p> <p>Burrell, G., & Morgan, G. 1979. <i>Sociological Paradigms and Organizational Analysis</i>. Portsmouth, New Hampshire: Heinemann. Chapters 1-3.</p> <p>Scott and Davis. 2007. Chapter 1. The Subject is Organizations; The Verb is Organizing. 1-34.</p> <p>Thompson, J. D. 1956. On Building an Administrative Science. <i>Administrative Science Quarterly</i>, 1(1): 102–111.</p>
2	2/4 online	<p>Rational Systems</p> <p>Scott and Davis. 2007. Chapter 2. Organizations as Rational Systems.</p> <p>Taylor, F. 1919. <i>The Principles of Scientific Management</i>. New York and London: Harper & Brothers Publishers (pg. 30-59).</p> <p>Scott and Davis. 2007. Chapter 7. Labor and Structure (pg. 158-163)</p> <p>Boje, D. M., & Winsor, R. D. 1993. The Resurrection of Taylorism: Total Quality Management’s Hidden Agenda. <i>Journal of Organizational Change Management</i>, 6(4): 57–70.</p>
3	2/8 (Tuesday) online	<p>Natural Systems</p> <p>Scott and Davis. 2007. Chapter 3. Organizations as Natural Systems</p> <p>Krygier, M. 2012. <i>Philip Selznick: Ideals in the World</i>. Stanford University Press. Chapter 3 and 4. (eBook available at Newman Library)</p> <p>Perrow, C. 1991. A Society of Organizations. <i>Theory and Society</i>, 20(6): 725–762.</p>
	2/11	College Closed-No Class

4	2/18 online	<p>Open Systems</p> <p>Scott and Davis. 2007. Chapter 4. Organizations as Open Systems</p> <p>Stinchcombe, A. L. 1965. Social Structure and Organizations. <i>Handbook of Organizations</i>: 142–193. Chicago: Rand McNally.</p> <p>Weick, K. E., Sutcliffe, K. M., & Obstfeld, D. 2005. Organizing and the Process of Sensemaking. <i>Organization Science</i>, 16(4): 409–421.</p> <p>Amdam, R. P., & Elias, A. L. 2021. Business Schools and the Role of the Executives' Wives. <i>Academy of Management Learning & Education</i>, 20(3): 300–319.</p>
5	2/25 F2F Proposal Due Proposal presentation for Non-MGT students	<p>Carnegie School and Loose Coupling</p> <p>March, J. G., & Simon, H. A. 1958. <i>Organizations</i>. New York, NY: Wiley. Chapter 6.</p> <p>Cohen, M. D., March, J. G., & Olsen, J. P. 1972. A Garbage Can Model of Organizational Choice. <i>Administrative Science Quarterly</i>, 17(1): 1–25.</p> <p>Weick, K. E. 1976. Educational Organizations as Loosely Coupled Systems. <i>Administrative Science Quarterly</i>, 21(1): 1–19.</p> <p>Greve, H. R. 1998. Performance, Aspirations, and Risky Organizational Change. <i>Administrative Science Quarterly</i>, 43(1): 58–86.</p>
6	3/4 online	<p>Institutional Theory: Introduction</p> <p>Meyer, J. W., & Rowan, B. 1977. Institutionalized Organizations: Formal Structure as Myth and Ceremony. <i>American Journal of Sociology</i>, 83(2): 340–363.</p> <p>DiMaggio, P. J., & Powell, W. W. 1983. The Iron Cage Revisited: Institutional Isomorphism and Collective Rationality in Organizational Fields. <i>American Sociological Review</i>, 48(2): 147–160.</p> <p>Suchman, M. C. 1995. Managing Legitimacy: Strategic and Institutional Approaches. <i>Academy of Management Review</i>, 20(3): 571–610.</p> <p>Dobbin, F., Sutton, J. R., Meyer, J. W., & Scott, R. 1993. Equal Opportunity Law and the Construction of Internal Labor Markets. <i>American Journal of Sociology</i>, 99(2): 396–427.</p>

7	3/11 online	<p>Sets and Organizations</p> <p>Ragin, C. C. 2008. <i>Redesigning Social Inquiry: Fuzzy Sets and Beyond</i>. Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press. Chapters 1-5.</p> <p>Fiss, P. C. 2007. A set-theoretic approach to organizational configurations. <i>Academy of Management Review</i>, 32(4): 1180–1198.</p> <p>Crilly, D., Zollo, M., & Hansen, M. T. 2012. Faking It or Muddling Through? Understanding Decoupling in Response to Stakeholder Pressures. <i>Academy of Management Journal</i>, 55(6): 1429–1448.</p>
8	3/18 online	<p>Transaction Costs and Resource Dependence</p> <p>Scott and Davis. 2007. Chapter 9. The Dyadic Environment of the Organization.</p> <p>Williamson, O. E. 1981. The Economics of Organization: The Transaction Cost Approach. <i>American Journal of Sociology</i>, 87(3): 548–577.</p> <p>Davis, G., & Cobb, J. A. 2010. Resource Dependence Theory: Past and Future. <i>Research in the Sociology of Organizations</i>, 28: 21–42.</p> <p>Oliver, C. 1990. Determinants of Interorganizational Relationships: Integration and Future Directions. <i>Academy of Management Review</i>, 15(2): 241–265.</p> <p>Casciaro, T., & Piskorski, M. J. 2005. Power Imbalance, Mutual Dependence, and Constraint Absorption: A Closer Look at Resource Dependence Theory. <i>Administrative Science Quarterly</i>, 50(2): 167–199.</p>
9	3/25 F2F Working Draft Due	Interactive Presentations for non-MGT students [MGT students present in Newbert’s class on 3/24)

10	4/1 online	<p>Institutional Theory: Logics, Pluralism and Hybridity</p> <p>Thornton, P. H., Ocasio, W., & Lounsbury, M. 2012. <i>The Institutional Logics Perspective: A New Approach to Culture, Structure, and Process</i>. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press. Chapters 1 and 8.</p> <p>Kraatz, M. S., & Block, E. S. 2008. Organizational Implications of Institutional Pluralism. <i>The Sage Handbook of Organizational Institutionalism</i>, vol. 840: 243–275.</p> <p>Battilana, J., & Silvia Dorado. 2010. Building Sustainable Hybrid Organizations: The Case of Commercial Microfinance Organizations. <i>Academy of Management Journal</i>, 53(6): 1419–1440.</p> <p>Greenwood, R., Raynard, M., Kodeih, F., Micelotta, E. R., & Lounsbury, M. 2011. Institutional Complexity and Organizational Responses. <i>Academy of Management Annals</i>, 5(1): 317–371.</p>
11	4/8 F2F	<p>Institutional Theory: Values in Organizations</p> <p>King, B. G. 2015. Organizational Actors, Character, and Selznick’s Theory of Organizations. <i>Research in the Sociology of Organizations</i>, 44: 149–174.</p> <p>Kraatz, M. S., & Block, E. S. 2017. Institutional Pluralism Revisited. In R. Greenwood, C. Oliver, T. B. Lawrence, & R. E. Meyer (Eds.), <i>Sage Handbook of Organizational Institutionalism</i> (Second Edition).</p> <p>Kraatz, M. S., Flores, R., & Chandler, D. 2020. The Value of Values for Institutional Analysis. <i>Academy of Management Annals</i>, 14(2): 474–512.</p> <p>Risi, D. 2020. Business and Society Research Drawing on Institutionalism: Integrating Normative and Descriptive Research on Values. <i>Business & Society</i>, 000765032092895.</p>
	4/14 No meeting today	Submission due at midnight
	4/15	Spring Break- no class
	4/22	Spring Break- no class

12	4/29 F2F	<p>Institutional Theory: Institutional Entrepreneurship and Field Change</p> <p>Garud, R., Hardy, C., & Maguire, S. 2007. Institutional Entrepreneurship as Embedded Agency: An Introduction to the Special Issue. <i>Organization Studies</i>, 28(7): 957–969.</p> <p>Navis, C., & Glynn, M. A. 2010. How New Market Categories Emerge: Temporal Dynamics of Legitimacy, Identity, and Entrepreneurship in Satellite Radio, 1990–2005. <i>Administrative Science Quarterly</i>, 55(3): 439–471.</p> <p>Hardy, C., & Maguire, S. 2017. Institutional Entrepreneurship and Change in Fields. <i>The SAGE Handbook of Organizational Institutionalism</i>. SAGE Publications.</p> <p>Greenwood, R., Hinings, C. R., & Whetten, D. 2014. Rethinking Institutions and Organizations. <i>Journal of Management Studies</i>, 51(7): 1206–1220.</p>
13	5/6 online	<p>Organizational Ecology</p> <p>Scott, R. W., & Davis, Gerald F. 2007. <i>Organizations and Organizing: Rational, Natural and Open Systems Perspectives</i>. Routledge. Chapter 10.</p> <p>Hannan, M. T., & Freeman, J. 1977. The Population Ecology of Organizations. <i>American Journal of Sociology</i>, 82(5): 929–964.</p> <p>Hannan, M. T., & Freeman, J. 1984. Structural Inertia and Organizational Change. <i>American Sociological Review</i>, 49(2): 149–164.</p> <p>Hsu, G. 2006. Jacks of All Trades and Masters of None: Audiences’ Reactions to Spanning Genres in Feature Film Production. <i>Administrative Science Quarterly</i>, 51(3): 420–450.</p>

14	5/13 online	<p>Networks</p> <p>Granovetter, M. 1985. Economic Action and Social Structure: The Problem of Embeddedness. <i>American Journal of Sociology</i>, 91(3): 481–510.</p> <p>Burt, R. 2005. Chapter 1 in <i>Brokerage and Closure</i>. New York: Oxford University Press</p> <p>Powell, W. W. 2012. Neither Market nor Hierarchy. <i>The Sociology of Organizations: Structures and Relationships</i>, 30–40.</p> <p>Soda, G., Mannucci, P. V., & Burt, R. S. 2021. Networks, Creativity, and Time: Staying Creative through Brokerage and Network Rejuvenation. <i>Academy of Management Journal</i>, 64(4): 1164–1190.</p>
15	5/20 F2f	Final Presentation by non-MGT students [MGT students present in Newbert’s class on May 19]
	5/23	Revision and Response Documents due at 9am

Grading

		Due Date	Points
	Class Participation		15
	Class Leads (1.5x)		3
	Synthesis Papers (12x)		12
Research Paper Components (70 points)	Proposal	Feb 25	5
	Working Draft	March 25	10
	Interactive Presentation	March 25	5
	Original Submission	April 14	15
	Presentation	May 20	10
	Revision	May 23	20
	Response Document	May 23	5
			100

Letter Grade Key

A	93-100
A-	90-92.99
B+	87-89.99
B	83-86.99
B-	80-82.99
C+	77-79.99
C	73-76.99
C-	70-72.99
F	Below 70

Class Participation: This is my subjective evaluation of the contributions you made to the class over the course of the semester.

Class Lead: Each week, one or two students will serve as a discussion leader. The discussion leader is the “head student” for the week. You should be thoroughly familiar of all the assigned readings and be able identify the integrative themes (and divisions) within them. You should also come prepared with some good questions that can serve as the basis for discussion in class. I’d also recommend that you prepare an extended summary of the readings that you can share with your classmates before class. This is an important part of the role. To clarify, your job as discussion leader is not to be the professor for the day or to fully run the class. I will maintain that responsibility. But, you do need to be even more prepared than usual when you are the discussion leader.

Synthesis Papers: To provide you with an extra incentive to keep up with the readings, you will be required to provide a very brief (one page single spaced) summary of the readings. Post your synthesis paper on Blackboard by 9am on the day the class meets. There are no synthesis papers due on January 28, March 25 and May 20. You will not be able to fully summarize each article in one page. Thus, you should focus on identifying and summarizing what you believe to be the integrative themes and “big issues” in the readings for that week. How do the readings hold together? What are the deep questions and big, new insights running through them? How do this week’s readings compare with what we’ve read before? You have wide latitude on this assignment. Just show me that you’ve read the stuff and that you “get it” – or are at least trying to get it.

Research Paper

Each student will write an original research paper on a pre-approved topic within the organizational domain.

[If your paper will be submitted for Newbert's Entrepreneurship class, it must be empirical in nature and include statistical analyses of data (i.e., no descriptive or qualitative studies, and no meta-analyses). Given the constrained timeline in which this paper must be completed, students are strongly encouraged to use publicly-available secondary database.]

Given that a main objective of this assignment is to mirror the actual research process, there will be several deliverables associated with this assignment over the course of the semester:

Proposal: (Due February 25 at 9am, but the sooner the better)

During the first few weeks of the semester, students should think carefully about a topic within the organizational domain. With the instructor's guidance, students will develop a short proposal of about 2 pages (double-spaced, 12-point font, MS Word that specifies the following:

- Title
- Topic – what area in the organizational domain is being explored and why is this of interest to you?
- Objectives – what research questions will be answered?
- Contribution – what gap in the literature is filled by the paper?
- Approach – what literature will the paper draw upon to develop the conceptual model? What hypotheses will be tested? Where will the data come from? How will the data be analyzed?
- Plan – what is the timeline for the work to be done?
- References – cite all references used to support your idea

During class, each student will have a maximum of 10 minutes to present their proposals to their peers in an informal, roundtable-style discussion. Peers and the instructor will then have 15 minutes to provide thoughtful feedback on each proposal with an aim toward improving its focus and rigor.

Working Draft: (due March 25 at 9am, but the sooner the better)

Based on the oral and written feedback provided on the proposal, each student will prepare a working draft of his/her research paper. The working draft should be ~10-15 pages in length (double-spaced, 12-point font, MS Word), with a focus on the "front end."

[In other words, students need not have analyzed their data yet, but should have access to and have begun to explore it, as well as have a plan for how they will code and analyze it.] Thus, working drafts should include the following major sections (note, this is a general guide from which students are free to deviate so long as the requisite information is included):

- Title – choose something informative yet provocative if possible
- Abstract – provide an overview of the research in 100 words or less
- Introduction – make a case for why the research you are conducting is important
- Hypothesis development – review relevant, current literature, identify a theoretical foundation for your conceptual model, explain the causal mechanisms at work, and present the conceptual model visually
- [Method – explain in detail the sample (what database is being used), the measurement model (how will the dependent, independent, and control variables be operationalized), and the empirical approach (how will the data be analyzed)]

To prepare students for future submissions to the top management journal, working drafts must be formatted according to the Academy of Management Journal's [Style Guide for Authors](#).

Interactive Presentation: (March 24 for MGT PhDs/March 25 for others)

Papers that are promising but not quite developed enough for formal presentations are designated to informal, discussion-based presentation sessions at the leading academic conferences. As the research papers at this stage of the course are similarly undeveloped at this point in the semester, and to gain experience in this format of presentation, students will share the main ideas of their working drafts with the instructor and their peers in a 25-minute roundtable discussion. Note, because this is a conversation (i.e., two-way dialogue) rather than a traditional presentation (i.e., one-way dialogue), PowerPoint will not be used to communicate any information except to a visual representation of the model the student intends to test; thus, use only one slide may be used. The goal of this session is for peers and the instructor to offer constructive feedback on how to improve the quality of the research and offer useful suggestions for the work ahead.

Submission: (due April 14 at 9am)

Based on the oral and written feedback provided on the working draft, students will prepare an initial draft of their research paper for submission. This submission should be ~30 pages [for MGT students, ~20 pages for others] all inclusive (double-spaced, 12-point font, MS Word) and include all of the major sections included in the working draft as well as the following:

- [Results – explain what you found and which hypotheses they do/do not support]
- Discussion – explain what the findings mean with respect to your theorizing as well as how they contribute to theory and practice more generally
- Limitations and directions for future research – identify limitations with your study and how they might be improved upon by future scholars
- Conclusion – what is the main takeaway from the study
- References – cite all sources

As with the working draft, students should format their submissions according to the Academy of Management Journal's [Style Guide for Authors](#). Students must upload their submissions to Blackboard no later than the day prior to the class during which they will be presented.

In order to build upon the students' understanding of the peer-review and editorial processes and to provide them experience of responding to critiques of their own research, submissions will be handled as if they were submitted to a journal. Thus, the instructor will provide each student with

a thorough review of his/her submission and render one of the following editorial decisions on it, which will correspond to a grade for the assignment:

Decision	Grade	
Accept	A+	100
Minor Revisions	A	95
Moderate Revisions	B	85
Major Revisions	C	75
Reject	F	0-69

Presentation (May 19 for MGT PhDs/ May 20 for others)

During class, students will present their revised research papers to their peers in a formal research presentation. Consistent with most conference guidelines, each student will have 20 minutes to present their papers (presentations will be timed), and there will be a 10-minute question and answer period. PowerPoint slides must be used; however, they should be used to aid the student in his/her communication of the research and not the other way around.

Revision: (due May 23 at 9am, but the sooner the better)

Based on the written feedback provided on the submission, students will prepare a revised draft of their research paper. This revision is expected to address the concerns outlined in the instructor's decision letter in substantive ways. As with the working draft and submission, students should format their submissions according to the Academy of Management Journal's [Style Guide for Authors](#). As with the submission, the instructor will provide each student with a thorough review of his/her revision and render a second editorial decision on it along with a corresponding grade per the above rubric.

Response Document: (Due May 23 at 9am, but the sooner the better)

The difference between submitting a paper and publishing it is almost always determined by the author's responsiveness to the reviewers and the editor. For good or bad, those who review and edit a paper are the gatekeepers and, thus, authors must respond to their concerns in ways that appease them. This does not mean that authors have to do whatever the reviewers and editors say, but they do need to do most of it and, for those things they choose not to do, they must put forth a defensible (and respectful) argument in support of their non-action. Thus, in order to develop experience and competency in responding to reviewers and editors, students must document, point by point, how they revised their submissions in response to each of the individual concerns raised by the instructor. The response should be parsimonious (i.e., there is no need to cut-and-paste entire sections of the revision to show how the manuscript has evolved) but, at the same time, be specific (i.e., a concise explanation of each change should be provided along with page references to where those changes reside in the revision). While preparing such a document may seem tedious, there are four important reasons for doing so:

- It is standard practice in the field
- It communicates to the reviewers and editors that all of their concerns have been addressed
- It minimizes the likelihood that reviewers and editor will introduce new concerns in future rounds

- It allows the author to present their version of what they did rather than allow reviewers and editors to infer what was done (or not) on their own

Response documents should include each comment made by the instructor, followed immediately by an explanation of the way in which the manuscript was (or was not) revised to address it.

Academic Integrity

Plagiarism and cheating are inimical to maintaining the bonds of trust necessary for academic freedom to flourish. I fully support Baruch College's policy on Academic Honesty, which states, in part:

"Academic dishonesty is unacceptable and will not be tolerated. Cheating, forgery, plagiarism and collusion in dishonest acts undermine the college's educational mission and the students' personal and intellectual growth. Baruch students are expected to bear individual responsibility for their work, to learn the rules and definitions that underlie the practice of academic integrity, and to uphold its ideals. Ignorance of the rules is not an acceptable excuse for disobeying them. Any student who attempts to compromise or devalue the academic process will be sanctioned."

Academic sanctions in this class will range from an F on the assignment to an F in this course. A report of suspected academic dishonesty will be sent to the Office of the Dean of Students. Additional information and definitions can be found at http://www.baruch.cuny.edu/academic/academic_honesty.html.

How to avoid plagiarism: Plagiarism is the act of presenting another person's ideas, research or writing as your own, such as:

- Copying another person's actual words without the use of quotation marks and footnotes (a functional limit is four or more words taken from the work of another)
- Presenting another person's ideas or theories in your own words without acknowledging them
- Using information that is not considered common knowledge without acknowledging the source
- Failure to acknowledge collaborators on homework and laboratory assignment

Your written work may be submitted by the professor to an online plagiarism detection system to ensure that it is yours alone – not from another student, from the web or another source. Be careful not to “copy” phrases or sentences excessively from the readings. Should you use the author’s words, provide quotation marks and a citation.

Working Together: Individual written assignments should be entirely written by the individual. You may discuss ideas together with classmates, but do not share/borrow any sentences or outlines. The written work should be entirely your own.

Students with Disabilities

Baruch College provides reasonable accommodations and modifications for students with disabilities to ensure that no student with a disability is denied the benefits of, is excluded from participation in, or otherwise is subjected to discrimination under the education program or activity operated by the College because of the absence of educational auxiliary aids for students with disabilities. Arrangements for adapting class procedures without compromising course content and standards may take time. Therefore, students who require accommodations or modifications should speak with me as soon as possible. I am available for you to talk with me before or after this class or during my office hours described above.

In order to receive services, you must register with the Office of Services for Students with Disabilities. Documentation is necessary for every disability. For more information concerning services for students with disabilities, please the Office of Services for Students with Disabilities, Vertical Campus Building, One Bernard Baruch Way, 2nd floor, Room 2-270, phone number: 646-312-4590.