MGMT 952: SEMINAR IN MACRO-ORGANIZATIONAL BEHAVIOR

SPRING 2016, QUARTER 3 (January 20 – March 2)

Professor Lori Rosenkopf
3018 Steinberg-Dietrich Hall
8-6723
rosenkopf@wharton.upenn.edu
http://www-management.wharton.upenn.edu/rosenkopf
Canvas site: https://canvas.upenn.edu/courses/1308838
Class meets Wednesdays 10:30-1:30 in 2034 SH-DH)
Office hours by appointment

Organizations are ubiquitous, and so is organization. This half-semester course explores modern organization theory (OT); that is, OT from the 1960s through the end of the 20th century. We will examine the proliferation of several theories of organization during this time period (such as contingency theory, resource dependence theory, ecological theory, and institutional theory) and understand how each theory attempts to relate structure and action over varying levels of analysis. While other topics such as behavioral decision theory, transaction cost theory, and network theory might be logical additions to this syllabus, we do not cover them here as you are exposed to them in MGMT 900, 925, 933 and 935. In addition, there is a companion half-semester course, MGMT 958, which examines topics of the most recent decades, which is offered some years (but not this one). Accordingly, we will include two topics – status and categorization – which exemplify the field's recent focus on mechanisms of organizational action.

For each week, three to five of the listed articles will be chosen as the required readings (** or SKIM on reading list); you should focus your preparation on these articles as these will be the ones discussed in class. Other listed articles may be considered "recommended" for additional reading, but I do not expect you to prepare them for class. Readings are posted on Canvas.

Evaluation is based on four components.

1) Class participation: Like all doctoral seminars, the value we each take from our class sessions is a function of the effort we put into preparation, our willingness to discuss our reactions, and our courage in brainstorming and volunteering ideas even when the topic is challenging. I expect these behaviors from all students in the class. Although I do not assign formal participation grades I will take strong/weak participation into account when aggregating the written work assessments for your final grade.

2) Five reaction papers: In preparation for weeks 2-7, choose one of the required articles and write a 750-word paper describing your reaction to the paper. Use

your two pages to tell us things that you thought about while you were reading the paper. These reactions may describe (but are certainly not limited to) how other schools of thought would approach the problem similarly or differently; how current organizational phenomena may or may not be understood with this lens, what is missing from the paper, and so on. Please don't waste your word quota summarizing what we have already read! Since five reaction papers are required, you are free to skip one week of your choice. Hard copies of the reaction papers are due to me at the start of class.

3) Leading discussion for one article: Choose one of the required articles for which you plan to write a reaction paper. You will be responsible for leading the discussion for this article. You may find it easier to choose one of the empirical papers so that you can build upon our overarching discussion of the classic theoretical articles, but you are welcome to choose a theoretical piece if you prefer. Whatever you choose, choose it for your own development as it is more challenging to lead a discussion than merely to participate in it. I will not grade this component other than to require that you do it once during the course; I will help you as needed during the discussion as well. Sign up on Canvas for your article choice so that we insure each person has a different article.

4) Final paper (due March 4). Choose an organizational problem and develop a "panel discussion" about this problem between two or three prominent scholars representing different schools of organizational thought. Read additional articles by that scholar and by contemporaries that would be likely to influence the scholar's perspective (so you might think of this assignment in the genre of "historical fiction"). The output should resemble a copy of a transcript of an Academy of Management (AoM) symposium. Limit 2500 words. You may work alone or in pairs. Submit your paper via email.

READINGS

Week 1 (January 20): From Classical to Contemporary Organization Theory

(NOTE: January 13 is a Wednesday but the new University calendar deems it a Monday to compensate for the MLK holiday.)

** Stinchcombe, A. 1965. "Social Structure and Organizations" in James G. March (ed.) Handbook of Organizations. Chicago, IL: Rand McNally. 142-193.

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

** Cannella, A.A. & Paetzold, R.L. 1994. Pfeffer's barriers to the advance of organization science: A rejoinder. Academy of Management Review, 19: 331-341.

March, J.G. 1996. Continuity and Change in Theories of Organizational Action. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 41:278-287.

** 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.

Scott, W.R. & Davis, G.F. 2006. Organizations & Organizing: Rational, Natural and Open Systems, 1st Edition. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Prentice Hall.

Week 2 (January 27): Contingency Theory

Burns, T. & Stalker, G.M. 1961. The Management of Innovation. London: Tavistock. Chaps. 1-6.

Woodward, 1965. Industrial Organization Introduction, Chapters 4 and 5

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

SKIM Thompson, J.D. 1967. Organizations in action: Social science bases of administrative theory: Chapters 1-7.

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

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

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

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

SKIM 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.

** Puranam, P., Raveendran, M. & T. Knudsen. 2012. Organization design: The epistemic interdependence perspective. Academy of Management Review 37: 419-440.

Week 3 (February 3): Resource Dependence Theory

Emerson, Richard M. 1962. Power-Dependence Relations. American Sociological Review, 27: 31-41.

** Pfeffer, J. & Salancik, G.R. 1978. *The External Control of Organizations: A Resource Dependence Perspective*. Stanford University Press. (Chapters 1 and 3)

Burt, R.S. 1982. *Corporate Profits and Cooptation.* Academic Press. (Chapter 2)

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

** 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.

** Gulati, R. & Sytch, M. 2007. "Dependence asymmetry and joint dependence in interorganizational relationship: Effects of embeddedness on manufacturers' performance in procurement relationships." Administrative Science Quarterly, 52: 32-69.

Davis, G. & J.A. Cobb. 2009. "Resource Dependence Theory: Past and Future." Research in the Sociology of Organizations.

Week 4 (February 10): 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.

J. Freeman, G.R. Carroll and M.T. Hannan. 1983. The Liability of Newness: Age Dependence in Organizational Death Rates. *American Sociological Review* 48:692-710.

Carroll, G. 1985. Concentration and specialization: Dynamics of niche width in populations of organizations. American Journal of Sociology 90: 1262-83.

** Barnett, W.P. and G.R. Carroll. 1987. "Competition and Mutualism Among Early Telephone Companies." *Administrative Science Quarterly,* 32: 400-421.

Anderson, P. and M. Tushman. 1990. Technological Discontinuities and Dominant Designs: A Cyclical Model of Technological Change. *Administrative Science Quarterly* 35: 604-633.

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

** Carroll, Glenn and Anand Swaminathan. 2000. Why the Microbrewery Movement? Organizational Dynamics of Resource Partitioning in the U.S. Brewing Industry. *AJS* 106(3): 715-762.

Ruef, Martin. 2000. The Emergence of Organizational Forms: A Community Ecology Approach. American Journal of Sociology, 106: 658-714.

Mezias, S.J. & Boyle, E. 2005. Blind Trust: Market Control, Legal Environments, and the Dynamics of Competitive Intensity in the Early American Film Industry, 1893–1920. Administrative Science Quarterly, 50(1): 1-34.

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.

Week 5 (February 17): Institutional Theory

** Meyer & Rowan 1977. Institutionalized organizations: formal structure as myth and ceremony. American Journal of Sociology, 83: 340-363.

** DiMaggio & Powell 1983. The iron cage revisited. ASR, 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" ASQ 22-39.

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.

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.

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.

Westphal, Gulati & Shortell 1997. Customization or conformity. Administrative Science Quarterly, 42: 366-394

Zbaracki, M.J. 1998. "The Rhetoric and Reality of Total Quality Management." Administrative Science Quarterly, 43: 602-636.

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

Suddaby, R. & Greenwood, R. 2005. Rhetorical Strategies of Legitimacy. Administrative Science Quarterly, 50(1): 35-67.

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.

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

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

** Lounsbury, M. 2007. A tale of two cities: Competing logics and practice variation in the professionalizing of mutual funds. *Acad. Management J.* **50** 289-307.

Battilana, J., Dorado, S. 2010. Building sustainable hybrid organizations: The case of commercial microfinance organizations..*Academy of Management Journal*, 53: 1419-1440.

Week 6 (February 24): Categorization

Weick, Karl. 1995. Sensemaking in organizations. Sage Publications.

** Porac, J., Thomas, H., Wilson, F., Paton, D. & Kanfer, A. 1995. Rivalry and the Industry Model of Scottish Knitwear Producers. Administrative Science Quarterly, 40: 203-227.

** Zuckerman, E. 1999. The categorical imperative: Securities analysts and the illegitimacy discount. American Journal of Sociology, 104: 1398-1438.

** Hsu, G. 2006. Jack of all trades and masters of none: Audience responses to spanning genres in feature film production. *Admin. Sci. Quart.* **51** 420-450.

** Benner, M. & R. Ranganathan. 2013. Divergent reactions to convergent strategies: Investor beliefs and analyst reactions during technological change. Organization Science, 24: 378-394.

Wry, T. & J. Vergne. 2013. Categorizing categorization research: Review, integration, and future directions. Journal of Management Studies.

Week 7 (March 2): Status (Tentative)

** Podolny, J.M. 1994. Market uncertainty and the social character of economic exchange. Adinistrative Science Quarterly, 39: 458-483.

Stuart, T. Hoang, H. & R. Hybels. 1999. Interorganizational endorsements and the performance of entrepreneurial ventures. Administrative Science Quarterly, 44: 315-349.

** Phillips, D. & E. Zuckerman. 2001. Middle-status conformity: Theoretical restatement and empirical demonstration in two markets. American Journal of Sociology, 107: 379-429.

* Kim, J. & B. King. 2014. Seeing stars: Matthew effects and status bias in Major League Baseball umpiring. *Management Science*. 60: 2619-44