

PA762:
Public Organization Theory
Course Syllabus
Spring 2008

Time & Location: Mondays 3:00 – 5:45pm; Winston 110

Contact Information

Instructor: Branda Nowell, Ph.D.

Email: blnowell@chass.ncsu.edu

Office: 205 Caldwell

Phone: (919) 513-1768

Office Hours: Mondays,10-11; Tuesdays 4:30-5:30pm or by appointment

Readings: Available under library reserves: (<http://www.lib.ncsu.edu/reserves/>) or in

Clegg, S. & Hardy, C. (1999). *Studying Organization: Theory and Method*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Course Overview & Objectives: The core objectives of this course are twofold. The first objective is to introduce you to classical and modern theoretical frameworks for understanding organizations. Toward this end, we will explore, discuss, and debate theories related to organizational design, power dynamics, organizational culture, and the relationship between organizations and their environments. These theories will differ in their intended function. Some will attempt to prescribe what should be, others will attempt to describe what actually is, still others will focus on predicting cause and effect.

The second objective of this course is methodological; focusing on *how to use theory to inform research*. Theories are powerful tools for the scholar. They help to frame and position your research interests within a broader literature, provide the basis for developing hypotheses, bolster the generalizability of findings, and, when applied in creative ways, can help to generate new and innovative research questions. However, the ability to use theory as a tool for conducting theory-driven research *is a skill* just as learning to use multivariate regression to examine causal relationships between variables is a skill. Through this course, you will have ample opportunities to play with a wide array of theoretical perspectives as they relate to your research interests. Some will easily resonate with your interests, others may require some exercise of creative thinking to identify the linkage. Regardless, all will help you to hone your skills in how to think about theory as a tool for helping to inform research.

Course Format

The format for this course will be a doctoral seminar in which you will be responsible for weekly readings, writing assignments, and participation in as well as facilitation of class discussions. Your labors throughout the course will culminate in a final paper. The core components of the course are described in more detail below.

Research Article Critique (10 points each)

Throughout the course, you will be responsible for three (3) research article critiques. Critiques should be no more than four double spaced pages in length. For each critique, you will identify an empirical article that is grounded in one or more of the theories you've selected. You will then provide a critique of how the theory was used to inform the research question and hypotheses, study design, and/or interpretation of findings. Your critique should include the following elements: 1) *brief* (no more than 1 page) overview of the study and the focus of its research question(s), 2) identification of the applied theory, 3) description of where and in what ways this theory was used by the author(s) in the article (e.g., to inform research questions, design, interpret results, etc), and 4) a critique of how the theory was used – For example, do you agree with the author(s)' interpretation and application of the theory? Would you have come to the same conclusions? Were there conceptual inconsistencies? Was the application of the theory appropriate? Did it strengthen the generalizability of the findings? If so, in what ways? Was it innovative? Etc. Critiques are due in class the week which corresponds to the selected theory.

Discussant (15 points)

As this course will adopt a seminar format, for most classes a discussant will be responsible for presenting and facilitating discussion on the week's readings. As scholars, you may be asked to serve as a discussant to symposiums at conferences or professional meetings so this is an important professional skill to develop. In preparation for this, you will be responsible for developing four to six discussion questions that will be posted on the WebCT at least one week in advance. These questions should serve to focus your colleagues' attention on what you feel are the critical questions raised by the readings and will be evaluated as part of your grade. For example, you may focus on:

- Questions that suggest consideration of the theory(s) from an historical perspective as it relates to dominant paradigms of the time or a comparative perspective that considers the theory in contrast to other ideas and theories
- Questions that provoke critical thought as to the value and implications of a theory or set of theories
- Questions that invite consideration of the limitations of the theory or set of theories - what might they obscure or distort
- Questions that encourage readers to explore potential contradictions or ambiguities among different authors' understandings of a given theory
- Questions that provoke thought concerning the implication and application of the theory for informing research and what types of research questions it creates or supports

During class, the initial role of a discussant is to review *and synthesize* the articles **as a set**. This will require you to identify key overarching themes or contrasting positions or arguments across two or more articles. Your presentation should be organized around these overarching themes – proposing to your colleagues a framework for thinking about these readings *as a set and in context*. This review should be brief – no more than 20 minutes. The remaining time will be spent facilitating an engaging discussion among your colleagues drawing from the assigned discussion questions.

Participation (10 points)

In any one class, you will be in either one of two formal roles: discussant or participant. The formal role expectations of the discussant are described above. The formal role expectations of participant are as follows:

- **Be conversant in the week's readings** and corresponding concepts, frameworks, and theories **as they relate to the discussion questions** provided by the discussant
- **Identify points of ambiguity** and be willing to present these to the class as points for discussion. These may include ambiguities related to:
 - *Content* (I'm not sure what the authors mean by....?)
 - *Implication* (if we accept this perspective, does that mean that....?)
 - *Relevance* (I get that the author/theory is saying X, but I'm not sure why X matters for anything. – Or - Now that I know X, I'm not sure what to do with it)
- **Identify and be willing to share insights** related to content, implication, and/or relevance of the theories, particularly as they relate to your own research interests. As an emerging scholar, your cognitive framework for engaging new readings should be simultaneously characterized by:
 - A general intellectual curiosity about a broad range of ideas
 - A ruthless and unrelenting pursuit of the implications of various theories and perspectives to your research interests

Practice makes perfect – and the art of integrating abstract theory into more specific research interests is no exception. So, for each class you should have developed some preliminary ideas about how the ideas in the week's readings could inform or have implications for your research interests.

Literature management system (15 points)

In order to accomplish the above, you will need to develop a system for managing the volume of information we will be covering. Unless you are blessed with a gifted memory, most of what you read will be forgotten unless you have a system for recording it. Therefore, most scholars develop systems for organizing and managing literature so that key take aways can be easily referenced at a future date (e.g., studying for comprehensive exams) . You will be provided one framework in class of such a system. Throughout the class you will develop you own and use it to capture the key points of the readings. This framework should allow you to distill: What is the thesis? What are the critical components of the argument that support this thesis? What is useful/insightful that you want to remember? In order to help make this a priority, you will turn in your literature notes periodically throughout the semester.

Research Proposal (30 points)

Your final project for this course will be to write the introduction for a theory-driven research proposal due *April 14th* submitted via the WebCT course website. This introduction will be similar in format to an introduction for a research paper you might write for submission to a peer-reviewed journal. For examples, you should consult peer-reviewed journals publishing empirical research such as the Journal of Public

Administration Research and Theory, Academy of Management Journal, and Administrative Science Quarterly. You will likely want to think about this assignment as an opportunity to develop some ideas for your dissertation although this is not a requirement. You may submit a one-page prospectus for feedback at any time during the semester. Your proposal should be no more than 20 pages in length. At the end of the semester, you will be responsible for providing an oral defense of your research proposal. The research proposal will be evaluated on the following criteria:

- Proposal makes appropriate use of an existing theory or set of theories to provide a framework for the research phenomenon under investigation and/or to justify research questions or hypotheses
- Proposal provides a sufficient review of the existing literature to firmly support and provide context for research questions and hypotheses (if applicable).
- Proposal draws clean linkages between the research gap, the research question(s), the guiding theoretical framework(s), and the guiding hypotheses (if applicable).
- Proposal is clear, concise, grammatically well-written/organized, and makes appropriate use of citations and references using APA format
- Oral defense is well-organized and provides a compelling defense of the proposed research

Summary of Points	
Research Critique (10 pts each)	30
Discussant	15
Participation	10
Literature management	15
Final paper & oral defense	30
TOTAL POINTS	100

Grading Policy

A+ = 98-100
 A = 93-97
 A- = 90-92
 B+ = 87-89
 B = 83-86
 B- = 80- 82 etc..

Attendance

The quality of the learning experience for this course is dependent upon the active participation of students in weekly discussions and exercises. Your attendance and active involvement are critical, not only for your own learning, but for your classmates as well. In light of this, it is my expectation that you will attend each class. If for some reason you must miss class, please notify me as soon as possible. Excessive absences (more than 2) will result in full letter grade reduction.

Late Assignments

Late assignments will only be accepted within 24 hours of their due date and will receive a full letter grade reduction unless arrangements have been made with me *prior* to the assigned due date.

Academic Integrity

Students should familiarize themselves with the university policies re: academic integrity found in the Code of Student Conduct

(http://www.ncsu.edu/policies/student_services/student_discipline/POL11.35.1.php) that apply to this class. In addition, please be advised of the following:

To: PBS and Graduate Students in Public Administration Courses

Public Administration faculty members have observed that some students may be unsure of what constitutes academic dishonesty. The following statement (used with permission) describes a range of behaviors that constitute academic dishonesty

“Plagiarism, or presenting another’s works or ideas as one’s own, is a form of stealing. The instructor reserves the right to examine any source used by the student before giving a grade on a paper, and to give an “incomplete” in the course if necessary, to allow time to obtain sources. Students should be prepared to show source material to the instructor for the purpose of verifying information. Academic dishonesty will not be tolerated.

Academic dishonesty includes the following offenses:

- 1) Claiming as your own work a paper written by someone else (including unpublished papers).
- 2) Turning in a paper that contains paraphrases of someone else’s ideas but does not give proper credit to that person for those ideas.
- 3) Turning in a paper that is largely a restatement in your own words of a paper written by someone else, even if you give credit to that person for those ideas. The thesis and organizing principles of a paper must be your own.
- 4) Turning in a paper that uses the exact words of another author without using quotation marks, even if proper credit is given in a citation, or that changes the words only slightly and claims them to be paraphrases.
- 5) Turning in the same paper, even in a different version, for two different courses without the permission of both professors involved.
- 6) Using any external source (notes, books, other students, etc.) for assistance during an in-class exam, unless given permission to do so by the professor.”

Kendra Stewart et al., Columbia College

The public administration faculty has agreed that violations of academic integrity must have consequences. Consequently, students who cheat (behaviors cited in point 1 and 6 or similar behavior) may receive at least an F in the course; other forms of dishonesty, similar to those covered in points 2 through 5 may result in at least a 0 for the

assignment. If you have any questions regarding this policy or any other matter concerning academic integrity, please feel free to discuss them with me.

Date	Topic	Readings
Jan 14	Intro to O.T.	<p>Astley & Van de Ven (1983). Central perspectives and debates in organization theory. <i>Administrative Science Quarterly</i>, 28.</p> <p>Reed, M. (1999). Organizational Theorizing: A historically contested terrain. In S. R. Clegg and C. Hardy (Eds.), <i>Studying Organization: Theory and Method</i> (pp. 25-51). London: Sage.</p>
Jan 21	NO CLASS	Martin Luther King, Jr. Day
Jan 28	Classical O. T. ; Neoclassical O. T., & Human Resource Theory	<p>Classical</p> <p>In Shafritz, Ott, & Jang (2005) Ch. 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • pp. 37-41: Adam Smith, Of the Division of Labour • pp. 48-60: Henri Fayol, General Principles of Management • pp. 61-72: Frederick Winslow Taylor, The Principles of Scientific Management • pp. 73-78: Max Weber, Bureaucracy • pp. 79-88: Luther Gulick, Notes on the Theory of Organization <p>Neo-Classical</p> <p>In Shafritz, Ott, & Jang (2005) Ch. 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • pp. 93-102: Chester Barnard (1966), The economy of incentives from <i>The Functions Of The Executive</i> • pp. 135-144: Richard Cyert & James March (1959), A behavioral theory or organizational objectives <p>Herbert Simon (1946). The Proverbs of Administration. <i>Public Administration Review</i>, 6, 53-67.</p> <p>Selznick, P. (1948). Foundations of the theory of organization. <i>American Sociological Review</i>, 13, 25-35.</p> <p>Human Resource Theory</p> <p>In Shafritz, Ott, & Jang (2005) Ch. 3</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • pp. 152-157: Mary Parker Follett, The Giving of Orders • pp. 158-166: Fritz Roethlisberger, The Hawthorne Experiments • pp. 179-184: Douglas McGregor, The Human Side of Enterprise
Feb 4	Modern Structural Theories	<p>Burns, T. & Stalker, G.M. (1994) Mechanistic and organic systems of management. In <i>The Management of Innovation</i> rev ed. (pp. 96-125), Oxford: Oxford University Press.</p> <p>Peter Blau & W. Richard Scott (1994). The concept of formal organization. In <i>Formal Organizations: A Comparative</i></p>

		<p><i>Approach</i> (pp. 1 – 25), San Francisco: Chandler.</p> <p>Walker, A & Lorsch, J. (1968). Organizational choice: Product versus function. <i>Harvard Business Review</i>, 46(6), p129-138.</p> <p>Mintzberg, H. (1980). Structure in 5's: A synthesis of the research on organization design. <i>Management Science</i>, 26(3), 322-341.</p> <p>Jacques, E. (1990). In praise of hierarchy. <i>Harvard Business Review</i>. 68(1),127-133.</p>
Feb 11	<p>Environmental & Contingency Theories</p> <p>Literature Notes Due</p>	<p>Donaldson (1999). The normal science of structural contingency theory. In S. R. Clegg and C. Hardy (Eds.), <i>Studying Organization: Theory and Method</i> (pp. 51-70). London: Sage.</p> <p>Laurence, P. R. & J. W. Lorsch (1967). <i>Organization and Environment</i>. (pp. 185-245), Boston: Division of Research, Graduate School of Business Administration, Harvard.</p> <p>Gresov, C. (1989) Exploring fit and misfit with multiple contingencies. <i>Administrative Science Quarterly</i>, 34: 431-453.</p> <p>Tosi, H. L. & Slocum, J. W. (1984). Contingency theory: Some suggested directions. <i>Journal of Management</i>, 10(1), 431-453.</p> <p>Pfeffer & Slancik (2003). An external perspective on organizations. In <i>The Extended Control of Organizations</i> (pp. 1-22), Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.</p>
Feb 18	<p>Decision Theories & Organizational Economics</p>	<p>Eisenhardt, K. (1989). Agency theory: An assessment and review. <i>Academy of Management Review</i>, 14(1): 57-74.</p> <p>Simon, H. A. (1955). A behavioral model of rational choice. <i>The Quarterly Journal of Economics</i>, 69, 99-118.</p> <p>Barney, J. B. & Hesterly, W. (1999). Organizational economics: Understanding the relationship between organizations and economic analysis. In S. R. Clegg and C. Hardy (Eds.), <i>Studying Organization: Theory and Method</i> (pp. 109-141), London: Sage.</p> <p>Cohen, M., March, J. and Olsen, J. (1972) A garbage can model of organizational choice. <i>Administrative Science Quarterly</i>, 17: 1-25.</p> <p>Williamson, O. (1981). The Economics of Organization: The Transaction Cost Approach. <i>The American Journal of Sociology</i>, 87(3), 548-577.</p>
Feb 25	<p>Power and Politics</p>	<p>Pfeffer, J. (1981) Understanding the role of power in decision making. In <i>Power in Organizations</i> (pp. 1 -32), Marshfield, MA: Pitman.</p> <p>Hardy, C. & Clegg, S. (1999). Some dare call it power. In S. R. Clegg and C. Hardy (Eds.), <i>Studying Organization: Theory and</i></p>

		<p><i>Method</i> (pp. 368-387), London: Sage.</p> <p>French, J. & Raven, B.(1959). The bases of social power. In D. Cartwright (ed.) <i>Studies in Social Power</i> (pp. 150-167), Ann Arbor: Institute for Social Research.</p> <p>Mintzberg, H. (1983). The power game and the players. In <i>Power In and Around Organizations</i>, Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.</p> <p>Moss Kanter, E. (1979). Power failure in management circuits. <i>Harvard Business Review</i>, 57 (4), 65-75.</p>
Mar 3	NO CLASS	Enjoy your spring break!
Mar 10	Systems Theories	<p>Katz & Kahn (1966). Organizations and the system concept. In <i>The Social Psychology Of Organizations</i> (pp.14-29), New York: John Wiley & Sons..</p> <p>Pondy & Mitroff (1979). Beyond Open systems models of organization. In L.L. Cummings and B. M. Staw (Eds.) <i>Research on Organizational Behavior</i>, Vol. 1. Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.</p> <p>Kast & Rosenzweig (1972). General Systems theory: Application for organization and management. <i>Academy of Management Journal</i>, 15, 4, 447-465.</p> <p>Ashmos, D. and Huber, G. P. (1987). The systems paradigm in organization theory: Correcting the record and suggesting the future. <i>Academy of Management Review</i>. 12: 607-621.</p> <p>Simon, H. A. (1962). The Architecture of Complexity. <i>Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society</i>, 106 (6): 467-482.</p>
Mar 17	Population Ecology & Demography Literature notes due	<p>Hannan, M. T. & Freeman, J. (1977) The population ecology of organizations. <i>American Journal of Sociology</i>, 82: 929-964.</p> <p>Hannan, M. T. & J. Freeman, (1984). Structural inertia and organizational change. <i>American Sociological Review</i>, 49: 149-154.</p> <p>Astley, W. G. (1985). The two ecologies: Population and community perspectives on organizational evolution. <i>Administrative Science Quarterly</i>, 30: 224-241.</p> <p>Baum, J. A. (1999). Organizational Ecology. In S. R. Clegg and C. Hardy (Eds.), <i>Studying Organization: Theory and Method</i> (pp. 71-108), London: Sage.</p> <p>Lincoln, J. R. (1979). Organizational differentiation in urban communities: A study in organizational ecology. <i>Social Forces</i>, 57: 915-930.</p>
Mar 24	Institutional Theory.	<p>Meyer, J. W. & Rowan, B. (1976). Institutionalized organizations: Formal structure as myth and ceremony. <i>American Journal of Sociology</i>, 83: 340-363.</p> <p>DiMaggio, P. & Powell, W. (1983). The iron cage revisited: Institutional isomorphism and collective rationality in organizational fields. <i>American Sociological Review</i>, 2: 147-</p>

		<p>160.</p> <p>Oliver, C. (1991). Strategic response to institutional processes. <i>Academy of Management Review</i>, 16: 145-179.</p> <p>Tolber, P.S. and L. G. Zucker (1999). The institutionalization of institutional theory. In S. R. Clegg and C. Hardy (eds.) <i>Studying Organization: Theory and Method</i> (169-184). London, Sage.</p> <p>March J & Olsen, J (1996). Institutional perspectives on political institutions. <i>Governance</i> 9 (3), 247-264.</p>
Mar 31	Culture and Sense making	<p>Schein, E. (1993). Defining Organizational Culture. In <i>Organization Culture and Leadership</i>, (pp. 3-15) San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.</p> <p>Smirchich, L. (1983). Concepts of culture and organizational analysis. <i>Administrative Science Quarterly</i>, 28: 339-358.</p> <p>Martin, J. & Frost, P. (1999). The organizational culture war games: A struggle for intellectual dominance. In S. R. Clegg and C. Hardy (Eds.), <i>Studying Organization: Theory and Method</i> (pp. 345-367), London: Sage.</p> <p>Weick, K (2001). <i>Making Sense of the Organization</i>. Ch1 & 2 pp. 5-56. Malden, MA: Blackwell publishing.</p>
April 7	Critical Theory, Postmodernism and Feminist approaches	<p>Gergen, K. (1992). Organization theory in the postmodern era. In Reed, M. and M. Hughes (eds) <i>Rethinking Organization: New Directions in Organization Theory and Analysis</i> (pp. 207-226). London: Sage.</p> <p>Alvesson, M. and Deetz, S. (1996). Critical theory and postmodernism approaches to organizational studies. In S. R. Clegg and C. Hardy (Eds.), <i>Studying Organization: Theory and Method</i> (pp. 185-211), London: Sage.</p> <p>Kilduff, M. (1993). Deconstructing organizations, <i>Academy of Management Review</i>, 18(1): 13-31.</p> <p>Calas, M. B. & Smirchich, L. (1996). From the women's point of view: Feminist approaches to organization studies. In S. R. Clegg and C. Hardy (eds.) <i>Studying Organization: Theory and Method</i> (pp. 212-251). London, Sage.</p> <p>Martin, J. (1990). Deconstructing organizational taboos: The suppression of gender conflict in organizations. <i>Organization Science</i>, 1: 339-359.</p>
April 14	Networks and Interorganizational Relations <i>Final Papers Due</i>	<p>Nohria, N. (1992) Is a network perspective a useful way of studying organizations? In N. Nohria and R. G. Eccles, (eds) <i>Networks and Organizations: Structure, Form, and Fit</i>. Boston: Harvard Business School Press.</p> <p>Rowley, T. (1997) Moving beyond dyadic ties: A network theory of stakeholder influences. <i>The Academy of Management Review</i>, 22(4), 887-910.</p> <p>Salancik, G. (1995). Wanted: A good network theory of organization. <i>Administrative Science Quarterly</i>, 40(2), 345-</p>

		<p>349.</p> <p>Scott, W. R. & Davis, G. F. (2007). Networks in and around organizations. (Ch 11). In <i>Organizations and Organizing: Rational, Natural, and Open System Perspectives</i>. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.</p> <p>Borgatti and Foster (2003). The Network Paradigm in Organizational Research: A Review and Typology. <i>Journal of Management</i>, 29: 991-1013</p>
April 21	<p>Organizational Learning and Learning Organizations</p> <p><i>Literature notes due</i></p>	<p>March, J. G. (1991). Exploration and exploitation in organizational learning. <i>Organization Science</i>, 2 (1): 71-87.</p> <p>Argyris, C. (1999). Making sense of limited learning. In <i>On Organizational Learning</i> (pp. 19- 53). Cambridge, MA: Blackwell Publishers.</p> <p>Flood, R. (1998). Fifth discipline: Review and discussion. <i>Systemic Practice and Action Research</i>, 11(3), 259-273.</p> <p>Bierema, L. (2001). Philosophy of organizational learning. In J. Gilly, P. Dean, & L. Bierema's <i>Philosophy and Practice of Organizational Learning, Performance, and Change</i> (13-39). Cambridge, MA: Perseus Publishing.</p> <p>Tsang, E. (1997). Organizational learning and the learning organization: A dichotomy between descriptive and prescriptive research. <i>Human Relations</i>. 50(1), 73-89.</p>
April 28	Final Paper Presentations	
May 5	Final Paper Presentations	