

**B790  
Management Theory  
Fall 2017 Course Outline**

**Human Resources and Management Area  
Michael G. DeGroot School of Business  
McMaster University**

---

***COURSE OBJECTIVE***

---

The ultimate objective of this workshop is to work toward developing a grounded theory of management. The workshop attempts to achieve this objective by laying the foundation toward developing an understanding of the meanings of management (a) in different cultural contexts, (b) in different fields, (c) in different sectors of the economy, (d) in different systems of governance, and (e) in different time periods. The motivation comes from the question, how do insights from other professions, other disciplines, and other bodies of knowledge contribute to our understanding of management. An exposure to the epistemology of management could arguably lead to the identification of the core concept of management and the operational differences that make it viable as a field of practice.

---

***INSTRUCTOR AND CONTACT INFORMATION***

---

**Dr. Vishwanath Baba**  
**Title:** Professor  
**Email:** [baba@mcmaster.ca](mailto:baba@mcmaster.ca)  
**Office:** DSB 424  
**Office Hours:** Wednesdays 1:00pm – 3:00pm  
**Telephone:** (905) 525-9140 x26947

**C01:** Tuesdays  
**Time:** 9:00am – 12:00pm  
**Location:** TSH 613

**C02:** Thursdays  
**Time:** 9:00am – 12:00pm  
**Location:** TSH 613

---

***COURSE DESCRIPTION***

---

Management as a discipline appears to house a multitude of paradigms, principles, and approaches. They vary depending upon whether management is viewed as a system, a set of functions, processes, pattern of activities, or simply a collection of techniques. In order to provide the discipline with a sense of cohesion, it is suggested that we examine the fundamental value or concept, which underlies management functions, processes, activities, and techniques. This effort at developing a theory (in use) of management aims to document commonalities and differences among its functional variants and work toward an integrative theory of management.

The endeavor here is to explore the meaning of management invoked in the writings of both scholars and practitioners and probe what it is that they consider as managerial in their thoughts and behavior and why. Eventually, I believe that a picture will emerge that will shed light on aspects of management that are shared across the spectrum by all managers as well as those aspects of management that are unique to the activity that is being managed. Here what I have in mind is to explore the meaning of management in such activities as strategic management, marketing management, financial management, human resources management, knowledge and information management, production and operations management, managerial accounting to mention a few. In addition, I am interested in locating the meaning of management in context - that is to explore contextual attributions to the term "management" and its operationalization not only in different fields but also in different cultures.

The immediate outcome is a framework that would help a scholar-in-training to understand the intellectual forces that shape management research regardless of its specific focus on human resources management or operations management or financial management or marketing management etc. The typical PhD student gets a lot of depth in the field of choice. However, they do not often acquire a breadth of vision. This course attempts to provide that missing breadth, in essence, a wider managerial optic. The more enduring hope here is to *develop* a framework that would facilitate re-codification of knowledge currently available under the rubric of traditional management education, management training, and management development curricula and develop new knowledge guided by the "new" theory of management. Eventually, this effort will energize and motivate broad-based curriculum changes and contribute toward further professionalization of management.

---

## **LEARNING OUTCOMES**

---

This workshop has two parts. The purpose of the first part is to introduce the student to the epistemology of management, notions of scientific inquiry, theory, models and their role in the study of management. Consequently, we will deal with major approaches to theory building, hypothesis testing, and ways of understanding phenomena, particularly as they apply to work and organizational settings. In the second half of the course, students will be exposed to the different schools of management thought and learn the meaning of management as revealed in each school of thought. Toward the end, students will analyze the commonalities and differences in the meaning of management in each school of thought and work toward a developing a theory of management that is abstract, fundamental, and integrative. This course is designed to complement more specialized and depth oriented field seminars that introduce the students to the substantive literature in the areas of their choice leading to dissertation research. As a result, information discussed in this course can be applied toward a deeper understanding of the material in advanced seminars in the different fields of management.

---

## **REQUIRED COURSE MATERIALS AND READINGS**

---

The course requires extensive reading (see Course Schedule section). The readings will be made available to students in advance of the classes electronically. Class meetings will involve group discussions of the assigned readings, punctuated with lectures and/or presentations. Each student will be responsible for summarizing and leading discussion on one or more assigned readings in class.

---

## **EVALUATION**

---

1. Preparation, Presentation, Participation (30%).
2. Book Review (20%) – due October 20 (section 1) or October 22 (section 2)
3. Term Paper (50%): Each student will select a field of interest. Using the same model that guides the class discussion and the one pager that serves as the basis for the discussion, the student will research the notion of management and critique the theories of management that energize the selected field, and propose a theory of management that would shape that field in the future. The field can be financial management, human resources management, organizational behaviour, strategic management, operations management...any functional field. The question that will form the basis for the paper will be “what is management in financial management?” or “operations management etc”. It will lead to a survey of the literature in that field, a critical evaluation of the field and then derivation of a theory of management relevant to that field, a critique of that theory and some theoretical propositions that would flesh out that theory. The student is to submit a paper (about 25 pages) by the end of the semester (50%). Another variant of this model is to develop a theory of best practice in their chosen fields – say HRM or Financial Management. It has to be “management” along with a chosen adjective. This will involve outlining the meaning of management in that field, reviewing best practices, and developing a theory of best practice. Alternately, the student can do a Systematic Review of a central question that pertains to his or her field with the role of extant theory in providing the answer (Due December 12 – C01, and 14, 2017 for C02).

For the second part of the course, I would like you to focus your attention on the following issues as you go through the reading list and preparing for the class.

1. What is management according to the readings? Here concentrate on a definition of management based on the readings.
2. What are the elements of management? Here we are breaking the definition down starting the process of deconstruction.

3. What are the underlying assumptions, which inform these readings?  
Here I am thinking of assumptions about work, life, human nature etc.
4. What aspects of western or eastern thought or movement that you have hitherto been exposed to influence early management thought?
5. What are the cultural assumptions, historical antecedents, contextual factors that have influenced early management thought? Why should we know them? How do they shape management thought?
6. Now synthesize the readings and articulate a theory of management. Write it down on a sheet of paper and hand it in at the end of each class. I do not expect it to be more than a page. In fact, it should be around half a page. Remember parsimony is a positive feature of a theory. And even more important, have fun with it...we all learn better when we are having fun!

Given the interactive nature of the workshop, attendance is mandatory for every session.

Preparation, Presentation, Participation		30%
Book Review	Due October 20 (C01) or October 22 (C02)	20%
Term Paper		50%
Total		100%

### **Conversion**

At the end of the course your overall percentage grade will be converted to your letter grade in accordance with the following conversion scheme.

LETTER GRADE	PERCENT
A+	90 - 100
A	85 - 89
A-	80 - 84
B+	75 - 79
B	70 - 74
B-	65 - 69
F	00 - 64

Please review the Graduate Examinations Policy (if applicable):

<http://www.mcmaster.ca/policy/Students-AcademicStudies/GradExamsPolicy.pdf>

---

## ***ACADEMIC DISHONESTY***

---

You are expected to exhibit honesty and use ethical behaviour in all aspects of the learning process. Academic credentials you earn are rooted in principles of honesty and academic integrity.

Academic dishonesty is to knowingly act or fail to act in a way that results or could result in unearned academic credit or advantage. This behaviour can result in serious consequences, e.g. the grade of zero on an assignment, loss of credit with a notation on the transcript (notation reads: “Grade of F assigned for academic dishonesty”), and/or suspension or expulsion from the university.

It is your responsibility to understand what constitutes academic dishonesty. For information on the various types of academic dishonesty please refer to the Academic Integrity Policy, located at:

[www.mcmaster.ca/academicintegrity](http://www.mcmaster.ca/academicintegrity)

The following illustrates only three forms of academic dishonesty:

1. Plagiarism, e.g. the submission of work that is not one’s own or for which other credit has been obtained.
2. Improper collaboration in group work.
3. Copying or using unauthorized aids in tests and examinations

---

## ***MISSED ACADEMIC WORK***

---

Late assignments will not be accepted. No extensions are available except under extraordinary circumstances. Please discuss any extenuating situation with your instructor at the earliest possible opportunity.

---

## ***STUDENT ACCESSIBILITY SERVICES***

---

Student Accessibility Services (SAS) offers various support services for students with disabilities. Students are required to inform SAS of accommodation needs for course work at the outset of term. Students who require academic accommodation must contact Student Accessibility Services (SAS) to make arrangements with a Program Coordinator. Academic accommodations must be arranged for each term of study. Student Accessibility Services can be contacted by phone 905-525-9140 ext. 28652 or e-mail [sas@mcmaster.ca](mailto:sas@mcmaster.ca).

For further information, consult McMaster University's Policy for Academic Accommodation of Students with Disabilities:

<http://www.mcmaster.ca/policy/Students-AcademicStudies/AcademicAccommodation-StudentsWithDisabilities.pdf>

### **POTENTIAL MODIFICATION TO THE COURSE**

The instructor and university reserve the right to modify elements of the course during the term. The university may change the dates and deadlines for any or all courses in extreme circumstances. If either type of modification becomes necessary, reasonable notice and communication with the students will be given with explanation and the opportunity to comment on changes. It is the responsibility of the student to check their McMaster email and course websites weekly during the term and to note any changes.

### **COURSE SCHEDULE**

<b>READING LIST</b>		
<b>WEEK</b>	<b>DATE</b>	<b>ARTICLES</b>
<b><u>Part 1: Epistemology of Management</u></b>		
<b>1</b>		<u>Introduction &amp; Organization</u>  <a href="http://www.public.asu.edu/~vanfleet/history/mgt_timeline.htm">http://www.public.asu.edu/~vanfleet/history/mgt_timeline.htm</a>
<b>2</b>		<u>Science and Scientific Thinking</u>  Hausman, D.M. (1989). Economic methodology in a nutshell. <u>Journal of Economic Perspectives</u> , 3, 2, 115-127.  Kerlinger, F.N. (1979). <u>Behavioral research: A conceptual approach</u> . New York: Holt, Rinehart, & Winston. Chapters 1-5  Locke, E.A. (2007). The case for inductive theory building. <u>Journal of Management</u> , Vol. 33, No. 6, December 2007, pp. 867-890  Popper, K. (1981). The myth of inductive hypothesis generation. In R.D. Tweney, M.E. Doherty, and C.R. Mynatt (Eds.), <u>On Scientific Thinking</u> . New York: Columbia University Press.

		<p>Popper, K. (1981). Science, pseudo-science, and falsifiability. In R.D. Tweney, M.E. Doherty, and C.R. Mynatt (Eds.), <u>On Scientific Thinking</u>. New York: Columbia University Press.</p> <p>Platt, J.R. (1964). Strong inference. <u>Science</u>, <u>146</u>, 347-353.</p>
3		<p><u>Theory Building: Roles and Criteria</u></p> <p>Bacharach, S.B. (1989). Organizational theories: Some criteria for evaluation. <u>Academy of Management Review</u>, <u>14</u>, p.496-515.</p> <p>Campbell, J. P. (1990). The role of theory in industrial and organizational psychology. In M.D. Dunnette and L.M. Hough (Eds.), <u>Handbook of Industrial and Organizational Psychology</u> (2nd ed.), Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press, Inc.</p> <p>Christenson, C. (1983). The methodology of positive accounting. <u>The Accounting Review</u>, <u>58</u>, 1, 1-22.</p> <p>DiMaggio, P.J. Comments on What theory is not. <u>Administrative Science quarterly</u>, <u>40</u>, 3, 391-397.</p> <p>Dubin, R. (1976). Theory building in applied areas. In M. Dunnette (Ed.), <u>Handbook of Industrial-Organizational Psychology</u>. New York: McNally.</p> <p>Gregor, S. (2006). The nature of theory in information systems. <u>MIS Quarterly</u>, <u>30</u>, 3, 611-642.</p> <p>Klein, K.J., Dansereau, F., &amp; Hall, R.J. (1994). Level issues in theory development, data-collection, and analysis. <u>Academy of Management Review</u>, <u>19</u>, 2, 195-229;</p> <p>Sutton, R.I. &amp; Staw, B.M. (1995). What theory is not. <u>Administrative Science quarterly</u>, <u>40</u>, 3, 371-384.</p> <p>Weick, K. (1995). What theory is <i>not</i>, Theorizing <i>is</i>. <u>Administrative Science quarterly</u>, <u>40</u>, 3, 385-390.</p>
4		<p><u>Theory Building: Tools, Perspectives, &amp; Debates</u></p> <p>Astley, G. (1984). Subjectivity, sophistry and symbolism in Management Science. <u>Journal of Management Studies</u>, <u>21</u>, 259-272.</p>

		<p>Astley, G. (1985). Administrative science as socially constructed truth. <u>Administrative Science Quarterly</u>, 30, 497-513.</p> <p>Astley, G. &amp; Van de Ven, A. (1983). Central perspectives and debates in organization theory. <u>Administrative Science Quarterly</u>, 28, 245-273.</p> <p>Barney, J. B., &amp; Zhang, S. (2009). The future of Chinese management research: A theory of Chinese management versus a Chinese theory of management. <u>Management and Organizational Research</u>, 5, 15-28.</p> <p>Gioia, D., &amp; Pietre, E., (1994). Multiparadigm perspectives on theory building, <u>Academy of Management Review</u>, 15, 4, 584-602.</p> <p>Hambrick, D.C. (2007). The field of management's devotion to theory: Too much of a good thing. <u>Academy of Management Journal</u>, 50, 6, 1346-52.</p> <p>Hines, R.D. (1988). Financial accounting: In communicating reality, we construct reality. <u>Accounting, Organization and Society</u>, 13, 3, 251-261.</p> <p>Hinings, C.R., &amp; Greenwood, R (2002). Disconnect and consequences in organization theory. <u>Administrative Science Quarterly</u>, 47, 411-421.</p> <p>Lee, A.S., Baskerville, R.L. (2003). Generalizing generalizability in information systems research. <u>Information Systems Research</u>, 14, 221-243</p> <p>Miner, J.B. (2003). The Rated Importance, Scientific Validity, and Practical Usefulness of Organizational Behavior Theories: A Quantitative Review, <u>Academy of Management Learning and Education</u>, 2(3), 250-268.</p>
<p><b><u>Part 2: Theories of Management</u></b></p>		
<p>5</p>		<p><u>Early Management Thought</u></p> <p>Barnard, C.I. (1996). The theory of authority. In Matteson, M. &amp; Ivancevich, J.M. (Eds.) <u>Management and Organizational Behavior Classics</u> (6<sup>th</sup> ed.), p. 162-170. Irwin: Toronto</p> <p>Carroll, S.J. &amp; Gillen, D.J. (1996). Are the classical management functions useful in describing managerial work? In Matteson, M. &amp; Ivancevich, J.M. (Eds.) <u>Management and Organizational Behavior Classics</u> (6<sup>th</sup> ed.), p. 66-84. Irwin: Toronto</p> <p>Fayol, H. (1996). Planning. In Matteson, M. &amp; Ivancevich, J.M. (Eds.) <u>Management and Organizational Behavior Classics</u> (6<sup>th</sup> ed.), p. 87-94. Irwin: Toronto</p>



	<p>Follett, M.P. (1996). Management as a profession. In Matteson, M. &amp; Ivancevich, J.M. (Eds.) <u>Management and Organizational Behavior Classics</u> (6<sup>th</sup> ed.), p. 7-17. Irwin: Toronto</p> <p>Koontz, H. (1996). The management theory jungle. In Matteson, M. &amp; Ivancevich, J.M. (Eds.) <u>Management and Organizational Behavior Classics</u> (6<sup>th</sup> ed.), p. 18-34. Irwin: Toronto</p> <p>Taylor, F.W. (1996). What is scientific management? In Matteson, M. &amp; Ivancevich, J.M. (Eds.) <u>Management and Organizational Behavior Classics</u> (6<sup>th</sup> ed.), p. 3-6. Irwin: Toronto</p> <p>Taylor, F. W. (1980). The principles of scientific management. In Boone, L.E &amp; Bowen, D.D. (Eds.) <u>The Great Writings in Management and Organizational Behavior Classics</u> (6<sup>th</sup> ed.), p. 34-52. Petroleum Publishing Company: Tulsa, Oklahoma.</p> <p>Weber, M. (1996). The ideal bureaucracy. In Matteson, M. &amp; Ivancevich, J.M. (Eds.) <u>Management and Organizational Behavior Classics</u> (6<sup>th</sup> ed.), p. 171-177. Irwin: Toronto</p>
<p>6</p>	<p><u>The Behavioural School</u></p> <p>Cummings, L.L. (1996). Toward organizational behavior. In Matteson, M. &amp; Ivancevich, J.M. (Eds.) <u>Management and Organizational Behavior Classics</u> (6<sup>th</sup> ed.), p. 35-46. Irwin: Toronto</p> <p>Homans, G.C. (1996). The Western Electric researches. In Matteson, M. &amp; Ivancevich, J.M. (Eds.) <u>Management and Organizational Behavior Classics</u> (6<sup>th</sup> ed.), p. 241-249. Irwin: Toronto</p> <p>House, R.J., &amp; Podsakoff, P.M. (1994) Leadership effectiveness: Past perspectives and future directions for research. In Greenberg, J., (Ed.). <u>Organizational Behavior: The State of the Science</u>. p.45-82. Laurence Earlbaum: Hillsdale, N.J.</p> <p>Pfeffer, J. (1996). The ambiguity of leadership. In Matteson, M. &amp; Ivancevich, J.M. (Eds.) <u>Management and Organizational Behavior Classics</u> (6<sup>th</sup> ed.), p. 301-313. Irwin: Toronto</p> <p>Quinn, R.E., Khan, J.A., Mandl, M.J. (1994). Perspectives on organizational change: Exploring movement at the interface. In Greenberg, J., (Ed.). <u>Organizational Behavior: The State of the Science</u>. p.103-133. Laurence Earlbaum: Hillsdale, N.J.</p>

		<p>Scott, W.G. (1996). Organization theory: An overview and an appraisal. In Matteson, M. &amp; Ivancevich, J.M. (Eds.) <u>Management and Organizational Behavior Classics</u> (6<sup>th</sup> ed.), p. 134-155. Irwin: Toronto</p> <p>Whetten, D.A. &amp; Cameron, K.S. (1994). Organizational effectiveness: Old models and new contracts. In Greenberg, J., (Ed.). <u>Organizational Behavior: The State of the Science</u>. p.135-153. Laurence Earlbaum: Hillsdale, N.J.</p>
7		<u>Book Reviews and Discussion</u>
8		<p><u>The Operations School</u></p> <p>Buffa, E.S. (1995). Research in operations management. In Sower, V.E., Motwani, J. &amp; Svoie, M.J. (Eds.), <u>Classic Readings in Operations Management</u>, p. 151-164. Dryden: Montreal.</p> <p>Chase, R.B. (1995). Where does the customer fit in a service operation? In Sower, V.E., Motwani, J. &amp; Svoie, M.J. (Eds.), <u>Classic Readings in Operations Management</u>, p. 491-499. Dryden: Montreal.</p> <p>Gilbreth, F.B. &amp; Gilbreth, L.M. (1996). Clarifying the elements of work. In Matteson, M. &amp; Ivancevich, J.M. (Eds.) <u>Management and Organizational Behavior Classics</u> (6<sup>th</sup> ed.), p. 301-313. Irwin: Toronto</p> <p>Juran, J. (1995). The quality trilogy. In Sower, V.E., Motwani, J. &amp; Svoie, M.J. (Eds.), <u>Classic Readings in Operations Management</u>, p. 277-288. Dryden: Montreal.</p> <p>Kast, F.E. &amp; Rozenzweig, J.E. (1996). General systems theory: Applications for orgainzataions and management. In Matteson, M. &amp; Ivancevich, J.M. (Eds.) <u>Management and Organizational Behavior Classics</u> (6<sup>th</sup> ed.), p. 47-65. Irwin: Toronto</p> <p>Meredith, J.R., Raturi, A., Amoako-Gyampah., K., &amp; Kaplan, B. (1989). Alternative research paradigms in operations. <u>Journal of Operations Management</u>, 8, 4, 297-326.</p> <p>Schonberger, R.J. (1995). The vital elements of world-class manufacturing. In Sower, V.E., Motwani, J. &amp; Svoie, M.J. (Eds.), <u>Classic Readings in Operations Management</u>, p. 177-184. Dryden: Montreal.</p>

		<p>Skinner, W. (1995). The productivity paradox. In Sower, V.E., Motwani, J. &amp; Svoie, M.J. (Eds.), <u>Classic Readings in Operations Management</u>, p. 461-470. Dryden: Montreal.</p>
9		<p><u>The Information School</u></p> <p>Alavi, M., &amp; Leidner, D.E. (2001). Review : Knowledge management and knowledge management systems : Conceptual foundations and research issues. <u>MIS Quarterly</u>, 25, 1, 107-136.</p> <p>Jonscher, C. (1994). An economic study of the information technology revolution. In Allen, T.J. &amp; Scott Morton, M.S. (Eds.) <u>Information Technology and the Corporation of the 1990's: Reserach studies</u>, p.5-42. Oxford University Press: New York.</p> <p>Lee, B., Barua, A., Whinston, A.B. (1997). Discovery and representation of causal relationships in MIS research: A methodological framework. <u>MIS Quarterly</u>, 21, 1, 109-136.</p> <p>Little, J.D.C. (1994). Information technology in marketing. In Allen, T.J. &amp; Scott Morton, M.S. (Eds.) <u>Information Technology and the Corporation of the 1990's: Reserach studies</u>, p.454-474. Oxford University Press: New York.</p> <p>Lindbloom, C.E. (1996). The science of muddling through. In Matteson, M. &amp; Ivancevich, J.M. (Eds.) <u>Management and Organizational Behavior Classics</u> (6<sup>th</sup> ed.), p. 398-413. Irwin: Toronto.</p> <p>Schein, E.H. (1994). Innovative cultures and organizations. In Allen, T.J. &amp; Scott Morton, M.S. (Eds.) <u>Information Technology and the Corporation of the 1990's: Reserach studies</u>, p.125-146. Oxford University Press: New York.</p> <p>Simon, H.A. (1996). Administrative decision making. In Matteson, M. &amp; Ivancevich, J.M. (Eds.) <u>Management and Organizational Behavior Classics</u> (6<sup>th</sup> ed.), p. 388-397. Irwin: Toronto.</p>
10		<p><u>The Marketing School</u></p> <p>Arndt, J. (1985). On making marketing science more scientific: Role of orientations, paradigms, metaphors, and puzzle solving. <u>Journal of Marketing</u>, 49, 3, 11-23.</p> <p>Bartels, R. (1986). Development of marketing thought: A brief history. In Sheth, J.N. &amp; Garrett, D.E. (Eds.), <u>Marketing Theory: Classic and Contemporary Reading</u>, p.190-210. South-West: Cincinnati, OH</p>

	<p>Deshpande, R. (1986). Paradigms lost: On theory and method in research in marketing. In Sheth, J.N. &amp; Garrett, D.E. (Eds.), <u>Marketing Theory: Classic and Contemporary Reading</u>, p.112-118. South-West: Cincinnati, OH</p> <p>Howard, J.A. &amp; Sheth, J.N. (1976). A theory of buyer behavior. In H.A. Thompson, (Ed.) <u>The Great Writings in Marketing</u>, p.218-244. The Commerce Press: Plymouth, MI</p> <p>Hunt, S. (1986). General theories and the fundamental explanation of marketing. In Sheth, J.N. &amp; Garrett, D.E. (Eds.), <u>Marketing Theory: Classic and Contemporary Reading</u>, p.190-210. South-West: Cincinnati, OH</p> <p>Hunt, S. (1986). The nature and scope of marketing. In Sheth, J.N. &amp; Garrett, D.E. (Eds.), <u>Marketing Theory: Classic and Contemporary Reading</u>, p.20-39. South-West: Cincinnati, OH</p> <p>Kotler, P. (1986). Behavioral models for analyzing buyers. In H.A. Thompson, (Ed.) <u>The Great Writings in Marketing</u>, p.147-166. The Commerce Press: Plymouth, MI</p> <p>Kotler, P. &amp; Levy, S.J. (1986). Broadening the concept of marketing. In H.A. Thompson, (Ed.) <u>The Great Writings in Marketing</u>, p.59-72. The Commerce Press: Plymouth, MI</p> <p>Vargo, S.L., &amp; Lusch, R.F. (2004). Evolving to a new dominant logic for marketing. <u>Journal of Marketing</u>, 68, 1-17.</p>
<p><b>11</b></p>	<p><u>The Economics and Finance Schools</u></p> <p>Chua, W.F. (1986). Radical developments in accounting thought. <u>The Accounting Review</u>, 61, 4, 601-632.</p> <p>Eisenhardt, K.M. (1989). Agency theory: An assessment and review. <u>Academy of Management Review</u>, 14, 57-74.</p> <p>Ferraro, F., Pfeffer, J., &amp; Sutton, R.I. (2005). Economics language and assumptions: How theories can be self-fulfilling. <u>Academy of Management Review</u>, 30, 8-24.</p> <p>Jensen, M., &amp; Meckling, W.H. (1976). Theory of the firm: Managerial behaviour, agency costs, and ownership structure. <u>Journal of Financial Economics</u>, 3, 305-360.</p> <p>Kakani, R.K. (2000). Milestones in Financial Management. WPS #396/Sep</p>

	<p>2000, Working paper Series, Indian Institute of Management Calcutta.</p> <p>Loasby, B.H. (1971). Hypothesis and paradigm in the theory of the firm. <u>The Economic Journal</u>, 81, 324, 863-885.</p> <p>Myers, S.C. (1984). Finance theory and financial strategy. <u>Interfaces</u>, 14, 126-137.</p> <p>Nyberg, A.J., Fulmer, I.S., Gerhart, B., &amp; Carpenter, M.A. (2010). Agency theory revisited: CEO returns and shareholder interest alignment. <u>Academy of Management Journal</u>, 53, 5, 1029-1049.</p> <p>Welch, I (2001). The top achievements, challenges, and failures of Finance. <u>Yale International Center for Finance</u>, November 2001, 1-15.</p>
<p>12</p>	<p><u>Integration of Management Thought</u></p> <p>Alvesson, M., &amp; Sandberg, J. (2013). Has Management Studies Lost Its Way? Ideas for More Imaginative and Innovative Research. <u>Journal of Management Studies</u>, 50:1, 128-152.</p> <p>Koontz, H. (1980). The management theory jungle revisited. <u>Academy of Management Review</u>, 5, 175-187.</p> <p>Khurana, R., &amp; Nohria, N. (2008). It's time to make management a true profession. <u>Harvard Business Review</u>, October, 70-77.</p> <p>Rousseau, D.M. (2006). Is there such a thing as “Evidence-based Management?” <u>Academy of Management Review</u>, 31, 256-269.</p> <p>Spender, J.C. (2007). Management as a Regulated Profession: An Essay. <u>Journal of Management Inquiry</u>, March, 16: 32-42.</p> <p>Thomas, M. (2006). Management: A profession in theory. <u>Management Decision</u>, 44, 3, 309-315.</p> <p>The Editors (2013). The Driver of New Theory Development in Management Studies: Imagination or Rigour? (2013). <u>Journal of Management Studies</u>, 50(1), 126-127. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-6486.2012.01074.x</p> <p>Hitt, M. A., Beamish, P. W., Jackson, S. E., &amp; Mathieu, J. E. (2007). Building theoretical and empirical bridges across levels: Multilevel research in management. <u>Academy of Management Journal</u>, 50(6), 1385-1399.</p>

		<p>Oswick, C., Fleming, P., &amp; Hanlon, G. (2011). From borrowing to blending: Rethinking the process of organizational theory building. <u>Academy of Management Review</u>, 36(2), 318-337.</p> <p>Rigby, D. &amp; Bilodeau, B. (2015). Management tools and trends, 2015. The Bain Company Report, <a href="http://www.bain.com/publications/articles/management-tools-and-trends-2015.aspx">http://www.bain.com/publications/articles/management-tools-and-trends-2015.aspx</a></p>
13		<p><u>Toward a Theory of Management</u></p> <p>Baba, V.V. (2004). Toward a paradigm for management: Implications for research and practice. <u>Metamorphosis: A Journal of Management Research</u>. 3, 132-142.</p>