

B790
Workshop on Management Theory
Course Outline 2016

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

COURSE OBJECTIVES

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

Instructor: Dr. Vishwanath Baba
Office: DSB 424; Office Hours: Wednesdays 1:00pm-3:00pm
Tel.: 905 525-9140 x26947
Email: baba@mcmaster.ca
Everybody calls him Baba... You can too!

COURSE SCHEDULE

Section 1: Tuesdays, 9 AM – 12 noon in DSB 421 Sept. 13 – Dec. 6
Section 2: Thursdays, 9 AM – 12 noon in DSB 421, Sept 15 – Dec.8

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. As a consequence, 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 15 (section 1) or October 17 (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. (Due December 13 – C01, and 15, 2016 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.

GRADE 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 |

ACADEMIC DISHONESTY

It is the student's responsibility to understand what constitutes academic dishonesty. Please refer to the University Senate Academic Integrity Policy at the following URL:

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

This policy describes the responsibilities, procedures, and guidelines for students and faculty should a case of academic dishonesty arise. Academic dishonesty is defined as to knowingly act or fail to act in a way that results or could result in unearned academic credit or advantage. Please refer to the policy for a list of examples. The policy also provides faculty with procedures to follow in cases of academic dishonesty as well as general guidelines for penalties. For further information related to the policy, please refer to the Office of Academic Integrity at:

<http://www.mcmaster.ca/academicintegrity>

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 must forward a copy of such SAS accommodation to the instructor normally, within the first three (3) weeks of classes by setting up an appointment with the

instructor. If a student with a disability chooses NOT to take advantage of an SAS accommodation and chooses to sit for a regular exam, a petition for relief may not be filed after the examination is complete. The SAS website is:

<http://sas.mcmaster.ca>

POTENTIAL MODIFICATIONS 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.

Part 1: Epistemology of Management

Week 1 Introduction & Organization

http://www.public.asu.edu/~vanfleet/history/mgt_timeline.htm

Week 2 Science and Scientific Thinking

Hausman, D.M. (1989). Economic methodology in a nutshell. Journal of Economic Perspectives, 3, 2, 115-127.

Kerlinger, F.N. (1979). Behavioral research: A conceptual approach. New York: Holt, Rinehart, & Winston. Chapters 1-5

Locke, E.A. (2007). The case for inductive theory building. Journal of Management, 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.), On Scientific Thinking. New York: Columbia University Press.

Popper, K. (1981). Science, pseudo-science, and falsifiability. In R.D. Tweney, M.E. Doherty, and C.R. Mynatt (Eds.), On Scientific Thinking. New York: Columbia University Press.

Platt, J.R. (1964). Strong inference. Science, 146, 347-353.

Week 3 Theory Building: Roles and Criteria

- Bacharach, S.B. (1989). Organizational theories: Some criteria for evaluation. Academy of Management Review, 14, p.496-515.
- Campbell, J. P. (1990) The role of theory in industrial and organizational psychology. In M.D. Dunnette and L.M. Hough (Eds.), Handbook of Industrial and Organizational Psychology (2nd ed.), Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press, Inc.
- Christenson, C. (1983). The methodology of positive accounting. The Accounting Review, 58, 1, 1-22.
- DiMaggio, P.J. Comments on What theory is not. Administrative Science quarterly, 40, 3, 391-397.
- Dubin, R. (1976). Theory building in applied areas. In M. Dunnette (Ed.), Handbook of Industrial-Organizational Psychology. New York: McNally.
- Gregor, S. (2006). The nature of theory in information systems. MIS Quarterly, 30, 3, 611-642.
- Klein, K.J., Dansereau, F., & Hall, R.J. (1994). Level issues in theory development, data-collection, and analysis. Academy of Management Review, 19, 2, 195-229;
- Sutton, R.I. & Staw, B.M. (1995). What theory is not. Administrative Science quarterly, 40, 3, 371-384.
- Weick, K. (1995). What theory is *not*, Theorizing *is*. Administrative Science quarterly, 40, 3, 385-390.

Week 4 Theory Building: Tools, Perspectives, & Debates

- Astley, G. (1984). Subjectivity, sophistry and symbolism in Management Science. Journal of Management Studies, 21, 259-272.
- Astley, G. (1985). Administrative science as socially constructed truth. Administrative Science Quarterly, 30, 497-513.
- Astley, G. & Van de Ven, A. (1983). Central perspectives and debates in organization theory. Administrative Science Quarterly, 28, 245-273.
- Barney, J. B., & Zhang, S. (2009). The future of Chinese management research: A theory of Chinese management versus a Chinese theory of management. Management and Organizational Research, 5, 15-28.

- Gioia, D., & Pietre, E., (1994). Multiparadigm perspectives on theory building, Academy of Management Review, 15, 4, 584-602.
- Hambrick, D.C. (2007). The field of management's devotion to theory: Too much of a good thing. Academy of Management Journal, 50, 6, 1346-52.
- Hines, R.D. (1988). Financial accounting: In communicating reality, we construct reality. Accounting, Organization and Society, 13, 3, 251-261.
- Hinings, C.R., & Greenwood, R (2002). Disconnect and consequences in organization theory. Administrative Science Quarterly, 47, 411-421.
- Lee, A.S., Baskerville, R.L. (2003). Generalizing generalizability in information systems research. Information Systems Research, 14, 221-243
- Miner, J.B. (2003). The Rated Importance, Scientific Validity, and Practical Usefulness of Organizational Behavior Theories: A Quantitative Review, Academy of Management Learning and Education, 2(3), 250-268.

PART 2: THEORIES OF MANAGEMENT

Week 5 Early Management Thought

- Barnard, C.I. (1996). The theory of authority. In Matteson, M. & Ivancevich, J.M. (Eds.) Management and Organizational Behavior Classics (6th ed.), p. 162-170. Irwin: Toronto
- Carroll, S.J. & Gillen, D.J. (1996). Are the classical management functions useful in describing managerial work? In Matteson, M. & Ivancevich, J.M. (Eds.) Management and Organizational Behavior Classics (6th ed.), p. 66-84. Irwin: Toronto
- Fayol, H. (1996). Planning. In Matteson, M. & Ivancevich, J.M. (Eds.) Management and Organizational Behavior Classics (6th ed.), p. 87-94. Irwin: Toronto
- Follett, M.P. (1996). Management as a profession. In Matteson, M. & Ivancevich, J.M. (Eds.) Management and Organizational Behavior Classics (6th ed.), p. 7-17. Irwin: Toronto
- Koontz, H. (1996). The management theory jungle. In Matteson, M. & Ivancevich, J.M. (Eds.) Management and Organizational Behavior Classics (6th ed.), p. 18-34. Irwin: Toronto

- Taylor, F.W. (1996). What is scientific management? In Matteson, M. & Ivancevich, J.M. (Eds.) Management and Organizational Behavior Classics (6th ed.), p. 3-6. Irwin: Toronto
- Taylor, F. W. (1980). The principles of scientific management. In Boone, L.E & Bowen, D.D. (Eds.) The Great Writings in Management and Organizational Behavior Classics (6th ed.), p. 34-52. Petroleum Publishing Company: Tulsa, Oklahoma.
- Weber, M. (1996). The ideal bureaucracy. In Matteson, M. & Ivancevich, J.M. (Eds.) Management and Organizational Behavior Classics (6th ed.), p. 171-177. Irwin: Toronto

Week 6

The Behavioural School

- Cummings, L.L. (1996). Toward organizational behavior. In Matteson, M. & Ivancevich, J.M. (Eds.) Management and Organizational Behavior Classics (6th ed.), p. 35-46. Irwin: Toronto
- Homans, G.C. (1996). The Western Electric researches. In Matteson, M. & Ivancevich, J.M. (Eds.) Management and Organizational Behavior Classics (6th ed.), p. 241-249. Irwin: Toronto
- House, R.J., & Podsakoff, P.M. (1994) Leadership effectiveness: Past perspectives and future directions for research. In Greenberg, J., (Ed.). Organizational Behavior: The State of the Science. p.45-82. Laurence Earlbaum: Hillsdale, N.J.
- Pfeffer, J. (1996). The ambiguity of leadership. In Matteson, M. & Ivancevich, J.M. (Eds.) Management and Organizational Behavior Classics (6th ed.), p. 301-313. Irwin: Toronto
- Quinn, R.E., Khan, J.A., Mandl, M.J. (1994). Perspectives on organizational change: Exploring movement at the interface. In Greenberg, J., (Ed.). Organizational Behavior: The State of the Science. p.103-133. Laurence Earlbaum: Hillsdale, N.J.
- Scott, W.G. (1996). Organization theory: An overview and an appraisal. In Matteson, M. & Ivancevich, J.M. (Eds.) Management and Organizational Behavior Classics (6th ed.), p. 134-155. Irwin: Toronto
- Whetten, D.A. & Cameron, K.S. (1994). Organizational effectiveness: Old models and new contracts. In Greenberg, J., (Ed.). Organizational Behavior: The State of the Science. p.135-153. Laurence Earlbaum: Hillsdale, N.J.

Week 7 Book Reviews and Discussion

Week 8 The Operations School

Buffa, E.S. (1995). Research in operations management. In Sower, V.E., Motwani, J. & Svoie, M.J. (Eds.), Classic Readings in Operations Management, p. 151-164. Dryden: Montreal.

Chase, R.B. (1995). Where does the customer fit in a service operation? In Sower, V.E., Motwani, J. & Svoie, M.J. (Eds.), Classic Readings in Operations Management, p. 491-499. Dryden: Montreal.

Gilbreth, F.B. & Gilbreth, L.M. (1996). Clarifying the elements of work. In Matteson, M. & Ivancevich, J.M. (Eds.) Management and Organizational Behavior Classics (6th ed.), p. 301-313. Irwin: Toronto

Juran, J. (1995). The quality trilogy. In Sower, V.E., Motwani, J. & Svoie, M.J. (Eds.), Classic Readings in Operations Management, p. 277-288. Dryden: Montreal.

Kast, F.E. & Rozenzweig, J.E. (1996). General systems theory: Applications for orgainzataions and management. In Matteson, M. & Ivancevich, J.M. (Eds.) Management and Organizational Behavior Classics (6th ed.), p. 47-65. Irwin: Toronto

Meredith, J.R., Raturi, A., Amoako-Gyampah., K., & Kaplan, B. (1989). Alternative research paradigms in operations. Journal of Operations Management, 8, 4, 297-326.

Schonberger, R.J. (1995). The vital elements of world-class manufacturing. In Sower, V.E., Motwani, J. & Svoie, M.J. (Eds.), Classic Readings in Operations Management, p. 177-184. Dryden: Montreal.

Skinner, W. (1995). The prodicutivity paradox. In Sower, V.E., Motwani, J. & Svoie, M.J. (Eds.), Classic Readings in Operations Management, p. 461-470. Dryden: Montreal.

Week 9 The Information School

Alavi, M., & Leidner, D.E. (2001). Review : Knowledge management and knowledge management systems : Conceptual foundations and research issues. MIS Quarterly, 25, 1, 107-136.

Jonscher, C. (1994). An economic study of the information technology revolution. In Allen, T.J. & Scott Morton, M.S. (Eds.) Information Technology and the Corporation of the 1990's: Resaerach studies, p.5-42. Oxford

University Press: New York.

- Lee, B., Barua, A., Whinston, A.B. (1997). Discovery and representation of causal relationships in MIS research: A methodological framework. MIS Quarterly, 21, 1, 109-136.
- Little, J.D.C. (1994). Information technology in marketing. In Allen, T.J. & Scott Morton, M.S. (Eds.) Information Technology and the Corporation of the 1990's: Resaerach studies, p.454-474. Oxford University Press: New York.
- Lindbloom, C.E. (1996). The science of muddling through. In Matteson, M. & Ivancevich, J.M. (Eds.) Management and Organizational Behavior Classics (6th ed.), p. 398-413. Irwin: Toronto.
- Schein, E.H. (1994). Innovative cultures and organizations. In Allen, T.J. & Scott Morton, M.S. (Eds.) Information Technology and the Corporation of the 1990's: Resaerach studies, p.125-146. Oxford University Press: New York.
- Simon, H.A. (1996). Administrative decision making. In Matteson, M. & Ivancevich, J.M. (Eds.) Management and Organizational Behavior Classics (6th ed.), p. 388-397. Irwin: Toronto.

Week 10

The Marketing School

- Arndt, J. (1985). On making marketing science more scientific: Role of orientations, paradigms, metaphors, and puzzle solving. Journal of Marketing, 49, 3, 11-23.
- Bartels, R. (1986). Development of marketing thought: A brief history. In Sheth, J.N. & Garrett, D.E. (Eds.), Marketing Theory: Classic and Contemporary Reading, p.190-210. South-West: Cincinnati, OH
- Deshpande, R. (1986). Paradigms lost: On theory and method in research in marketing. In Sheth, J.N. & Garrett, D.E. (Eds.), Marketing Theory: Classic and Contemporary Reading, p.112-118. South-West: Cincinnati, OH
- Howard, J.A. & Sheth, J.N. (1976). A theory of buyer behavior. In H.A. Thompson, (Ed.) The Great Writings in Marketing, p.218-244. The Commerce Press: Plymouth, MI
- Hunt, S. (1986). General theories and the fundamental explanation of marketing. In Sheth, J.N. & Garrett, D.E. (Eds.), Marketing Theory: Classic and Contemporary Reading, p.190-210. South-West: Cincinnati, OH

- Hunt, S. (1986). The nature and scope of marketing. In Sheth, J.N. & Garrett, D.E. (Eds.), Marketing Theory: Classic and Contemporary Reading, p.20-39. South-West: Cincinnati, OH
- Kotler, P. (1986). Behavioral models for analyzing buyers. In H.A. Thompson, (Ed.) The Great Writings in Marketing, p.147-166. The Commerce Press: Plymouth, MI
- Kotler, P. & Levy, S.J. (1986). Broadening the concept of marketing. In H.A. Thompson, (Ed.) The Great Writings in Marketing, p.59-72. The Commerce Press: Plymouth, MI
- Vargo, S.L., & Lusch, R.F. (2004). Evolving to a new dominant logic for marketing. Journal of Marketing, 68, 1-17.

Week 11 The Economics and Finance Schools

- Chua, W.F. (1986). Radical developments in accounting thought. The Accounting Review, 61, 4, 601-632.
- Eisenhardt, K.M. (1989). Agency theory: An assessment and review. Academy of Management Review, 14, 57-74.
- Ferraro, F., Pfeffer, J., & Sutton, R.I. (2005). Economics language and assumptions: How theories can be self-fulfilling. Academy of Management Review, 30, 8-24.
- Jensen, M., & Meckling, W.H. (1976). Theory of the firm: Managerial behaviour, agency costs, and ownership structure. Journal of Financial Economics, 3, 305-360.
- Kakani, R.K. (2000). Milestones in Financial Management. WPS #396/Sep 2000, Working paper Series, Indian Institute of Management Calcutta.
- Loasby, B.H. (1971). Hypothesis and paradigm in the theory of the firm. The Economic Journal, 81, 324, 863-885.
- Myers, S.C. (1984). Finance theory and financial strategy. Interfaces, 14, 126-137.
- Nyberg, A.J., Fulmer, I.S., Gerhart, B., & Carpenter, M.A. (2010). Agency theory revisited: CEO returns and shareholder interest alignment. Academy of Management Journal, 53, 5, 1029-1049.
- Welch, I (2001). The top achievements, challenges, and failures of Finance. Yale International Center for Finance, November 2001, 1-15.

Week 12 Integration of Management Thought

Alvesson, M., & Sandberg, J. (2013). Has Management Studies Lost Its Way? Ideas for More Imaginative and Innovative Research. Journal of Management Studies, 50:1, 128-152.

Koontz, H. (1980). The management theory jungle revisited. Academy of Management Review, 5, 175-187.

Khurana, R., & Nohria, N. (2008). It's time to make management a true profession. Harvard Business Review, October, 70-77.

Rousseau, D.M. (2006). Is there such a thing as "Evidence-based Management?" Academy of Management Review, 31, 256-269.

Spender, J.C. (2007). Management as a Regulated Profession: An Essay. Journal of Management Inquiry, March, 16: 32-42.

Thomas, M. (2006). Management: A profession in theory. Management Decision, 44, 3, 309-315.

The Editors (2013). The Driver of New Theory Development in Management Studies: Imagination or Rigour? (2013). Journal of Management Studies, 50(1), 126-127. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-6486.2012.01074.x

Hitt, M. A., Beamish, P. W., Jackson, S. E., & Mathieu, J. E. (2007). Building theoretical and empirical bridges across levels: Multilevel research in management. Academy of Management Journal, 50(6), 1385-1399.

Oswick, C., Fleming, P., & Hanlon, G. (2011). From borrowing to blending: Rethinking the process of organizational theory building. Academy of Management Review, 36(2), 318-337.

Rigby, D. & Bilodeau, B. (2015). Management tools and trends, 2015. The Bain Company Report, <http://www.bain.com/publications/articles/management-tools-and-trends-2015.aspx>

Week 13 Toward a Theory of Management

Baba, V.V. (2004). Toward a paradigm for management: Implications for research and practice. Metamorphosis: A Journal of Management Research, 3, 132-142.