



B795
Research Issues PhD Seminar
Organizational Behaviour and Organizational Theory
Fall 2020 Course Outline (first 6 weeks only)
Course meets afternoon on Weds.12-3
Human Resources and Management Area
DeGroote School of Business
McMaster University

INSTRUCTOR AND CONTACT INFORMATION

Name:Benson Honig

E-Mail:Bhonig@mcmaster.ca

Class Times: Weds, 12-3 pm

Virtual Office Hours:

ACTIVITY	DELIVERY	DESCRIPTION	TOOL(S)
Readings	Asynch	Tied to weekly discussion prompts	Readings available for download from library
Group Discussions	Synch	Synch: Breakout rooms during lecture synch:	Synch: Zoom
Live Lectures	Synch	3 hr. live session; opportunity to elaborate on content, present challenges, engage discussion	Synch: Zoom

COURSE DELIVERY

GRADE COMPONENT	WEIGHT	DESCRIPTION
Weekly Summaries	20%	Summaries of weekly readings with an * beside them (typically 4 per week)
Two Individual Presentations	10%	Presentations of non * articles
Final Paper	50%	Based on research based publishable article, less data
Participation	20%	Based on class discussion
Total	100%	

COURSE OBJECTIVE

This seminar course focuses on current research *issues* in the organizational sciences, (the first half focusing on meso and macro levels). Seminar readings and activities (discussions, assignments) are intended to provide an overview of the most pressing issues and gaps in several content areas of the OT field, while at the same time developing your skills for critically evaluating research designs, methodologies, interpretations and overall the contribution of published studies to advancing scholarship and practice. Through taking this course you will be well positioned to identify and develop a promising research program – with exposure and discussions to ongoing debates and issues within the field.

This first section of the course (weeks 1-6) will focus on the OT field. Each week you will be presented with a combination of chapters and articles that cover methodological perspectives, theoretical perspectives, and empirical study. We will explore each of these toward a better understanding of the research and publication environment of OT.

Further, through in-class discussions you will be given the opportunity to strengthen your skills in:

1. Developing and communicating arguments, listening, and understanding and critiquing the views of others, while expanding your knowledge of the field.
2. Critical thinking and writing
3. Developing rigorous research designs
4. Building a strong theoretical foundation for your research studies
5. Maintain and understand scholarly ethics for your career

My role in this course is to stimulate and guide discussion. Your role is to come to each seminar having read the assigned readings and being prepared to engage. In this course, the role of the professor will be to stimulate and guide student discussion. I will ask questions and encourage you to present, and support, different points of view in discussion.

INSTRUCTOR AND CONTACT INFORMATION

Dr. Benson Honig
Professor
bhonig@mcmaster.ca
Office: DSB/407
Office Hours: by appointment
by appointment
Tel: (905) 525-9140 x23943

EVALUATION

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.

McMaster 12-point scale, as follows: A+ = 12, A = 11, A- = 10, B+ = 9, B = 8, B- = 7, C+ = 6, C = 5, C- = 4, D+ = 3, D = 2, D- = 1, F = 0. Further, all .5 marks will be rounded up. The passing grades for courses at the graduate level are A+, A, A-, B+, B, and B-.

Four One-Page Reports (4 articles x 6 weeks= 20%)

Each week, there are various chapters and empirical articles. I would like you to summarize four articles each week, those with the asterisk (*) indicating they are for summary. In addition, you will be required to read the additional chapters and short articles assigned. Each week, two students will each be asked to summarize one of the empirical, methodological, or theoretical **non-asterisked** papers presented each week and lead a discussion of that article. As well, two students will also lead a discussion of two different **asterisked articles** (so, you will lead four discussions for the term, two on an asterisked article, and two on a non- asterisked article). For the summaries, please write a one page (single spaced, 1" margins, 12-point Times New Roman font, name and student number can go in a header) summary of each article/chapter, where you answer the following questions: (1) what is the article saying? (2) what do I agree with? (3) what do I disagree with? (4) what else should the author(s) have included? (5) what is my overall assessment?

All work must be completed independently. Each week's article summaries should be submitted to me **via email on the SUNDAY midnight before our class**, according to the order of the class schedule. Late assignments will not be accepted.

Final Project (50%)

Your paper (double spaced, 1" margins, 12-point Times New Roman font, title page with name and student number, maximum 40 pages including references) will consist of a research proposal for an interesting topic focussing on organization theory. The paper will review the existing literature, provide theoretical justifications for the hypotheses, and describe how these hypotheses would be tested. That is, students will be writing a standard research article except that the data will not have yet been collected (therefore there will be no results or discussion section).

I am flexible about your choice of topics (e.g., you might like to choose something related to your dissertation), but you should discuss your choice with me before beginning your project. You are not required to choose a topic that we have discussed in class, although I expect you to choose a macro - or meso-level topic.

This paper is due exactly two weeks after our final class meeting. No extensions are available except under extraordinary circumstances.

Participation (20%)

All students are expected to demonstrate their understanding of the course material, verbally, in our virtual class. Generally, you should err on the side of participating more than you would ordinarily. Your comments and questions are welcome, will not be judged, and help to make the entire course more interesting and enjoyable for everyone. There is no penalty for being "wrong" but there is a (small) penalty for being silent.

Professional academic demeanour is mandatory at all times. Academic discourse requires that opinions be expressed honestly, but professionalism requires that these opinions also be expressed respectfully. Behaviours or comments that would be inappropriate in a conference or classroom setting are also inappropriate in our seminar.

Each student will have two opportunities to lead the class discussion in one of the articles that are not being summarized for that particular week (e.g. that are not indicated with an *).

If you are wondering if your participation is adequate, send me an email or come to my office and I will provide an estimate of your anticipated participation grade for the semester.

For each class, you should read all the assigned book chapters and articles. If you are not already familiar with the topics being covered, then you may find it useful to read an introductory textbook in organizational behaviour. I can lend you an OB textbook if you do not already have one.

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/univsec/policy/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>

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.

MISSED 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.

Reading List: In syllabus by week, also:

http://www.cbs.dk/files/cbs.dk/o_4._thomas_basboll_any_old_map_wont_do_improving_the_credibility_of_storytelling_in_sensemaking_scholarship_2012.pdf

SESSION AND TOPIC	ARTICLES AND CHAPTERS
<p>Week 1: Theory and Review of organization and management theory</p> <p>Sept. 9</p>	<p>Podcast:</p> <p>https://www.npr.org/2017/03/13/519661419/when-it-comes-to-politics-and-fake-news-facts-arent-enough</p> <p>*Barley, S. R., & Kunda, G. (2001). Bringing work back in. <i>Organization science</i>, 12(1), 76-95.</p> <p>Tourish, D. (2020). The triumph of nonsense in management studies. <i>Academy of Management Learning & Education</i>, 19(1), 99-109.</p> <p>*Sunstein, C. R., & Vermeule, A. (2009). Conspiracy theories: Causes and cures. <i>Journal of Political Philosophy</i>, 17(2), 202-227.</p> <p>Honig, B; Lampel, J; Baum, J; Glynn, MA; Jing, R; Llounsbury, M; Schubler, E; Sirmon, D; Tsui, A; Walsh, J; Witteloostuijn, A. (2018). Reflections on scientific misconduct in management. <i>Academy of Management Perspectives</i>. Vol. 32, No. 4, 1–31</p> <p><u>Weick, K. E. (1995). What theory is not, theorizing is. <i>Administrative Science Quarterly</i>, 385-390.</u></p> <p><u>*Hinings, C. R., & Greenwood, R. (2002). Disconnects and consequences in organization theory? <i>Administrative Science Quarterly</i>, 411-421.</u></p> <p>*2 Swieringa, R and Weick, K. (1982). An assessment of laboratory experiments in accounting. <i>Journal of accounting research</i> 20 (supplement):56-1-101. <u>PP 70-76 only NO NEED TO SUMMARIZE BUT EVERYONE MUST READ THESE 6 PAGES!! ONLY THESE SIX PAGES PLEASE!!</u></p> <p><u>*Basbøll, T., & Graham, H. (2006). Substitutes for Strategy Research: Notes on the source of Karl Weick’s anecdote of the. <i>ephemera</i>, 194.</u></p>
<p>Week 2: Emergence Sept. 16</p>	<p>Luker, K. (2008). What is this a case of, anyway? In Kristen Luker, <i>Salsa Dancing in the Social Sciences, Research in an age of Info-Glut</i>. Boston, Harvard Univ. Press, pp. 51-75.</p> <p>Azevedo, J. (2002) Updating Organizational Epistemology,. In Baum, J. A. (Ed.). (2002). <i>The Blackwell companion to organizations</i>. Blackwell Publishers. Chapter 31, pp715-732.</p>

	<p>Moldoveanu, M and Baum, J. (2002). Contemporary Debates in Organizational Epistemology, in In Baum, J. A. (Ed.). (2002). <i>The Blackwell companion to organizations</i>. Blackwell Publishers. Chapter 32, pp733-751.</p> <p>Powell, W; Packalen, K; and Whittington, K. (2012). Organizational and Institutional Genesis: The Emergence of *High-Tech Clusters in the Life Sciences in Padgett, J. F., & Powell, W. W. (2012). <i>The emergence of organizations and markets</i>. Princeton University Press. Chapter 13.</p> <p>*Navis, C and M. Glynn, 2010, How New Market Categories Emerge: Temporal Dynamics, Identity, and Entrepreneurship in Satellite Radio, 1990-2005. <i>Administrative Science Quarterly</i>, 55, 439-471.</p> <p>*McKinley, W., Mone, M. A., & Moon, G. (1999). Determinants and development of schools in organization theory. <i>Academy of Management Review</i>, 24(4), 634-648.</p> <p>*Padgett, J. F., & Powell, W. W. (2012). The problem of emergence. <i>The emergence of organizations and markets</i>, 1-29.</p> <p>*Ruef, M. (2000). The Emergence of Organizational Forms: A Community Ecology Approach1. <i>American Journal of Sociology</i>, 106(3), 658-714.</p>
<p>Week3 : Networks Sept. 23</p>	<p>Knocke, D; Marsden, PI and Kalleberg, A. (2002). Survey Research Methods In Baum, J. A. (Ed.). (2002). <i>The Blackwell companion to organizations</i>. Blackwell Publishers. Chapter 34, pp782-804.</p> <p>Kilduff, M and Tsai, W. (2005). Understanding Social Network Research, in Kilduff and Tsai (eds) <i>Social Networks and Organizations</i>, London, Sage Press, pp 13-34.</p> <p>*Brass, D. J., Galaskiewicz, J., Greve, H. R., & Tsai, W. (2004). Taking stock of networks and organizations: A multilevel perspective. <i>Academy of management journal</i>, 47(6), 795-817.</p> <p>*Shipilov, A., & Gawer, A. (2020). Integrating research on interorganizational networks and ecosystems. <i>Academy of Management Annals</i>, 14(1), 92-121.</p>

	<p>*Provan, K. G., & Milward, H. B. (1995). A preliminary theory of interorganizational network effectiveness: A comparative study of four community mental health systems. <i>Administrative science quarterly</i>, 1-33.</p> <p>*O'Boyle, E. H., Banks, G. C., & Gonzalez-Mulé, E. (2014). The Chrysalis Effect How Ugly Initial Results Metamorphosize Into Beautiful Articles. <i>Journal of Management</i>, 0149206314527133.</p>
<p>Week 4: Social Capital</p> <p>Sept. 30</p>	<p>Van de Ven, A and Poole, M. (2002). Field Research Methods, in Baum, J. A. (Ed.). (2002). <i>The Blackwell companion to organizations</i>. Blackwell Publishers. Chapter 38, pp867-888</p> <p>Luker, K. (2008). Field (and other) methods In Kristen Luker, <i>Salsa Dancing in the Social Sciences, Research in an age of Info-Glut</i>. Boston, Harvard Univ. Press, pp156-189</p> <p>*Emirbayer, M., & Johnson, V. (2008). Bourdieu and organizational analysis. <i>Theory and Society</i>, 37(1), 1-44.</p> <p>Gedajlovic, E., Honig, B., Moore, C. B., Payne, G. T., & Wright, M. (2013). Social capital and entrepreneurship: A schema and research agenda. <i>Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice</i>, 37(3), 455-478.</p> <p>*Qi, X. (2013). Guanxi, social capital theory and beyond: Toward a globalized social science. <i>The British journal of sociology</i>, 64(2), 308-324.</p> <p>*Xiao, Z., & Tsui, A. S. (2007). When brokers may not work: The cultural contingency of social capital in Chinese high-tech firms. <i>Administrative Science Quarterly</i>, 52(1), 1-31.</p> <p>*Maguire, S., Hardy, C., & Lawrence, T. B. (2004). Institutional entrepreneurship in emerging fields: HIV/AIDS treatment advocacy in Canada. <i>Academy of management journal</i>, 47(5), 657-679.</p>
<p>Week 5: Qualitative approaches</p> <p>Oct. 7</p>	<p>Dougherty, D. (2002). Grounded Theory Research Methods. In Baum, J. A. (Ed.). (2002). <i>The Blackwell companion to organizations</i>. Blackwell Publishers. Chapter 37, pp849-866..</p> <p>Suddaby, R. (2006). From the editors: What grounded theory is not. <i>Academy of management journal</i>, 49(4), 633-642.</p> <p>*Kieser, A. (1994). Why organization theory needs historical analyses—and how this should be performed. <i>Organization Science</i>, 5(4), 608-620.</p>

	<p>*Vallas, S. P. (2003). Why teamwork fails: Obstacles to workplace change in four manufacturing plants. <i>American Sociological Review</i>, 223-250.</p> <p>*Barley, S. R. (1990). Images of imaging: Notes on doing longitudinal field work. <i>Organization Science</i>, 1(3), 220-247.</p> <p><u>Eisenhardt, K. M. (1989). Building theories from case study research. <i>Academy of management review</i>, 14(4), 532-550.</u></p> <p>*Siggelkow, N. (2007). Persuasion with case studies. <i>Academy of Management Journal</i>, 50(1), 20-24.</p>
<p>Week 6: Evolutionary and Neo-Carnegie perspectives</p> <p>Oct. 14</p>	<p>Luker, K. (2008). Historical-Comparative methods In Kristen Luker, <i>Salsa Dancing in the Social Sciences, Research in an age of Info-Glut</i>. Boston, Harvard Univ. Press, pp190-197.</p> <p>* Vergne, J. P., & Durand, R. (2011). The path of most persistence: An evolutionary perspective on path dependence and dynamic capabilities. <i>Organization Studies</i>, 32(3), 365-382.</p> <p>*Gavetti, G., Levinthal, D., & Ocasio, W. (2007). Perspective-Neo-Carnegie: The Carnegie School's Past, Present, and Reconstructing for the Future. <i>Organization Science</i>, 18(3), 523-536.</p> <p>*Barnett, W. P., & Carroll, G. R. (1987). Competition and mutualism among early telephone companies. <i>Administrative Science Quarterly</i>, 400-421.</p> <p>* Casciaro, T., & Piskorski, M. J. 2005. Power Imbalance, Mutual Dependence, and Constraint Absorption: A Closer Look at Resource Dependence Theory. <i>Administrative Science Quarterly</i>, 50(2): 167-199.</p>