

University of North Carolina Charlotte
Organizational Theory and Systems
Semester 1

Professor: 5 Instructors – Lead Instructor Prof. Dr. Franz Kellermanns

Course: *Organizational Theory and Systems*

Room: *Center City*

Meeting Time: 8:00 to 5:00.

Contact Information:

Fax (dept): 704-687-1380

Phone (dept area coordinator): 704-687-7684

Instructor Email Addresses

Franz Kellermanns: kellermanns@uncc.edu

George Banks: gbanks3@uncc.edu

Jared Hansen: jared.hansen@uncc.edu

Dave Woehr: dwoehr@uncc.edu

Justin Webb: Justin.W.Webb@uncc.edu

Course Description

Review of a broad range of organizational theory and topics in the field of management, marketing and information systems, with the following goals in mind:

Knowledge-oriented goals

1. To review and synthesize fundamental themes in organizational theory in management
2. To review and synthesize fundamental themes in organizational theory in marketing
3. To develop an appreciation of data analysis
4. To explore the latest ideas for doing empirical research

Skills-oriented goals:

To increase theory-building skills, in particular to enhance the following abilities:

1. to articulate theoretically interesting, well-focused topics
2. to develop logical argumentation in support of a model
3. to define internally consistent theoretical constructs and identify non-trivial relationships among them
4. to identify critical assumptions and boundary conditions for a theory
5. to write compelling research questions or propositions

Course Objectives

1. Demonstrate ability to:
 - understand the core research questions and methods embodied in a particular stream of literature,
 - evaluate the theoretical significance and methodological rigor of the material,
 - frame relevant questions and critique

- identify logical next steps in the research stream.
2. Demonstrate ability to write an empirical or theoretical paper that makes a contribution within the domain of the topic area.
 3. Demonstrate readiness to submit the above paper at a regional or national meeting.

Instructional Method: Seminar style discussion/debate, lectures, and in-class exercises are used in the class.

Credit Hours: This is a 3 credit hour course.

Required Materials/ Readings

There are no mandatory textbooks to purchase. Core readings for each topic are identified at the end of this syllabus for each session. They need to be read prior to attending class. They can be found online using the university library databases and/or will be posted to Canvas depending on the sources and instructor for that session. Please feel free to explore the topic further using the references in assigned papers. There is always much more literature than one can assign in a seminar.

Grading

Grades will be based on the following weights:

50% Class Participation/Discussion (Class discussion and group work in class)

50% Research Paper + Research Paper PowerPoint

Description of Assignments and Grading

Class Participation/Discussion

Class attendance at all five class sessions is mandatory. The learning from the group discussion of research articles cannot be replicated outside of that environment.

We will meet once a month for 5 months. Each class day is led by a faculty member in either marketing or management. Each meeting will follow the outlined procedure:

- Check in
- For most classes doctoral students are assigned to guide the discussion.
- Each student is expected to identify and discuss major themes and subtopics – What are the key contributions of each paper? What are the methodological issues in studying this topic?

Students' participation will be evaluated based on active class involvement. Students will take turns in leading seminar discussions. Disrespectful or disturbing behavior of students during class time will have a substantial negative impact on the class participation grade. Students are strongly encouraged to actively share their views in class discussions since the final participation grade is determined based on both attendance and class involvement.

Research Paper

You will submit a literature review paper that focuses on a potential area of interest for your research. The paper should not be longer than 40 double spaced pages (including tables, figures, and references) using a 12-point font in Microsoft Word. The due date for this assignment is posted in the schedule is on December 8th.

Note: It is desirable that a form of the paper will also be submitted to a relevant upcoming academic conference for review. It is your responsibility to find out when the deadline is and make sure the paper is submitted on time. Instructors are available for consultation on conference suggestions. The general submission processes will be discussed in other classes.

Research Paper PowerPoint

You will submit a brief PowerPoint overview of your literature review that can educate your fellow students about the topic.

Note: The entire class will have access to the papers and PowerPoint presentations to aid them in understanding the research interests of their peers so they can identify future potential research collaborators, as well as deepen their knowledge of the topics of this class.

General Course Information Guidelines

Statement on Diversity. University and Belk College of Business strives to create an inclusive academic climate in which the dignity of all individuals is respected and maintained. We celebrate diversity that is beneficial to employers and society at large. Students are encouraged to actively and appropriately share their different views in class discussions of cases and exercises and when called upon by the instructor.

Documented Disability. Any student who feels s/he may need an accommodation based on the impact of a documented disability should contact the lead instructor privately to discuss your specific needs, as well as contact the Office of Disability Services (see <http://ds.uncc.edu/>) to register to receive accommodations.

Severe Weather. Students will be responsible for any academic work which they miss due to absences caused by severe weather conditions. It is the individual student's responsibility to take the initiative to make up any missed class work. The campus will notify students if the university is closed for all classes. Instructors will notify students via email if any additional alterations are being made due to inclement weather.

Classroom expectations. This syllabus contains the policies and expectations established for this course. Please read the entire syllabus carefully before continuing in this course. These policies and expectations are intended to create a productive learning atmosphere for all students. Students who fail to abide by these policies and expectations, risk losing the opportunity to participate further in the course.

Civility. Students are encouraged to actively appropriately share their views in class discussions; the vigorous debate of alternative ideas is an important part of advancing scientific knowledge

and society. The University strives to create a robust intellectual environment that values social and cultural diversity, free expression, collegiality, integrity, and courtesy in discussions. It is important that all of these elements are jointly included and balanced as we spend significant time engaged in critical review of real world examples of branding and new product ideation related topics. The instructors will encourage everyone to consider how they can recognize, promote, and celebrate diversity that is beneficial to both employers and society at large. The instructors will end discussion as needed to keep discussion from become too heated, off topic, or going over time, etc. Violations of UNCC Policy 406, Code of Student Responsibility, including vulgar or offensive language, depictions, graphics, or behaviors can result in a significant decrease in course grade.

Academic integrity. Cheating and disruptive behavior have significant consequences. All students are required to read and abide by the [Code of Student Academic Integrity](#) which governs student behavior relating to academic work. Violations of the Code of Student Academic Integrity, including plagiarism, will result in disciplinary action as provided in the Code. Definitions and examples of plagiarism are set forth in the Code. The Code is available from the Dean of Students Office or online at: <http://www.legal.uncc.edu/policies/ps-105.html>. All UNC Charlotte students are expected to be familiar with the Code and to conduct themselves in accord with these requirements. To clarify, this code forbids cheating, fabrication or falsification of information, multiple submissions of academic work without authorization, plagiarism (which includes viewing others work without instructor permission), abuse of academic materials, and complicity in academic dishonesty. This forbidding includes sharing/copying work between individuals or teams without permission of instructors. Any special requirements or permission regarding academic integrity in this course will be stated by the instructor, and are binding on the students. Students who violate the code can be expelled from UNC Charlotte. The normal penalty for a first offense is zero credit on the work involving dishonesty and further substantial reduction of the course grade. In almost all cases the course grade is reduced to failing. Students are expected to report cases of academic dishonesty to the course instructor.

Materials. All materials submitted as part of course requirements become the property of the instructors. Students desiring to retain copies of their work should make such copies before turning in their materials.

Technology in the classroom. The use of laptops, smart phones, tablets, and other communication devices for *non-class* related purposes (e.g., emailing/texting, shopping, other classes, social media, etc.) is disruptive, and is therefore prohibited during class, except for during breaks or other specific times indicated by the instructors.

Schedule

Class Day	Date	Instructor	
1	14-Jul	Kellermanns	Course Introduction – Program Background <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Library 9:30-11:00 • Mediation vs. Moderation – Scientific Language Management Related Readings
Online Contact See Canvas for Updates – 1 st August			
2	11-Aug	Banks	Management Related Readings
Online Contact See Canvas for Updates – 1 st September			
3	8-Sep	Hansen	Marketing Related Readings
Online Contact See Canvas for Updates – 1 st October			
4	13-Oct	Webb	Management Related Readings
Online Contact See Canvas for Updates – 1 st November			
5	10-Nov	Woehr	Management Related Readings
Final Paper and PowerPoints due	8-Dec		Paper + PowerPoints

Readings:

Class Day 1:

Introductory Readings

1. Moderation vs. Mediation (Pizza and Beer Example – Handout during class)
2. Whetten, D.A., What constitutes a theoretical contribution? *Academy of Management Review*. 14, 1989: pp. 490-495.
3. Pfeffer, J., Barriers to the advance of organizational science: paradigm development as a dependent variable. *Academy of Management Review*. 18(4), 1993: pp. 599-620.
4. Mitchell, T.R., The academic life: Realistic changes needed for business school students and faculty. 6(2) 2007. 236-251.

Power and Institutions

1. Finkelstein, S., Power in top management teams: dimensions, measurement, and validation. *Academy of Management Journal*. 35(3), 1992: pp. 505-538.
2. Ouchi, W.G., Market, bureaucracies, and clans. *Administrative Science Quarterly*. 25(1), 1980: pp. 129-141.
3. Mechanic, David, Sources of Power of Lower Participants in Complex Organizations, *ASQ*, 7(3), 1962: pp. 349 - 364.

4. Pfeffer, J. and Salancik, G. R., Organizational Decision Making as a Political Process: The Case of a University Budget, *ASQ*, 19(2), 1974:135-151.
5. Zellweger, T. M., Kellermanns, F. W., Chrisman, J. J., & Chua, J. H. 2012. Family control and family firm valuation by family CEOs: The importance of intentions for transgenerational control. *Organization Science*, 23(3): 851-868.
6. Ge, J., Stanley, L.J, Eddleston, K. & Kellermanns, F. W. A note on institutional deterioration and entrepreneurial investment: The role of political connection. Forthcoming in *Journal of Business Venturing*.

Networks

1. Granovetter, M. The strength of weak ties. A network theory revisited. *American Journal of Sociology*. 78(6)/1983: 1360-1380.
2. Coleman, James S. (1988). Social capital in the creation of human capital. *American Journal of Sociology*, 94: S95-S120.
3. Walter, J., Kellermanns, F. W., & Lechner, C. (2012). Decision making within and between organizations: Rationality, politics and alliance performance. *Journal of Management*, 38(5), 1582-1610.
4. Levin, D. Z., Walter, J., & Murnighan, J. K. 2011. Dormant ties: The value of reconnecting. *Organization Science*, 22(4): 923-939.
5. Parkhe, A., Strategic alliance structuring: A game theoretic and transaction cost examination of interfirm cooperation. *Academy of Management Journal*. 36, 1993: pp. 794-820.
6. Rousseau, D.M., S.B. Sitkin, R.S. Burt, and C. Camerer, Not so different after all: a cross discipline view of trust. *Academy of Management Review*. 23(3), 1998: pp. 393-404.
7. Peredo A-M, Chrisman JJ. Toward a theory of community-based enterprise, *Academy of Management Review* 2006, 31, 2, 309-329.

Class Day 2:

1. Antonakis, J., Bastardo, N., Jacquart, P., & Shamir, B. (2016a). Charisma: An ill-defined and ill-measured gift. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior*, 3(1), 293–319.
2. Banks, G. C., Engemann, K. E., Williams, C. E., Gooty, J., Davis McCauley, K., & Medaugh, M.R. (in press). A meta-analytic review and future research agenda of charismatic leadership. *The Leadership Quarterly*.
3. Banks, G. C., Davis McCauley, K., Gardner, W. L., & Guler, C. E. (2016). A meta-analytic review of authentic and transformational leadership: A test for redundancy. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 27, 634-652.
4. Bell, S. T. (2007). Deep-level composition variables as predictors of team performance: a meta-analysis. *Journal of applied psychology*, 92(3), 595.
5. Humphrey, R. H., Pollack, J. M., & Hawver, T. (2008). Leading with emotional labor. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 23(2): 151-168.
6. De Dreu, C. K. & Weingart, L. R. (2003). Task versus relationship conflict, team performance, and team member satisfaction: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 88, 741-749.

7. Gerstner, C. R. & Day, D. V. (1997). Meta-Analytic review of leader–member exchange theory: Correlates and construct issues. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 82, 827-844.
8. Gooty, J., Connelly, S., Griffith, J., & Gupta, A. (2010). Leadership, affect and emotions: A state of the science review. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 21(6), 979-1004.
9. Judge, T. A. & Piccolo, R. F. (2004). Transformational and transactional leadership: a meta-analytic test of their relative validity. *Journal of Applied psychology*, 89(5), 755.
10. Martins, L. L., Gilson, L. L., & Maynard, M. T. (2004). Virtual teams: What do we know and where do we go from here? *Journal of Management*, 30(6): 805-835.
11. Mathieu, J., Maynard, M. T., Rapp, T., & Gilson, L. (2008). Team effectiveness 1997-2007: A review of recent advancements and a glimpse into the future. *Journal of Management*, 34(3), 410-476.
12. Morgeson, F. P., DeRue, D. S., & Karam, E. P. (2009). Leadership in teams: A functional approach to understanding leadership structures and processes. *Journal of Management*.
13. Rico, R., Sánchez-Manzanares, M., Gil, F., & Gibson, C. (2008). Team implicit coordination processes: A team knowledge–based approach. *Academy of Management Review*, 33(1): 163-184.
14. Stahl, G. K., Maznevski, M. L., Voigt, A., & Jonsen, K. (2010). Unraveling the effects of cultural diversity in teams: A meta-analysis of research on multicultural work groups. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 41(4), 690-709.
15. Wageman, R., Gardner, H., & Mortensen, M. (2012). The changing ecology of teams: New directions for teams research. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 33(3): 301-315.

Class Day 3:

Development of New Marketing Theory

1. Hunt, S.D. (1983). General Theories and the Fundamental Explananda of Marketing. *Journal of Marketing*, 47(4): 9-17. (note: extra focus on pages 10-12).
2. Hunt, S. D. (1971). The Morphology of Theory and the General Theory of Marketing. *The Journal of Marketing*, 35(2): 65-68.
3. Hunt, S. D. (1994). On rethinking marketing: our discipline, our practice, our methods. *European Journal of Marketing*, 28(3), 13-25.
4. Sutton, R.I., & Staw, B.M. (1995). What Theory is Not. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 40(3): 371-384.
5. Davis, M. S. (1971). That's interesting! Towards a phenomenology of sociology and a sociology of phenomenology. *Philosophy of the Social Sciences*, 1(2), 309-344.

Selected Theories on Market Competition and Market Intelligence

1. Wernerfelt, B. (1984). A Resource-Based View of the Firm. *Strategic Management Journal*, 5(2): 171-180.
2. Barney, J (1991). Firm Resources and Sustained Competitive Advantage. *Journal of Management*, 17(1): 99-120.

3. Prahalad, C.K. and Hamel, G. (2006). The Core Competence of the Corporation. *Harvard Business Review*, (May/June), 275-292.
4. Hansen, McDonald, and Mitchell (2013). Resource Specialization, Causal Ambiguity, Competitiveness, and the Creation and Decay of Competences: The Role of Marketing Strategy in New Product Performance and Shareholder Value. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science* 41(3), 300-319
5. Teece, D.J., Pisano, G., and Shuen, A. (1997). Dynamic Capabilities and Strategic Management, *Strategic Management Journal*, 18(7), 509-533.
6. Hunt, S.D. (2012), The Evolution of Resource-Advantage Theory: Six Events, Six Realizations, Six Contributions, *Journal of Historical Research in Marketing*, 4(1), 7-29.
7. Kohli, A.K., and Jaworski, B.J. (1990), Market Orientation: The Construct, Research Propositions, and Managerial Implications,” *Journal of Marketing*, 54(2), 1-18.
8. Narver, J.C., and Slater, S.F. (1990) “The Effects of Market Orientation on Business Profitability,” *Journal of Marketing*, 54(4), 20-35.

Selected Theories on Consumer Motivation and New Product/Technology Adoption

1. Ajzen, I. and Fishbein, M. (1973). Attitudinal and Normative Variables as Predictors of Specific Behavior, *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 27(1), 41-57.
2. Davis, F.D. Bagozzi, R.P., and Warshaw, P.R. (1989). User Acceptance of Computer Technology: A Comparison of Two Theoretical Models, *Management Science*, 35(8), 982-1003.
3. Venkatesh, V., Davis, M.D., and Davis, G.B. (2003). User Acceptance of Information Technology: Toward a Unified View, *MIS Quarterly*, 27(3), 425-478.
4. Hansen, J.M. and Levin, M.A. (2016). The Interactive Effects of Apathetic Motivation on Employees’ Intentions to Use Social Media Platforms for Businesses, *Journal of Business Research*, 69(12), 6058-6066.

Selected Theories on Business Ethics and Corporate Social Responsibility

1. Godfrey, P.C., Merrill, C.B., and Hansen, J.M. (2009). The Relationship Between Corporate Social Responsibility and Shareholder Value: An Empirical Test of the Risk Management Hypothesis, *Strategic Management Journal*, 30(4), 425-445.
2. Hunt, S.D., and Hansen, J.M. (2007). Understanding Ethical Diversity in Organizations, *Organizational Dynamics*, 36(2), 202-216.

Class Day 4:

Institutional Theory

1. Bitektine, A. & Haack, P. 2015. The “macro” and the “micro” of legitimacy: Toward a multilevel theory of the legitimacy process. *Academy of Management Review*, 40: 49-75.
2. Dacin, M.T., Munir, K., & Tracey, P. 2010. Formal dining at Cambridge colleges: Linking ritual performance and institutional maintenance. *Academy of Management Journal*, 53: 1393-1418.

3. DiMaggio, P.J. & Powell, W.W. 1983. The iron cage revisited: Institutional isomorphism and collective rationality in organizational fields. *American Sociological Review*, 48: 147-160.
4. Fisher, G., Kuratko, D.F., Bloodgood, J.M., & Hornsby, J.S. 2017. Legitimate to whom? The challenge of audience diversity and new venture legitimacy. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 32: 52-71.
5. Greenwood, R., Oliver, C., Suddaby, R., & Sahlin-Andersson, K. 2008. *The SAGE Handbook of Organizational Institutionalism*. SAGE Publications.
6. Hardy, C. & Maguire, S. 2010. Discourse, field-configuring events, and change in organizations and institutional fields: Narratives of DDT and the Stockholm Convention. *Academy of Management Journal*, 53: 1365-1392.
7. Kistruck, G.M., Webb, J.W., Sutter, C.J., & Bailey, A.V. 2015. The double-edged sword of legitimacy in base-of-the-pyramid markets. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 30: 436-451.
8. Maguire, S. & Phillips, N. 2008. 'Citibankers' at Citigroup: A study of the loss of institutional trust after a merger. *Journal of Management Studies*, 45: 372-401.
9. Thornton, P.H. & Ocasio, W. 2008. Institutional logics. *Sage Handbook of Organizational Institutionalism*: 99-129.
10. Zimmerman, M.A. & Zeitz, G.J. 2001. Beyond survival: Achieving new venture growth by building legitimacy. *Academy of Management Review*, 27: 414-431.

Transaction Cost Economics

1. Argyres, N. 1996. Evidence on the role of firm capabilities in vertical integration decisions. *Strategic Management Journal*, 129-150.
2. Ghoshal, S. & Moran, P. 1996. Bad for practice: A critique of transaction cost theory. *Academy of Management Review*, 21: 13-47.
3. Ireland, R.D. & Webb, J.W. 2007. A multi-theoretic perspective on trust and power in strategic supply chains. *Journal of Operations Management*, 25: 482-497.
4. Jacobides, M.G. & Winter, S.G. 2005. The co-evolution of capabilities and transaction costs: Explaining the institutional structure of production. *Strategic Management Journal*, 26: 395-413.
5. Jones, G.R. 2001. Towards a positive interpretation of transaction cost theory: The central roles of entrepreneurship and trust. In Hitt, M.A., Freeman, R.E., & Harrison, J.S. (Eds.), *The Blackwell Handbook of Strategic Management* (pp. 208-228). Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishers.

6. Kistruck, G.M., Morris, S.S., Webb, J.W., & Stevens, S.E. 2015. The importance of client heterogeneity in predicting make-or-buy decisions. *Journal of Operations Management*, 33-34: 97-110.
7. Mayer, K.J. & Solomon, R.M. 2006. Capabilities, contractual hazards, and governance: Integrating resource-based and transaction cost perspectives. *Academy of Management Journal*, 49: 942-959.
8. Poppo, L., Zhou, K.Z., & Li, J.J. 2015. When can you trust “trust”? Calculative trust, relational trust, and supplier performance. *Strategic Management Journal*.
9. Reuer, J.J. & Devarakonda, S.V. 2016. Mechanisms of hybrid governance: Administrative committees in non-equity alliances. *Academy of Management Journal*, 59: 510-533.
10. Weber, L. & Mayer, K.J. 2014. Transaction cost economics and the cognitive perspective: Investigating the sources and governance of interpretive uncertainty. *Academy of Management Review*, 39: 344-363.
11. Williamson, O.E. 1985. *The Economic Institutions of Capitalism*. New York: The Free Press – Chapters 1-4, p. 15-102.

Class Day 5:

Management and Organizational Behavior

The primary focus of this section is on organizational behavior and human resource management. The goal is to provide an introduction and overview across several topics. Topics include: an overview of management as an academic discipline; theories of organizational behavior; person-environment fit; models of individual job performance; the strategic role of human resource management in organizations; and, the importance of job-related attitudes.

Management Overview

1. Cascio, W.F., & Aguinis, H. (2008). Research in industrial and organizational psychology from 1963 to 2007: Changes, choices, and trends, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 93, 1062-1081.
2. McGrath, R.G. (2007). No longer a stepchild: How the management field can come into its own. *Academy of Management Journal*, 50(6), 1281-1303.
3. Rousseau, D.M. (1997). Organizational Behavior in the new organizational era. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 48, 515-546.

Organizational Behavior Theory

4. Bandura, A. (2001). Social cognitive theory: An agentic perspective. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 52, 1-26.

5. Locke, E.A., & Latham, G.P. (2004). What should we do about motivation theory? Six recommendations for the twenty-first century. *Academy of Management Review*, 29, 388-403.
6. Miner, J.B. (2003). The rated importance, scientific validity, and practical usefulness of organizational behavior theories. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 2, 250-268.

Person-Environment Fit

7. Hoffman, B. & Woehr, D. J. (2006). A quantitative review of the relationship between person-organization fit and behavioral outcomes. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 68, 389-399.
8. Kristof-Brown, A.L., Zimmerman, R.D., & Johnson, E..C., (2005). Consequences of individuals' fit at work: A meta-analysis of person-job, person-organization, person-group, and person-supervisor fit. *Personnel Psychology*, 58, 281-342.
9. Schneider, B., Goldstein, H.W., & Smith, D.B. (1995). The ASA framework: An update. *Personnel Psychology*, 48: 747-773.

Strategic HRM

10. Crook, T. R., Todd, S. Y., Combs, J. G., Woehr, D. J., & Ketchen, D. J. (2011). Does human capital matter? A meta-analysis of the relationship between human capital and firm performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 96, 443-456.
11. Jiang, K., Lepak, D., Hu, J., & Baer, J. (2012). How Does Human Resource Management Influence Organizational Outcomes? A Meta-Analytic Investigation of Mediating Mechanisms. *Academy of Management Journal*, 55, 1264-1294.

Job Performance

12. Viswesvaran, C., & Ones, D.S. (2000). Perspectives on models of job performance. *International Journal of Selection And Assessment*, 8(4), 216-226.
13. Hoffman, B., Blair, C., Meriac, J., & Woehr, D.J. (2007). Expanding the criterion space? A Quantitative Review of the OCB Literature. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 92(2), 555-566.

Job Attitudes

14. Harrison, D. A., Newman, D.A., & Roth, P.L. (2006). How important are job attitudes? Meta-analytic comparisons of integrative behavioral outcomes and time sequences. *Academy of Management Journal*, 41, 96-107.
15. Saari, L.M., & Judge, T.A. (2004) Employee Attitudes and Job Satisfaction. *Human Resource Management*, 43, 395-407.