|  |
| --- |
| **COURSE INFORMATON**  |
| **Course Title** | *Code* | *Semester* | *L+P Hour* | *Credits* | *ECTS* |
| Advanced Organization Theory | PBA 610 |  | 3 + 0 | 3 | 10 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Prerequisites** | - |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Language of Instruction** | English |
| **Course Level** | PhD Program |
| **Course Type** | Compulsory |
| **Course Coordinator** |  |
| **Instructors** |   |
| **Assistants** |  |
| **Goals** | This course introduces the principal theoretical perspectives and empirical findings used to explain relationships among management theories, environments, organizational goals, designs, and performance. |
| **Content** | The main body of organizational literature, the historical development and the main features of major organization/management theories, the major perspectives and issues involved in the paradigms of organization and management theory, the opportunity to develop the ability and skills to critique both conceptual and methodological dimensions of these paradigms, more extensive and intensive research in the literature of organization and management theory, and share the results of their research efforts with colleagues in oral presentations, more precise research designs leading toward publishable research effort and/or their dissertations. |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Learning Outcomes** | **Program Learning Outcomes** | **Teaching Methods** | **Assessment Methods** |
| The students who succeeded in this course; will be able to; explain the historical development of the organizations and management theories. | 1,3,9 | 1,2,3 | A,C |
| The students who succeeded in this course; will be able to compare the different theories of organizations affect, differ from and similar to each other. | 1,3,9 | 1,2,3 | A,C |
| The students who succeeded in this course; will be able to evaluate the whole management science concepts’ and the general philosophy. | 1,3,9 | 1,2,3 | A,C |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Teaching Methods:**  | 1: Lecture, 2: Question-Answer, 3: Discussion, 9: Simulation, 12: Case Study  |
| **Assessment Methods:**  | A: Testing, B: Homework, C: Performance |

|  |
| --- |
| **COURSE CONTENT** |
| **Week** | **Topics** | **Study Materials** |
| 1 | ORGANIZATIONS AS THE OBJECT OF STUDY | Academic Papers |
| 2 | RATIONAL ORGANIZATION | Academic Papers |
| 3 | SCIENTIFIC MANAGEMENT | Academic Papers |
| 4  | THE HUMAN RELATIONS PERSPECTIVE AND MOTIVATION | Academic Papers |
| 5 | THE HUMAN RELATIONS PERSPECTIVE | Academic Papers |
| 6 | THE CARNEGIE PERSPECTIVE | Academic Papers |
| 7 | THE CONTINGENCY PERSPECTIVE AND BEYOND | Academic Papers |
| 8 | Midterm | Academic Papers |
| 9 | THE ACTION PERSPECTIVE | Academic Papers |
| 10 | POLITICAL PERSPECTIVES | Academic Papers |
| 11 | (NEO)MARXIST PERSPECTIVES | Academic Papers |
| 12 | INSTITUTIONALIZATION THEORY | Academic Papers |
| 13 | INSTITUTIONALIZATION THEORY | Academic Papers |
| 14 | POPULATION ECOLOGY AND EVOLUTION | Academic Papers |
| 15 | THE NETWORK PERSPECTIVE | Academic Papers |
| 16 | Final Exam  |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **RECOMMENDED SOURCES** |
| **Textbook** | W. Richard Scott, Organization: Rational, Natural and Open Systems, N.Y. Prentice Hall, 1998 Ch. 1. € Lex Donaldson, American AntiManagement Theories of Organization, N.Y.: Cambridge University Press, 1995: Ch. 1 € Charles Perrow, Complex Organization: A Critical Essay, 3rd ed.,N.Y: Random House, 1986 € C. Perrow, "The short and glorious history of organizational theory, "Organizational Dynamics, 1973. pp. 215. € Astley and Van de Ven (1983) “Central Perspectives and Debates in OT,” ASQ, 28: 245273. € James S. Coleman, “Prologue: Constructed Social Organizations” in Pierre Bourdieu and J.S. Coleman, eds. € Social Theory for a Changing Society, pp. 120, incl. commentaries by Hechter and Shapiro. € Jeffrey Pfeffer, Organizations and organization theory, Marshfield: Pitman, 1982, Ch.1 € J D Thompson, “On building an administrative science,” ASQ 1, 1956, 102111 € T Parsons, “Suggestions for a sociological approach to the theory of organizations—I, II” ASQ 1, 1956, 6385, 223239.€ G. Roth and C. Wittich (eds.) Weber: Economy and Society, 2 vols., Berkeley: University of California Press. 1978, esp. Vol. 1, Part 1, Ch 3, and Vol. 2, Chs. 10, € Alvin Gouldner, “Metaphysical Pathos and the Theory of Bureaucracy,” American Political Science Review, June 1955, pp. 496507. € Cohen, J., Hazelrigg, L. and Pope, W. “DeParsoning Weber: A critique of Parson’s interpretation of Weber’s sociology,” ASR 40, 1975: 229241. € Marsall W. Meyer, William Stevenson, Stephen Webster, Limits to Bureaucratic Growth, New York: DeGruyter, 1985) € Michel Crozier, The Bureaucratic Phenomenon (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1964) € Robert K. Merton, “Bureaucratic structure and personality,” in Social Theory and Social Structure, 3rd ed., (New York: Free Press, 1958, pp. 249260) € Peter M. Blau, The Dynamics of Bureaucracy, revised edition (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1963) € James Q. Wilson, Bureaucracy (New York: Basic, 1989) 6 € Richard H. Hall, “The concept of bureaucracy: An empirical assessment,” American Journal of Sociology, 69, 1963, pp. 32490 € Sanford Jacoby, Employing Bureaucracy (New York: Columbia UP, 1985) € John Langton, "The ecological theory of bureaucracy" Administrative Science Quarterly, 29, Sept 1984, pp.330354; € Charles Perrow, "Comment on Langton" Administrative Science Quarterly, 30, 1985, pp.278283; € John Langton, “Reply to Perrow” Administrative Science Quarterly, 30, 1985, pp. 274288. € D. S. Pugh et al. “Dimensions of organizational structure,” ASQ 13, 1968: 65105€ Taylor, F.W., The Principles of Scientific Management, New York: Norton, 1967 (originally published 1911). € Kelly, J.E., Scientific Management, Job Redesign and Work Performance, New York: Academic Press, 1982.Chs. 1, 2. pg 129. € Locke, E.A., "The ideas of Frederick W. Taylor: An Evaluation," Academy of Management Review, 7, 1,1982, pp. 1424. € Littler, C.R., The Development of the Labour Process in Capitalist Societies, London: Heinemann, 1982. € D. Nelson, Frederick W. Taylor and the Rise of Scientific Management, University of Wisconsin Press, 1980. € Haber, S., 1964, Efficiency and Uplift: Scientific Management in the Progressive Era, Chicago: U. of Chicago Press € C.P. Wrege and R.G. Greenwood, Frederick W. Taylor, the Father of Scientific Management: Myth and Reality, New York: Irwin, 1991 € H. Fayol, General and Industrial Management, London: Pitman, 1949€ T. Burns and G. Stalker, The Management of Innovation, London: Tavistock, 1961, Intro., Chs. 5,6,7. € Van de Ven and R. Drazin, “The concept of fit in contingency theory,” in L. Cummings and B. Staw (eds.) Research in Organizational Behavior, 7, 1985: 333365 € Paul Adler and Bryan Borys, “Two Types of Bureaucracy: Enabling and Coercive,” Administrative Science Quarterly, 41, 1, March 1996, pp. 6189. € J. D. Thompson, Organizations in Action, McGraw Hill, 1967, Part I plus Chs. 10, 11 € P. Lawrence and J. Lorsch, Organization and Environment, Harvard Business School Press, 1986/1967 € J. Woodward, Industrial Organization: Theory and Practice, New York: Oxford Univ Press, 1965 € B. Schoonhoven, “Problems with contingency theory: Testing assumptions hidden with the language of contingency theory,” ASQ 26, 1981: 34977 € Henry Tosi, Ramon Aldag and Ronald Storey, “On the measurement of the environment: An assessment of the Lawrence and Lorsch environmental uncertainty scale,” ASQ, 18, 1973, pp. 2736 € Daft, R.L. and Lengel, R.H., “Organizational Information Requirements, Media Richness and Structural Design,” Management Science, May 1986, pp. 554571. € Galbraith, J., 1973, Designing Complex Organizations, Reading, MA: AddisonWesley € Galbraith, J., 1977, Organization Design, Reading, MA: AddisonWesley € Beniger, James R. 1986. The Control Revolution. Harvard U. Press, esp. Ch. 2, 3. € J. M.. Pennings, “Structural contingency theory: A reappraisal,” In B. Staw and L. Cummings eds, Research in Organizational Behavior, 14, 1992: 267309 € Empirical studies: € P. Lawrence and J. Lorsch, "Differentiation and integration in complex organizations," ASQ 12, 1967. Pg. 147. € Donaldson, L. 1987. Strategy and structural adjustment to regain fit and performance: In defense of contingency theory,” Journal of Management Studies, 24: 124 € CONFIGURATIONAL APPROACHES € Gresov, and R. Drazin, “Equifinality, functional equivalence in organization design,” AMR 22, 1997: 403428 € R. Greenwood and C.R. Hinings, “Understanding strategic change: the contribution of archetypes,” AMJ 36, 5, 1993: 105281 € Miller and P. Friesen, “Momentum and revolution in organizational adaptation,” AMJ 23, 1980: 591614 € Miller, “Environmental fit versus internal fit,” Organization Science, 3, 2, 1992: 159178 € D. Harold Doty, William H. Glick, and George P. Huber, “Fit, equifinality, and organizational effectiveness: A test of two configurational theories,” AMJ, 36, 6, 1993: 11961250 |
| **Additional Resources** | PhD candidates are free the make use of any kind of academic reading in order improve their indepth knowledge about the topics. |

|  |
| --- |
| **MATERIAL SHARING** |
| **Documents** |  |
| **Assignments** |  |
| **Exams** | Midterm, and Final |

|  |
| --- |
| **ASSESSMENT** |
| **IN-TERM STUDIES** | **NUMBER** | **PERCENTAGE** |
| Mid-term | 1 | 60 |
| Attendance/Participation |  | 40 |
| **Total** |   | **100** |
| **CONTRIBUTION OF FINAL EXAMINATION TO OVERALL GRADE** |   | 50 |
| **CONTRIBUTION OF IN-TERM STUDIES TO OVERALL GRADE** |   | 50 |
| **Total** |   | **100** |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **COURSE CATEGORY** | Expertise/Field Courses |

|  |
| --- |
| **COURSE'S CONTRIBUTION TO PROGRAM** |
| No | Program Learning Outcomes | Contribution |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |  |
| 1 | Ph.D. candidates gain knowledge and skills to interpret and criticize many theories, models, and paradigms related to different perspectives that developed in the fields of business (organization and administration, organization behavior, marketing, finance, human resources, production technology, etc.) and social sciences and evaluation of scientific studies and research presented at scientific meetings |  |  |  |  | X |  |
| 2 | Ph.D. candidates learn to track and interpret the changes, innovations and developments in business administration or in other fields of social sciences, and as practitioners determine the organizational and managerial problems, create innovative solutions in the light of this information. |  |  |  | X |  |  |
| 3 | Ph.D. candidates gain knowledge, ability, and responsibility to carry out unique scientific and academic researches independently or in partnership with other researchers in the field of social sciences, and to publish the research results in forms of book, article, report and to present for discussing in scientific areas. |  |  |  |  | X |  |
| 4 | Ph.D. candidates become managers based on ethical issues, leaders, or academicians who have consciousness of a sustainable environment, social responsibility and active citizenship in the scientific environment in the university, in the close relationship with outstanding faculty members, selected guest speakers and the teammates who they are educated together. |  | X |  |  |  |  |
| 5 |  Ph.D. candidates learn that the employees of the national and international organizations they manage come from different backgrounds and culture, cultural conflicts occur in mergers and cross-country mobility of the labor force, in a scientific environment and evolve as successful managers and leaders who can manage cultural differences. |  |  | X |  |  |  |
| 6 | Ph.D. candidates gain leadership qualifications to make rational decision-making for long-term strategic planning and application of plans in the organizations they work.  |  |  |  | X |  |  |
| 7 | Ph.D. candidates learn that strategic management is teamwork and results can be achieved only by working as teams.  |  |  | X |  |  |  |
| 8 | Ph.D. candidates learn that information developed in different fields of social sciences complete each other and in scientific studies, having multidisciplinary approach and viewpoint is inevitable. |  |  |  |  | X |  |
| 9 | In long-term doctoral studies, Ph.D. candidates prepare papers and presentations in English and they criticized for improvement of their studies, they gain effective communication skills in both their native language and in English. |  |  |  |  | X |  |
| 10 | Ph.D. Candidates experiences how rapid is production and development of information in social sciences and in business administration and learn that life-long learning is inevitable. |  |  | X |  |  |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **ECTS ALLOCATED BASED ON STUDENT WORKLOAD BY THE COURSE DESCRIPTION** |
| Activities | Quantity | Duration(Hour) | TotalWorkload(Hour) |
| Course Duration (Including the exam week: 16x Total course hours) | 16 | 3 | 48 |
| Hours for off-the-classroom study (Pre-study, practice) | 16 | 3 | 48 |
| Mid-terms | - | - | - |
| Final examination | 10 | 12,6 | 126 |
| **Total Work Load** | 1 | 10 | 10 |
| **Total Work Load / 25 (h)** |  |  |  250 |
| **ECTS Credit of the Course** |  |  | 10 |