

組織理論專題研究 (Seminar on Organization Theory)

Spring, 2026

Classroom: 管二館九樓討論室

9F Seminar Room, Blg 2, College of Management

Friday 9:30-12:20

Instructor: 劉念琪 Nien-Chi Liu

Email: liunienchi@ntu.edu.tw

Office hour: Monday 13:30-15:00

Course Objectives:

Welcome to the fascinating study of complex organizations. They are ubiquitous, dynamic, bureaucratic, political, paradoxical, opportunistic human institutions. Our work on this semester is trying to find out a way (or ways) to understand how they work, and don't work. By theory, like practice, is not a destination; it is a process. Through it, we may find fantastic routes to explore the world of organizations which are beyond our imaginations, metaphors, language, theory and science.

This course is intended to introduce alternative approaches that are being taken to understand business organizations. Each week we will read about and discuss a different perspective or school of thought on organizations. Hopefully, the journey will provide some skills and exercise our creativity in extending our limited thinking on organizations.

The second objective of this course is to help prepare a research proposal. Each student will prepare a research proposal on a topic related to organization theory, but which may be grounded in any other Strategy or OB/HR topic.

Class Procedure and Students Participation:

Students are expected to be well-prepared for class by reading all papers required for a given class session, thinking critically about the themes and issues that characterize their content, and preparing to actively participate in class discussion. Class sessions will be spent evaluating, integrating, and supplementing the material presented in the readings. There is at least one course leader for every paper section meeting to lead course discussions.

In this course, students are expected not only that they can learn how to READ the research papers in organization theory field, but also that they can learn how to REVIEW and ASSESS these papers.

1. Students are required to lead the discussion of the assigned literature, and criticize papers in the class.
2. Except for the leading student, other students should also prepare the materials before the class and participate in the discussion actively.
3. Students are required to write a research proposal in the related organization theory field.

Final Report (Research Proposal):

Every student is asked to write a research paper or proposal on a topic related to the contents of this course. Students are required to develop a research idea for your term paper (or proposal), and hand in a 3-5 page-length research idea during the middle of semester. The final paper could be a theoretical or empirical one. It will be due by May 30th, 2022.

Grading:

The final grade will be composed as follows:

1. Term paper proposal: 50%
2. Class Leading: 30%
3. Course Participation 20%

Course Schedule

Date	Topics	
Meet 1 3/6	Course Introduction & Classical Organization Theory	9:30-15:00 2 sections
Meet 2 3/20	Technology, Work and Organizational Design	9:30-15:00 2 sections
Meet 3 3/27	Guest Speaker: Professor Andrew Weaver	10:00 – 12:00 1 section
Meet 4 4/10	Behavior theory of the firm & Strategic Decision-Making	9:30~ 15:00 2 sections
Meet 5 4/24	Organizational Learning & Dynamic Capabilities	9:30~ 15:00 2 sections
Meet 6 5/8	Organizational Economics / Guest Speaker	9:30~ 15:00 2 sections
Meet 7 5/15	Institutional Theory	9:30~ 15:00 2 sections
Meet 8 5/22	Organizational Change and Ambidexterity	9:30~ 15:00 2 sections
6/5	Final Paper Due One on one discussion (by appointment)	1 section

Reading materials:

Text Books

1. Scott, R. W. and Davis, G. F. (2015). *Organizations and Organizing: Rational, Natural and Open Systems*, Pearson Prentice Hall. (雙葉代理)
2. Hitt, M. A., & Smith, K. G. (Eds.). (2005). *Great minds in management: The process of theory development*. Oxford University Press.
3. 周雪光(2003), *組織社會學十講*, 北京：社會科學文獻出版社.

Weekly Readings:

I. Organization Theory Revisited

1. Haveman, H. A., Mahoney, J. T., & Mannix, E. (2021). The evolving science of organization: theory matters. *Academy of Management Review*, 46(4), 660-666.
 - i. Cornelissen, J., Höllerer, M. A., & Seidl, D. (2021). What theory is and can be: Forms of theorizing in organizational scholarship. *Organization Theory*, 2(3), 26317877211020328.
2. Scott and Davis. Ch 1-5
3. Kornberger, M., & Mantere, S. (2020). Thought experiments and philosophy in organizational research. *Organization Theory*, 1(3), 2631787720942524.
4. Joseph, J., & Sengul, M. (2025). Organization design: Current insights and future research directions. *Journal of Management*, 51(1), 249-308.
5. Monteiro, P., & Adler, P. S. (2022). Bureaucracy for the 21st century: Clarifying and expanding our view of bureaucratic organization. *Academy of Management Annals*, 16(2), 427-475.
6. Adler, P. and Borys, B. (1996). Two types of bureaucracy: Enabling and Coercive. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, pp. 61-89.
7. Kessler, S. R., Nixon, A. E., & Nord, W. R. (2017). Examining organic and mechanistic structures: Do we know as much as we thought?. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, 19(4), 531-555.

II. Technology, Work and Organizational Design

1. Donaldson, L. (2006). The contingency theory of organizational design: challenges and opportunities. *Organization Design: The evolving state-of-the-art*, 19-40.
 - i. Donaldson, L. (2001), *The Contingency Theory of Organizations*, Ch 1, 5, 6, 7
 - ii. Scott and Davis, Ch 6-7.
2. Shenkar, O., & Ellis, S. (2022). The rise and fall of structural contingency theory: A theory's 'autopsy'. *Journal of Management Studies*, 59(3), 782-818.
3. Orlikowski, W. J. (1992), *The Duality of Technology: Rethinking the Concept of Technology in Organizations*, *Organization Science* 1992 3:398-427
4. Sinha, K. K. and Van de Ven, A. H., (2005), *Designing Work Within and Between Organizations*, *Organization Science*, 16(4): 389-408.
5. Joseph, J., & Gaba, V. (2020). Organizational structure, information processing,

- and decision-making: a retrospective and road map for research. *Academy of Management Annals*, 14(1), 267-302.
6. Raveendran, M., Silvestri, L., & Gulati, R. (2020). The role of interdependence in the micro-foundations of organization design: task, goal, and knowledge interdependence. *Academy of Management Annals*, 14(2), 828-868.
 7. Bailey, D. E., Faraj, S., Hinds, P. J., Leonardi, P. M., & von Krogh, G. (2022). We are all theorists of technology now: A relational perspective on emerging technology and organizing. *Organization Science*, 33(1), 1-18.
 8. Anthony, C., Bechky, B. A., & Fayard, A. L. (2023). "Collaborating" with AI: Taking a system view to explore the future of work. *Organization Science*, 34(5), 1672-1694.
 9. Landers, R. N., & Marin, S. (2021). Theory and technology in organizational psychology: A review of technology integration paradigms and their effects on the validity of theory. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior*, 8(1), 235-258.

III. Behavior theory of the firm & Managerial Decision-Making

1. Argote, L. and Greve, H. R., (2007), A Behavioral Theory of the Firm--40 Years and Counting: Introduction and Impact, *Organization Science*, 18: 337-349
2. Gavetti, G., Greve, H. R., Levinthal, R. A. and Ocasio, W. (2012). The Behavioral Theory of the Firm: Assessment and Prospects, *The Academy of Management Annals*, 6(1): 1-40.
3. Wilden, R., Hohberger, J., Devinney, T. M., & Lumineau, F. (2019). 60 years of March and Simon's organizations: an empirical examination of its impact and influence on subsequent research. *Journal of management studies*, 56(8), 1570-1604.
4. Hagen, M., Su, W., & Junge, S. (2023). 60th birthday of 'A Behavioral Theory of the Firm': a review of the relational concepts and recommendations for future research. *Management Review Quarterly*, 1-46.
5. Nason, R. S., Bacq, S., & Gras, D. (2018). A behavioral theory of social performance: Social identity and stakeholder expectations. *Academy of Management Review*, 43(2), 259-283.
6. Fasolo, B., Heard, C., & Scopelliti, I. (2025). Mitigating cognitive bias to improve organizational decisions: An integrative review, framework, and research agenda. *Journal of Management*, 51(6), 2182-2211.
7. Raisch, S., & Fomina, K. (2025). Combining human and artificial intelligence: Hybrid problem-solving in organizations. *Academy of Management Review*, 50(2), 441-464.
8. Elbanna, S. (2006). Strategic decision-making: Process perspectives. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, 8(1), 1-20.
9. Shepherd, N. G., & Rudd, J. M. (2014). The influence of context on the strategic decision-making process: A review of the literature. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, 16(3), 340-364.

IV. Organizational Learning and Dynamic Capabilities

1. Argote, L., Lee, S., & Park, J. (2021). Organizational learning processes and

outcomes: Major findings and future research directions. *Management Science*, 67(9), 5399-5429.

2. Crossan, Lane & White (1999). An Organizational Learning Framework: From Intuition to Institution, *Academy Management Review*, 24, 3: 522-537.
3. Balasubramanian, N., Ye, Y., & Xu, M. (2020). Substituting human decision-making with machine learning: Implications for organizational learning. *Academy of Management Review*, (ja).
4. Grant, R. M. (2002). The knowledge-based view of the firm. *The strategic management of intellectual capital and organizational knowledge*, 17(2), 133-148.
5. Felin, T., & Hesterly, W. S. (2007). The knowledge-based view, nested heterogeneity, and new value creation: Philosophical considerations on the locus of knowledge. *Academy of management review*, 32(1), 195-218.
6. Salvato, C., & Vassolo, R. (2018). The sources of dynamism in dynamic capabilities. *Strategic Management Journal*, 39(6), 1728-1752.
7. Helfat, C. E., & Peteraf, M. A. (2015). Managerial cognitive capabilities and the microfoundations of dynamic capabilities. *Strategic Management Journal*, 36(6), 831-850.
8. Suddaby, R., Coraiola, D., Harvey, C., & Foster, W. (2020). History and the microfoundations of dynamic capabilities. *Strategic Management Journal*, 41(3), 530-556.

V. Organizational Economics and Organizations

1. Kim, J., & Mahoney, J. T. , 2010, A Strategic Theory of the Firm as a Nexus of Incomplete Contracts: A Property Rights Approach, *Journal of Management*, 36(4): 806-826
 - i. Kim, J., & Mahoney, J. T. 2005. Property rights theory, transaction costs theory, and agency theory: An organizational economics approach to strategic management. *Managerial and Decision Economics*, 26: 223-242.
2. Eisenhardt, K. M. (1989). Agency theory: An assessment and review. *Academy of management review*, 14(1), 57-74.
3. Cuypers, I. R., Hennart, J. F., Silverman, B. S., & Ertug, G. (2021). Transaction cost theory: Past progress, current challenges, and suggestions for the future. *Academy of Management Annals*, 15(1), 111-150.
4. Hennart, J. F., & Verbeke, A. (2022). Actionable and enduring implications of Oliver Williamson's transaction cost theory. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 53(8), 1557-1575.
5. Aguilera, R. V., De Massis, A., Fini, R., & Vismara, S. (2024). Organizational goals, outcomes, and the assessment of performance: Reconceptualizing success in management studies. *Journal of Management Studies*, 61(1), 1-36.
6. Chen, L., Tong, T. W., Tang, S., & Han, N. (2022). Governance and design of digital platforms: a review and future research directions on a meta-organization. *Journal of management*, 48(1), 147-184.
7. George, G., Fewer, T. J., Lazzarini, S., McGahan, A. M., & Puranam, P. (2024). Partnering for grand challenges: A review of organizational design considerations

in public–private collaborations. *Journal of Management*, 50(1), 10-40.

VI. Institutional theory

1. DiMaggio, P. and Powell, W. (1983). The iron cage revisited: Institutional isomorphism and collective rationality in organizational fields, *American Sociological Review*, 48, Pp. 147-160.
2. Powell, W. W., & DiMaggio, P. J. (2023). The iron cage redux: Looking back and forward. *Organization Theory*, 4(4), 26317877231221550.
3. Glynn, M. A., & D'anno, T. (2023). An intellectual history of institutional theory: Looking back to move forward. *Academy of Management Annals*, 17(1), 301-330.
4. Jeong, Y. C., & Kim, T. Y. (2019). Between legitimacy and efficiency: An institutional theory of corporate giving. *Academy of Management Journal*, 62(5), 1583-1608.
5. Ocasio, W. (2023). Institutions and their social construction: A cross-level perspective. *Organization Theory*, 4(3), 26317877231194368.
6. Thornton, P. H., & Ocasio, W. (2008). Institutional logics. *The Sage handbook of organizational institutionalism*, 840, 99-128.
7. Besharov, M. L., & Smith, W. K. (2014). Multiple institutional logics in organizations: Explaining their varied nature and implications. *Academy of Management Review*, 39(3), 364-381.

VII. Organizational Change and Ambidexterity

1. Van de Ven, A. H. and Poole, M. S. (1995). "Explaining Development and Change in Organizations," *Academy of Management Review*, 20, 510-540.
2. Van de Ven, A. H., Poole, M. S. (2005), *Alternative Approaches for Studying Organizational Change*, *Organization Studies*, 26: 1377-1404
3. Stouten, J., Rousseau, D. M., & De Cremer, D. (2018). Successful organizational change: Integrating the management practice and scholarly literatures. *Academy of Management Annals*, 12(2), 752-788.
4. Langley, A. (2009). Studying processes in and around organizations, in D. Buchanan & A. Bryman (eds) *Sage Handbook of Organizational Research Methods*, London: Sage Publications, 409–29.
5. Hanelt, A., Bohnsack, R., Marz, D., & Antunes Marante, C. (2021). A systematic review of the literature on digital transformation: Insights and implications for strategy and organizational change. *Journal of Management Studies*, 58(5), 1159-1197.
6. Raisch, S. and Birkinshaw, J. (2008). Organizational ambidexterity: Antecedents, outcomes, and moderators. *Journal of Management*, 34(3):375-409
7. Poole, M. S., & Van de Ven, A. H. (1989). Using paradox to build management and organization theories. *Academy of management review*, 14(4), 562-578.
8. Lavie, D., U. Stettner, et al. (2010). "Exploration and Exploitation Within and Across Organizations." *The Academy of Management Annals* 4(1): 109-155.
9. Luger, J., Raisch, S., & Schimmer, M. (2018). Dynamic balancing of exploration and exploitation: The contingent benefits of ambidexterity. *Organization Science*, 29(3), 449-470.

10. Hargrave, T. J., & Van de Ven, A. H. (2017). Integrating dialectical and paradox perspectives on managing contradictions in organizations. *Organization Studies*, 38(3-4), 319-339.
11. Li, P. P., Liu, H., Li, Y., & Wang, H. (2023). Exploration–exploitation duality with both tradeoff and synergy: The curvilinear interaction effects of learning modes on innovation types. *Management and Organization Review*, 19(3), 498-532.