

GENERAL RESEARCH THEORIES IN MANAGEMENT SCIENCE I

Professor: **CATERINA MOSCHIERI**

E-mail: cmoschieri@faculty.iese.edu

INTRODUCTION

Caterina holds a PhD in General Management, with a specialization in Strategy from IESE Business School, and graduate degree in economics, with a major in social economics, from Bocconi University, Italy. She also spent part of her PhD in London Business School and attended the GPCL Course at Harvard Business School. She also holds a certificate for bond trading on the London Stock Exchange (GCP from IFID/ISMA).

Her research and intellectual interests span from mergers and acquisitions to spin-offs to organizational design. Her research has been presented at several conferences and institutions around the world. Her work has been published in academic outlets, such as Strategic Management Journal, Academy of Management Perspectives, and Long Range Planning, and broader-audience outlets, such as the Financial Times and Forbes. Her work has been broadly featured or cited, for example by the International Monetary Fund to analyze the current European crisis and possible recovery, and has received several awards and prizes, including national grants from the Portuguese and the Spanish governments. Since 2015 she is a member of the Spanish Research Evaluation commission in the Spanish Ministry of Economics. In the Academic year 2016-2017 she held a Visiting Professor position at INSEAD, Paris, as she did in 2014 and 2015.

Prior to joining Instituto de Empresa, Caterina has been teaching and researching at Universidade Catolica Portuguesa, Universidad de Navarra, ESCP-EAP, Pompeu Fabra University (ESCI), IESE and London Business School. During her PhD she collaborated in different consulting projects with several MNCs, including AtKearney and DrOetker. Before starting her PhD, Caterina worked for some years in Reuters Financial Services in Switzerland and the UK and in the European Commission.

Academic Background

PhD in Strategic Management, IESE, Spain.

Visiting PhD, London Business School, UK.

International Securities Market Authority degree (ISMA), UK.

BSc and MSc in Economics with a Major in Social Economics (DES) at Bocconi University, Milan, Italy.

OBJECTIVES

The objective of this course is to provide a good (but probably not complete!) overview of the current theories in management and a few examples of their application. We will try to discuss each theory in about two sessions: the first session offers an overview of the theoretical studies and seminal papers on the specific theory, while the second session provides a few practical example of how the theory was applied or tested in practice.

In grading class participation I will look at both the quantity and quality of contribution.

With regards to quality, some of the criteria normally applied are: Is the participant a good listener? Are the points made relevant to the discussion? Do they reflect analysis rather than expressions of opinions? Are they linked to those of others and to the overall discussion? Do they further the class's understanding of the issues? Does the student lead and take ownership discussion? Does the student engage in discussion with fellow students, and not only with the professor?

CAVEAT:

The physical sessions will be of 3 hours each (1,20 mins + 1,20 mins).

2. Many of the theories we cover in one or two sessions could be the topic of a whole doctoral seminar by themselves! We will be able to spend about 1.5 to 3 hours on a theoretical framework, and this will hardly make you a master of that theory. However this survey course should give you an overview, a mental map, a seminal list of references and additional references to navigate your way into the depths of the theory(es) you may be more interested into. It is your own responsibility to do follow up work to deepen you knowledge of a theory and its associated literature.

3. In terms of pre-requisites and organization, I expect all students to read all papers assigned each session. However, each student will focus on one specific paper, which s/he will summarize in writing and then present in class leading the discussion (both in the residential and online sessions). The rest of the class is expected to be prepared to discuss and make comments and contributions.

EVALUATION CRITERIA

1. There are typically 2-3 "above the line" readings for each class. I will expect you to have thoroughly read and digested each of these before class. This will take between 3-5 hours of preparation per week. Budget for it. This seems like a huge effort but remember that it is an investment that will last for all your future academic life. In addition each student will be assigned an "above the line" reading to summarize in Power Point Format. This summary will be distributed to your fellow mates at the beginning of each session (physical or online) and will be used as base for discussion. Though each student will hand in a written summary for his/her assigned article before class, s/he is also responsible for doing the remaining readings in the session as well. These critical summaries will prove a valuable study aid (think of a structure as Positioning of the paper, Theoretical framework and analysis, Contributions, and Your conclusions and comments). The summaries will count towards 33% of the final evaluation.

1. Weekly summary by session leader: we cover about ten important theoretical frameworks in this course. For each week/session/theory I need one of you to volunteer to be a discussion leader. The role of the discussion leader is twofold. First, s/he will offer an overview to the class about the papers that we will discuss together before our conversation start. After that and by the end of the week, the discussion leader will have to email to me a 2 page, single-spaced summary of what we saw and discussed together. The structure of these summaries is: overview of the theory (i.e. how these papers relate to each other), discussion of each paper, highlighting the theoretical contribution and empirical angles if pertinent, class curiosities and your impressions. These summaries will represent the backbone of your class learning and they will be a unique, tailored and personalized takehome of what you as individual students and as a group have learnt together. My suggestion is that this review covers all the mandatory and some of the recommended readings. This summary will count for 33% of the final evaluation.

2. The quality of this class will ultimately depend on the inputs you provide. Your role in class discussions- assessed in terms of quality of comments, maintenance of standards of academic argument, involvement and knowledge of the issues being debated - will count for the remaining 33% of the final evaluation.

In all sessions, I expect students to choose and distribute the readings in a balanced way among themselves, to select a discussion leader (who will summarize the content of the session in class), and to deliver printed copies of their summaries of the readings that they will present (e.g. in one session with 3 papers, i expect to have 1 discussion leader, and 3 students presenting one of the three papers each, handing in the printed summary just BEFORE class). In the past, students found useful to set up a Doodle document to organize this all among themselves.

PROGRAM AND BIBLIOGRAPHY

PROGRAM and BIBLIOGRAPHY

Papers: I offer a list of mandatory (and to be distributed and prepared as described above) and additional readings.

I chose the articles for this syllabus because (one of) the following reasons:

- Different disciplines & different journals within the same discipline
- For "already known" theories: special angle
- Major authors and cult-pieces
- Within discipline: different journals

Students who wish to also have a book as a backbone of the course, can use The Blackwell Companion to Organizations by Joel Baum (Nov 1, 2005). The book is not mandatory.

PROGRAM

SESSIONS 1 - 2

Day 1 (2 physical sessions): Introduction Sociology foundations *** Additional readings *** • Introduction to the AMJ special issue, 2007. Carrying Sumantra Ghoshal's torch, *Academy of Management Journal*, 50: 745-747

T.N.: •Christensen CM, Raynor ME. 2003. *Why Hard-Nosed Executives Should Care About Management Theory*. *Harvard Business Review*, 81(9): 66-74

T.N.: •McGahan, 2007. *Academic research that matters to managers*, *Academy of Management Journal*, 50: 748-753

T.N.: •Markides, 2007. *In search of ambidextrous professors*, *Academy of Management Journal*, 50: 762-768

T.N.: •Davis, G and Marquis C. 2005. *Prospects for organization theory in the twenty-first century: Institutional fields and mechanisms*. *Organization Science*, 16: 332-343

T.N.: •Pfeffer, J. 1993. *Barriers to the advance of organizational science: Paradigm development as a dependent variable*. *Academy of Management Review*, 18: 599-620.

T.N.: •Schein, Edgar H. 1996. *Culture: The Missing Concept in Organization Studies*. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 41: 229-240

T.N.: •Granovetter, M. 1985. *Economic action and social structure: The problem of embeddedness*. *American Journal of Sociology*, 91: 481-518

SESSIONS 3 - 4

Day 2 (2 physical sessions): Structural Contingency and Resource Dependence Theories Carnegie School: Behavioral Decision Making *** Additional readings *** • Emerson, R. "Power-Dependence Relations." *American Sociological Review*, 27 (1962): 31-41. • Levitt, B., & Nass, C. 1989. The lid on the garbage can: Institutional constraints on decision making in the technical core of college-text publishers. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 34: 190-207. • Child, J. 1972. Organizational structure, environment and performance: The role of strategic choice. *Sociology*, 6: 1-22. • Tushman, M.L. 1979. Work characteristics and subunit communication structure: A contingency analysis. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 24: 82-97.

T.N.: •Schoonhoven, C.B. 1981. *Problems with contingency theory: Testing assumptions hidden within the language of contingency theory*. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 349-377.

T.N.: •Siggelkow, N. 2002. *Evolution toward fit*. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 47: 125-159.

T.N.: *A Leaders Framework for Decision Making*

T.N.: •Levitt, B. & March, J. G. 1988. *Organizational Learning*. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 14:319-340

T.N.: •Cohen, M.D., March, J.G., & Olsen, J.P. 1972. *A garbage can model of organizational choice*. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 17: 1-25

T.N.: *Neo Carnegie The Carnegie Schools Past present and Reconstructing for the Future*

SESSIONS 5 - 6

Day 3 (2 physical sessions): Agency Theory – Theory & Application *** Additional readings *** • Jarrell, G.A., J.A. Brickley, and J.M. Netter, "The Market for Corporate Control: The Empirical Evidence Since 1980," *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 1988. • Levinthal, D., "A Survey of Agency Models of Organization," *Journal of Economic Behavior and Organization*, 9, 1988. • Jensen and Meckling 1976. *Theory of the Firm: Managerial Behavior, agency costs, and Ownership Structure*, *Journal of Financial Economics*, 3: 305-360. • Fama, E.F., "Agency Problems and the Theory of the Firm," *Journal of Political Economy*, 88, 1980, pp. 288-307. • Milgrom P and Roberts J, (1992) 7, *Economics, Organizations and Management*, Prentice Hall • Shapiro, C (1989) *The theory of business strategy* *The RAND Journal of Economics*, Vol. 20, No. 1. (Spring, 1989), pp. 125-137 • Wiseman, R. M., & Gomez-Mejia, L. R. 1998. A behavioral agency model of risk taking. *Academy of Management Review*, 25: 133-152

T.N.: •Davis JH, Schoorman FD, Donaldson L. 1997. *Toward a stewardship theory of management*. *Academy of Management Review* 22(1): 20-47

T.N.: •Fox MA, Hamilton RT. 1994. *Ownership and diversification: Agency theory or stewardship theory*. *Journal of Management Studies* 31(1): 69-81

T.N.: •Zenger TR (1994) *Explaining Organizational Diseconomies of Scale in R&D: Agency Problems and the allocation of engineering talent, ideas and effort by firm size*, *Management Science*, 40 (6): pp. 706-729

T.N.: •Jensen and Ruback, *The Market for Corporate Control: The Scientific Evidence*, *Journal of Financial Economics*, 11, 1983, pp. 5-50

T.N.: *When the CEOs Personal Crusade Drives Decisions*

SESSIONS 7 - 8

Day 4 (2 physical sessions): Institutionalism and neo-institutionalism – Theory & Application *** Additional readings *** • Meyer, J. & Rowan, B. 1977. *Institutionalized organizations: Formal structure as myth and ceremony*. *American Journal of Sociology*, 83: 333-363 • Henisz W, Zelner B. 2005. *Legitimacy, interest group pressures and change in emergent institutions: the case of foreign investors and host country governments*. *Academy of Management Review* 30 340-. • DiMaggio PJ. 1988. *Interest and agency in institutional theory*. In *Institutional patterns and organizations*. Zucker LG (ed.), Ballinger: Cambridge, MA. • Fligstein N. 1991. *The structural transformation of the American industry: The causes of diversification in the largest firms, 1919-1979*. In *The new institutionalism in organizational analysis*. Powel W, DiMaggio PJ (eds.), University of Chicago Press: Chicago. DiMaggio PJ. 1988. *Interest and agency in institutional theory*. In *Institutional patterns and organizations*. Zucker LG (ed.), Ballinger: Cambridge, MA. • Oliver C. 1991. *Strategic responses to institutional processes*. *Academy of Management Review* 16(1): 145-179.

T.N.: •Aldrich HE, Fiol CM. 1994. *Fools rush in? The institutional context of industry creation*. *Academy of Management Review*, 19(4): 645-670

T.N.: •DiMaggio PJ, Powell W. 1983. *The iron cage revisited: Institutional isomorphism and collective rationality in organizational fields*. *American Sociological Review*, 95: 1401-1440.

T.N.: •Dacin MT, Oliver C, Roy J-P. 2007. *The legitimacy of strategic alliances: an institutional perspective*. *Strategic Management Journal*, 28(2): 169-187

T.N.: •Thornton and Ocasio. 1999. *Institutional logics and the historical contingency of power in organizations: Executive succession in the higher education publishing industry, 1958-1990*. *American Journal of Sociology*, 105: 801-843

T.N.: •Peng, Mike W.; Sunny Li Sun; Pinkham, Brian; Hao Chen. 2009. *The Institution-Based View as a Third Leg for a Strategy Tripod*. *Academy of Management Perspectives*, 23 (3): 63-81.

SESSION 9

Session 9 (Online) Evolutionary theory – Theory (I) *** Additional readings (for this session and for session 10)*** • Nelson RR, Winter SG. 1984. Neoclassical vs evolutionary theories of economic growth: critique and prospectus. *Economic Journal* 84(336): 886-905. • Stinchcombe A. 1965. Social structure and organizations. In *Handbook of Organizations*. JG M (ed.), Rand-McNally: Chicago, IL. • Nelson R, Winter S. 1982. An evolutionary theory of economic change. Belknap: Cambridge. • Weick KE. 1979. The social psychology of organizing (2nd ed.). Addison-Wesley: Reading, MA. • Lewin AY, Volberda HW. 1999. Prolegomena on coevolution: a framework for research on strategy and new organizational forms. *Organization Science* 10(5): 519-534.

T.N.: •Weick KE. 1974. Middle range theories of social systems. *Behavioral Science*, 19: 357-367

T.N.: •Hannan MT, Freeman J. 1984. Structural inertia and organizational change. *American Sociological Review*, 49: 149-164

T.N.: •Lewin AY, Long CP, Carroll TN. 1999. The coevolution of new organizational forms. *Organization Science*, 10(5): 535-550

SESSION 10

Session 10 (Online) Evolutionary theory – Theory and application

T.N.: •Nelson, Richard R. (1991). *Why Do Firms Differ, and How Does It Matter?* *Strategic Management Journal* 12: 61-74

T.N.: •Freeman J, Carroll GR, Hannan MT. 1983. The liability of newness: age dependence in organizational death rates. *American Sociological Review* 48: 629-710

SESSION 11

Session 11 (Online) Organizational ecology – Theory *** Additional reading *** Singh, J.V., & Lumsden, C.J. 1990. Theory and research in organizational ecology. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 16: 161-195.

T.N.: •Hannan, M.T., & Freeman, J. 1977. The population ecology of organizations. *American Journal of Sociology*, 82: 929-964.

T.N.: •Aldrich HE. 1990. Interdisciplinary forum: Using an ecological perspective to study organizational founding rates. *Entrepreneurship theory and practice*, 7-24

SESSION 12

Session 12 (Online) Organizational ecology – Application *** Additional readings *** • Raisch S, Birkinshaw J. 2008. Organizational Ambidexterity: Antecedents, Outcomes, and Moderators. *Journal of Management* 34(3): 375-409 • Raisch S, Birkinshaw J, Probst G, Tushman ML. 2009. Organizational Ambidexterity: Balancing Exploitation and Exploration for Sustained Performance. *Organization Science* 20(4): 685-695 • Amburgey, T., & Rao, H. 1996. Organizational ecology: Past, present and future directions. *Academy of Management Journal*, 39(5): 1265-1286. • Gupta AK, Smith KG, Shalley CE. 2006. The interplay between exploration and exploitation. *Academy of Management Journal* 49(4): 639-706. • Aldrich HE. 1979. *Organizations and environment*. Prentice Hall: Englewood Cliffs, NJ. • O'Reilly III CA, Tushman ML. 2004. The Ambidextrous Organization. *Harvard Business Review* 82(4): 74-81. • O'Reilly CA, Tushman ML. 2007. Ambidexterity as a dynamic capability: Resolving the innovator's dilemma. *Res. Organ. Behav.* 28: 1–60. • He Z-L, Wong P-K. 2004. Exploration vs. Exploitation: An Empirical Test of the Ambidexterity Hypothesis. *Organization Science* 15(4): 481–494. • Benner MJ, Tushman ML. 2003. Exploitation, exploration, and process management: the productivity dilemma revisited. *Academy of Management Review* 28(2): 238-256

T.N.: •Carroll. G. and Swaminathan, A. 2000. *Why the Microbrewery Movement?* *Organizational*

Dynamics of Resource Partitioning in the US Brewing Industry. American Journal of Sociology, 106:715-762.

T.N.: •Amburgey, T.L. Kelley, D. and Barnett, W.P. 1993. *Resetting the Clock: The Dynamics of Organizational Change and Failure. Administrative Science Quarterly, 38: 51-73.*

SESSION 13

Session 13 (Online) Social capital and Network theory *** Additional readings and movie!*** •
MOVIE: THE SOCIAL NETWORK • Powell, W.W., Koput, K.W., Smith-Doerr, L. 1996. Interorganizational collaboration and the locus of innovation: Networks of learning in biotechnology. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 41: 116-145.* • Pollock, T.G., Porac, J.F. & Wade, J.B. 2004. Constructing deal networks: Brokers as network 'architects' in the U.S. IPO market and other examples. *Academy of Management Review, 29: 50-72.* • Granovetter, M.S. 1973. The strength of weak ties. *AJS, 78: 1360-1380.* • Salancik, G.R. 1995. Wanted: A good network theory of organization. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 40: 345-349.* • Uzzi B. 1997. Social Structure and Competition in Interfirm Networks: The Paradox of Embeddedness. *Administrative Science Quarterly 42(1): 37-69.* • Kraatz, M.S. 1998. Learning by association? Interorganizational networks and adaptation to environmental change. *Academy of Management Journal, 41: 621-643.* • Wellman, Barry. 1983. Network Analysis: Some Basic Principles. In Randall Collins (Ed.), *Sociological Theory: 155-200.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers. • Burt, R. S. 2000. The network structure of social capital. In R. I. Sutton & B. Staw (eds.) *Research in Organizational Behavior, 22: 345-423.* Greenwich, CT: JAI Press. • Adler, P.S., & Kwon, S. 2002. Social capital: Prospects for a new concept. *Academy of Management Review, 27: 17-40.* • Mizruchi, M. 1996. What do Interlocks do? An analysis, critique, and assessment of research on interlocking directorates. *Annual Review of Sociology, 22: 271-298.* • Seidl, M.D. & Westphal, J.D. 2004. Research Impact: How seemingly innocuous social cues in a CEO survey can lead to change in board and director network ties. *Strategic Organization, 2: 227-270.* • Lin, N., Ensel, W.M, & Vaughn, J.C. 1981. Social resources and strength of ties: Structural factors in occupational status attainment. *American Sociological Review, 46: 393-405.* • Ahuja, Gautam. 2000. Collaboration networks, structural holes, and innovation: a longitudinal study. *ASQ, 45: 425-455.* • Coleman, J.S. 1988. Social capital in the creation of human capital. *American Journal of Sociology, 94: s95-s121.*

T.G., Baker, T. & Wowak, A. 2008. Who's the new kid? The process of becoming central in venture capitalist deal networks. In J.A.C. Baum & T.J. Rowley (Eds.) *Advances in Strategic Management, 25.* London, UK: Emerald Publishing: 565-596 • Uzzi, B. 1999. Embeddedness in the making of financial capital: How social relations and networks benefit firms seeking financing. *American Sociological Review, 64: 481-505.*

T.N.: •Uzzi, B. 1996. *The sources and consequences of embeddedness for the economic performance of organizations: The network effect. American Sociological Review, 61: 674-698*

T.N.: •Moran, P. 2005. *Structural vs relational embeddedness: Social capital and managerial performance. Strategic Management Journal, 26(12): 1129-1151.*

SESSION 14

Social Movement Theory:

• Davis, G.F, Yoo, M. & Baker, W.E. 2003. The small world of the American corporate elite: 1991-2001. *Strategic Organization, 1: 301-326.* • Davis, Gerald F. 1991. Agents Without Principles? The Spread of the Poison Pill Through the Intercompany Network. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 36(4): 583-613.* • Pollock, T.G. 2004. The Benefits and Costs of Underwriters' Social Capital in the U.S. Initial Public Offerings Market. *Strategic Organization, 2(4): 357-388.* • Fund, B.R., Pollock,

*** Additional readings and movie! ***

- Davis, G.F., Morrill, C., Rao, H & Soule, S.A. 2008. Introduction: Social movements in organizations and markets. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 53(3): 389-394.
- Finkelstein, S. 1992. Power in top management teams: Dimensions, measurement, and validation. *Academy of Management Journal*, 35: 505-538.
- Wade, J.B., O'Reilly, C.A., III, & Chandratat, I. 1990. Golden Parachutes: CEOs and the exercise of social influence. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 35: 587-603.
- MOVIE: OTHER PEOPLE'S MONEY (note: the speech to the shareholders' meeting)
- Morrill, C., Zald, M.N & Rao, H. 2003. Covert political conflict in organizations: Challenges from below. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 29: 391-415.
- Rao, H., Monin, P., & Durand, R. 2003. Institutional change in Toque Ville: Nouvelle cuisine as an identity movement in French gastronomy. *American Journal of Sociology*, 108(4): 795-843.
- Davis, G.F., & Thompson, T.F. 1994. A social movement perspective on corporate control. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 39: 141-173.
- Briscoe, F. & Safford, S. 2008. The Nixon-in China effect: Activism, imitation and the institutionalization of contentious practices. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 53(3): 460-491.
- Hambrick, D.C. & Chen, M.J. 2008. New academic fields as admittance-seeking social movements: The case of strategic management. *Academy of Management Review*, 33(1): 32-54.
- McCarthy, J.D., & Zald, M.N. 1977. Resource mobilization and social movements: A partial theory. *American Journal of Sociology*, 82: 1212-1241.
- King, B.G & Soule, S.A. 2007. Social movements as extra-institutional entrepreneurs: The effect of protests on stock market returns. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 52(3): 413-442.
- King, B.G. 2008. A political mediation model of corporate response to social movement activism. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 53(3): 395-421.
- O'Mahony, S. & Bechky, B.A. 2008. Boundary organizations: Enabling collaboration among unexpected allies. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 53(3): 422-459.
- King, M.D. & Haveman, H.A. 2008. Antislavery in America: The press, the pulpit and the rise of antislavery societies. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 53(3): 492-528.
- Weber, K., Heinze, K.L., & DeSoucey, M. 2008. Foraging for thought: Mobilizing codes for the movement in grass-fed meat and dairy products. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 53(3): 529-567.
- Zald, M.N. 2008. Epilogue: Social movements and political sociology in the analysis of organizations and markets. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 53(3): 568-574.
- Davis, G.F. 2005. New Directions in Corporate Governance. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 31: 143-162.
- Westphal, J.D. & Khanna, P. 2003. Keeping Directors in Line: Social Distancing as a Control Mechanism in the Corporate Elite. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 48: 361-398.
- Westphal, J.D. 1998. Board games: How CEOs adapt to increases in structural board independence from management. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 43: 511-537.
- Zajac, E.J. & Westphal, J.D. 1995. Accounting for the Explanations of CEO Compensation: Substance & Symbolism. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 40: 283-308.
- Westphal, J.D. & Bednar, M.K. 2008. The pacification of institutional investors. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 53(1): 29-72.
- Westphal, J.D. & Stearn, I. 2007. Flattery will get you everywhere (especially if you are a male Caucasian): How ingratiation, boardroom behavior, and demographic minority status affect additional board appointments at U.S. companies. *Academy of Management Journal*, 50(2): 267-288.
- Pollock, T.G., Fischer, H.M. & Wade, J.B. 2002. The Role of Power and Politics in Repricing Executive Options. *Academy of Management Journal*, 45(6): 1172-1182.

- Westphal, J.D. & Zajac, E.J. 1998. The Symbolic Management of Stockholders: Corporate Governance Reforms and Shareholder Reactions. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 43: 127-153.
 - Belliveau, M.A., O'Reilly, C.A., III, & Wade, J.B. 1996. Social capital at the top: Effects of social similarity and status on CEO compensation. *Academy of Management Journal*, 39: 1568-1593.
 - David, P., Kochar, R., & Levitas, E. 1998. The effect of institutional investors on the level and mix of CEO compensation. *Academy of Management Journal*, 41: 200-208.
 - Main, B.G., O'Reilly, C.A., III, & Wade, J.B. 1995. The CEO, the board of directors and executive compensation: Economic and psychological perspectives. *Industrial and Corporate Change*, 4: 293-332.
 - Westphal, J.D., & Zajac, E.J. 1995. Who shall govern? CEO/board power, demographic similarity and new director selection. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 40: 60-83
- T.N.: •Davis, G.F., Morrill, C., Rao, H & Soule, S.A. 2008. Introduction: Social movements in organizations and markets. Administrative Science Quarterly, 53(3): 389-394.*
- T.N.: •Finkelstein, S. 1992. Power in top management teams: Dimensions, measurement, and validation. Academy of Management Journal, 35: 505-538.*
- T.N.: •Wade, J.B., O'Reilly, C.A., III, & Chandratat, I. 1990. Golden Parachutes: CEOs and the exercise of social influence. Administrative Science Quarterly, 35: 587-603.*

SESSION 15

Session 15 (Online) TN: Moschieri (2013) Organizational Theory (to be distributed in class) Q&As Examples of how you would apply any of these theoretical lenses to your research (in preparation for the final assignment)

EVALUATION CRITERIA

Criteria	Percentage	Comments
----------	------------	----------