

Edward G. Rozycki, Ed. D.

WORKBOOK

for

Organizational Theory

© Spring 2008 Edward G. Rozycki, Ed. D.

NEWFOUNDATIONS



P.O. Box 94, Oreland PA, 19075

www.newfoundations.com

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS	2
COURSE MECHANICS	4
BASIC REQUIREMENTS FOR PAPERS	5
SPECIFICATIONS FOR INITIAL SEMINAR PRESENTATION PAPERS	6
PRESENTATION EVALUATION SHEET.....	7
AN EVALUATION RUBRIC FOR PAPERS	8
SPECIFICATIONS FOR CRITIQUE PAPERS	9
WHAT IS A SYNOPSIS?	10
TWO MODELS OF CLASSROOM INSTRUCTION	11
GENERAL THEORY	12
PARTITIONING & MEASURABILITY (METRICIZATION).....	13
LIKELIHOODS AND PROBABILITIES: EXERCISES.....	14
THE NEED FOR EVIDENCE: ASKING THE RIGHT QUESTIONS.....	16
CALCULATIVE RATIONALITY, TASKS AND ORGANIZATIONS: THE CONNECTIONS	19
THE TOULMIN MODEL IN ORGANIZATIONAL REASONING	20
SYSTEM: METAPHORS & LIKENESS	21
TERMS FOR DEFINITION.....	22
WHAT MAKES A METAPHOR? EXERCISE.....	23
COMPARING INDIVIDUALS, GROUPS AND ORGANIZATIONS: AREAS OF DISCOURSE	24
FAMILIES OF CORRESPONDENCES.....	25
SYSTEMS	26
WHAT SYSTEM? WHAT ASSUMPTIONS? EXERCISE.....	26
WHAT MAKES A SYSTEM? EXERCISE	27
BASIC SYSTEMS ANALYSIS EXERCISES.....	28
BEHAVIOR OVER TIME GRAPHS & CAUSAL HYPOTHESES	29
CAUSAL ANALYSIS: AN EXERCISE	30
EXPLANATION & CAUSE IN ORGANIZATIONAL THEORY	31
PROCESSES	32
TASK ANALYSIS EXERCISE	33
MAKE SOME FLOWCHARTS: EXERCISE	34
CONFUSING PROCESS WITH OUTCOME.....	35
CONFLICT AND ORGANIZATIONS	36
PROFILES OF ORGANIZATIONAL MODELS	37
IMAGE.....	37
BASIC ORGANIZATIONAL CONFLICTS	38
THE FUNCTIONS OF CONFLICT IN ORGANIZATIONS	39
THEORIES OF MOTIVATION IN ORGANIZATIONS	40
BASIC CONFLICTS AND THEORIES X, Y AND Z	41
MOTIVATION TO WORK	42
ORGANIZATIONAL COMPLEXITY	43
ROLES IN ORGANIZATIONS.....	44
THE TIMES-MIRROR COALITIONS 1984-1999.....	45
CULTURE AND ORGANIZATIONS - LECTURE NOTES	46
ORGANIZATIONAL FACTORS RELATING TO STEREOTYPING AND DISCRIMINATION:	52
GROUP DYNAMICS, ROLES AND THE FUNCTIONS OF CONFLICT	56
ARCHETYPES	59
LIST OF ARCHTYPES FOR CAUSAL LOOP DIAGRAMS.....	60
ERODING GOALS (LOWERING STANDARDS).....	61
ADJUSTMENT WITH DELAY: OVERREACTION	62
LIMITS TO GROWTH.....	63

	page	3
SHIFTING THE BURDEN		64
SUCCESS TO THE SUCCESSFUL		66
TRAGEDY OF THE COMMONS		67
FIXES THAT FAIL		68
GROWTH AND UNDERINVESTMENT		69
DOING RESEARCH		70
CRITERIAL AND CRITICAL QUESTIONS		71
OPERATIONALIZATION		72
OPERATIONALIZING THE VARIABLES OF A SYSTEM		74
THE SCHOOL AS AN ORGANIZATION: TESTS		76
PRACTICE COMP QUESTION 1 -- INCREASING THE ATHLETIC BUDGET		77
PRACTICE COMP QUESTION 2 -- MISSION, ENROLLMENT, ALUMNI CONTRIBUTIONS		78
MULTIPLE-CHOICE PRACTICE TEST I		79
TRUE/FALSE PRACTICE TEST I		80
MATCHING PRACTICE TEST I		80
MULTIPLE-CHOICE PRACTICE TEST II		81
TRUE/FALSE PRACTICE TEST II		82
MATCHING PRACTICE TEST II		82
INDEX		83

SAMPLE

SAMPLE

BASIC REQUIREMENTS FOR PAPERS**Form**

1. Typewritten or word-processed and printed
2. White, 8¹/₂ x 11 inch paper minimum 20 lbs. 90 brightness
3. Margins 1” all around
4. 12 point font, Times or Times New Roman, or other cleared proportional font.
5. Double-spaced
6. Paginated and Dated
7. Use a standard style consistently throughout (APA, Chicago, Turabian)

Content

1. Do NOT hand in a first draft.
2. Read your supporting documents, think, then compose. Compose, then complete. Read, think then revise. Complete again. Repeat this cycle as necessary.
3. You may use footnotes. If you use endnotes, place them in a separate section.
4. References (Bibliography) go into a separate section.
5. If you have a word processor, use its spell-checker and grammar checker.

General

1. Keep a copy of the paper you have handed in.
2. Meet your deadline.
3. Stay within a 5% error of the specified word length, for section and entire paper.

SPECIFICATIONS FOR INITIAL SEMINAR PRESENTATION PAPERS

Form

1. **All Basic requirements are to be met.**
2. Total Length 1000 words.
3. Four sections: Justification for Thesis (200 words); Initial Literature Review (300 words) Findings and Argument (250 words); Endnotes and References (250 words); 10% variance per section without reducing total length.

Content

1. **First section:** Why are you undertaking this research? Why is it important? What importance might answers to your questions have?
2. **Second section:** Initial Literature Review. Cite relevant research or critical articles that support or undermine your thesis.
3. **Third section:** Findings and Argument. What are the issues? Do reasonable persons differ on the answers? How does your research support on side or the other? What is the structure of the argument?
4. **Fourth section:** Endnotes and References. If you have both, keep them separate.

General

1. A copy goes to the instructor and to each of your critics.
2. Your final paper will be 2500 words total. It will incorporate your critics' concerns together with additional research materials.
3. In the final draft you will maintain the four section structure given above.
4. Within section variance up to 10% without shortening total length.

PRESENTATION EVALUATION SHEET

Without making any identifying references to yourself indicate below for each item your judgment about the extent to which it has been dealt with in the presentation.

1. Basic analysis-
 Were analysis questions well used to clarify problem?

1 2 3 4 5
 NOT OK VERY
 WELL WELL

2. Cogency-
 Was the analysis made convincing and illuminating?

1 2 3 4 5
 NOT OK VERY
 WELL WELL

3. Information-
 Was other course material integrated into the analysis?

1 2 3 4 5
 NOT OK VERY
 WELL WELL

4. Length-
 Was the length of the presentation appropriate to the analysis?

1 2 3 4 5
 NOT OK VERY
 WELL WELL

5. Cooperation-
 Were the burdens of presentation shared among the presenters?

1 2 3 4 5
 NOT OK VERY
 WELL WELL

6. Preparation-
 Did the presentation evidence care in its preparation?

1 2 3 4 5
 NOT OK VERY
 WELL WELL

7. Pedagogy-
 Were pedagogical aids used to assist audience understanding?

1 2 3 4 5
 NOT OK VERY
 WELL WELL

8 Professional Relevance-
 Would you be disposed to invite this group to present at a function you sponsored?

1 2 3 4 5
 NOT OK VERY
 WELL WELL

9. Other

1 2 3 4 5
 NOT OK VERY
 WELL WELL

AN EVALUATION RUBRIC FOR PAPERS

Writing skill development is generally a matter of error avoidance. The rubric sketched out below tends to focus, therefore, on reasons for lowering the evaluation of a written assignment. It specifies those items which must be improved to raise a paper's evaluation. Specific reasons for a lower grade which can be addressed by the student and corrected are more effective in improving writing than vague, positively stated goals such as: completeness, terseness, good style, etc.

To use the rubric one must imagine that the purpose of the paper was to answer a question or set of questions. (For example, even a simple descriptive essay can be cast as, "What is X like?")

The paper is lacking because:

A: It does not answer the question(s) posed:(check off any and all that apply)

- 1. It offers a narrow or off-center examples that misses important concerns.
- 2. It gets sidetracked or never focusses on the relevant points.
- 3. It confuses the intent of the question, e.g. responds to a hypothetical as though it were an assertion.
- 4. It confuses a request for a review of fact or theory for an expression of personal opinion.
- 5. It offers personal experience instead of the general treatment required.
- 6. It misinterprets principles of research implicit or expressed in the question.

B. It fails to demonstrate *expert knowledge of the topic*: (check off any and all that apply)

- 1. It treats the question with superficial laypersons' conceptions.
- 2. It fails to indicate relevant expert options or controversies involved with the topic.
- 3. It fails to examine problematic issues involved with the topic.
- 4. It misses major developments or aspects of the topic.
- 5. It misses important secondary developments or aspects of the topic.
- 6. It fails to demonstrate sufficient knowledge of pertinent literature.
- 7. It makes error of fact.
- 8. It lacks sufficient elaboration of the pertinent themes.

C. It contains major aberrations:

- 1. The writing is non-standard, or illegible.
- 2. It draws inferences that do not follow from the assumptions made or premisses established.
- 3. It contains other major rhetorical flaws.

SPECIFICATIONS FOR CRITIQUE PAPERS**Form**

1. **All Basic requirements are to be met.**
2. Total Length 600 words.
3. Four sections: Recapitulation of Critiqued Thesis (100 words); Argument review and clarification (150 words); Literature Review Critique and additional suggestions (200 words); Additional questions for researcher, comments, etc. (150 words); 10% variance per section without reducing total length.

Content

1. **First section:** Tell the reader what you believe the researcher you are critiquing is trying to do. What is the thesis of the research?
2. **Second section:** Argument review. What conclusions is the researcher apparently after? What assumptions are being made? Is the argument valid?
3. **Third section:** Literature Review Critique. Is the literature cited on target? Is it weak? Suggest some other sources.
4. **Fourth section:** Additional questions, comments. What additional questions are relevant to the research? What warnings or suggestions can you make?

General

1. A copy goes to the instructor and to the author of the paper critiqued.
2. Keep a copy for yourself.
3. Confer with the person whose paper you are critiquing if there is any question as to what the paper to be critiqued contains.

WHAT IS A SYNOPSIS?

A synopsis is primarily a condensation, an outline or a short presentation of an article, of an essay or of a book.

A synopsis is not a list of opinions, or an examination of the feelings and/or conscious states, e.g. likes, dislikes, preferences, annoyances, etc., of the writer of the synopsis.

If the writer wants to addend his or her reactions, he or she must take care to explain all the relevant points in the original article reacted to.

What Should A Synopsis Look Like?**Part A: The Body of the Synopsis -- the minimal conditions**

- 1. First indicate a concern of the author, or a point argued by the author. A complex article will have more than one of these but treat them one by one.
- 2. What secondary points does the author make to establish the importance of his or her concern, or to reach the conclusion of his or her argument?
- 3. What reasons does the author give for these secondary points?
- 4. Answer questions 1, 2, and 3 for each important item in the article.

Part B: Reaction and Evaluation - This is ALWAYS secondary!

- 1. Your personal judgments must be directed **only** at items brought up in Part A.
- 2. Give reasons for your judgments. These can be the citation of counterevidence, concerns about the consequences of the points made by the author, or similar things. **These reasons are never just your feelings.** Your responsibility **as a scholar** is to give the reader of your synopsis -- assumed to be someone other than a close friend of yours -- good reasons for agreeing with your evaluations.

“Everyone is entitled to his (her) own opinion!”

This may be a “rule” for casual conversation, parties and television talk shows, but **not** for a synopsis or any kind of scholarly work.

What is desired is not your *opinion*,
but your **informed and considered judgment!**