

Fall 2017
M. 3:10pm – 5:50pm

16:194:621

Organizational Communication Theory and Research

Professor: Matthew Weber, Ph.D.
Email: matthew.weber@rutgers.edu
Office Hours: By appointment
Office: Dewitt 101
Office phone: 848-932-8718

[A] Course Overview

This class will expose students to the basic theoretical perspectives in organizational communication, and to a lesser degree, organizational theory and organizational behavior.

The purpose of this course is to provide students a thorough grounding in organizational communication research. The readings are organized historically and integrate a survey of organizational communication research within a survey of organizational theory. This will enable students to understand the intellectual development of the interdisciplinary area of organizational theory and the evolution of organizational communication research. The class will focus on the change in theoretical perspectives over time as well as on new methodological approaches to the study of organizational communication.

As the area of organizational communication continues to expand, it is important to examine the relationship of organizational communication studies to other related “disciplines” in light of historical events as well as alternative agendas in academic discourse. As part of the course, students will be exposed to both “classic” readings and current perspectives, as well as alternative/diverse methods of research. Because organizations and their problems have been much in the news (think ENRON, the White House, and Volvo) we will also have a focus on “organizational change.”

[B] Course Learning Goals & Objectives

At the end of this course, you should:

- Discuss the history, major theories, and methods relevant to the study of issues in organizational communication
- Identify and discuss the key scholars and research findings regarding the

- weekly topics discussed in class
- Apply theory and research from the organizational communication topics in regular writing assignments (as well as in your own work experience)
 - Conduct and present findings (written and oral) from a small-scale research effort conducted on some aspect of organizational communication

[C] Course Format

This is a graduate level course comprised of PhD students. The course is discussion based, and all students are expected to have completed the class reading prior to the assigned day. Classes will feature a minimal amount of direct lecture and PowerPoint, and rather will focus on discussion of key ideas in the articles assigned for a given class. We will mix theory and practice, and students are encouraged to bring their own experiences into the classroom.

[D] Expectations, Requirements & Grading

There are three requirements for the course: one term paper, a peer review, and in-class participation.

Please note that it is necessary to complete ALL assignments and exams to pass the course.

Writing is a critical part of communication, and in order to be successful in this class it is important that you communicate in a clear and concise manner. Rutgers has a Writing Program where students can obtain help with writing skills and assignments: <http://plangere.rutgers.edu/index.html>. I encourage students to take advantage of these tutoring services before handing in written work.

With regards to grading, Rutgers SCI allows the following standard grades: A, B+, B, C+, C, D, and F. An F is used for failing work or for a student who has stopped attending class without formally withdrawing.

Your final grade will be allocated between the three requirements as follows:

Participation	20%
Peer Review:	15%
Term Paper	65%

Participation & Leadership (20%): Students will be responsible for leading discussion in a given week. Students assigned to a particular week and set of readings will take on responsibility for outlining the reading plus the empirical studies, and will help to

generate discussion based on:

- Topic overview and objectives of the study
- Theories addresses in the research
- Aspects of the design and implementation of the study
- Key contributions of the study and questions/issues it provokes
- Ways in which the reading connects to other research

We will follow Amazon rules for discussion; each student(s) leading reading will be expected to provide a 2-page summary of the articles for that week and the key questions. Bullets are encouraged. Your job is to identify key aspects of the readings explained in plain language (your own words-- i.e., no direct quotes), and find common themes, discoveries, controversies, etc., across articles. Include an opening comment on the connections among the articles. Upload to the Sakai resources folder for that week by noon on the day of class.

It is crucial that you read the material and come to seminar prepared for in-depth discussion of the basic questions (above). In particular, you should be ready to discuss the research question of a paper and how effective its theory, method, and write-up are at answering that questions. Breaking that down, use the following as a guide:

Motivations

- What **question** (relationship) is the paper addressing? How clear is it?
- What **assumptions** underlie the work? How valid are they?
- Are the question and proposed answer connected to prior work to provide clear **framing**?
- What **mechanism** is proposed to explain key relationships? Is there one?

Argumentation

- How effectively do the **evidence and / or argumentation** address the question?
- For empirical pieces, do the **data and methods** fit the question?
- What are the main **findings and implications**?
- Are **conclusions justified** by the evidence or argumentation presented?

Implications

- What **extensions or refinements** does this work suggest or require?
- What **connections** relate the work to other pieces for this session? Prior sessions?
- In the end, **what is at stake**? Theoretically? Practically?

The papers we read will do better and worse jobs at motivating questions, arguing them, and drawing implications from them, so you should look for these differences and comment on them. The best papers we read will be strong in all three dimensions and, in so doing, teach us about their topics while also teaching the craft of research. Consistent with that, the best discussions will cover papers thoroughly in each of these three

dimensions, evaluating what we can learn both about their specific topics and about research more generally.

Tips: Getting good at identifying mechanisms generally takes practice. In a paper investigating the relationship between size and survival, for example, size is *not* a mechanism. Think about what might be, and be prepared to discuss it in our second session.

You will be evaluated in two ways. First, you will choose articles from the readings list to summarize, both with a very brief oral summary that week in class and your write-up to the online forum prior to class. As part of this, you will also be expected to lead discussion on the articles assigned to you based on your questions you posed. Second, your ability to discuss the other articles in class in a scholarly manner and the quality of your insights and questions will be evaluated.

Peer Review (15% each): Students will exchange papers and will have a chance to write a “peer review” of the manuscript. These reviews will not be anonymous, but will give you a chance to work together to help to improve one another’s research.

Research Articles (65%): Students will conduct a class research project, either alone or in a team. The term paper should develop or elaborate a theory, method or application of your choice, explicitly incorporating a previously discussed approach to organizational theory or research. The paper should review the relevant research literature and include a research design that tests organizational hypotheses or makes novel methodological or computational contributions. Papers need to be prepared according to the guidelines specified in the *Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association* (6th ed.), or the guidelines for a specific journal of your choosing. You are free to use this as an opportunity to develop ideas you have worked on in other courses. The term paper is due on December 9. We will follow ICA rules for the paper, in that the text of the paper may be no longer than 25 pages, double-spaced, 1” margins.

PhD students will present their research at the end of the semester. Presentations will be 30 minutes in length, including discussion. The presentations are meant to be a forum for sharing the knowledge you’ve developed; although you do not need to share your paper ahead of time, feel free to do so. Plan to assign one reading to the class in order to give them background on your topic.

Research projects should be focused around one of the issues discussed in class and will be answered through an analysis of either existing data (e.g., publicly available policy/rules documents, website content, mission/vision statements, news coverage, etc.) or in rare cases, data you collect (via interviews, questionnaires, etc.). There are three parts to this assignment: (a) research and data plan (proposal including background literature, preliminary RQs, and contributions to a message database if applicable) (b) the final research report/paper, and (c) final presentation of research findings.

Grades: All grades are final. Please do not ask to have your grade changed for reasons other than mathematical error. Applying subjective standards after the fact invalidates the

standards applied to the entire class and is unfair to every student.

An incomplete, IN, can only be assigned to a student who due to unforeseen (and generally emergency) circumstances cannot finish coursework within the given semester. Students should not assume that they have the option of an IN grade; this option will be utilized infrequently and at the professor's discretion.

Final grades will be assigned according to the following scale:

A	(90-100%)	=	900-1000 Points
B+	(87-89.9%)	=	870-899 Points
B	(80-86.9%)	=	800-869 Points
C+	(77-79.9%)	=	770-799 Points
C	(70-76.9%)	=	700-769 Points
D	(60-69.9%)	=	600-699 Points
F	(00-59.9%)	=	000-599 Points

Academic Integrity:

The consequences of academic dishonesty are very serious. Rutgers' academic integrity policy can be reviewed at <http://academicintegrity.rutgers.edu/understand.shtml>

Academic integrity means, among other things, that you will:

- Develop and write all of your own assignments.
- Show in detail where the materials you use in your papers come from.
- Create citations whether you are paraphrasing authors or quoting them directly.
- Keep your eyes on your own work during exams.
- Not fabricate information or citation in your work.

If you are not sure about any issue related to plagiarism, please come to discuss it with me.

[E] Course Readings

There are a few required texts, and a number of optional texts; the Monge and Contractor text is required for all, but the Wasserman and Faust is required only for PhD level. Pick and choose from the optional texts as desired.

Required Readings:

- Putnam, L. L., & Mumby, D. K., Eds., (2014). *The SAGE handbook of organizational communication: Advances in theory, research, and methods* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage. [select Handbook chapters as noted below]
- Weick, K. (1995) *Sensemaking in Organizations*. Sage ISBN: 080397177X
- Giddens, A. (1990). *The Constitution of Society*. Los Angeles, CA.: UCLA Press.

- All other journal/chapter readings will be made available on the course website. There is no course packet to purchase for this class, but you may need to pay to print out readings.

Additionally, I strongly recommend that you use a citation software package (e.g. Endnote) and a good writing guide:

- American Psychological Association (2012). *Publication manual of the American Psychological Association* (6th Ed.). Washington, DC. APA.

[F] Paper Mechanics and Quality:

All papers must be wordprocessed, proofread, and delivered to me electronically as a Word (or compatible) file. For the papers, I am happy to talk over ideas at length—but I cannot evaluate your papers in advance. On the final paper, I will assist as needed in running any needed statistical analysis you may need. Please follow the APA stylebook (6th ed.) for your papers and references.

[G] Writing Pet Peeves (21 Errors You Should Avoid) (credit to Craig Scott)

1. A is a word and lot is a word, but you should avoid using a lot (which is not a word) and a lot (which is overused). Try a great deal or another phrase (but not alot, which means something entirely different!).
2. Sexist language is unacceptable. Use phrases that allow you to avoid he and she when you can. In no case should the plural they be used for a singular case of either he or she. All people should know this.
3. Use the word which only in a prepositional phrase or when set off with a comma, which is the correct way to use the word. Use that in all other cases.
4. Effect and affect are not the same word. Effect the noun is the result of some cause (anxiety causes several effects). Effect the verb indicates the causation of some outcome (The presence of anxiety effects a climate of silence). Affect the noun is a synonym for emotion (many communication majors display a great deal of affect). Affect the verb means about the same as influence (lack of confidence affects people differently).
5. Contractions have no place in formal communication. Please do not use them in your papers.
6. Know the difference between to, two, too, (and tutu).
7. Similarly, try to remember that peek (to look at quickly), peak (a sharp point) and pique (to provoke) are different words. It may take more than a peek at your writing to catch this error.
8. Do not end sentences with prepositions. This is a mistake with which I care not to deal.
9. The past tense of lead (as in *she leads her people*) is led. Do not be led astray by typing *lead*.
10. A good paragraph is indented and should have a minimum of three sentences. However, it should not ramble on for pages. Each time you begin a new idea, start a new paragraph. Thus, each section in your papers will likely have several (not one) paragraphs.
11. Use a colon when listing items such as the following: names, theories, etc. A semicolon separates related sentences; however, it may also be used to separate items in a list when commas are unclear.
12. Although it is true that the “medium is the message,” it is generally not true that mediums is the plural of medium. Use *media* when talking about more than one medium.
13. There may be no “I” in “team” but there is one in “Internet,” and at least for now it is capitalized.
14. Compound adjectives used to describe a word are hyphenated (e.g., decision-making meeting), but have no hyphen otherwise (e.g., decision making is fun). Only a goof ball would make this goof-ball mistake.
15. If you refer back to the 1900s, or 80s (or some similar decade/century), do not use an apostrophe. To do so would be so “70s” of you.
16. Although the word *while* is mistakenly used to mean *although*, you should only use it while writing

when you mean to indicate that something occurs at the same time.

17. The Theory of Plurals and Possessives predicts you can have many different theories, any one theory's characteristics can be known, and you should know the difference between theories vs. theory's.
18. Modern technology has not only provided writers with wordprocessing and online publishing, but also introduced new words that increasingly do NOT have hyphens as they make their way into accepted use. Use words such as email, online, webpage, website, printout, etc. without a hyphen. O-kay? No, okay.
19. Words such as amongst and whilst are antiquated and rarely used anymore. While reading your paper, I hope not to see such terms among the pages.
20. Although popular to contrast "school" and "education" with some alleged "real world" outside of here, in my world you should avoid terms such as "in the real world." Doing so devalues your own education and suggests what we are doing is somehow not meaningful. Don't use this phrase...really.
21. One cannot put a space between can and not when accurately spelling the word cannot.
22. Avoid starting sentences with "*Me and* Mr. X (or whoever)..." because (a) it sounds like Mr. X (or whoever) is "mean" and (b) it is improper English to phrase it that way. Say "Mr. X and I..."
23. It is okay to use possessives, but don't confuse them with their homonyms. So, you can say *its*, *your*, *and their*, as long as you do not mean *it's*, *you're*, *and they're* (remember #5 and avoid contractions anyway).
24. You should stick to English over Latin, but if you use terms like e.g. (for example), i.e. (that is), etc. (and the rest) or et al. (and others), you should know how to use and spell/punctuate them correctly.
25. Even though fuggedaboutit, fuggedaboutit, fuggedabodit, and fuggeddaboutit are all in the Urban Dictionary of slang, they should not find their way into your paper. Forget about it!

[G] Course Outline

Date Topic

Sept. 11 History & Future of Organizational Communication

Redding, W. C., & Tompkins, P. K. (1988). Organizational communication--past and present tenses. In G. M. Goldhaber & G. A. Barnett (Eds.), *Handbook of organizational communication* (pp. 5-33). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Zorn, T. E. (2002). Converging within divergence: Overcoming the disciplinary fragmentation in business communication, organizational communication, and public relations. *Business Communication Quarterly*, 65(2), 44-53.

Jones, E., Watson, B., Gardner, J., & Gallois, C. (2004). Organizational communication: Challenges for the new century. *Journal of Communication*, 54, 722-750.

Barley, S. R. (2007). Corporations, democracy, and the public good. *Journal of Management Inquiry*, 16(3), 201-215.

Williamson, O. E. (1981). The modern corporation: origins, evolution, attributes. *Journal of economic literature*, 19(4), 1537-1568.

Perrow, C. (1991). A society of organizations. *Theory and society*, 20(6), 725-762.

Sept. 18 Theoretical Perspectives in Organizational Communication

P&M Ch 1: Developing a metatheoretical perspective (Deetz & Eger)

P&M Ch 2: Systems Theory (Poole)

P&M Ch 7: Approaches to the Communicative Constitution of Organizations (Brummans et al.)

P&M Ch 4: Critical Theory and Postmodernism (Mumby)

OPTIONAL: P&M Ch 3: Structuration Theory (McPhee et al.)

Sept. 25 Methods for Assessing Organizational Communication

Research Paper topic proposal due Oct. 7

P&M Ch 9: Field Methods (Doerfel & Gibbs)

P&M Ch 10: Ethnography & Qualitative (Tracy & Geist-Martin)

P&M Ch 11: Discourse Analysis (Fairhurst & Putnam)

P&M Ch 27: Engaged Scholarship (Dempsey & Barge)

OPTIONAL: P&M Ch 12: Mixed Methods (Myers)

Oct. 2 **Organizational Structure**

Giddens, A. (1990). *The Consequences of Modernity*. Cambridge, Mass.: Polity Press.

Scott, C. R., Corman, S. R., & Cheney, G. (1998). Development of a structural model of identification in the organization. *Communication Theory*, 8, 298-336.

Barrett, A. K., & Stephens, K. K. (2017). The Pivotal Role of Change Appropriation in the Implementation of Health Care Technology. *Management Communication Quarterly*, 31(2), 163-193.

DeSanctis, G., & Poole, M. S. (1994). Capturing the complexity in advanced technology use: Adaptive structuration theory. *Organization Science*, 5(2), 27.

Contractor, N. S., & Siebold, D. R. (1993). Theoretical frameworks for the study of structuring processes in group decision support systems: Adaptive structuration theory and self-organizing systems theory. *Human Communication Research*, 19(4), 36.

Oct. 9 **Making Sense of Organizations**

Weick, K. (1995) *Sensemaking in Organizations*. Sage ISBN: 080397177X

Maitlis, S., & Sonenshein, S. (2010). Sensemaking in crisis and change: Inspiration and insights from Weick (1988). *Journal of Management Studies*, 47(3), 551-580. doi:10.1111/j.1467-6486.2010.00908.x

Maitlis, S., & Lawrence, T. B. (2007). Triggers and enablers of sensegiving in organizations. *Academy of Management Journal*, 50(1), 57-84. doi:10.5465/AMJ.2007.24160971

Christianson, M. K., Farkas, M. T., Sutcliffe, K. M., & Weick, K. E. (2009). Learning through rare events: Significant interruptions at the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Museum. *Organization Science*, 20(5), 846-860. doi:10.1287/orsc.1080.0389

OPTIONAL:

Weick, K. E. (1977). Organization design: Organizations as self-designing systems.

Organizational dynamics, 6(2), 31-46.

Weick, K. E., Sutcliffe, K. M., & Obstfeld, D. (2005). Organizing and the process of sensemaking. *Organization Science*, 16(4), 409-421.
doi:10.1287/orsc.1050.0133

Oct. 16 Groups in Organizations

P&M Ch 15: Workplace Relationships (Sias)

Silva, D., & Sias, P. M. (2010). Connection, restructuring, and buffering: How groups link individuals and organizations. *Journal of Applied Communication Research*, 38, 145-166.

P&M Ch 13: Embedded Teams (Seibold et al.)

Abu Bakar, H., & Sheer, V. C. (2013). The mediating role of perceived cooperative communication in the relationship between interpersonal exchange relationships and perceived group cohesion. *Management Communication Quarterly*, 27, 443–465.

OPTIONAL:

Kuhn, T., & Poole, M. S. (2000). Do conflict management styles affect group decision making? Evidence from a longitudinal field study. *Human Communication Research*, 26, 558-590.

Oct. 23 Leadership, Participation and Decision Making

P&M Ch 21: Socialization & Assimilation (Kramer & Miller)

P&M Ch 16: Leadership Communication (Fairhurst & Connaughton)

Mitra, R. (2013). From transformational leadership to leadership trans-formations: A critical dialogic perspective. *Communication Theory*, 23, 395–416.

Seibold, D. R., & Shea, B. C. (2001). Participation and decision making. In F. M. Jablin & L. L. Putnam (Eds.), *The new handbook of organizational communication: Advances in theory, research, and methods* (3rd ed., pp. 664-703). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Stohl, C., & Cheney, G. (2001). Participatory processes / paradoxical practices: Communication and the dilemmas of organizational democracy. *Management Communication Quarterly*, 14, 349-407.

OPTIONAL:

Eisenberg, E. M., Murphy, A., & Andrews, L. (1998). Openness and decision making in the search for a university provost. *Communication Monographs*, 65, 1-23.

Oct. 30 **Knowledge and Organizations**

Aral, S., Brynjolfsson, E., & Van Alstyne, M. (2012). Information, Technology, and Information Worker Productivity. *Information Systems Research*, 23(3-part-2), 849-867. doi:10.1287/isre.1110.0408

P&M Ch 19: Knowledge & Knowing (Kuhn)

Ellison, N. B., Gibbs, J. L., & Weber, M. S. (2015). The Use of Enterprise Social Network Sites for Knowledge Sharing in Distributed Organizations: The Role of Organizational Affordances. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 59(1), 103-123. doi:10.1177/0002764214540510

Majchrzak, A., Faraj, S., Kane, G. C., & Azad, B. (2013). The contradictory influence of social media affordances on online communal knowledge sharing. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*, 19(1), 38-55.

OPTIONAL:

Contractor, N., S., & Monge, P. (2002). Managing Knowledge Networks. *Management Communication Quarterly*, 16, 10.

Cummings, J. (2004). Work Groups, Structural Diversity, and Knowledge Sharing in a Global Organization. *Management Science*, 50(3), 352-364. doi:10.1287/mnsc.1030.0134

Hansen, M. T. (1999). The search-transfer problem: The role of weak ties in sharing knowledge across organization subunits. *Administrative science quarterly*, 44(1), 82-111.

Nov. 6 **Networks, Technology and Communication**

P&M Ch 17: Information & Communication Technologies (Rice & Leonardi)

P&M Ch 18: Multidimensional Social Networks (Shumate & Contractor)

Doerfel, M. L., Chewning, L. V., & Lai, C. (2013). The evolution of networks and the resilience of interorganizational relationships after disaster. *Communication Monographs*, 80, 533-559.

Weber, M. S. (2012). Newspapers and the Long-Term Implications of Hyperlinking. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*, 17(2), 187-201.
doi:10.1111/j.1083-6101.2011.01563.x

Leonardi, P., & Barley, S. R. (2008). Materiality and change: Challenges to building better theory about technology and organizing. *Information and Organization*, 18(3), 159-176. doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.infoandorg.2008.03.001

OPTIONAL:

McPhee, R. D., & Poole, M. S. (2001). Organizational structures and configurations. In F. M. Jablin & L. L. Putnam (Eds.), *The new handbook of organizational communication: Advances in theory, research, and methods* (3rd ed., pp. 503-543). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Treem, J. W. (2012). Communicating expertise: Knowledge performances in professional-service firms. *Communication Monographs*, 79, 23-47.

Nov. 13 How Organizations Change

Grudin, J. (2012). Punctuated equilibrium and technology change. *interactions*, 19(5), 62-66. doi:10.1145/2334184.2334200

Jones, M., & Orlikowski, W. J. (2007). Information technology and the dynamics of organizational change. In R. Mansell, C. Avgerou, D. Quah, & R. Silverstone (Eds.), *The Oxford handbook of information and communication technologies*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Leonardi, P. (2009). Why Do People Reject New Technologies and Stymie Organizational Changes of Which They Are in Favor? Exploring Misalignments Between Social Interactions and Materiality. *Human Communication Research*, 35(3), 407-441.

Gioia, D. A., & Chittipeddi, K. (1991). Sensemaking and sensegiving in strategic change initiation. *Strategic Management Journal*, 12(6), 433-449.
doi:10.1002/smj.4250120604

Kelly, D., & Amburgey, T. L. (1991). Organizational inertia and momentum: A dynamic model of strategic change. *Academy of Management Journal*, 34(3), 591-612.
doi:10.2307/256407

OPTIONAL:

Boyd, B. (1990). Corporate linkages and organizational environment: A test of the resource dependence model. *Strategic Management Journal*, 11(6), 419-430. doi:10.1002/smj.4250110602

Weick, K. E., & Quinn, R. E. (1999). Organizational change and development. *Annual review of psychology*, 50(1), 361-386.

Pentland, B., & Feldman, M. (2005). Organizational routines as a unit of analysis. *Industrial and Corporate Change*, 14(5), 793.

Nov. 20 Ecological and Institutional Views of Organizations

Ruef, M. (2000). The emergence of organizational forms: A community ecology approach. *American Journal of Sociology*, 106, 57. doi:10.1086/318963

Hunt, C. S., & Aldrich, H. (1998). The Second Ecology: Creation and evolution of organizational communities. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 20, 267-301.

Miner, A. S. (1991). Organizational evolution and the social ecology of jobs. *American Sociological Review*, 56, 772-785.

Hannan, M., & Freeman, J. H. (1977). The population ecology of organizations. *American Journal of Sociology*, 85, 929-955.

Baum, J. A. C., & Oliver, C. (1996). Toward an Institutional Ecology of Organizational Founding. *The Academy of Management Journal*, 39(5), 1378-1427.

Usher, J. M., & Evans, M. G. (1996). Life and death along gasoline alley: Darwinian and Lamarckian processes in a differentiating population. *The Academy of Management Journal*, 39(5), 1428-1466. doi:10.2307/257004

OPTIONAL:

Nov. 27 Ecological and Institutional Views of Organizations II

Zorn, T. E., Flanagin, A. J., & Shoham, M. D. (2011). Institutional and noninstitutional influences on information and communication technology adoption and use among nonprofit organizations. *Human Communication Research*, 37, 1-33.

Baum, J. A. C., & Oliver, C. (1996). Toward an Institutional Ecology of Organizational Founding. *The Academy of Management Journal*, 39(5), 1378-1427.

DiMaggio, P. T., & Powell, W. W. (1983). The Iron Cage revisited: Institutional isomorphism and collective rationality in organizational fields. *American Sociological Review*, 48(2), 14. doi:10.1016/S0742-3322(00)17011-1

Lammers, J. C. (2011). How Institutions Communicate: Institutional Messages, Institutional Logics, and Organizational Communication. *Management Communication Quarterly*, 25(1), 154-182. doi:10.1177/0893318910389280

OPTIONAL:

Baum, J. A. C., & Singh, J. V. (1994). Organizational niches and the dynamics or organizational mortality. *American Journal of Sociology*, 100(2), 346-380.

Van de Ven, A. H., & Garud, R. (1994). The coevolution of technical and institutional events in the development of an innovation. In J. A. C. Baum & J. V. Singh (Eds.), *Evolutionary dynamics of organizations* (pp. 425-443). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Dec. 4 Emerging Areas in Organizational Communication

P&M Ch 14: Communicating Work-Life Issues (Kirby & Buzzanell)

P&M Ch 26: Incivility and Bullying (Kassing & Waldron)

Kirkman, B. L., Cordery, J. L., Mathieu, J. E., Rosen, B., & Kukenberger, M. (2013). Global organizational communities of practice: The effects of national diversity, psychological safety, and media richness on community performance. *Human Relations*, 66(3), 333-362. doi:10.1177/0018726712464076

Dec. 11 Research Presentations

Dec. 18 Final Research Paper due

[H] Additional Resources

Supplemental Syllabi: These provide additional readings and focused guidance on particular topics.

Brockmann, D. "ESAM 495: Dynamical Processes on Networks." Northwestern University.
<http://web.me.com/zwergen/S10-495/Home.html>

Howard, P. "Network Organization, New Media, and Collective Action Problems." University of Washington.
<http://faculty.washington.edu/pnhoward/teaching/netorg/netorg.html>

Leskovec, J. "CS224W: Social and Information Network Analysis." Stanford University.
<http://www.stanford.edu/class/cs224w/schedule.html>

Matei, S.A. "Comm 632: From Mass Media to Social Media Research: Theoretical and Methodological Trends."
<http://matei.org/ithink/2010/08/10/mass-to-social-media/>

McFarland, D. "Education 316/Sociology369: Network Analysis of Formal and Informal Organizations." Stanford University.
<http://www.stanford.edu/~dmcfarla/courses/net-anl-syl.htm>

Newman, M. "Complex Systems 535/Physics 508: Network Theory." University of Michigan.
<http://www-personal.umich.edu/~mejn/courses/2010/cscs535/index.html>

Raab, J. "Organization Studies 440804: Interorganizational Relationships." Tillburg University.
http://www.hks.harvard.edu/netgov/files/snasyllabi/Interorganizational_Relationships.pdf

Wheat, C. "15.992: Networks & Organizations." Massachusetts Institute of Technology.
<http://cwheat.scripts.mit.edu/teaching/15.992/readings.php>

[I] Other Resources

Academic organizations and conferences

Sunbelt Conference, International Network for Social Network Analysis (INSNA).
<http://www.insna.org/index.html>

INSNA SOcNET listserv
<http://www.insna.org/pubs/socnet.html>

Web Science Trust. <http://webscience.org/home.html>

Communication and Technology Division, Organizational Communication Division.
International Communication Association (ICA). <http://www.icahdq.org>

Organizational Behavior Division, Organizational Communication and Information Systems
Division, Academy of Management (AoM). <http://www.aom.pace.edu>

Conference on Human-Computer Interaction (CHI), Conference on Computer-Supported
Cooperative Work (CSCW), Conference on Supporting Group Work (GROUP), Association for
Computing Machinery (ACM). <http://www.acm.org>

Conference on Social Computing (SocialComp), World Wide Web Conference (WWW),
Hawaii Conference on System Sciences (HICSS), Conference on Advances in Social
Networking and Mining (ASONAM), IEEE Computer Society. <http://www.computer.org>

Conference on Network Science (NetSci). <http://www.netsci2014.net>

Conference on Weblogs and Social Media (ICWSM), Conference on Artificial Intelligence
(AAAI), Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining (KDD), Association for Advancement of
Artificial Intelligence (AAAI). <http://www.aaai.org/>

Data Sets

McFarland, D. "Social Network Analysis Labs in R and SoNIA." Stanford University.
<http://sna.stanford.edu/rlabs.php>

Newman, M. "Network data." University of Michigan.
<http://www-personal.umich.edu/~mejn/netdata/>

Leskovec, J. "Large Network Dataset Collection." Stanford University.
<http://snap.stanford.edu/data/>

Batagelj, V. & Mrvar, A. "Pajek datasets." University of Ljubljana.
<http://vlado.fmf.uni-lj.si/pub/networks/data/>

Börner, K., *et al.* "InfoVis Cyberinfrastructure Databases." Indiana University.
<http://iv.slis.indiana.edu/db/index.html>

People and Research groups

NetSCI Network Science Research Lab

<http://netsci.rutgers.edu>

Science of Networks in Communities (SONIC). Noshir Contractor.

<http://sonic.northwestern.edu>

Northwestern Institute on Complex Systems. Daniel Diermeier, Brian Uzzi, Kevin Lynch, William Kath, *et al.* <http://www.northwestern.edu/nico/>

Annenberg Networks Network. Peter Monge, University of Southern California.

<http://ann.uscannenberg.org/>

Program for Network Governance. David Lazer, Harvard University.

<http://www.hks.harvard.edu/netgov/html/index.htm>

NETLAB. Barry Wellman, University of Toronto. <http://www.chass.utoronto.ca/~wellman/>

CASOS. Kathleen Carley, Carnegie Mellon University. <http://www.casos.cs.cmu.edu/>

