

# THE LARGE INTRODUCTORY CLASS AS AN EXERCISE IN ORGANIZATION DESIGN

---

John A. Wagner III  
Linn Van Dyne  
*Michigan State University*

One of the most striking lessons we have learned during more than 10 years of relevant experience is that decisions about how to structure instructor-student interactions take on tremendous significance in large introductory classes. Virtually all other decisions about issues such as topical scope, teaching delivery, and student evaluation are rendered ineffectual by structuring that does not at least minimally satisfy the interests of key constituency groups. At the same time, well-founded structural decisions can facilitate delivery of content, presentation style, and retention of material. Structuring the large classroom is a nontrivial process that poses numerous challenges and opportunities.

Based on this insight, the purpose of this article is to contribute to the general improvement of large classroom instruction by enhancing the range of structures considered for implementation in large introductory classes. To accomplish this purpose, we start by introducing a heuristic definition of *large*. We then frame the process of structuring the large introductory class as an exercise in organization design and develop a 2-by-2 taxonomy of structural alternatives formed by the dimensions of centralization of control (centralization/decentralization) and standardization of coordination (standardization/mutual adjustment).

---

**Authors' Note:** Correspondence should be addressed to John A. Wagner III, Michigan State University, Department of Management, East Lansing, MI 48824; (voicemail) 517-355-1878; (fax) 517-432-1111; (e-mail) wagner@pilot.msu.edu; or Linn Van Dyne, Michigan State University, Department of Management, East Lansing, MI 48824; (voicemail) 517-432-3512; (fax) 517-432-1111; (e-mail) vandyne@pilot.msu.edu.

JOURNAL OF MANAGEMENT EDUCATION, Vol. 23 No. 2, April 1999 123-142  
© 1999 Sage Publications, Inc.

Next, we describe several contingency factors that influence choices among and effectiveness of the various alternatives delineated in our taxonomy. We conclude by assessing the contributions and limitations of our approach.

### **How Large is Large?**

Structuring in organizations forms and maintains patterns of interdependence that endure over time and contribute to the accomplishment of various organizational goals and objectives (March & Simon, 1958; Mintzberg, 1979). The same applies to structuring in classrooms. Instructors develop interdependent relationships with and among students for a variety of reasons—for instance, to communicate material, provide advice, infuse teamwork, or appraise performance. Sometimes these relationships are individualized, enabling the instructor to get to know each student as a person. In such instances, the instructor can tailor course content and pedagogy to reflect student interests and abilities. At other times, classroom relationships are routinized, requiring the instructor to treat students as more or less the same and to develop instructional content and processes without significant regard for individual differences in student needs and proficiencies.

Bearing this distinction in mind, we can label a class of students *large* when a single instructor exerting ordinary effort cannot hope to develop an individualized relationship with each and every student and must instead devote extraordinary personal effort or incorporate some degree of depersonalization into classroom interactions to accomplish basic instructional objectives. Some instructors, for instance, those who have many nonteaching responsibilities (e.g., research, professional service, consulting, or administrative duties), may perceive classes of 25 or 30 students as large. Other instructors, including those who are able to devote complete attention to teaching, may find that largeness is not felt until class sizes approach 100 students or more.

Although there is no absolute number of students that can serve as the definitional boundary between small and large classes, instructors of introductory classes tend to sense largeness and begin to rely on something other than ordinary effort and individualized relationships once class size exceeds approximately 50 students. The experience of largeness does not, by itself, lead instructors to adopt any one particular type of classroom structure. In fact, it may have the opposite effect of creating awareness of the importance of structuring and of the possible suitability of a number of structural alternatives. A classroom version of organization design—the process

of envisioning, enacting, and evaluating alternative organization structures—becomes salient.

## Structural Characteristics

Whether the focus is on structuring organizations or classrooms, current thinking on organization design traces back to a handful of classic theories and models (e.g., Galbraith, 1977; Lawrence & Lorsch, 1967; Thompson, 1967). Among these, Burns and Stalker's (1961) study of management processes and organization structures is among the most influential and widely cited (Brittain & Wholley, 1990). In examining operations in 20 British companies, Burns and Stalker noticed that some firms used a mechanistic, machinelike approach reminiscent of Weber's (1947) bureaucracy and favored for its low administrative cost and high operational efficiency. Others employed an organic, organism-like approach notable for its flexibility and adaptability in the face of change. Further analyses led Burns and Stalker (1961) to suggest that this contrast could be attributed to variations in structural characteristics subsequently labeled *centralization of control* and *standardization of coordination*.

Generally speaking, centralization of control concerns the degree to which the power to plan actions and implement changes is distributed according to vertical distinctions in hierarchical status and authority (Price & Mueller, 1986; Van de Ven & Ferry, 1980). As a dimension of organization structure, it can range from centralization, in which all control is retained at the top by hierarchical superiors, to decentralization, in which control is delegated downward and shared among hierarchical subordinates. Applied to the classroom, this dimension maps differences in the division and distribution of control over teaching processes. Centralization occurs when a single course instructor retains control over the planning and design of teaching processes. Centralization can reduce the quantity of human and financial resources consumed by course preparation and teaching because it limits the number of people involved in pedagogical planning. Conversely, decentralization is used when planning and design responsibilities are shared with other members of the classroom (assistant instructors, teaching assistants, or students). Decentralization allows broader participation and involvement in the process of determining the objectives and content of classroom activities.

In general terms, standardization of coordination concerns the extent to which interdependent task activities are coordinated by standard procedures (March & Simon, 1958; Mintzberg, 1979). As a dimension of organization

structure, it can range from standardization, in which coordination problems are anticipated and covered by standard operating procedures, to mutual adjustment, in which individuals performing interdependent tasks exchange information among themselves and respond to coordination problems as they occur. In the classroom, standardization occurs when coordination among participants is based on preexisting procedures and standards. Such standardization can be efficient and can facilitate greater uniformity because students read the same materials, take the same exams, and so forth. Nevertheless, it can discourage flexibility and individualized instruction. Conversely, mutual adjustment takes place when classroom coordination problems are identified and dealt with as they occur by the people who experience them. Mutual adjustment allows flexibility and adaptability. It also enables students to learn by doing through personal experience with interpersonal coordination, conflict management, and so forth. In most instances, however, mutual adjustment is inefficient because it consumes time and attention during ongoing processes of interpersonal coordination and pedagogical implementation.

### **Taxonomy of Classroom Alternatives**

In organizations, centralization of control and standardization of coordination vary independently (e.g., Aldrich, 1975; Blau, 1970; Donaldson, 1975; Wagner, Buchko, & Gooding, 1988). Our experience indicates that the same is also true in large introductory classes. Thus, suggested is the two-dimensional taxonomy of four structural alternatives shown in Figure 1.

#### **TYPE 1: CENTRALIZATION WITH MUTUAL ADJUSTMENT**

In one of the four alternatives, instructional control is centralized and classroom coordination is achieved through mutual adjustment. This structure, which is identical to the type often used in small classes, is one in which an instructor plans the course and delivers lectures. Students in this type of class interact among themselves and with the instructor to influence daily classroom activities. Through this process, a lecture-only course may become more of a lecture-discussion if students show the proclivity to participate in classroom discussions and the instructor can coordinate student input. Topical coverage and evaluation procedures remain fully determined by the instructor, but pedagogy—in this case, the pattern of interactions among students and between students and the instructor—is modified through student input.

|                                    |                   |                           |               |
|------------------------------------|-------------------|---------------------------|---------------|
|                                    | Standardization   | Type 2                    | Type 3        |
| Standardization of<br>Coordination |                   |                           |               |
|                                    | Mutual Adjustment | Type 1                    | Type 4        |
|                                    |                   | Centralized               | Decentralized |
|                                    |                   | Centralization of Control |               |

Figure 1: A Taxonomy of Large Classroom Structures

Due to the large number of relationships that must be established in the large introductory class, this first type of course structure requires extraordinary instructor effort and attention. In addition, student efforts invested in mutual adjustment can diminish efforts applied to mastering course content, unless class objectives involve learning by doing via mutual adjustment (in which case, the classroom becomes an experiential laboratory). Overall, the centralized class coordinated by mutual adjustment enables the instructor to control content and evaluation and at the same time remain reasonably responsive to student suggestions regarding instructional processes and procedures.

#### TYPE 2: CENTRALIZATION WITH STANDARDIZATION

The second of the four structures in our taxonomy is centralized with coordination through standardization. This type of course structure parallels the organizational form labeled *mechanistic* by Burns and Stalker (1961) and, similar to that form of structure and management, affords significant efficiency in the classroom at the cost of general inflexibility. In the centralized standardized class, a single instructor bears primary responsibility for teaching delivery and tries to anticipate coordination problems through a detailed course syllabus that covers teaching pedagogy, topical coverage, evaluation standards, and administrative procedures. The mass lecture-only classes associated in many people's minds with the large introductory class illustrate this second type of course structure. Other examples include most distance-learning classes, courses offered on the World Wide Web, classes organized

around a centralized laboratory of learning centers (each center consisting of dedicated resources allowing students to listen to audiotapes, view videotapes, read selected materials, etc.), and courses using computer-mediated instruction to supplement lecture instruction. In each of these alternatives, students are exposed to preplanned, highly structured learning experiences in which course-related information tends to flow in only one direction—from instructor or instructional materials to students.

The centralized standardized class is efficient once standards and procedures have been designed and implemented because institutional and instructor resources are conserved, and the productivity losses of mutual adjustment in the classroom are curtailed. In addition, students all receive similar instructional experiences, reducing complaints about inequities and inconsistencies that may occur in other types of large introductory courses. However, the ability to individualize instruction or adapt to changing circumstances is severely limited. Stability and routine are dominant features of the centralized standardized classroom.

### **TYPE 3: DECENTRALIZATION WITH STANDARDIZATION**

A third structural type is the decentralized standardized course. As in the centralized standardized type, the course instructor formulates standard procedures (although assistants may help with course preparation). In contrast to the two centralized alternatives, however, instruction is decentralized and often takes place in subsections managed by assistant instructors or teaching assistants. The course instructor may function as a first-order resource, delivering lectures in periodic coursewide meetings, or as a second-order resource, training subsection assistants to conduct standardized lessons in their own subsections. In addition to the instructor's lectures, the course may involve small group instruction and minilectures, case studies, experiential exercises, and so forth, carried out as subsection activities. The appendix contains a syllabus that illustrates salient features of a decentralized standardized course structure. In this example, an instructor delivers weekly lectures to the entire course and helps assistants use a variety of pedagogical techniques to deliver additional standardized material during smaller subsection meetings. The syllabus details a lengthy set of behavioral and output standards, including weekly assignments, grading criteria, and questions and answers intended to narrow the scope of student behavior.

Decentralization in the decentralized standardized class allows assistants to tailor classroom activities to student needs, subject to limitations imposed by standardized procedural requirements. Teaching assistants can get to

know their students given the smaller teacher-student ratios, and they can develop a small course atmosphere in their subsections. The course instructor must cope with the challenging task of standardizing classroom activities across multiple classrooms but can reduce the long-term personal costs of this task if the standardized preparation can be used several times.

#### **TYPE 4: DECENTRALIZATION WITH MUTUAL ADJUSTMENT**

A fourth type of course structure suggested by the taxonomy is the decentralized class coordinated by mutual adjustment. Here, instruction is entirely decentralized, and mutual adjustment shapes interactions between assistants and students as course participants solicit input from one another and tailor classroom activities accordingly. The instructor assumes the role of course coordinator and ensures that all subsection assistants have the necessary knowledge, skills, and teaching resources.

The experiential classroom, in which students structure classroom activities based on organizational models described in required readings, exemplifies the mix of decentralization and mutual adjustment found in this fourth type of class structure. Students redefine the classroom as an organization, develop a mission statement, design a product, divide class members into functional departments, form a hierarchy, initiate production, and manage ongoing organizational activities. Subsections are thus transformed into practical seminars on management and organizational behavior. By transferring control of structure and process to students, the instructor and assistants create a situation in which course participants learn how to manage by managing themselves.

This type of class structure parallels the organic form of management and structure described by Burns and Stalker (1961). Therefore, it is flexible and adaptive but subject to administrative and operational inefficiencies. Recurrent mutual adjustment among students in the classroom creates ongoing process loss. The false starts and reinvention that characterize experiential learning are another source of inefficiency. These costs are reasonable when learning how to coordinate through mutual adjustment is a primary course objective. In the absence of this feature, however, classroom activities may be seen as pointless and lacking in face validity.

### **Contingency Factors**

The concept of conditional usefulness lies at the heart of contingency models of organization design. According to this way of thinking, each type

of organization structure functions appropriately and contributes to organizational effectiveness under some conditions but not others (e.g., Child, 1972; Pfeffer, 1982). The application of this logic to our discussion of classroom structuring suggests that each of the four structural types just described has strengths and weaknesses that render it more useful in some situations than in others.

### **CLASS SIZE**

Our experience suggests that class size (number of students) has the greatest contingency effect on classroom structural design. Course structures characterized by centralization and mutual adjustment (Type 1) usually prove workable only in the smallest of large introductory classes (perhaps 50 to 100 students), because larger classes generate so much information during mutual adjustment among participants that the instructor succumbs to information overload. Centralization and standardization (Type 2) can be used effectively in classes that are considerably larger (up to as many as 200 to 300 students). Beyond this size, simple administrative matters—tracking attendance, administering exams, recording grades—begin to overwhelm instructor resources. Courses incorporating decentralization and standardization (Type 3) can be larger yet, because problems with administrative overload can be overcome by creating subsections staffed by assistants. Maximum manageable size (roughly 800 to 1,000) is determined by the number of exceptions that arise as standardized rules and regulations are administered. Too many exceptions, or too much change, prove overwhelming to instructor and structure alike. Courses structured around decentralization and mutual adjustment (Type 4) can be even larger, because reactions to exceptional circumstances can be developed as needed by participants in each subsection instead of being formulated centrally and in advance. Course size can exceed 1,000 students without substantial negative effect as long as each assistant can manage subsection activities without significant instructor involvement.

### **CONSTITUENCY INTERESTS**

Besides class size, demands made by key stakeholders or constituency groups (Freeman, 1984; Mitroff, 1983; Pennings & Goodman, 1977) also serve as contingency factors that influence structural effectiveness. Constituency groups are collections of individuals sharing common interests. Such groups are relevant to an organization if they are able to provide the organization with resources essential to its survival. They take on added significance



if they provide needed resources only when self-interested constituency demands are satisfied (Tsui, 1990; Wagner & Schneider, 1987).

In the large introductory class, three especially influential constituencies are the teaching staff (instructor and assistants, if any), students enrolled in the class, and agents of the surrounding educational institution. A large introductory class can be deemed effective only when its structural characteristics satisfy the interests of these three constituency groups.

*Teaching staff.* Staff interests in instructional quality and related areas of professional development affect structural choice and effectiveness by influencing the amount of time and effort willingly devoted to instructional activities. To the extent that the instructor's primary focus is teaching, personal preferences typically favor centralization due to the high instructor involvement and personal control over quality afforded by centralized classroom procedures. Mutual adjustment is also likely to be preferred due to its personal involvement and structural flexibility. Accordingly, teaching-oriented instructors will tend to prefer class structures that combine centralization and mutual adjustment (Type 1). When the course includes teaching-oriented assistants, they are also likely to prefer mutual adjustment. Assistants, however, generally prefer decentralization because it creates their jobs. Thus, decentralized classes coordinated by mutual adjustment (Type 4) will be preferred by assistants with strong teaching interests.

Teaching staff interests in nonteaching pursuits also influence structural choice. Instructors with strong nonteaching interests favor decentralization and the involvement of assistants as surrogates who can conduct classes, or standardization if a standardized preparation can be used several times. However, the combination of decentralization and standardization (Type 3) will be preferred less than decentralization and mutual adjustment (Type 4) because the latter structural combination transfers the greatest amount of teaching activity from the instructor to course assistants. Assistants interested primarily in nonteaching activities will gravitate toward decentralization and standardization (Type 3) because classroom planning and coordination remain largely the instructor's responsibility and do not interfere with assistants' other pursuits.

*Students.* Student interests in classroom skill development favor mutual adjustment, whereas concerns about equal treatment favor greater standardization. Centralization is preferred by students who equate instructor involvement with higher instructional quality, whereas decentralization is consistent with preferences for smaller classrooms and more individualized interaction between instructor and students. Thus, students who prefer personal attention

from their instructors combined with classroom discussions will most likely prefer centralization and mutual adjustment in large introductory classes (Type 1). Students who prefer a didactic and more anonymous learning environment with an emphasis on equal treatment will prefer centralization and standardization (Type 2). Student preferences for a mix of didactic and interactive learning experiences will push in the direction of decentralization and standardization (Type 3). Finally, students who want a small-group participatory or experiential learning environment in large introductory classes will prefer decentralization with mutual adjustment (Type 4).

*Institutional agents.* College or university administrators serve as agents who give voice to institutional interests. Such interests often determine class size, the availability of teaching assistants, whether subsections can be formed, and so forth, and thus influence other contingencies. In addition, they also have strong contingency effects of their own.

In institutions that are able to provide greater support for teaching, administrative concerns will emphasize quality, centralization, and faculty interaction with students. In this situation, a centralized course coordinated by mutual adjustment (Type 1) will be the most typical preference. To the extent that institutional interests favor efficiency and cost control, institutional constituencies may instead prefer the mechanistic approach of centralization with standardization (Type 2), which emphasizes lecture-only instruction. For schools that emphasize both teaching and nonteaching activities, decentralization may be preferred due to economies of scale associated with the lower payroll costs of using assistants in the classroom. Standardization is also attractive when it frees up faculty time and attention that can be redirected toward other productive activities. The decentralized standardized classroom (Type 3) will be the preferred choice in this instance. When a quality-conscious institution also values providing hands-on, experiential learning, decentralization with mutual adjustment (Type 4) will be the preferred design.

*Selective satisfaction.* Given the contrasting orientations of the three constituency groups just discussed, it is not at all unusual when the interests of one group push toward adoption of a course structure that does not satisfy the interests of other groups. Determining which constituency interests to weigh most heavily and which interests to minimize, overlook, or defer to the future is thus a necessary but challenging aspect of the task of structuring a large course. Although issues associated with selective constituent satisfaction have been discussed in the organizational literature (e.g., Pfeffer & Salancik, 1978), practical guidance in this area is lacking. Our own experiences have

not yet suggested any lasting means of resolving such issues during the process of large course design.

## Conclusion

In this article, we have outlined four structural alternatives that incorporate different combinations of centralization of control and standardization of coordination. We have also discussed the influence of class size, instructional staff interests, student interests, and institutional interests on the effectiveness of each of these structural alternatives. In so doing, we have presented a contingency model of design useful in planning and implementing the structures of large introductory classes.

Our taxonomy of alternatives is not exhaustive, given the existence of other structural characteristics that could be used to classify classroom arrangements. In addition, because each of the alternatives is an idealized, extreme type, other alternatives incorporating hybrid, middle-range structures can be envisioned. Furthermore, although we focused on those contingency factors that we believe to be the most influential, our list is by no means all-inclusive.

More generally, we acknowledge that contingency modeling similar to ours is sometimes criticized as underrepresenting the complexity of causal processes and relationships among contingency factors and structural characteristics (e.g., Pennings, 1975; Schoonhoven, 1981). However, our approach is consistent with the argument of theorists who contend that some degree of idealization and simplification is a necessary trade-off when accuracy and general applicability are desired (e.g., Thorngate, 1976; Weick, 1979). Our position is that "glossing" is a necessary precursor to practical action, making otherwise overwhelming problems tractable and suggesting the outlines of realistic solutions. Taxonomy development and contingency modeling facilitate conceptual analysis and stimulate practical action (Donaldson, 1985; Pennings, 1992).

In conclusion, this article emphasizes that the large introductory class can be structured in a variety of ways. It suggests that there is no one single way, nor even one best way, to structure classroom interactions and interdependence. The taxonomy it presents is a source of ideas intended to encourage instructors to consider a variety of structural alternatives when designing and teaching a large course. Structuring thus becomes a process of intentional choice instead of trial-and-error experience or historical precedent. Effective instructional delivery and enhanced classroom satisfaction are more likely to result.

## Appendix

### Sample Syllabus: Management 100

---

#### COURSE OBJECTIVES

Management 100 is an introductory course intended to familiarize students with key concepts, models, and theories of management and organizational behavior. Its developmental objectives are to enhance students' abilities to understand and manage behaviors in and of organizations. A combination of lecture, video, exercise, and objective examination techniques are used to achieve these objectives.

#### Required Materials

Wagner and Hollenbeck (1998b)  
 Wagner and Hollenbeck (1998a)  
 Wagner (1995)

#### LECTURE SCHEDULE

This schedule is advisory and is subject to change, if necessary, during the term. Students must complete preclass preparations for exercise and case assignments prior to the Wednesday, Thursday, or Friday recitation meeting. Consult your recitation section syllabus for further information.

| <i>Date</i> | <i>Lecture Topic</i>                             | <i>Text Chapters</i> | <i>Recitation Activities</i> |
|-------------|--|----------------------|------------------------------|
| Week 1      | Management and Managers                          | Syllabus, 1          |                              |
| Week 2      | International Organization Behavior (OB)         | 14                   | Exercise 1                   |
| Week 3      | Ability, Personality, and Perception             | 2, 3                 | Exercise 2                   |
| Week 4      | Motivation and Performance                       | 4                    | Case 11                      |
| Week 5      | Exam 1   |                      |                              |
| Week 6      | Job Design                                       | 6                    | Exercise 8                   |
| Week 7      | Interpersonal Processes                          | 7                    | Exercise 11                  |
| Week 8      | Midterm break—No lecture or recitation this week |                      |                              |
| Week 9      | Group and Team Productivity                      | 8                    | Exercise 12                  |
| Week 10     | Leadership                                       | 9                    | Case 18                      |
| Week 11     | Exam 2   |                      |                              |
| Week 12     | Power and Conflict                               | 10                   | Exercise 14                  |
| Week 13     | Organization Structure                           | 11                   | Exercise 17                  |
| Week 14     | Organization Design                              | 12                   | Exercise 18                  |
| Week 15     | Organization Culture and Change                  | 13                   | Case 26                      |
| Week 16     | Final exam                                       |                      |                              |

#### GRADING

Exam 1                      90 points  
 Exam 2                      90 points

|                        |            |
|------------------------|------------|
| Final exam             | 120 points |
| Recitation performance | 300 points |
| Total possible         | 600 points |

## EXAMS

Exams 1 and 2 will be given during the lecture periods on the dates shown above. Each of these two exams will consist of 90 five-answer multiple-choice questions. Neither Exam 1 nor Exam 2 will be comprehensive.

The final exam will be given during finals week. It will consist of 120 five-answer multiple-choice questions, 90 of which will test course material covered after Exam 2 and 30 of which will be comprehensive (these 30 questions will cover material previously tested in Exams 1 and 2 but will be new questions prepared specifically for the final exam).

All exams will assess your mastery of Management 100 lectures, readings, videotapes, and recitation discussions about these materials. No exam questions will be asked about recitation exercises or case analyses.

## RECITATION PERFORMANCE

In addition to this syllabus, you will receive a syllabus from your recitation instructor indicating how your recitation performance points will be assigned. The following grading framework will be used in all recitation sections.

| <i>Points</i> | <i>Source</i>            | <i>Explanation</i>   |
|---------------|--------------------------|--|
| 120           | Written quiz performance | Your recitation instructor will give you twelve 10-point quizzes, one quiz per week. Each quiz will consist of 10 objective (word-matching) questions covering the week's text material. To help you study, word lists for these quizzes are included in your course pack.   |
| 80            | Exercise reports         | In groups, you will perform eight classroom exercises in which you will use course materials as management tools. For each exercise, your group will submit a typed one-page brief worth 10 points. Guidelines to be used to grade these briefs are included in your course pack.  |
| 75            | Case analyses            | In the same groups, you will also perform three case analyses outside of class in which you will use course materials to diagnose and solve case study problems. For each case, your group will submit a typed two- to five-page report worth 25 points. Guidelines for the preparation and grading of these reports are included in your course pack. |
| 20            | Miscellaneous activities | To be based on completion of one or two short written assignments or, if available, participation in one or two approved business research experiments.  |

|   |               |   |
|---|---------------|---|
| 5 | Participation | Your participation as a group member and as a member of your recitation section will be assessed by your recitation instructor with the help of data provided by the members of your exercise group. Forms for collecting data from group members are included in this course pack. |
|---|---------------|---|

NOTE: Whether you receive the full allotment of exercise points or case analysis points earned by your group will also depend on your participation as a group and recitation section member. Individuals judged by their group or instructor to be free riders will be penalized accordingly (see later in this syllabus for additional information).

### GRADING SCALE

Your final Management 100 grade will be determined by the following straight scale.

|   |       |
|---|-------|
| 540-600 points (90-100% of the 600 points available this term)  | = 4.0 |
| 516-539 points (86-89.9% of the 600 points available this term) | = 3.5 |
| 480-515 points (80-85.9% of the 600 points available this term) | = 3.0 |
| 456-479 points (76-79.9% of the 600 points available this term) | = 2.5 |
| 420-455 points (70-75.9% of the 600 points available this term) | = 2.0 |
| 396-419 points (66-69.9% of the 600 points available this term) | = 1.5 |
| 360-395 points (60-65.9% of the 600 points available this term) | = 1.0 |
| 000-359 points (00-59.9% of the 600 points available this term) | = 0.0 |

### Questions and Answers

The following questions are often asked by students in our course. For your convenience, we answer them in this syllabus. Please keep the following information in mind during the term.

**Q:** Having a recitation instructor, course coordinator, and lecture instructor is confusing. Who is my teacher?

**A:** All three fill specific teaching roles in Management 100. Your recitation instructor will meet with you in a class of approximately 40 students each week. In these meetings, he or she will answer questions about the week's course material, administer a short 10-point quiz, and supervise classroom exercise and case activities. Your recitation instructor is also the teacher who will assess written exercise briefs and case papers, maintain grade records for your recitation section, and calculate your final grade for the course. To discuss questions about course material or grades, consult with your recitation instructor during his or her office hours.

The course coordinator (who is also one section's recitation instructor) will conduct a meeting each week with all of our recitation instructors to help the instructors standardize recitation teaching plans across sections. In addition, as described more fully below, the course coordinator will meet with students when a problem exists between the students and their recitation instructors that the recitation instructors cannot resolve to the students' satisfaction.

The lecture instructor will deliver a weekly lecture to the two courses of approximately 400 students each and will develop the three coursewide examinations. In addition, the lecture instructor is responsible for the course structure described in this syllabus and will ensure that your recitation instructor adheres to it. He or she will be available before and after the lecture each week to answer questions about lecture materials. He or she will also be available at his office during scheduled office hours. You can meet with or telephone him or her then.

**Q:** If I miss a lecture, who should I get notes from?

**A:** The best source for notes from missed lectures is other students in your exercise group. Because lectures change from term to term, neither the lecture instructor nor your recitation instructor will have notes prepared for distribution. If you cannot understand the notes that you acquire from another student, consult your recitation instructor during office hours.

**Q:** What should I do if I have to leave a lecture early?

**A:** To avoid disturbing other students, please sit by a door and exit quietly. Disruptive students will be penalized recitation points, and severely or repeatedly disruptive students will be asked to withdraw from the course.

**Q:** Can I register for one lecture or recitation section and attend another?

**A:** Students must attend the lecture meeting and recitation section for which they are officially enrolled. University and college regulations dictate that a student's failure to comply with this rule will result in a grade of 0.0.

**Q:** What do I do if I miss a recitation quiz?

**A:** You will be able to make up one missed quiz without an excuse—simply contact your recitation instructor, arrange a time acceptable to your instructor, and take the quiz. Each subsequent makeup quiz will require an acceptable written excuse. Acceptable reasons for missing a quiz include illness, family death or extreme emergency, and preapproved participation in certain university-sponsored activities. Unacceptable reasons include work, intramural sports events, social events, oversleeping, and so forth.

Except under extenuating circumstances (e.g., long-term illness), each missed quiz must be made up within 1 week. Students will receive a score of 0 for each quiz that is missed for an unacceptable reason or not made up within the allowed period of time.

**Q:** How important is recitation section attendance?

**A:** Students cannot adequately master the material presented in our course without attending recitation section classes and taking part in classroom exercises and case discussions on a regular basis. Therefore, students who repeatedly fail to attend recitation classes and/or who fail to submit completed recitation assignments (including quizzes, briefs, papers, etc.) will receive a course grade of 0.0 if, in the opinion of their recitation instructor, they have failed to demonstrate adequate mastery of recitation materials.

Three unexcused recitation absences or four recitation absences for any reason (whether excused or not) will be considered grounds for failing the course. Absence from recitation meetings held for the sole purpose of distributing examination feedback will not be included when assessing student attendance.

Recitation instructors retain the option of counting a student who leaves during a recitation meeting without acceptable excuse as absent for the entire meeting and refusing to grade any quizzes or assignments submitted by the student

during the meeting. If you routinely miss your recitation section, ignore recitation assignments, or leave recitation meetings early without a legitimate excuse, you will not pass the course.

Please be punctual, making sure to arrive at your recitation meeting on time. Recitation meetings begin with a quiz during the first 10 minutes of class, and if you arrive late, you will not be given additional time to complete your quiz.

Also note that recitation section classes will meet during the weeks of Exams 1 and 2. There will be no quizzes administered during these meetings, but you will receive written feedback about your exam performance. Except under extraordinary circumstances, students who miss a feedback meeting without a valid excuse will forfeit the option of meeting with their recitation instructor to receive supplementary feedback.

- Q:** I have worked in groups in which some students let others do all the work but receive the same grade anyway. Will there be any penalty for this free riding if it happens in a Management 100 group?
- A:** Yes. All students will have the opportunity at the end of the term to submit performance appraisals for everyone else in their exercise and case analysis group. If the appraisal forms completed by the members of a group indicate that one or more members have chosen to free ride during the term, the free riders will have points deducted from the participation part of their recitation section grade. If information on the forms indicates instances of recurrent or severe free riding or if the recitation instructor has other evidence of recurrent or severe free riding, the free riders will also have points deducted from the exercise or case performance points that they would otherwise receive. In addition, if in the opinion of the group's recitation instructor extreme cases of free riding have depressed the grades received by the honest members of the group, those members will have points added to the exercise and/or case performance parts of their grades. We will neither tolerate nor reward free riding in Management 100.
- Q:** I notice that I can earn miscellaneous activity credit by participating in business research experiments if experiments are available this term. How do I sign up to participate? Is there anything I should do prior to attending an experiment to prepare for it?
- A:** If experiments are available during the term, an experimenter will attend a lecture or recitation meeting and give you the opportunity to sign up for his or her experiment. No preparation will be necessary unless the experimenter specifically requests it.

Before participating in any experiment for miscellaneous activity credit, verify with your recitation instructor and the experimenter that the experiment is an approved source of Management 100 credit. If the experimenter cannot provide you with evidence of Management 100 preapproval, you may not receive Management 100 credit for your participation.

**Note:** If you experience personal harm or discomfort during your participation in an experiment for Management 100 credit, notify the lecture instructor's office immediately. Experimenters are required to guarantee your personal safety and security prior to soliciting your participation, and we want to be sure that these guarantees are fully honored.



- Q:** The times at which the three exams will be administered are shown above. What about telling us where the exams will be given?
- A:** We do not know where the exams will be given until a week or 2 beforehand. However, we will definitely use more than one room to administer all examinations, so you may be required to take an examination in a room other than the lecture auditorium. Examination locations will be announced in lecture and recitation meetings as soon as we know them. Management department secretaries will not provide information about examination times or locations over the telephone. Please do not call them to request it. Instead, contact your recitation instructor.
- Q:** In some of the other big classes I have taken, the instructors have used check-in procedures when administering coursewide exams. Will check-in procedures be used in Management 100?
- A:** Yes, so be sure to arrive 15 to 20 minutes early. Only students currently enrolled in Management 100 will be permitted to take the exams. All students should be able to provide a valid student identification (ID) and a picture ID to prove personal identity. Your recitation instructor will verify your status as a current student when you enter the examination room and again when you exit the room after completing your exam. If you are not a properly registered student who can prove personal identity to the satisfaction of your recitation instructor, you will not be allowed to enter the examination room or take our exam.
- Q:** What materials should I bring to the exams?
- A:** Bring at least two sharpened pencils with erasers. All other materials (question booklet and response sheet) will be provided. You will not need to purchase blue books for our exams. Do not bring Management 100 course materials (books, notes, etc.) to any exam. If you bring them, these materials will be impounded as you enter the examination room, and we will not guarantee their safekeeping during the exam. For Exams 1 and 2, materials from other courses that do not cover the topics discussed in Management 100 will be allowed in the examination room because we realize that many of you will be attending other classes immediately before or after the examination. However, do not bring materials, even if from another class, that are related to the topics being tested. No course materials should be brought to the final exam.
- Q:** What kinds of questions will be on the exams? How much weight will each chapter be given?
- A:** On each 90-question exam (Exams 1 and 2, plus the noncomprehensive component of the final exam), approximately 9 questions will be extremely difficult, testing for detailed knowledge of course material. About 9 questions will be difficult, testing for your knowledge of secondary definitions and supporting concepts. About 18 questions will be somewhat difficult, testing your knowledge of central definitions and concepts. The remaining questions should be fairly easy to answer for anyone who has read the text and attended lecture regularly. A similar profile will be used to construct the 30-question comprehensive component of the final exam.

Each of the chapters (including related lecture and video materials) tested in a particular exam will be weighted equally, meaning that approximately the same number of questions will be drawn from each chapter.

**Q:** Is there a procedure that I should follow while completing the exams?

**A:** Yes. Be sure to put your name on all examination materials, check your examination booklet for completeness, and hand in all materials at the appropriate location before you leave the examination room. Students who fail to correctly return all examination materials will receive a grade of 0.0 for the examination and may be subject to further penalization as directed by current university policies.

Please be advised that examination proctors will not answer questions during the examination. Do not ask them to clarify exam questions, define terms, or otherwise provide information about the exam.

Students for whom English is a second language and who make prior arrangements will be allowed to use translation dictionaries provided those dictionaries do not also include additional information (definitions, lists of synonyms, etc.).

**Q:** What do I do to make up a missed exam?

**A:** You will be allowed to make up any exams you miss (including makeup exams) but only if you can provide verifiable documentation (a signed doctor's slip detailing the reason for absence, documentation of conflicting final exams, etc.). Excuses will be verified by your recitation instructor and will only be allowed if acceptable to the lecture instructor.

Students missing Exam 1 will be required to make it up prior to Exam 2, and students missing Exam 2 will have to make it up before taking the final exam. Please make arrangements with your recitation instructor at least 3 to 5 days prior to the time you want to make up an exam.

Students missing the final exam due to scheduling conflicts (e.g., three exams in 24 hours or another exam scheduled at the same time as ours) should make arrangements with their recitation instructors to make up our exam at another time during finals week.

Other students missing the final exam will receive a grade of incomplete, requiring them to make up the missed exam before the middle of the next term (excluding summer) in which they are enrolled. You must make arrangements with your teaching assistant at least 2 weeks in advance of the date on which you want to make up the exam. Students who are not allowed to make up a missed exam or who fail to make up a missed exam within the allotted period will receive a course grade of 0.0.

We reserve the right to administer specially prepared exams to students who request makeups. These exams may be of the same general form as the regularly scheduled exam (90 or 120 multiple-choice questions), or they may be of another form (short answer, short essay, long essay). Students requesting a makeup exam will be informed by their recitation instructor of the exam's format at the time their request is accepted and a makeup date is set.

**Q:** Will final grades be posted at the end of the term? Where will grades be posted?

**A:** To ensure the privacy of every student, we will not post grades. In addition, we will not give out grades over the telephone. If you want to know your grade before receiving your report card, leave a stamped, self-addressed postcard with your recitation instructor during the last recitation meeting.

**Q:** Okay, I understand how Management 100 will proceed. But who do I contact during the term if I develop new concerns, questions, or complaints about the course?

**A:** You should first discuss course-related matters (e.g., grades, grading procedures, examination questions) with your recitation instructor. He or she is the

person who keeps grade records and is the most knowledgeable about your particular situation. If you find that your instructor cannot resolve your concerns, you should next meet with the course coordinator. Please be aware that you and/or your recitation instructor will be asked to submit documentation related to your concern or complaint so that the coordinator will have the information necessary to discuss your situation with you. In the event that you and the coordinator cannot resolve your problem, you should then meet with the lecture instructor. Please set up an appointment to meet with him or her during office hours.

**Q:** Who should I talk with about my grade after the term is over?

**A:** Follow the same procedure, consulting with your instructor and then the course coordinator if necessary and finally the lecture instructor if needed. If your recitation instructor is no longer available (due to his or her graduation, etc.), your grade record will be kept by the course coordinator.

**Note:** Grade problems must be resolved by the middle of the following semester (excluding summer) in which you are enrolled. Due to the time required to process change-of-grade paperwork, see your recitation instructor within the first 4 weeks of the semester. We will not initiate grade change procedures after this deadline.

**Q:** Who should I contact in the future if I want a letter of recommendation?

**A:** Contact your recitation instructor, who will work with you to draft a letter. The final version of the letter will be cosigned by your recitation instructor and the lecture instructor.

## References

- Aldrich, H. E. (1975). Reaction to Donaldson's note. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 20, 457-459.
- Blau, P. M. (1970). Decentralization in bureaucracies. In M. N. Zald (Ed.), *Power in organizations*. Nashville, TN: Vanderbilt University Press.
- Brittain, J., & Wholley, D. R. (1990). Assessing organizational ecology as social theory: Comment on Young. *American Journal of Sociology*, 95, 439-444.
- Burns, T., & Stalker, G. M. (1961). *The management of innovation*. London: Tavistock.
- Child, J. (1972). Organizational structure, environment, and performance: The role of strategic choice. *Sociology*, 6, 1-22.
- Donaldson, L. (1975). Organizational status and the measurement of centralization. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 20, 453-456.
- Donaldson, L. (1985). *In defence of organization theory: A reply to the critics*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Freeman, R. E. (1984). *Strategic management: A stakeholder approach*. Marshfield, MA: Pitman.
- Galbraith, J. R. (1977). *Organization design*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Lawrence, P. R., & Lorsch, J. W. (1967). *Organization and environment*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- March, J. G., & Simon, H. A. (1958). *Organizations*. New York: John Wiley.
- Mintzberg, H. (1979). *The structuring of organizations*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

- Mitroff, I. A. (1983). *Stakeholders of the organizational mind*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Pennings, J. M. (1975). The relevance of the structural-contingency model for organizational effectiveness. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 30, 393-410.
- Pennings, J. M. (1992). Structural contingency theory: A reappraisal. In B. M. Staw & L. L. Cummings (Eds.), *Research in organizational behavior* (Vol. 14, pp. 267-309). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
- Pennings, J. M., & Goodman, P. S. (1977). Toward a workable framework. In P. S. Goodman & J. M. Pennings (Eds.), *New perspectives on organizational effectiveness* (pp. 146-184). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Pfeffer, J. (1982). *Organizations and organizational theory*. Marshfield, MA: Pitman.
- Pfeffer, J., & Salancik, G. R. (1978). *The external control of organizations*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Price, J. L., & Mueller, C. W. (1986). *Handbook of organizational measurement*. Marshfield, MA: Pitman.
- Schoonhoven, C. B. (1981). Problems with contingency theory: Testing assumptions hidden within the language of contingency theory. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 26, 349-377.
- Thompson, J. D. (1967). *Organizations in action*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Thorngate, W. (1976). "In general" vs. "it depends": Some comments of the Gergen-Schlenker debate. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 2, 404-410.
- Tsui, A. S. (1990). A multiple-constituency model of effectiveness: An empirical examination at the human resource subunit level. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 35, 458-483.
- Van de Ven, A. H., & Ferry, D. L. (1980). *Measuring and assessing organizations*. New York: John Wiley.
- Wagner, J. A. III (1995). *Coursepack for Management 100* (3rd ed.). Needham Heights, MA: Simon & Schuster.
- Wagner, J. A. III, Buchko, A., & Gooding, R. Z. (1988). *Aston research on organizational structure: A meta-analytic examination of generalizability*. Unpublished manuscript, Michigan State University, East Lansing, MI.
- Wagner, J. A. III, & Hollenbeck, J. R. (1998a). *Exercises and cases for management and organizational behavior*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Wagner, J. A. III, & Hollenbeck, J. R. (1998b). *Organizational behavior: Securing competitive advantage* (3rd ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Wagner, J. A. III, & Schneider, B. (1987). Legal regulation and the constraint of constituent satisfaction. *Journal of Management Studies*, 24, 189-200.
- Weber, M. (1947). *The theory of social and economic organization*. New York: Free Press.
- Weick, K. E. (1979). *The social psychology of organizing* (2nd ed.). Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.