

**GEORGE MASON UNIVERSITY**  
**COLLEGE OF EDUCATION & HUMAN DEVELOPMENT**  
**EDLE 801: Foundations of Leadership – History & Leadership**  
**EDLE 802: Foundations of Leadership – Ethics, Philosophy & Law**

**Instructors:** Scott C. Bauer (801) & S. David Brazer (802)  
**Phone:** Bauer: 703-993-3775 Brazer: 703-993-3634  
**Fax:** 703-993-3643  
**Website:** [www.taskstream.com](http://www.taskstream.com)  
**e-mail:** [sbauer1@gmu.edu](mailto:sbauer1@gmu.edu) ; [sbrazer@gmu.edu](mailto:sbrazer@gmu.edu)  
**Mailing address:** George Mason University  
4400 University Drive, MSN 4C2  
Fairfax, VA 22030-4444  
**Office hours:** Tuesdays & Thursdays, 3:00 pm – class time, or by appointment

“In a crisis ... we call for someone with answers, decisions, strength, and a map of the future, someone who knows where we ought to be going – in short someone who can make hard problems simple.... Instead of looking for saviors, we should be calling for leadership that will change us to face problems for which there are no simple, painless solutions – problems that require us to learn in new ways.”

- Hiefetz (1994, p. 21).

**Schedule information:**

**Location:** Robinson A101

**Meeting times:** EDLE 801 and EDLE 802 are team-planned and team-taught. As a result, the two courses will meet seamlessly from 4:30 – 10:00 p.m. each Tuesday and Thursday from June 8 – July 27. Students are expected to attend every class session on time. Please contact one of the instructors by phone or e-mail if you have a problem that will prevent you from attending class.

**Catalog Descriptions:**

**EDLE 801**—Foundations of Education Leadership: History and Leadership. *Prerequisites: admission to PhD in education program. May be taken as corequisite with EDLE 802.* First in three-course sequence. Emphasizes historical foundations of U.S. education and evolution of school, district, and state leadership. Students begin work on analytical literature review.

**EDLE 802**—Foundations of Education Leadership: Ethics, Philosophy, and Law. *Prerequisites: EDLE 801. May be taken as corequisite with EDLE 801.* Emphasizes ethical, philosophical, and legal foundation of U.S. education; and the evolution of school, district, and state leadership. Students continue work on analytical literature review.

**Course objectives:**

EDLE 801 and 802 are the first two in a three-course sequence designed to introduce students to foundations of education and issues in education leadership. The general emphasis in the sequence, culminating in EDLE 803, is on students learning how to explore their research interests in the context of the larger sweep of education leadership as a field, with a focus on how leaders at all levels impact the effectiveness and improvement of schools and school systems.

As the first two courses in the specialization sequence, these seminars are constructed as survey courses. The goals include introducing students to a wide variety of theory and applied research on leadership, school organization, and decision making. The courses also seek to provide you with the opportunity to begin to develop your *personae* as researchers, and to develop the necessary skills to be successful as a doctoral candidate in education leadership. The courses are designed around the theme of connecting *theory, research, and practice*. Thus, we will explore:

1. Theory: What are the features and assumptions of the perspective? What content themes are stressed? Does the perspective adequately describe, explain, and predict something of interest in the world of educational leaders?
2. Research: What kinds of empirical questions tend to be addressed using this perspective? Are there any particular methodological considerations associated with the perspective (i.e., unit of analysis, typical research methods used)?
3. Practice: What does each perspective help us understand about school leadership, organization, and decision making? What are the limitations of the perspective?

**Student Outcomes:**

Students who successfully complete these courses will be able to:

1. demonstrate a solid understanding of formal organization and leadership theory through discussion, presentation and written paper assignments;
2. read research literature and present persuasive written and oral critiques;
3. engage in conversation to explore topics in their field of interest that represent opportunities for future investigation;
4. use theory to frame researchable questions and use extant literature to inform problems relating to research and professional practice; and
5. further develop their ability to write doctoral-level papers.

**Nature of course delivery:**

Each class will include a variety of activities and exercises. Broadly speaking, your primary responsibilities are 1) to read the literature; 2) to share your questions, reflect on your experiences, and engage in productive discussion to make the literature relevant to the world of practice that we experience and understand; and 3) to write, share your written work, and provide feedback to others in a respectful fashion.

1. Classes will reflect a balance of activities that enable students to participate actively in the development of their *personae* as scholars. To promote an atmosphere that allows us to accomplish this, we will:
  - a. start and end on time;

- b. maintain (flexibly) a written agenda reflecting objectives for each class;
  - c. support our points of view with evidence;
  - d. strive to be open to new ideas and perspectives; and
  - e. listen actively to one another.
2. Student work will reflect what is expected from scholars. As such, students are expected to:
- a. write papers that are well researched, proofread, submitted in a timely fashion, and consistent with APA guidelines;
  - b. participate actively in class discussions in a manner that challenges the best thinking of the class; and
  - c. provide constructive feedback to others both on their ideas and on their written work, striving to learn from each other and to test each other's ideas.
3. We will endeavor to create a classroom climate that approximates what we know about learning organizations. As such, it is important that we create a space that allows participants to try out new ideas and voice opinions without fear of ridicule or embarrassment. The hallmark of a learning organization is a balance between openness and constructive feedback; hence, everyone is expected to:
- a. come fully prepared to each class;
  - b. demonstrate appropriate respect for one another;
  - c. voice concerns and opinions about class process openly;
  - d. recognize and celebrate each other's ideas and accomplishments; and
  - e. show an awareness of each other's needs.

**Course materials:**

Allison, G, & Zelikow, P. (1999). *Essence of decision: Explaining the Cuban Missile Crisis*. New York: Longman.

Cuban, L. (1988). *The managerial imperative and the practice of leadership in schools*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

March, J.G. (1994). *A primer on decision making: How decisions happen*. New York: The Free Press.

Marion, R. (2002). *Leadership in education: Organizational theory for the practitioner*. Long Grove, IL: Waveland Press.

Books are available in the GMU Bookstore in the Johnson Center. In addition to the books, there will be a number of required readings available from the Johnson Center library's e-reserves and through a flash drive or DVD specially prepared for the courses. The password for e-reserve is **leader**. Articles placed on e-reserve include:

Cohen, M. D., March, J.G., Olsen, J.P. (1972). A garbage can model of organizational choice. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 17, pp. 1 – 25.

Langley, A. et al. (1995). Opening up decision making: the view from the black stool. *Organization Science* 6, pp. 260 –279.

Simon, H. (1993). Decision making: rational, nonrational, and irrational. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 29, pp. 329 – 411.

Weick, K.E. (1976). Educational organizations as loosely coupled systems. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 21, pp. 1 – 19.

To complete required assignments successfully, students will need to have access to a personal computer with internet access, and the ability to use basic word processing and e-mail. Correspondence by e-mail will use your Mason e-mail account. We will also use TaskStream to facilitate communication, to post assignments and class handouts, and to submit written work for assessment.

### **Grading:**

Consistent with expectations of any doctoral program, grading is based heavily on student performance on written assignments. The assignments constructed for this course reflect a mix of skills associated with synthesis and critique. Overall, written work will be assessed using the following broad criteria:

- Application of concepts reflected in class discussion and readings, and your ability to pick the most salient concepts and apply them.
- Creativity and imagination; papers provide an opportunity to speculate, to float questions or ideas reflecting your appreciation of the literature.
- Organization and writing. A clear, concise, and well-organized paper will earn a better grade.

Additionally, a portion of your class grade will be based on participation and the contribution you make to class discussions. The overall weights of the various performances are as follows:

### **Class leadership and participation - 10 points**

Students are expected to participate actively in class discussions, in study group activities, and in serving as critical friends to other students. Each student will be expected to **co-teach** during at least one class session. Co-teaching will be planned with one of the instructors. Students will periodically have an opportunity to read and review each other's work in colleague-critical teams, as well.

As stated earlier, attendance is expected for all classes. If you must be absent, please notify one of the instructors by e-mail or phone. More than one absence may result in a reduction in participation points. Likewise, arriving at class more than 30 minutes late or leaving more than 30 minutes before the end of class may result in loss of points.

### **Written assignments - 90 points**

Two different types of papers will be expected of students in this class, one reflecting the skills associated with *critique* and the other *synthesis of research literature*. The critiques will take

the form of analyses of published research papers. One synthesis paper requires application of a key concept to a decision you have observed and/or participated in. A second synthesis assignment involves first accessing published work on a research topic and summarizing it (annotated bibliography), and then proposing a research focus that is grounded in published literature. All papers must be submitted to TaskStream as Word file attachments. The specific assignments appear at the end of the syllabus.

Late work: It is expected that student work will be submitted on time. Late assignments may receive a deduction in points; however, assignments will not be accepted later than one week after a due date.

Rewrites: Students who receive a grade lower than 3.5 may re-write their papers. All re-writes are due one week after the student receives the initial grade and comments.

**Grading scale:**

A	=	95-100 points
A-	=	90-94 points
B+	=	87-89 points
B	=	84-86 points
B-	=	80-83 points
C	=	75-79 points
F	=	below 75 points

**College of Education and Human Development statement of expectations:**

- Students are expected to exhibit professional behavior and dispositions. See <http://cehd.gmu.edu/teacher/professional-disposition/> for a listing of these dispositions.
- Students must follow the guidelines of the University Honor Code. See <http://academicintegrity.gmu.edu/honorcode/> for the full honor code.
- Students must agree to abide by the university policy for Responsible Use of Computing. See <http://mail.gmu.edu> and click on Responsible Use of Computing at the bottom of the screen.

Students with disabilities who seek accommodations in a course must be registered with the GMU Disability Resource Center (DRC) and inform the instructor, in writing, at the beginning of the semester. See [www.gmu.edu/student/drc](http://www.gmu.edu/student/drc) or call 703-993-2474 to access the DRC.

**Proposed schedule of classes with readings:**

Date	Topics	Readings, assignments
<b>Tues June 8</b>	<p>Overview: What’s expected; how the course fits together</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Introduction to the study of organization theory and decision making</li> <li>• Theory, research &amp; practice— characteristics of successful doctoral students</li> <li>• Some academic advising</li> </ul>	<p>Exercises:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Study group protocol – Distributed leadership papers</li> <li>➤ Jigsaw -- Charles Perrow’s “The short and glorious history of organizational theory”</li> <li>➤ Cuban, chapters 2, 4, and 6</li> <li>➤ Bauer &amp; Brazer Ch 8 (fyi...)</li> </ul>
<b>Thurs June 10</b>	<p>The machine metaphor: Classical management theory &amp; bureaucracy</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Frederick W. Taylor, The principles of scientific mgt; Max Weber, Bureaucracy (Film: “Clockwork”)</li> <li>• Administrative Progressives and the structure of schooling</li> <li>• What is a critique? Preparing for the first written assignment</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Marion, chapters 1 &amp; 2</li> <li>➤ Hechinger (1988) – Does school structure matter?</li> <li>➤ Hoy &amp; Sweetland (2001) – Enabling bureaucracy</li> </ul>
<u>Tues June 15</u>	<p>What is rational? How rational can we be?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Rational decision making</li> <li>• Bounded rationality</li> <li>• Risks and risk taking</li> <li>• Tolerance for failure and learning communities</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Allison &amp; Zelikow, Introduction – ch. 2</li> <li>➤ March, ch. 1</li> <li>➤ Simon (1993) -- Decision making: rational, non-rational, and irrational</li> </ul>
<b>Thurs June 17</b>	<p>Enter people: Human relations theory</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mayo, Roethlisberger, The Hawthorne experiments</li> <li>• Barnard, Functions of the executive</li> <li>• Maslow, A theory of human motivation</li> <li>• McGregor, The human side of the enterprise</li> <li>• Student co-teaching #1</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Marion, chapters 3 &amp; 4</li> <li>➤ Goddard et al. (2009) – Trust as a mediator...</li> <li>➤ Somech (2005) – Directive vs. participative leadership...</li> <li>➤ <b>Bring draft of Critique #1</b></li> </ul>
Sun June 20		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ <b>Critique # 1 due via TaskStream</b></li> </ul>

Date	Topics	Readings, assignments
<u>Tues June 22</u>	How much do people actually think? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Roles, rules, and routines</li> <li>• Working in groups: What is a team?</li> <li>• Group decision making, group think, or learning community?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Cuban, chs. 1 &amp; 3</li> <li>➤ March, ch. 2</li> <li>➤ A &amp; Z, ch. 3</li> </ul>
<b>Thurs June 24</b>	Organizations as organisms: Open systems, Contingency theory <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Katz &amp; Kahn, Organization &amp; the systems concept</li> <li>• Thompson, Organizations in action</li> <li>• Burns &amp; Stalker, Mechanistic and organic systems</li> <li>• Student co-teaching #2</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Marion, chapters 5 &amp; 6</li> <li>➤ Pfeffer &amp; Salancik (1977) – Organization design: The case for a coalitional model...</li> <li>➤ Rowan (1994) – Comparing teacher’s work</li> <li>➤ Jacobson et al (2009) – Sustaining success...</li> <li>➤ <b>Bring draft of Critique #2</b></li> </ul>
Sun June 27		➤ <b>Critique #2 due</b>
<u>Tues June 29</u>	Power and politics in decision making <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Politics &amp; decision making</li> <li>• Bounded rationality and politics</li> <li>• Coalitions</li> <li>• Student co-teaching #3</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Cuban, chs. 5, 7, &amp; 8</li> <li>➤ March, ch. 3</li> <li>➤ A &amp; Z 4-6</li> </ul>
<b>Thurs July 1</b>	Annotated bibliography & library work	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Bauer &amp; Brazer, chapter 7</li> <li>➤ <b>Bring draft of Bounded Rationality paper</b></li> </ul>
Sun July 4		➤ <b>Bounded Rationality paper due</b>
<b>Tues July 6</b>	Politics in organizations <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How is power manifest in schools?</li> <li>• French &amp; Raven, The bases of social power</li> <li>• Power dependence theory</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Marion, chapters 7 &amp; 8</li> <li>➤ Salancik &amp; Pfeffer (1977) – Who gets power...</li> <li>➤ Penuel et al. (2010) – Alignment of informal and formal supports...</li> </ul>

Date	Topics	Readings, assignments
Thurs July 8	The true meaning of organization culture <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Professional bureaucracy</li> <li>• Organizational culture</li> <li>• Schein, Defining organizational culture</li> <li>• Martin, Three faces of culture</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Marion, chapters 9 (skim), 10</li> <li>➤ Hallinger &amp; Leithwood (1998) – Unseen forces...</li> <li>➤ Bezzina et al. (2009) – National curriculum...</li> <li>➤ <b>Bring draft of Annotated bibliography</b></li> </ul>
Sun July 11		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ <b>Annotated bibliography due</b></li> </ul>
Tues July 13	Uncertainty and ambiguity <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Decision making under loose coupling</li> <li>• Decision making as deterministic</li> <li>• Student co-teaching #4</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Weick (1976) – Educational organizations as loosely coupled systems</li> <li>➤ March, chs. 4-5</li> <li>➤ Cohen, March, and Olsen (1972) -- A garbage can model of organizational choice</li> </ul>
Thurs July 15	Organizations as copycats <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Institutional, Neo-institutional theory</li> <li>• Student co-teaching #5</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Marion, chapter 12</li> <li>➤ Powell &amp; DiMaggio (1983) - The iron cage revisited</li> <li>➤ Meyer &amp; Rowan (1977) – Institutionalized organizations...</li> <li>➤ Bidwell (2001) – Analyzing schools as organizations...</li> </ul>
Tues July 20	Re-enter humans <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Decision making as intensely human</li> <li>• Student co-teaching #6</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Strategic decision making in three school districts</li> <li>➤ Langley, et al., Opening up decision making</li> </ul>
Thurs July 22	Back to leadership: How do school leaders change schools?] ➤ Complexity and organizational change ...	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Marion, chapters 13 &amp; 14</li> <li>➤ Harris (2004) – Distributed leadership and school improvement...</li> <li>➤ Leithwood et al., (2004) -- How school leaders impact instruction</li> <li>➤ Argyris (1994) – Initiating change that perseveres</li> <li>➤ <b>Bring in drafts of Research Problem and Rationale</b></li> </ul>
Sun July 25		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ <b>Research Problem and Rationale paper due</b></li> </ul>
Tues July 27	Wrap up!	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Ogawa &amp; Bossert (1995) – Leadership as an organizational quality...?</li> </ul>

<b>Date</b>	<b>Topics</b>	<b>Readings, assignments</b>
		➤

## **Papers 1 & 2: Critique of Research Articles** **30 Points (15 points each)**

### **Overview**

As scholars using published research to bolster your arguments, it is important that you become a discerning reader. The purpose of these two papers is to give you opportunities to analyze and criticize published work both in terms of the contribution the work makes to the knowledge base and methodology. We intend that the feedback we provide will help you to hone your criticism skills.

### **Task**

1. Read the two articles assigned for the critique. Each article is related to the theory we are studying and has been selected from recent, top-quality journals. Carefully read the articles with an eye toward understanding the contribution the work makes to the knowledge base and the methodological soundness of the work. You will be assigned to write a critique of **one of the two** articles.
2. Write a critique of the article in terms of its usefulness to scholars. Include in your critique a discussion of the structure of the paper; the value of the research question(s) addressed; the appropriateness of the methodology used to address the question; and the reasonableness of the claims made regarding the conclusions. Be certain to begin your critique with an introduction that draws the reader into your paper and ends with a **clear thesis** for your paper. The thesis must establish your burden of proof for the paper.
3. Conclude your paper with a re-statement of your thesis and a brief discussion of the implications of your critique in terms of policy and practice.
4. Your critique should be approximately 7 double-spaces, typewritten pages.

### Assessment Rubric for Critique of Research Articles

	<b>Exceeds Expectations (4 points)</b>	<b>Meets Expectations (3 points)</b>	<b>Approaching Expectations (2 points)</b>	<b>Falls Below Expectations (1 point)</b>
<u>Introduction (15%)</u> Introduction orients the reader to the purpose of the paper and introduces the article you are reviewing.	Introduction describes the paper critiqued, the purpose of the critique itself, and foreshadows significant findings through the thesis.	Introduction provides an adequate description of the paper critiqued and purpose of the critique itself.	Introduction is vague and does not adequately orient the reader to the paper.	Introduction is either missing or insufficient; there is little consideration of reader's perspective.
<u>Topic &amp; review of literature (20%)</u> Review addresses the appropriateness of research questions posed and the adequacy of the review of literature provided in the paper.	Extensive discussion of research questions, importance of topic for theory and practice. Considerable discussion of the merits of the literature review and organization of the review.	Adequate treatment of research questions, importance of topic for theory and practice, and adequacy of the literature review.	Superficial treatment of topic, research questions, importance. Superficial discussion of the merits of the literature review.	One or more of the elements of this criterion are missing and/or confusing.
<u>Research design (20%)</u> Review summarizes and deals with the quality and technical appropriateness of the methodology used to conduct the study.	Extensive analysis of the methods used, including consideration of research design; subjects; procedures, instruments; & limitations. Appropriateness of design for addressing research questions is discussed.	Adequate analysis of the methods used in the study (subjects, procedures, instruments, limitations, etc.) and their appropriateness for research questions.	Superficial or incomplete critique of the methods used in the study and their appropriateness for research questions.	Analysis of methods used is missing or incomplete.
<u>Data &amp; findings (20%)</u> Critique discusses the quality of the presentation of findings.	Extensive critique of the research findings in terms of presentation and appropriateness; some discussion of alternative ways of presenting data and/or any gaps or inaccuracies in presentations of findings	Adequate discussion of the research findings in terms of presentation, appropriateness, and/or accuracy.	Superficial discussion of the research findings in terms of either presentation, appropriateness, and/or accuracy.	Discussion of findings is missing or incomplete.

<p><u>Conclusions (15%)</u> Paper closes with a restatement of the thesis, a brief summary of the critique, and implications of the critique.</p>	<p>Conclusion follows logically from the body of the paper and is persuasive. It summarizes main points made in the critique, including whether the conclusions are reasonable; whether the research questions were answered; and the implications of the study for policy and practice</p>	<p>Adequate conclusion, including brief summary and implications for policy and practice. Conclusion is not necessarily persuasive.</p>	<p>Conclusion merely summarizes paper content and does not provide implications.</p>	<p>Critique ends without a discernable conclusion.</p>
<p>Mechanics and APA (10%) Your written work should always represent you as accurate and precise.</p>	<p>Nearly error-free, which reflects clear understanding APA format and thorough proofreading .</p>	<p>Occasional grammatical errors, questionable word choice, and minor APA errors.</p>	<p>Errors in grammar and punctuation, but spelling has been proofread. Difficulty conforming to APA rules.</p>	<p>Frequent errors in spelling, grammar, punctuation , and APA format.</p>

**ANNOTATED BIBLIOGRAPHY ENTRIES**  
**Due via TaskStream**  
**20 points**

**Purpose**

An annotated bibliography is a tool that helps you sift through existing research on a question that interests you and organize the knowledge that you are gaining by reading this literature. Creswell (2009) refers to this as “abstracting studies.” This writing assignment has the following goals:

1. To give students practice reading and organizing research literature;
2. To provide students an opportunity to determine how, or in what way(s) research studies they identify inform the research questions they are interested in pursuing; and
3. To allow students to begin to identify constructs they may need to include in the conceptual framework they propose to use in conducting their research.

**Tasks**

To complete this writing assignment, follow the steps below:

1. Using the specific research question(s) you identified as the focus of your work, identify research literature that you believe may inform your study. Note that the expectation here is that you focus on empirical research (broadly construed, i.e., not limited to any particular type of design), rather than opinion pieces or the like.
2. Select pieces that you believe to be highly relevant to your research. [PLEASE try to prepare annotated entries for work that you believe has promise to inform your research; this means that you might scan many times the number of sources you eventually include. Part of the skill set you are building here is the capacity to identify useful work.]
3. For each piece, write a one-page entry that includes the following:
  - Bibliographic citation in APA format
  - A statement summarizing the problem being addressed
  - A statement summarizing the purpose of the paper
  - A brief statement of the methodology used (sample, population, subjects; design; analytic approach)
  - A summary of key results
  - Your assessment of the strengths and/or weaknesses of the paper (in general, and/or for your purposes)
  - *List* any constructs that are developed or used in the study that you are interested in including in your own work (e.g., job satisfaction, principal retention)

In the end, your twelve (12) entries should provide you with a good deal of information about research that may form the foundation of your Research Problem and Rationale paper.

The paper must be formatted in accordance with APA requirements. All non-original ideas and quotations must be properly cited and a full list of references must be included at the end of the paper. (The title page and reference list are not part of the page count.) The reference list must include only sources that have been cited in the text.

**ANNOTATED BIBLIOGRAPHY  
ASSESSMENT RUBRIC**

	<b>Exceeds Expectations (4 points)</b>	<b>Meets Expectations (3 points)</b>	<b>Approaching Expectations (2 points)</b>	<b>Falls Below Expectations (1 point)</b>
<b>Bibliographic entries - content (40%)</b> The annotated entries are well-written, balanced abstracts that are powerfully written to include relevant assessments of the merits of each piece.	Annotated entries provide a clear and concise summary of each research source. Each entry includes an overview of the research (including method and findings); and an assessment of its utility.	Annotated entries provide a summary of each research source. Each entry includes a brief overview of the research and an assessment of its utility, but may be lacking in specificity.	Annotated entries provide a general overview research sources, but lack detail or are missing significant elements needed to make the entries useful.	Annotated entries are severely lacking in detail, rendering them of little use
<b>Bibliographic entries - focus (10%)</b> The sources abstracted should clearly relate to the research question(s) posed.	All entries clearly and specifically relate to the research question.	Most entries relate clearly to the research question.	Most entries relate only generally to the research question.	The connection between annotated entries and the research question is difficult to discern.
<b>Bibliographic entries -- quality (20%)</b> Sources selected should be from high-quality, credible sources (i.e., generally peer reviewed journals).	Sources are well balanced, including predominantly original research pieces from high-quality, credible sources.	Sources are balanced, but are not focused predominantly on original research from high-quality sources.	One or more entries are included from questionable sources, reflecting largely opinion pieces rather than original research.	Entries are dominated by material from questionable sources; a review of research is not evident.
<b>Bibliographic entries -- quantity (10%)</b>	Twelve completed annotated entries are presented.	Only 11 completed entries are presented.	Only 10 completed entries are presented.	Fewer than 10 annotated summaries are presented.
<b>References (10%)</b> Each entry should have a complete citation in APA format.	References are complete and presented in APA format.	References include 1-3 errors (APA format or incomplete information).	References include 4-6 errors (APA format or incomplete information).	References include more than 6 errors in format or omission of required information.
<b>Mechanics (10%)</b>	Nearly error-free which reflects clear understanding and thorough proofreading	Occasional grammatical errors and questionable word choice	Errors in grammar and punctuation, but spelling has been proofread	Frequent errors in spelling, grammar, and punctuation

## **Paper 3: Bounded Rationality**

**20 points**

### **Overview**

The purpose of this paper is for you to put the concept of bounded rationality to use as a tool for examining an organizational decision you have experienced. Although some description is required, keep in mind that the paper is intended to be primarily analytical. Your thesis must be analytical and must be demonstrated through the body of your paper.

### **Task**

1. Introduce the paper by briefly describing a decision made in your school or organization that had an impact—either positive or negative. Your thesis must explain your perspective on how the rationality (or reasonableness) of that decision was limited or bounded under the circumstances.
2. In the body of the paper, provide enough narrative description of the decision for the reader to understand its most important features. **DO NOT GO INTO EXCESSIVE DETAIL.** Subsequent to the description, demonstrate the validity of your thesis by using bounded rationality and related concepts (from Allison and Zelikow, the Simon paper, the March book, and our classroom discussions of organizational perspectives thus far) to construct logical arguments that show the limitations of human reasoning in the decision-making process. Your task is to demonstrate how the concept of bounded rationality **helps to explain why the decision you chose came out as it did.** For example, one could argue (not without controversy) that President Bush chose to go to war in Iraq based on false or exaggerated intelligence reports of that country's possession and deployment of weapons of mass destruction. The President's rationality in this decision was bounded or limited by the quality of information he received.
3. Conclude by re-stating your thesis and explaining how decision makers and organizations might cope with or mitigate the effects of bounded rationality.
4. Your paper should be approximately seven pages.

## Assessment Rubric for Bounded Rationality

	<b>Exceeds Expectations (4 points)</b>	<b>Meets Expectations (3 points)</b>	<b>Approaching Expectations (2 points)</b>	<b>Does Not Meet Expectations (1 point)</b>
<u>Introduction</u> (20%) Introduction orients the reader to the purpose of the paper and introduces the decision you are analyzing.	Introduction draws the reader into the paper effectively. The thesis is clear and analytical., dealing directly with the concept of bounded rationality, and requires demonstration through coherent arguments and support based on what the author has read, class sessions, the author's experience, or sound reasoning.	Introduction orients the reader to the paper. The thesis is apparent, though not entirely clear. It may be more descriptive than analytical. The thesis may not include bounded rationality.	Introduction explains what is in the paper, but lacks a clear and analytical thesis.	Introduction is weak. The paper lacks a clear thesis.
<u>Developing Arguments</u> (50%) The author must develop arguments in support of the thesis. These should be both logical and supported by evidence from published material, class sessions, or personal experience.	Author presents arguments that are clear, logical, persuasive, and easy to follow. Each argument relates directly to the thesis. Any debatable assertions are supported with evidence. Quotations or citations may be used judiciously to make especially difficult or powerful points.	Arguments are clearly linked to the thesis, but they may not be entirely persuasive.	Arguments are presented, but they may be unrelated to one another and/or to the thesis. Assertions and opinions are left largely unsupported.	Clear arguments in support of or related to the thesis are not made
<u>Conclusions</u> (20%) It is important to conclude your paper in a manner that is persuasive to the reader and that leads to broader thinking on the topic.	The conclusions drawn at the end follow logically from the body of the paper, and begin with a re-worded statement of the thesis. The author explains how a leader could mitigate or better cope with the effects of bounded rationality in the decision examined.	Conclusions are related to the thesis but are not entirely persuasive. Mitigation and coping are not adequately discussed.	Conclusions follow from the body, but may not relate directly to the thesis. Mitigation and coping are not adequately discussed.	The conclusions drawn do not appear to be related to the thesis or supported by logical arguments.
<u>Mechanics and APA</u> (10%) Students use APA format and standard English.	The paper is nearly free of errors.	The paper has some errors.	The paper has numerous errors.	The paper appears not to have been proofread.

## **Paper 4: Research Problem and Rationale**

**20 points**

### **Overview**

This paper requires students to establish a research focus. It serves as a precursor to a statement of research problem that would be appropriate for a dissertation proposal or dissertation. As with all other papers in this course, the Research Problem and Rationale has a thesis and supporting arguments that are intended to persuade the reader. This time, however, the topic is your own research. Most important, this paper requires extensive literature support to demonstrate how you have situated your thinking in established theory and empirical research.

Many of the articles and books we have provided for this course may be useful to you in your development of this paper. It is also true that what we have provided will miss the mark for many topics that interest our students. Students should expect to spend at least some time during the semester searching for sources relevant to their own research interests. A good strategy would be to explore the reference lists of articles and books we have assigned to check for sources that seem to come closest to your research focus.

### **Task**

1. Write an introduction that orients the reader to the type of research you wish to conduct. The introduction must include a question (or set of questions) that guides your thinking about your topic. This could be a viable research question, but we are not yet holding you to that standard. The introduction must also include a thesis statement that explains why it is important to conduct a study within your topic.
2. The body of your paper begins with a statement of purpose, answering the question: What is it you wish to learn about your topic? The purpose may be supported with literature citations if others have pursued or recommended a similar purpose, but it may not be possible or appropriate to support the purpose with literature.
3. The majority of the body should focus on significance, the “so what?” question that all researchers must answer. It is usually helpful to think in terms of research (or academic) significance and practical significance. How would your study contribute to both scholarship and practice?
4. The final portion of the body should be a listing of potential research questions that flow logically from your statement of purpose and significance. Be inclusive and imaginative. This is a list you should want to carry forward and refine for portfolio 3 and beyond.
5. Conclude your paper with a restatement of your thesis and brief discussion of the implications of your potential study. Be sure to include discussion of gaps in the literature you have been able to locate and read up to this point. What should be the next steps in your work?
6. Your literature review should be no more than about 8 pages, and must include citations and a reference list in APA format.

### Assessment Rubric for Research Problem and Rationale

	<b>Exceeds Expectations (4 points)</b>	<b>Meets Expectations (3 points)</b>	<b>Approaching Expectations (2 points)</b>	<b>Falls Below Expectations (1 point)</b>
<u>Introduction (10%)</u> Introduction orients the reader to the purpose of the paper—a discussion of your intended research focus.	Introduction draws the reader into the paper effectively. The thesis is clear and analytical, dealing directly with significance, and requires demonstration through coherent arguments and support from published literature.	Introduction orients the reader to the paper. The thesis is apparent, though not entirely clear. It may be more descriptive than analytical. The thesis may not be clear about significance.	Introduction explains what is in the paper, but lacks a clear and analytical thesis.	Introduction is weak. The paper lacks a clear thesis.
<u>Purpose (25%)</u> It is important to explain to the reader what you wish to study.	Purpose is clear and compelling and well supported by published literature, if possible. Purpose is explained from multiple perspectives (e.g., practical and academic) in a logical and persuasive manner.	The purpose of the research is clear and engaging.	The purpose is apparent, but confusing.	Purpose is missing or unclear.

<p><u>Significance (25%)</u> It is important to explain to the reader why it is meaningful to pursue your chosen topic.</p>	<p>Significance is clear and compelling and well supported by published literature. Significance is explained from multiple perspectives (e.g., practical and academic) in a logical and persuasive manner, and significance is clearly linked to purpose.</p>	<p>The author weaves together persuasive arguments regarding the significance of the topic that follow logically from the stated purpose.</p>	<p>Significance is apparent, but not well supported by literature and/or seems unrelated to purpose.</p>	<p>Significance is unclear or missing.</p>
<p><u>Potential Research Questions (15%)</u> Brainstorming research questions is an effective means for articulating research interests.</p>	<p>The list of potential research questions is inclusive and stimulating. The questions are clearly and persuasively linked to purpose and significance.</p>	<p>A reasonable set of questions is presented. The questions clearly follow from purpose and significance.</p>	<p>The list of questions is brief and not very imaginative. Links to purpose and significance may not be clear.</p>	<p>The list of questions is inadequate.</p>
<p><u>Conclusion (15%)</u> Every paper should conclude in a manner that both summarizes the current work and anticipates future work.</p>	<p>The conclusion begins with a restatement of the paper's thesis in new language. After a very brief summary of the paper's main points, the conclusion broadens out to discuss the direction of the study and future literature needs to support purpose and/or significance.</p>	<p>The conclusion summarizes the content of the paper well and restates the thesis in a manner that seems to flow logically from the body of the paper. The future direction is apparent.</p>	<p>The conclusion merely summarizes what has come before. The thesis may be stated in the same words as at the beginning or it may be missing from the conclusion.</p>	<p>The paper fails to conclude properly.</p>
<p><u>Mechanics, and APA style (10%)</u></p>	<p>The paper is error free.</p>	<p>The paper contains few errors and is consistent with APA style.</p>	<p>The paper has several errors.</p>	<p>The paper has numerous errors.</p>