

**City University of Hong Kong
Course Syllabus**

**offered by Department of Public and International Affairs
with effect from Semester A in 2024/25**

Part I Course Overview

Course Title: Managing Public Institutions and Organizations

Course Code: PIA5301

Course Duration: One Semester

Credit Units: 3

Level: P5

Medium of Instruction: English

Medium of Assessment: English

Prerequisites:
(Course Code and Title) Nil

Precursors:
(Course Code and Title) Nil

Equivalent Courses:
(Course Code and Title) POL5301 Managing Public Institutions and Organizations

Exclusive Courses:
(Course Code and Title) Nil

Part II Course Details

1. Abstract

Gleaning information from organization theory (OT), organizational behavior (OB), and institutional analysis, this course is designed to advance students' knowledge and skills in leading and managing public organizations and their institutional environments. The first half of the course will be devoted to familiarizing students with the history and development of institutional and organizational research. The second half of the course aims to provide students an overview of the central concepts, strategies, and practices in the institutional and organizational dimensions of public administration. Drawing on materials from different academic disciplines, including psychology, political science, law, sociology, public policy, and public administration, this course enables students to contemplate, make sense of, and critically analyze solutions for specific issues pertaining to the management of public institutions and organizations in both their workplace and the broader community.

2. Course Intended Learning Outcomes (CILOs)

(CILOs state what the student is expected to be able to do at the end of the course according to a given standard of performance.)

| No. | CILOs | Weighting (if applicable) | Discovery-enriched curriculum related learning outcomes (please tick where appropriate) | | |
|-----|---|------------------------------|---|----|----|
| | | | A1 | A2 | A3 |
| 1. | Acquire main theories, arguments, concepts, and issues in OT, OB, and institutionalism. | | √ | √ | |
| 2. | Evaluate critically the extent to which the core assumptions and historical roots of organizational research can be applied to the current context(s) | | √ | √ | √ |
| 3. | Become conversant with organizationally-relevant issues and capable of analyzing these issues from fine-tuned theoretical or practical standpoints | | √ | √ | √ |
| 4. | Gain broad familiarity with theory and research concerned with managerial processes, and develop the analytical skills necessary to critically evaluate the institutional environment they are currently in | | √ | √ | √ |
| 5. | Have as much hands-on practical experience as possible within the confines of the classroom and become an intuitive public manager who is adept at developing effective and creative solutions for specific managerial challenges | | √ | √ | √ |
| 6. | Collaborate with peers to prepare, conduct and critique group research on a cutting-edge topic traversing the OT and OB disciplines with a focus on communicating and interacting productively and in culturally responsive ways with a diverse and changing workforce and society at large | | √ | √ | √ |
| 7. | Constructively reflect on their own engagement with theory and practice | | √ | √ | √ |
| | | 100% | | | |

A1: Attitude

Develop an attitude of discovery/innovation/creativity, as demonstrated by students possessing a strong sense of curiosity, asking questions actively, challenging assumptions or engaging in inquiry together with teachers.

A2: Ability

Develop the ability/skill needed to discover/innovate/create, as demonstrated by students possessing critical thinking skills to assess ideas, acquiring research skills, synthesizing knowledge across disciplines or applying academic knowledge to self-life problems.

A3: Accomplishments

Demonstrate accomplishment of discovery/innovation/creativity through producing /constructing creative works/new artefacts, effective solutions to real-life problems or new processes.

3. Learning and Teaching Activities (LTAs)

(LTAs designed to facilitate students' achievement of the CILOs.)

| LTA | Brief Description | CILO No. | | | | | | | Hours/week (if applicable) |
|---|--|----------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | |
| Workshops | <p>Presentation of theories, concepts and ideas based on academic literature (including course readings).</p> <p>Course lecturer responds to questions raised by students attending the workshops and facilitates discussion and in-class exercises.</p> | √ | √ | | √ | | | | 3 hours per week |
| Canvas | PowerPoint slides to support workshops posted for students to download. | √ | √ | | √ | | | | N/A |
| Independent reading and a reflection report | Readings contained in course handbook are expected to be read by every student. In addition, each student must write a reflection report on the implications of the readings of their choosing so that solutions to a contemporary public management challenge or an organizational predicament can be developed. | √ | √ | | √ | √ | | √ | This will vary from student to student: average: 4-5 hours per week |
| Discussion leaders and Group presentations | <p>Students will</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> take turns as “discussion leaders” during the in-class meetings. The purpose of having student discussion leaders is to engage the class in a dialogue of the readings. locate relevant information; evaluate, organize & synthesize materials; present ideas to the class in a clear, concise; and stimulating way; engage with classmates in answering questions and discussing presentation topics. | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ | 6 hours allocated for presentations (excluding preparation) |

4. Assessment Tasks/Activities (ATs)

(ATs are designed to assess how well the students achieve the CILOs.)

| Assessment Tasks/Activities | CILO No. | | | | | | | Weighting | Remarks |
|-----------------------------|----------|---|---|---|---|---|---|-----------|---|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | | |
| Continuous Assessment: 100% | | | | | | | | | |
| Class Participation | √ | √ | | √ | | | | 15% | The success of this class hinges thoroughly on students' active engagement with readings and an intrinsic willingness to share their points of view. When necessary, students may be called upon if they do not proactively contribute. Quantity and quality of participation in class discussions will be an important component of each student's participation grade. Please note that mere physical attendance is not a substitute for active participation and will not automatically grant class participation points. |
| Discussion Leader | √ | √ | | √ | | | √ | 15% | <p>Each class member will be randomly assigned into a discussion team constituting approximately five members. Each group will submit their preferred topics to the course leader, who will then ensure that each group is matched with a class topic.</p> <p>Students are expected to complete the reading(s) listed under their assigned topic BEFORE group meetings and work collectively to prepare the discussion handout.</p> <p>Discussion leaders (i.e., discussion teams) will strive to cover the assigned readings</p> |

| | | | | | | | | | |
|---------------------------------|--|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|--|
| | | | | | | | | thoroughly and put forth probing questions that go beyond “What do you think of the authors’ arguments?” or “Do you agree with that point?” In-class discussion follows. | |
| Reflection Paper | | √ | √ | | √ | | √ | 30% | <p>Each student is expected to write a reflection report on the strengths, limitations, and implications of the readings listed under their selected topic. Despite the fact that students possess absolute discretion over the format of this reflection paper, they need to be explicit about how these reflections help them develop ideas to address a thorny issue in their workplace.</p> <p>The paper should be a maximum of 1,500 words (excluding the title page, references, and essential appendices), double-spaced, and draw on materials from the assigned readings or lecture slides.</p> |
| Group “innovation” presentation | | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ | | 20% | <p>Each group needs to deliver a presentation of novel hypotheses i.e., something not already known or immediately obvious to people interested in organization phenomena.</p> <p>In this presentation, please clearly state the hypotheses and then explain why they are likely to be true and interesting. The presentation should (a) articulate the motivation behind these hypotheses, (b) examine the background to them, (c) be guided by pertinent literature, and</p> |

| | | | | | | | | | |
|---|--|---|---|---|---|---|--|------|---|
| | | | | | | | | | (d) make a plan about how these innovative ideas can spur advancements in professional practice. |
| Group Written Report | | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ | | 20% | <p>After the presentation, the instructor will meet up with the team and comment on the strengths and weaknesses of its presentations. This meeting aims to 1) help the team re-organize its arguments and 2) give suggestions for writing up the group report. The arguments made in the report has to be driven by literature, substantiated with concrete examples and credible data, and appropriately referenced and footnoted.</p> <p>The paper should be a maximum of 2,500 words (excluding the title page, references, and essential appendices), double-spaced, and draw on materials from the assigned readings or lecture slides.</p> |
| Examination: 0% (duration: if applicable) | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | 100% | |

5. Assessment Rubrics

(Grading of student achievements is based on student performance in assessment tasks/activities with the following rubrics.)

Applicable to students admitted before Semester A 2022/23 and in Semester A 2024/25 & thereafter

| Assessment Task | Criterion | Excellent (A+, A, A-) | Good (B+, B, B-) | Fair (C+, C, C-) | Marginal (D) | Failure (F) |
|---------------------|--|--|---|---|--|--|
| Class participation | Input of students during class participation | High standard of being able to recall define, explain and relate key concepts derived from the readings. Participate very frequently in class discussion, including answering the probing questions raised by the discussion group. | Fairly standard of being able to recall define, explain and relate key concepts derived from the readings. Participate frequently in class discussion, including answering the probing questions raised by the discussion group. | Rudimentary standard of being able to recall define, explain and relate key concepts derived from the readings Participate occasionally in class discussion, including answering the probing questions raised by the discussion group. | Poor standard of being able to recall define, explain and relate key concepts derived from the readings Participate rarely in class discussion, including answering the probing questions raised by the discussion group. | Almost no standard of being able to recall define, explain and relate key concepts derived from the readings Never participate in class discussion, including answering the probing questions raised by the discussion group. |
| Discussion Leader | levels of preparedness for the readings on the selected week | The discussion handout is prepared in a manner that showcases the group members' excellent understanding of the readings. | The discussion handout is prepared in a manner that showcases the group members' very good understanding of the readings. | The discussion handout is prepared in a manner that showcases the group members' good understanding of the readings. | The discussion handout is prepared in a manner that showcases the group members' rough understanding of the readings. | The discussion handout is prepared in a manner that showcases the group members' poor understanding of the readings. |
| Reflection Paper | Level of mastery in readings and critical thinking ability | Strong familiarity with the readings and an ability to apply the learnt materials to "make | Fairly good familiarity with the readings and an ability to apply the learnt | Weak familiarity with the readings and an ability to apply the learnt materials to "make | Very little familiarity with the readings and an ability to apply the learnt materials to "make sense" of an | Almost no familiarity with the readings nor an ability to apply the learnt materials to "make |

| | | | | | | |
|---------------------------------|-----------------------------------|---|--|---|--|--|
| | | sense” of an existing organizational phenomenon. | materials to “make sense” of an existing organizational phenomenon. | sense” of an existing organizational phenomenon. | existing organizational phenomenon. | sense” of an existing organizational phenomenon. |
| Group “innovation” presentation | Innovativeness level of the paper | Highly innovative ideas and conscientious attitude in discovering, analyzing and contributing to the current dialogue in the field and/or the development of creative solutions for specific OT and OB issues in a jurisdiction of interest. | Fairly innovative ideas and conscientious attitude in discovering, analyzing and contributing to the current dialogue in the field and/or the development of creative solutions for specific OT and OB issues in a jurisdiction of interest. | Little innovative ideas and conscientious attitude in discovering, analyzing and contributing to the current dialogue in the field and/or the development of creative solutions for specific OT and OB issues in a jurisdiction of interest. | Very little innovative ideas and conscientious attitude in discovering, analyzing and contributing to the current dialogue in the field and/or the development of creative solutions for specific OT and OB issues in a jurisdiction of interest. | No innovative ideas and conscientious attitude in discovering, analyzing and contributing to the current dialogue in the field and/or the development of creative solutions for specific OT and OB issues in a jurisdiction of interest. |
| Group Written Report | Quality of the report | Excellent research and writing skills to 1) assemble evidence, 2) present coherent arguments, 3) contextualize the core assumptions of the utilized organization or institutional theories, 4) lay out an action plan that helps empirically investigate the proposed | Good research and writing skills to 1) assemble evidence, 2) present coherent arguments, 3) contextualize the core assumptions of the utilized organization or institutional theories, 4) lay out an action plan that helps empirically investigate the proposed | Basic research and writing skills to 1) assemble evidence, 2) present coherent arguments, 3) contextualize the core assumptions of the utilized organization or institutional theories, 4) lay out an action plan that helps empirically investigate the proposed hypotheses, and 5) assess the feasibility | Insufficient research and writing skills to 1) assemble evidence, 2) present coherent arguments, 3) contextualize the core assumptions of the utilized organization or institutional theories, 4) lay out an action plan that helps empirically investigate the proposed hypotheses, and 5) assess the feasibility and practical | Poor research and writing skills to 1) assemble evidence, 2) present coherent arguments, 3) contextualize the core assumptions of the utilized organization or institutional theories, 4) lay out an action plan that helps empirically investigate the proposed hypotheses, and 5) assess the feasibility and practical |

| | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|----------------------------|----------------------------|
| | | hypotheses, and 5) assess the feasibility and practical implications of this plan. | hypotheses, and 5) assess the feasibility and practical implications of this plan. | and practical implications of this plan. | implications of this plan. | implications of this plan. |
|--|--|--|--|--|----------------------------|----------------------------|

Applicable to students admitted from Semester A 2022/23 to Summer Term 2024

| Assessment Task | Criterion | Excellent (A+, A, A-) | Good (B+, B) | Marginal (B-, C+, C) | Failure (F) |
|---------------------|--|--|---|---|--|
| Class participation | Input of students during class participation | High standard of being able to recall define, explain and relate key concepts derived from the readings. Participate very frequently in class discussion, including answering the probing questions raised by the discussion group. | Fairly standard of being able to recall define, explain and relate key concepts derived from the readings. Participate frequently in class discussion, including answering the probing questions raised by the discussion group. | Rudimentary standard of being able to recall define, explain and relate key concepts derived from the readings Participate occasionally in class discussion, including answering the probing questions raised by the discussion group. | Almost no standard of being able to recall define, explain and relate key concepts derived from the readings Never participate in class discussion, including answering the probing questions raised by the discussion group. |
| Discussion Leader | levels of preparedness for the readings on the selected week | The discussion handout is prepared in a manner that showcases the group members' excellent understanding of the readings. | The discussion handout is prepared in a manner that showcases the group members' very good understanding of the readings. | The discussion handout is prepared in a manner that showcases the group members' good understanding of the readings. | The discussion handout is prepared in a manner that showcases the group members' poor understanding of the readings. |
| Reflection Paper | Level of mastery in readings and critical thinking ability | Strong familiarity with the readings and an ability to apply the learnt materials to | Fairly good familiarity with the readings and an ability to apply the learnt materials to | Weak familiarity with the readings and an ability to apply the learnt materials to | Almost no familiarity with the readings nor an ability to apply the learnt |

| | | | | | |
|---------------------------------|-----------------------------------|--|---|--|---|
| | | “make sense” of an existing organizational phenomenon. | “make sense” of an existing organizational phenomenon. | “make sense” of an existing organizational phenomenon. | materials to “make sense” of an existing organizational phenomenon. |
| Group “innovation” presentation | Innovativeness level of the paper | Highly innovative ideas and conscientious attitude in discovering, analyzing and contributing to the current dialogue in the field and/or the development of creative solutions for specific OT and OB issues in a jurisdiction of interest. | Fairly innovative ideas and conscientious attitude in discovering, analyzing and contributing to the current dialogue in the field and/or the development of creative solutions for specific OT and OB issues in a jurisdiction of interest. | Little innovative ideas and conscientious attitude in discovering, analyzing and contributing to the current dialogue in the field and/or the development of creative solutions for specific OT and OB issues in a jurisdiction of interest. | No innovative ideas and conscientious attitude in discovering, analyzing and contributing to the current dialogue in the field and/or the development of creative solutions for specific OT and OB issues in a jurisdiction of interest. |
| Group Written Report | Quality of the report | Excellent research and writing skills to 1) assemble evidence, 2) present coherent arguments, 3) contextualize the core assumptions of the utilized organization or institutional theories, 4) lay out an action plan that helps empirically investigate the proposed hypotheses, and 5) assess the feasibility and practical implications of this plan. | Good research and writing skills to 1) assemble evidence, 2) present coherent arguments, 3) contextualize the core assumptions of the utilized organization or institutional theories, 4) lay out an action plan that helps empirically investigate the proposed hypotheses, and 5) assess the feasibility and practical implications of this plan. | Basic research and writing skills to 1) assemble evidence, 2) present coherent arguments, 3) contextualize the core assumptions of the utilized organization or institutional theories, 4) lay out an action plan that helps empirically investigate the proposed hypotheses, and 5) assess the feasibility and practical implications of this plan. | Poor research and writing skills to 1) assemble evidence, 2) present coherent arguments, 3) contextualize the core assumptions of the utilized organization or institutional theories, 4) lay out an action plan that helps empirically investigate the proposed hypotheses, and 5) assess the feasibility and practical implications of this plan. |

Part III Other Information (more details can be provided separately in the teaching plan)

1. Keyword Syllabus

(An indication of the key topics of the course.)

The core assumptions and historical roots of organization theories; the uniqueness of public organizations; the institutional and behavioral dimensions of public management; managerial mantra and professionalism; organizational culture and diversity; employee motivation; leadership; condition and decision making; customer-oriented bureaucracy; the interplay between political and economic factors in public-sector issues.

2. Reading List

2.1 Compulsory Readings

(Compulsory readings can include books, book chapters, or journal/magazine articles. There are also collections of e-books, e-journals available from the CityU Library.)

1. Scott, W. R. 1992. *Organizations: Rational, Natural, and Open Systems*. 3rd ed.
2. Rainey, H. G. 2009. *Understanding and Managing Public Organizations*
3. John D. Huber and Charles R. Shipan (2002) *Deliberate Discretion? The Institutional Foundations of Bureaucratic Autonomy*, New York: Cambridge University Press
4. Douglass C. North (1990) *Institutions, Institutional Change and Economic Performance*, New York: Cambridge University Press
5. Scott, I. 2010. *The Public Sector in Hong Kong*.
6. Weick, K.E. 1995. *What Theory is Not, Theorizing Is*
7. Taylor, F.W. 1967. *The Principles of Scientific Management* (first published 1911).
8. Barnard, C.I. 1938. *The Functions of the Executive*
9. Cohen, Michael D., James C. March, and Johann P. Olsen. 1972. *A Garbage Can Model of Organizational Choice*
10. March, J.G., & Simon, H.A. 1958. *Organizations*, Chapters 5-6.
11. Emerson, R.M. 1962. *Power-dependence Relations*
12. March, J.G. 1991. *Exploration and Exploitation in Organizational Learning*
13. Heath, C., & Sitkin, S. B. 2001. *Big-B versus Big-O: What Is Organizational about Organizational Behavior?*
14. Barrick, M. R., & Mount, M. K. 1991. *The Big Five Personality Dimensions and Job Performance: A Meta-Analysis*
15. Elliott, E. S., & Dweck, C. S. 1988. *Goals: An Approach to Motivation and Achievement*
16. Bunderson, J. S., & Thompson, J. A. 2009. *The Call of the Wild: Zookeepers, Callings, and the Double-edged Sword of Deeply Meaningful Work*
17. Fast, N. J., Halevy, N., & Galinsky, A. D. 2011. *The Destructive Nature of Power without Status*

18. Eagly, A. H., Johannesen-Schmidt, M. C., & Van Engen, M. L. 2003. *Transformational, Transactional, and Laissez-Faire Leadership Styles: A Meta-Analysis Comparing Women and Men*

2.2 Additional Readings

(Additional references for students to learn to expand their knowledge about the subject.)

| |
|---|
| Shui-Yan Tang. 2012. <i>Ten Principles for a Rule-Ordered Society: Enhancing China's Governing Capacity</i> , Beijing: China Development Press |
| Chatterjee, Arijit and Donald Hambrick. 2007. <i>It's All about Me: Narcissistic Chief Executive Officers and Their Effects on Company Strategy and Performance</i> |
| Brewer. 1991. <i>The Social Self: On Being the Same and Different at the Same Time</i> |
| Oyserman, Daphna. 2009. Identity-Based Motivation: <i>Implications for Action-Readiness, Procedural-Readiness, and Consumer Behavior</i> |
| Iyengar, Sheena, Rachael Wells, and Barry Schwartz. 2006. <i>Doing Better but Feeling Worse: Looking for the "Best" Job Undermines Satisfaction</i> |
| Ferris, James M., and Shui-Yan Tang. 1993. "The New Institutionalism and Public Administration: An Overview," <i>Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory</i> , Vol. 3, pp.4-10 |
| Scott, Kristyn and Douglas Brown. 2006. <i>Female First, Leader Second? Gender Bias in the Encoding of Leadership Behavior</i> |
| Haidt, Jonathan. 2001. <i>The Emotional Dog and Its Rational Tail: A Social Intuitionist Approach to Moral Judgment</i> |
| Williamson, Oliver E. 1999. "Public and Private Bureaucracies: A Transaction Cost Economics Perspectives," <i>Journal of Law, Economics, and Organization</i> , Vol. 15, pp. 306-342 |