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# Article summary:

1. The article reviews the origins and primary arguments of resource dependence theory and its influence on subsequent literatures in multiple social science and professional disciplines.

2. The theory's recent upsurge in citations is attributed to Stanford's position of power in the network of academic exchange.

3. The article concludes with a review of promising lines of recent research that extend and qualify resource dependence theory's insights, as well as outlining potentially fruitful areas for future research.

# Article rating:

Appears moderately imbalanced: The article provides some useful information, but is missing several important points or pieces of evidence that would be required to present the discussed topics in a balanced and reliable way. You are encouraged to seek a more balanced perspective on the presented issues by exploring the provided research topics and looking at different information sources.

# Article analysis:

The article "Chapter 2 Resource dependence theory: Past and future" by Davis and Cobb provides a comprehensive review of the origins, primary arguments, and influence of resource dependence theory in multiple social science and professional disciplines. The authors also contrast it with Emerson's power-dependence theory and highlight some promising lines of recent research that extend and qualify resource dependence theory's insights.

One potential bias in the article is its focus on Stanford's position of power in the network of academic exchange as a reason for the upsurge in resource dependence theory's citations in recent years. While this may be a contributing factor, it overlooks other possible reasons such as the increasing relevance of resource dependence theory to contemporary organizational issues.

The article also presents a one-sided reporting by not exploring counterarguments or alternative perspectives on resource dependence theory. For example, it does not address criticisms that resource dependence theory oversimplifies complex organizational dynamics or neglects the agency of actors in shaping their relationships with external resources.

Moreover, the article lacks evidence for some claims made, such as when it states that recent research has extended and qualified resource dependence theory's insights without providing specific examples or references to support this claim.

Additionally, the article contains promotional content for Emerald Group Publishing Limited, which is listed as the publisher. This raises questions about potential conflicts of interest or partiality towards promoting certain academic works over others.

Overall, while "Chapter 2 Resource dependence theory: Past and future" provides a useful overview of resource dependence theory's history and impact, it could benefit from more balanced reporting that acknowledges alternative perspectives and provides evidence to support its claims.

# Topics for further research:

* Criticisms of resource dependence theory
* Agency in organizational relationships
* Complex organizational dynamics
* Alternative perspectives on resource dependence theory
* Recent research on resource dependence theory
* Conflicts of interest in academic publishing
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