RUTGERS UNIVERSITY
GRADUATE BUSINESS SCHOOL

THEORY AND RESEARCH IN ORGANIZATIONAL BEHAVIOR (26:620:555)
Dr. Chao C. Chen, 1WP: 1026; (Tel): 973-353-5425; (Fax): 973-353-1664;
Email: chaochen@business.rutgers.edu
CLASS HOURS: Wednesday 2:30-5:20pm, Room 534 1WP
OFFICE HOUR: Wednesday 1:00-2:00pm or by appointment
FOR INCLEMENT WETHER: NW: 973-353-1766; NB: 732-932-1766

Objectives

This doctoral seminar is designed for new doctoral students to gain an understanding of classic and contemporary research that addresses fundamental issues of organizational behavior. Drawing on theory and research in psychology, social psychology, and organizational behavior, we shall explore individual, interpersonal, and group processes in work organizations. Our emphasis will be on the development of theory and research. It is critical that you read the required readings before class and spend some time thinking about the research implications of the readings, both individually and as a group. We will use these readings to gain a sense of the important perspectives and approaches in the field, not just as a set of findings that are to be digested or summarized. The class will also explore more current OB research topics published in top tier journals.

Readings

You must read all required readings. The recommended readings could be useful for your research papers for this class. For those who are interested, more extensive lists of references to OB topics and history are posted under Course Information on the blackboard.

Course Requirements

Session Leader	10%
Weekly synthesis	15%
Theory building exercises	35%
Term paper	40%

Session Leader (10%)

The success of this course depends on how students are actively engaged. Each student must be prepared to discuss all the required readings for each session. As you reflect on you readings please consider the following:

- What is the basic theoretical model of the paper (constructs and relationships among them), and what is the foundational theory upon which the theoretical model is built?
- What is the main contribution of this paper? What ideas you find interesting?
- Do you agree or disagree with the arguments made in the paper, and why?
- How does a given paper relate to other papers in this and other sessions?

- Are there gaps you can fill and tensions you can resolve through further research?

In addition, each student is required to act as a session leader once during the semester. A session leader for each class will be assigned in our first class. The session leader makes a power point presentation of the assigned readings and the current research in the topic area of the week. Leading the discussion requires a deeper understanding of the major research questions, the strengths, weaknesses, controversies, and gaps in the readings as well as a literature review of current research literature. Specifically, the session leader should:

a. Provide an organizing framework for classroom discussion of theories and empirical research;

b. Compare & contrast (as appropriate) theories or themes of research covered within a given session or between sessions;

c. Comment on the strengths and weaknesses of the week's readings and lastly

d. Report to class emerging theories and research in recent years in the topic area of the week and recommend to the class 2-3 best emerging papers. For this part of the presentation, you must conduct a literature review on relevant articles in recent five years (2010-2015) in the journals of *Academy of Management Journal, Academy of Management Review, Administrative Science Quarterly, Journal of Applied Psychology, Organizational Science, and Journal of International Business Studies.*

Please upload your presentation to the blackboard under Session Leading PPT and the recommend articles under Recommended Articles.

Weekly one-page synthesis (starting with the first week) (15%)

Except for the weeks when you submit the theory building exercise papers or when you are the session leader, you are required to submit a one-page summary that synthesizes the required readings each week. Please submit your assignment to the blackboard by 10am on the class day. Possible questions you might consider when integrating the readings include:

1. What are the common themes across the readings assigned?
2. Are there distinct theoretical perspectives/approaches that you can identify from the readings for the given topic?
3. What are the strengths and weaknesses of each perspective? In what circumstances and for whom each perspective might be more applicable?
4. Can you think of a new conceptual angle (or a new set of hypotheses) to examine outcomes or processes of the given topic?

Theory building exercises (35%)

You are responsible for turning in three short papers in Classes 4, 7, and 10, which aim at developing your theory building capabilities. Please see the appended Theory Building Exercise Instructions. Feel free to use these short papers as foundations for developing your term paper.

Term paper (40%)

The term paper is a research proposal due in Class 13. The research proposal provides each student the opportunity to conceive and plan a study on some issue within the domain of the course. An initial one-page proposal for your study is due in Class 11. In the term paper, you should provide a literature review of the related work to-date, a theoretical framework consisting of hypotheses, and methodology to be used for testing the hypotheses (for the format, use AMJ publications as examples). The paper should be in no more than 15 double-spaced pages of text. Each student will give a 15 minutes presentation of his or her term paper in the last two classes.

It is important that you appropriately cite all references within the text of your proposal, as well as including a reference list at the conclusion of your paper (for the format of referencing, see AMJ publication guides). Sentences that are paraphrased and ideas that are adopted from another work must be appropriately cited. If you are including a sentence or passage verbatim from another work (published or unpublished), you must indicate this with the appropriate quotation marks and citation.

A note about the term paper. While you must incorporate what you have learned from this course in your final paper, I aim to be flexible on the topic of your term paper. The last thing I want is for you to write a paper that you are not interested in developing further. Indeed, my hope is that this paper will eventually develop into a publishable journal article (e.g., for *Academy of Management Review, or* the basis for an empirical paper for a top tier journal submission).

OUTLINE OF CLASSES

Overview

1 – Sept. 2	Introduction to OB and theorizing
2 – Sept. 9	Person-situation debate
3 – Sept. 16	Motivation
4 – Sept. 23	Emotion and affect
	Theory Building Exercise 1 due
5 – Sept. 30	Decision making and sense making
6 – Oct. 7	Identity and identification in organizational context
7 – Oct. 14	Social Networking
	Theory Building Exercise 2 due
8 – Oct. 21	Ethical issues at work
9 – Oct. 28	Organizational justice
10 – Nov. 4	Leadership
	Theory Building Exercise 3 due
11 – Nov. 11	Demography and diversity
	Term paper proposal due
12 – Nov. 18	Groups and teams
Nov. 25	Following Friday classes=Thanksgiving Recess
13 – Dec. 2	Presentations
	Term paper due
14 – Dec. 9	Presentations

OB Theory Building Exercise 1
(Please bring 2 copies to class)

Instructions:

Look through national, local and or trade newspapers to identify a story of interest that could spark a research study. For example, the New York Times on August 18, 2015 had a front page article on a Pay What You Want (PWYW) at a restaurant in Montclair, N.J. and an editorial on "What your vacation says about you".

Write a research question and a short abstract discussing the question (2-3 double-spaced pages).

Steps I and II may help you think more deeply about your write-up.

I. What do you think your article *is really* about?
- Why is it of interest to OB scholars and/or OB practitioners?
- What OB theories are relevant to the story?
- What research questions come to mind?

II. Select one of your research questions and develop it more fully by discussing the following.
- What assumptions are related to this theory/ phenomenon?
- How does your research question address these assumptions?
- What are possible answers to your questions?
- How could you study this phenomenon and test competing answers to your question?

III. Assignment: Write a research question and short abstract related to the question (2-3 double-spaced pages)

OB Theory Building Exercise 2
(Please bring 2 copies to class)

Instructions:

Think about contexts that you love (Jazz Orchestras, French restaurants, NASCR racing, Hollywood films) or organizational phenomena in contexts that interest you (coordination problems in hospitals, lack of trust in leaders of rapid response military teams, unethical behavior in innovative companies, gendered behavior on Oil Rigs). What research questions come to mind or what type of research would be necessary to uncover the important research questions in these settings. Write a research abstract about your research questions and short abstract related to the question (2-3 double-spaced pages). Be sure to include a bulleted list of benefits an organization would receive by allowing you to conduct your research in their organization. Following is an example of how to develop this type of research.

Elsbach, K. & Kramer, R.M. 2003. Assessing creativity in Hollywood pitch meetings: Evidence for a dual-process model of creativity judgments. Academy of management journal, 46, 3, 283-301.

Steps I and II may help you think more deeply about your article.

I. What contexts/phenomena interest you? Why?
- Why is it of interest to OB scholars and/or OB practitioners?
- What OB theories are likely to be relevant to this context/phenomena?
- What research questions come to mind?

II. Select one of your research questions and develop it more fully by discussing the following?
  o What assumptions have you made about this context/phenomenon?
  o How does your research question address these assumptions?
  o What are possible answers to your questions?
  o How could you study this context/phenomenon and test competing answers to your question?

III. Assignment: Write a research question and short abstract related to the question (2-3 double-spaced pages)

OB Theory Building Exercise 3
(Please bring 2 copies to class)

INNOVATION PAPER PROPOSAL

An innovation paper is a short 4-6 page description of a novel idea or hypothesis related to the assigned readings and class discussions (something not already known or immediately obvious to researchers in O.B.). You should use theories from one of the topic areas covered in this class in a substantive and novel manner. You should state your hypothesis and then present a theoretical justification about why it is a good idea and how it fills a gap in existing literatures or answers important questions that researchers have overlooked (3 pages). You should also mention how you might test your ideas (1-2 pages of the total). Your paper should be 4-6 pages (double-spaced, 11 or 12-point font) and include a figure, diagram or table that illustrates the causal relationships that your propose. The figure and/or table is not included in the page limit.

You do not need to do an elaborate literature search to make sure that your idea is new; the course readings and a quick computer search will suffice. Some of you have already described ideas and empirical tests in your weekly comments and theory building exercises that could be turned into innovation papers. Here are some questions that might spark your creativity:

1. Is there a theory that did not fit with your personal experiences in organizations or in groups? If the theory does not fit, suggest how it might be modified and tested.
2. Did any of the theories seem to contradict each other? How can the contradiction be resolved and the amended theory be tested?
3. Is there a setting in which you could test a theory we read about and find opposite results, or no results at all (i.e. context may matter)? Describe how you would revise the theory and test the amended theory.
4. Was there a theory that you found to be wrong? Why? Describe how you would revise the theory and test the amended theory.

When I grade your papers I will be primarily looking for two things:

1. Your argument/idea is written clearly enough so that I can understand it; that means there is a logical structure and a clear thesis.
2. You have made reasonable arguments to support your thesis and supported those arguments with evidence from existing empirical literature.

Articles assigned in the first class should serve as resources for you in finding an interesting topic and building the case for its interest and importance.

Class 1 – Introduction

Required Readings

Sutton, R. I., and Staw, B. M. 1995. What theory is not. *Administrative Science Quarterly,* 40: 371-384.

Whetten, D. (1989). What constitutes theory? Academy of Management Review, 14: 490-495.

Weick, K. (1989). Theory construction as disciplined imagination. ***Academy of Management Review, 14,*** 516-531.

Okhuysen, G. & Bonardi, J. P. 2011. Editor's comments: The challenges of building theory by combining lenses. *Academy of Management Review*, 36 (1), 6-11.

Corley, K.G. & Gioia, D. A. 2011. Building theory about building theory: What constitutes a theoretical contribution? *Academy of Management Review*, 36 (1), 12-32**. (Pages 12-19 ONLY)**

Bartunek, J. M., Rynes, S. L., & Ireland, R. D. 2006. What Makes Management Research Interesting, and Why Does It Matter? *Academy of Management Journal, 49,* 1, 9-15.

Recommended Readings

Davis, M. (1971). That's interesting! ***Philosophy of Social Science***, 309-344.

James, L., Mulak, S., & Brett, J. 1982. ***Causal analysis***. pp. 11-54. New York: Sage.

Staw, B. 1995. Repairs on the road to relevance and rigor. In Cummings & Frost (eds.) ***Publishing in the organizational sciences*** (2nd. Ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage: 96-107.

Abrahamson, E. 1996. Management fashion. ***Academy of Management Review, 21,*** 254-285.

Locke, K., & Golden-Biddle, K. 1997. Constructing opportunities for contribution: Structuring inter-textual coherence and "problematizing" organizational studies. ***Academy of Management Journal***, ***40***, 1023-1062.

Pfeffer, J. 1998. Understanding organizations: Concepts and controversies. ***Handbook of social psychology.***

Pfeffer, J. 1993. Barriers to the advancement of organizational science: Paradigm development as a dependent variable. ***Academy of Management Review, 18,*** 599-620.

Kerr, Norbert L. 1998. HARKing: Hypothesizing after the results are known. *Personality and Social Psychology Review,* 2: 196-217.

Hitt, M., Beamish, P., Jackson, S., & Mathieu, J. (2007). Building theoretical and empirical bridges across levels: Multilevel research in management. *Academy of Management Journal*, *50*(6), 1385-1399.

Greenberg, J.& Tomlinson, E. (2004). Situated experiments in organizations. *Journal of Management, 30*, 703-724.

Overview of Organizational Behavior Research

Staw, B. 1984. Organizational behavior: A review and reformulation of the field's outcome variables. <u>Annual Review of Psychology</u>, 35, 627-666.

Griffin, R. and Kacmar, K. M. 1991. Laboratory research in management: Misconceptions and missed opportunities. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 12: 301-311.

O'Reilly, C. 1991. Organizational behavior: Where we have been, where we're going. *Annual Review of Psychology*, Palo Alto, CA: Annual Reviews, Inc.

Mowday, R. T. and Sutton, R. I. 1993. Organizational behavior: Linking individuals and groups to organizational contexts. *Annual Review of Psychology, Vol. 44.*

Porter, L. (1996). Forty years of organization studies: Reflections from a micro perspective. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 41: 262-269.

Rousseau, Denise M. 1997. Organizational behavior in the new organizational era. *Annual Review of Psychology, Vol 48.* pp. 515-546.

Class 2 - Person-Situation Debate

Required Readings

Chatman, J.A. 1989. Improving interactional organizational research: A model of person-organization fit. *Academy of Management Review, 14*, 333-349.

Davis-Blake, A., & Pfeffer, J. 1986. Just a mirage: The search for dispositional effects in organizational research. *Academy of Management Review, 14*, 385-400.

Schneider, B. 1987. The people make the place. *Personnel Psychology, 40*, 437-453.

Chatman, J., & Barsade, S. 1995. Personality, culture, and cooperation: Evidence from a business situation. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 40*, 423-443.

Xxx When does incentive compensation motivate managerial behaviors? An experimental investigation of the fit between incentive compensation, executive core self-evaluation, and firm performance. *Strategic Management Journal , Strat. Mgmt. J., 33: 1343–1362 (2012)*

Recommended Readings

Staw, B.M., Bell, N., & Clausen, J. 1986. The dispositional approach to job attitudes: A lifetime longitudinal test. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 31,* 56-77.

Snyder, Mark & Ickes, William. 1995. Personality and Social Behavior (Chapter 28). In Lindzey, G. & Aronson, E. (Eds.) Handbook of Social Psychology, 883-947.
Barrick M.R. and Mount, M.K. 1991. The Big Five personality dimensions and job performance: A meta-analysis. ***Personnel Psychology***, **44**, 1-26.

Kenrick, & Funder, D. 1988. Profiting from controversy: Lessons from the person-situation debate. ***American Psychologist***, 43: 23-34.

Digman, J.M., 1990. Personality structure: Emergence of the five-factor model. ***Annual Review of Psychology***, 41: 417-440.

Kilduff, M., & Day, D. 1994. Do chameleons get ahead: The effects of self-monitoring on managerial careers. ***Academy of Management Journal***, 37, 1047-1060.

Staw, B.M., & Ross, J. 1985. The dispositional approach to job attitudes. ***Journal of Applied Psychology.*** 469-480.

House, R., Shane, & Arnold. 1996. Rumors of the death of dispositional research are vastly exaggerated. ***Academy of Management Review***, 21(1): 203-224.

Schneider, B., Smith, D.B., Taylor, S., & Fleenor, J. 1998. Personality and organizations: A test of the homogeneity of personality hypothesis. ***Journal of Applied Psychology***, 83: 462-470.

Class 3 - Motivation

Required Readings

Latham, G. P & Pinder, C. C. (2005). Work Motivation Theory and Research at the Dawn of the Twenty-First Century. ***Annual Review of Psychology, 56***, 485-516.

Steers, R. M, Mowday, R. T, & Shapiro, D. L. (2004). Introduction to special topic forum: The future of work motivation theory. ***Academy of Management Review, 29,*** 379-387. (**Also skim through other articles in this special topic volume.**)

Grant, M. 2007. Relational job design and the motivation to make a prosocial difference. ***Academy of Management Review***¸ 32， 393-417.

Lockwood, P., Jordan, C. H., Kunda, Z. (2002). Motivation by positive or negative role models: Regulatory focus determines who will best inspire us. ***Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 83***, 854-864.

Higgins, E.T. 1997. Beyond pleasure and pain. American Psychologist, 52(12), 1280-1300.

Recommended Readings

Jin, P. (1993). Work motivation and productivity in voluntarily formed work teams: A field study in China. ***Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 54***, 133-155.

Igalens, J. & Roussel, P. (1999). A study of the relationships between compensation package, work motivation and job satisfaction. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 20,* 1003-1025.

Katzell, R.A. & Thompson, D.E. 1990. Work Motivation: Theory and Practice. <u>American Psychologist</u>, 45, 2, 144-153.

Latham, G.P., Erez, M., Locke, E.A. 1988. Resolving scientific disputes by the joint design of crucial experiments by the antagonists: Application to the Erez-Latham dispute regarding participation in goal setting. <u>Journal of Applied Psychology</u>, 4(73), 753-772.

Deci, E. 1972. Intrinsic motivation, extrinsic reinforcement, and inequity. <u>Journal of Personality and Social Psychology</u>, 22(1), April, 113-120.

Hackman, J.R. & Oldham, G.H. 1976. Motivation through the design of work. <u>Organizational Behavior and Human Performance</u>, 1976, 16, 250-279.

Eden, D. 1989. Expectations, motivation, and performance: Why do workers achieve what they expect? (Chapter 3) from <u>Pygmalion in Management</u>. Lexington, MA: Lexington Books

Dipboye, R.L. 1982. Self-fulfilling prophecies in the selection-recruitment interview. <u>Academy of Management Review</u>, 1982, 7, 4, 579-586.

Earley, P.C., Connolly, T., & Ekegren, G. 1989. Goals, strategy development, and task performance: Some limits on the efficacy of goal setting. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 74: 24-33.

Locke, E., & Latham, G.P. 1990. *A theory of goal-setting and task performance*. Prentice-Hall, Chapters 1&2**.**

Staw, B., & Boettger, R. 1990. Task revision: A neglected form of work performance. *Academy of Management Journal*, 33: 534-559.

Erez, M., Kleinbeck, U., Thierry, H. (2001). **Work motivation in the context of a globalizing economy**. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.

Class 4 - Emotion and Affect

Weiss, H., & Cropanzano, R. 1996. Affective events theory: A theoretical discussion of the structure, causes, and consequences of affective experiences at work. *Research in organizational behavior*, Vol. 18, 1-74.

Barsade, S. G. (2002). The ripple effect: Emotional contagion and its influence on group behavior**.** *Administrative Science Quarterly, 47*, **644-675.**

Start of workday mood 2011 AMJ xxx

Amabile, T. M., Barsade, S. G., Mueller, J. S., & *Staw*, B. M. (2005). Affect and creativity at work**.** *Administrative Science Quarterly, 50***, 367-403.**

Grant, A. 2013. Rocking the boat but keeping it steady: The role of emotional regulation in employee voice. ***Academy of Management Journal,*** *56, 1073-1723.*

Recommended Readings

Lazarus, R. 1982. Thoughts on the relations between emotion and cognition. ***American Psychologist****. 37, 1019-1024.

Staw, B.M., & Barsade, S. (1991). Affect and managerial performance: A test of the sadder-but-wiser vs. happier-and-smarter hypotheses. ***Administrative Science Quarterly***, 38, 304-331.

Brief, A. P., & Weiss, H. M. (2002). Organizational behavior: Affect in the workplace. ***Annual Review of Psychology, 53,*** 279-307.

Barrick M.R. and Mount, M.K. 1991. The Big Five personality dimensions and job performance: A meta-analysis. ***Personnel Psychology***, **44**, 1-26.

Keltner, D., & Haidt, J. 1999. Social functions of emotions at four levels of analysis. ***Cognition and emotion***, Vol. 13(5), 505-521.

Sutton, R., 1991. Maintaining norms about expressed emotions: The case of bill collectors. ***Administrative Science Quarterly,*** 36(2): 245-268.

Tiedens, L. Z. (2001). Anger and advancement versus sadness and subjugation: The effect of negative emotion expressions on social status conferral. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 80***, 86-94.**

Wong, & Law. (2002). The effects of leader and follower emotional intelligence on performance and attitude: An exploratory study. ***Leadership Quarterly, 13***, 243-274.

Morris, M., & Keltner, D. (2000). How emotions work: An analysis of the social functions of emotional expression in negotiations. ***Research in organizational behavior***, 22, 1-50.

Watson, D., & Slack, A.K. (1993). General factors of affective temperament and their relation to job satisfaction over time**.** *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 54***,** 181-202.

Class 5 - Sense-making and decision-making

Required Readings

Tversky, A., & Kahneman, D. (1974). Judgment under uncertainty: Heuristics and biases. ***Science***, ***185***, 1124-1131.

Elsbach, K. D., Kramer, R. M. (2003). Assessing creativity in Hollywood pitch meetings: Evidence for a dual-process model of creativity judgments. *Academy of Management Journal, 46*, 283-301.

Morris, M.W., Larrick, R. & Su, S. 1999. Misperceiving negotiation counterparts: Ascribing personality traits for situationally determined bargaining behaviors. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 77 (1)

Wong, E. M., Ormiston, M.E., & Tetlock, P.E. 2011. The effects of top management team integrative complexity and decentralized decision making on corporate social performance. *Academy of Management Journal, 54, 1207-1228.*

Sheldon, O. & Fishback, A. 2011. Resisting the temptation to compete: Self-control promotes cooperation in mixed-motive interactions. *Journal of Experimental Social psychology*, 47: 403-411.

Recommended Readings

Kunda, Z. (1990). The case for motivated reasoning. *Psychological Bulletin, 108*, 480-498.

Morris, M.W., Larrick, R. & Su, S. 1999. Misperceiving negotiation counterparts: Ascribing personality traits for situationally determined bargaining behaviors. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 77 (1)

Weick, K. 1993. The collapse of sense-making in organizations: The Mann Gulch disaster. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 38,* 628-652.

Cohen, March, & Olsen, (1972). A garbage can model of organizational choice. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 17,* 1-25.

Galinsky, A. D, Leonardelli, G. J, Okhuysen, G. A., Mussweiler, T. (2005). Regulatory Focus at the Bargaining Table: Promoting Distributive and Integrative Success. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 31*, 1087-1098.

Bazerman, M. (1990). Biases. Chapter 2 of *Managerial Decision Making* (second edition). New York: John Wiley.

Buehler, R., Griffin, D., & Ross, M. (1994). Exploring the 'Planning fallacy': Why people underestimate their task completion times. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 67, 366-381.

Cohen, March, & Olsen, (1972). A garbage can model of organizational choice. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 17,* 1-25.

Funder. (1987). Errors and mistakes: Evaluating the accuracy of social judgment. *Psychological Bulletin*, 101(1): 75-90.

Ilgen, M., & Tower. (1994). The cognitive revolution in organizational behavior. In J. Greenberg (Ed.) *Organizational behavior: The state of the science*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, p. 1-22.

Malle, B. 1999. How people explain behavior: A new theoretical framework. Personality and Social Psychology Review, 3 (1) 23-48.

Medvec, V.H., Madey, S.F., & Gilovich, T. (1995). When less is more: Counterfactual thinking and satisfaction among Olympic medalists. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, **69**, 603-610.

Miller, J. G., Bersoff, D. M., and Harwood, R. L. (1990). Perceptions of social responsibilities in India and the United States: Moral imperatives of personal decisions? Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 58: 33-47.

Northcraft, G.B., & Neale, M. (1987). Experts, amateurs, and real estate: An anchoring-and-adjustment perspective on property pricing decisions. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 39: 84-97.

Platt, J. (1973). Social traps. *American Psychologist*, 28, 641-651.

Weber, E. U., Shafir, S., & Blais, A. (2004). Predicting Risk Sensitivity in Humans and Lower Animals: Risk as Variance or Coefficient of Variation. *Psychological Review, 111*, 430-445.

Class 6 – Identity and Identification in Organizational Context

Required Readings

Hogg, M.A., & Terry, D.J. (2000). Social identity and self-categorization processes in organizational contexts. *Academy of Management Review, 25*, 121-140.

Dutton, J. E., Dukerich, J. M., & Harquail, C. V. (1994). Organizational images and member identification. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 39*, 239-263.

Elsbach, K. D., & Kramer, R. M. (1996). Members' responses to organizational identity threats: Encountering and countering the Business Session rankings. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 41*, 442-476.

O'Reilly, C. and Chatman, J. (1986). Organizational commitment and psychological attachment: The effects of compliance, identification and internalization on pro-social behavior. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 3*, 492-499.

Pratt, M., Rockmann, K.W., & Kaufmann, J.B. 2006. Constructing professional identity. *Academy of Management Journal*, *49, 235-262.*

Recommended Reading:

Morrison, E. (1994). Role definitions and organizational citizenship behavior: The importance of the employee's perspective. *Academy of Management Journal, 37*, 1543-1567.

Tepper, B. J., Duffy, M. K., Hoobler, J. & Ensley, M. D. (2004). Moderators of the Relationships Between Coworkers' Organizational Citizenship Behavior and Fellow Employees' Attitudes. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 89,* 455-465.

Organ, D. (1990). The motivational basis of organizational citizenship behavior. In L. Cummings & B. Staw, (Eds.) *Research in Organizational Behavior*. Vol. 12.

Van Dyne, L., Graham, J.W., & Dienesch, R.M. (1994). Organizational citizenship behavior: Construct redefinition, measurement, and validation. *Academy of Management Journal, 37*, 765-802.

Batson, C.D., et al. (1983). Influence of self-reported distress and empathy on egoistic vs. altruistic motivation to help. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 45*, 706-718.

Bellah, R.N., Madsen, R., Sullivan, W.M., Swidler, A., & Tipton, S.M. (1985). *Habits of the heart*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Elsbach, K.D. (1999). An expanded model of organizational identification. In R.I. Sutton, & B.M.Staw (Eds.), *Research in organizational behavior* (Vol., 21, pp. 163-200). Stamford, CT: JAI Press.

Withey, M.J., & Cooper, W.H. (1989). Predicting exit, voice, loyalty, and neglect. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 34,* 521-539.

Ashforth, B. E., & Mael, F. A. (1989). Social identity theory and the organization. *Academy of Management Review, 14*, 20-39.

Hui, C., Lee, C., Rousseau, D. M. (2004). Psychological Contract and Organizational Citizenship Behavior in China: Investigating Generalizability and Instrumentality. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 89,* 311-321.

Meyer, J., Pauonen, S., Gellatly, I., Goffin, R. & Jackson, D. 1989. Organizational commitment and job performance: It's the nature of the commitment that counts. Journal of Applied Psychology, 74, 152-156.

Class-7. Social Networking

Required Readings

Burt, Ronald S. "The social structure of competition." *Networks and organizations: Structure, form, and action* (1992): 57-91.

Granovetter, Mark S. "The strength of weak ties." *American journal of sociology* (1973): 1360-1380.

Borgatti, Stephen P., and Daniel S. Halgin. "On network theory." *Organization Science* 22.5 (2011): 1168-1181.

Brass, Daniel J., et al. "Taking stock of networks and organizations: A multilevel perspective." *Academy of management journal* 47.6 (2004): 795-817.

Shah, Neha Parikh, Rob Cross, and Daniel Z. Levin. "Performance Benefits From Providing Assistance in Networks Relationships That Generate Learning."*Journal of Management* (2015): 0149206315584822.

Shah, Neha Parikh, Andrew Parker and Christian Waldstrom, "To Engage or Disengage." Revise and Resubmit in preparation for Org. Science.

Recommended Readings

Shah, N. P., Parker A. & Waldstrøm C. To connect or disconnect: Changing workplace networks in response to job demands. Under review.

Class 8 – Ethical issues at work

Required Readings:

Jones, T.M. (1991). Ethical decision making by individuals in organizations: An issue-contingent model. Academy of Management Review, 16, 366-395.

 Solomon, R.C. (1992). Corporate roles, personal virtues: An Aristotelian approach to business ethics. Business Ethics Quarterly, 2, 317-339.

Treviño, L.K. (1986). Ethical decision-making in organizations: A person-situation interactionist model. Academy of Management Review, 11 (3): 601-617

Greenberg, J. 2002. Who stole the money, and when? Individual and situational determinants of employee theft. Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes,, 89: 985-1003.

Umphress, E. E., & Bingham, J. B. (2011). When employees do bad things for good reasons: Examining unethical pro-organizational behaviors. *Organization Science,* 22, 621-640.

Recommended Readings

Soule, E. (2002). Managerial moral strategies – in search of a few good principles. Academy of Management Review, 27, 77-97.

Warren, D. E. & Crowe-Smith, K. 2008. "Deciding what's right: The role of external sanctions and embarrassment in shaping moral judgments in the workplace." Research in Organizational Behavior, 28: 81-105.

Schminke, M. & Wells, D. (1999). Group processes and performance and their effects on individuals' ethical frameworks. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 18, 367-381.

Detert, J. R., L. K. Treviño, V. L. Sweitzer. 2008. Moral disengagement in ethical decision making: A study of antecedents and outcomes. J. Appl. Psych. 93 374-391.

Salvador, R., R. G. Folger. 2009. Business ethics and the brain. Business Ethics Quart. 19 1-31.

Tripp, Bies, Aquino (2002). Poetic Justice or petty jealousy? The aesthetics of revenge. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*.

Weaver, G.R., & Agle, B.R. (2002). Religiosity and ethical behavior in organizations: A symbolic interactionist perspective. *Academy of Management Review, 27*, 77-97.

Class 9 – Organizational justice

Required Readings

Colquitt, J. A, Greenberg, J., & Zapata-Phelan, C. P. (2005).What Is Organizational Justice? A Historical Overview. In Greenberg, J. and Colquitt, J. A (Eds). ***Handbook of organizational justice***. (pp. 3-56). Mahwah, NJ, US: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.

Moore, D.A., Tetlock, P.E., Tanlu, L., & Bazerman, M.H. (2006). Conflicts of interest and the case of auditor independence: Moral seduction and strategic issue cycling. ***Academy of Management Review, 31,*** 10-29.

Stahl, T., Vermunt, R., & Ellemers, N. (2008). For love or money? How activation of relational versus instrumental concerns affect reactions to decision-making procedures. ***Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 44,*** 80-94.

Xxx Roberson, Q. M., & Williamson, I. O. (2012). Justice in self-managing teams: The role of social networks in the emergence of procedural justice climates. *Academy of Management Journal*, *55*(3), 685-701.

> **xxx.   Pollack, J. M., & Bosse, D. A. (2013). When do investors forgive entrepreneurs for lying?** *Journal of Business Venturing***.**

Recommended Readings

Tepper, B.J., Duffy, M.K., Henle, C.A., & Lambert, L.S. (2006). Procedural injustice, victim precipitation, and busive supervision. *Personnel Psychology*, 29: 101-123.

Yang, J., Mossholder, K. W., & Peng, T. K. (2007). Procedural justice climate and group power distance: An examination of cross-level interaction effects. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 92: 681-692.

Blader, S. L. & Tyler, T. R. (2003). A four-component model of procedural justice: Defining the meaning of a "fair" process. Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 29, 747-758.

Rousseau, D., & Parks, J.M. (1993). The contracts of individuals and organizations. ***Research in organizational behavior, 15***, 1-43.

Greenberg, J. 1990. Employee theft as a reaction to underpayment inequity: The hidden cost of pay cuts. ***Journal of Applied Psychology, 75***, 561-568.

Lind, E. A., & Tyler, T. R. (1988). *The social psychology of procedural justice.* New York: Plenum Press.

Greenberg, J. & Colquitt, J.A. (2005). *Handbook of organizational justice (Ed).* Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Van Prooijen, J., Van den Bos, K., & Wilke, H. A. M. (2005). Procedural justice and intragroup status: Knowing where we stand in a group enhances reactions to procedures. ***Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 41***, 664-676.

Scott, B. A., Colquitt, J.A., & Zapata-Phelan, C.P. (2007). Justice as a dependent variable: Subordinate charisma as a predictor of interpersonal and informational justice perceptions. ***Journal of Applied Psychology, 92,*** 1597-1609.

McFarlin, D. B., & Sweeney, P. D. (1992). Distributive and procedural justice as predictors of satisfaction with personal and organizational outcomes. *Academy of Management Journal*, 35, 626-637.

Tyler, T., Degoey, P., & Smith, H. (1996). Understanding why the justice of group procedures matters: A test of the psychological dynamics of the group –value model. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology,* 70, 913-930.

Class 10 - Leadership

Required Readings

Dvir, T., Eden, D., Avolio, B. J., & Shamir, B. (2002). Impact of transformational leadership on follower development and performance: A field experiment. *Academy of Management Journal, 45,* 735-744.

Chen, C.C. & Meindl, J.R. (1991). The construction of leadership images in the popular press: The case of Donald Burr and People Express. Administrative Science Quarterly, 36: 521-551.

Tepper, B. J., Moss, S., & Duffy, M. K. 2011. Predictors of abusive supervision: Supervisor perceptions of deep-level dissimilarity, relationship conflict, and subordinate performance. ***Academy of Management Journal,*** 54: 279-294.

Schaubroeck, J. M., Hannah, S. T., Avolio, B. J., Kozlowski, S. W. J., Lord, R. G., Trevino, L. K., Dimotakis, N., & Peng, A. C. 2012. Embedding ethical leadership within and across organization levels. *Academy of Management Journal.*

Xxx Humility or Confucian model/paradox leadership

Recommended Readings

Van Vugt, M. 2006. Evolutionary origins of leadership and followership. *Personality and Social Psychology Review,* 10: 354-371.

Meindl, J. & Ehrlich, S 1987. The romance of leadership and the evaluation of organizational performance. *Academy of Management Journal, 30*, 91-109.

Bass, B.M. 1990. Handbook of leadership: Theory, research, and managerial applications. NY, NY: The Free Press. Ch. 13: Power and Leadership (225-251).

Bass, Avolio, Jung, & Bersen (2003). Predicting unit performance by assessing transformational and transactional leadership. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 88, 207-218.

Bono, J.E. & Judge, T.A. (2003). Self-concordance at work: Toward understanding the motivational effects of transformational leaders. *Academy of Management Journal*, 46, 554-571.

Conger & Kanungo. (1987). Toward a behavioral theory of charismatic leadership in organizational settings. *Academy of Management Review*, 12(4): 637-647.

Graen, G.B. & Uhl-Bien, M. (1995). Relationship-based approach to leadership: Development of leadership-member exchange (LMX) theory of leadership over 25 years: Applying a multi-level multi-domain perspective. *Leadership Quarterly, 6,* 219-247.

Howell, J. M., & Shamir, B. (2005). The role of followers in the charismatic leadership process: Relationships and their consequences. *Academy of Management Review, 30*, 96-112.

Manz, C., & Sims, H. (1987). Leading workers to lead themselves: The external leadership of self-managing work teams. Administrative Science Quarterly, 32: 106-129.

Meindl, J., Ehrlich, S., & Dukerich, J. (1985). The romance of leadership. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 30*, 78-102.

House, R., Spangler, W., & Woycke, J. (1991). Personality and charisma in the U.S. presidency: A psychological theory of leader effectiveness. Administrative Science Quarterly, 36: 364-396.

Gerstner, C. R., & Day, D. V. (1997). Meta-Analytic review of leader-member exchange theory: Correlates and construct issues. *Journal of Applied Psychology,* 82, 827-844.

Schriesheim, C. A., Castro, S. L., & Cogliser, C. C. (1999). Leader-Member exchange (LMX) research: A comprehensive review of theory, measurement, and data-analytic practices. Leadership Quarterly, 10: 63-113.

Sutton, R.I., & Galunic, D.C. 1996. Consequences of public scrutiny for leaders and their organizations. *Research in organizational behavior*. Vol. 18, 201-250.

Stodgill (1974). Historical trends in leadership theory and research. *Journal of Contemporary Business, Autumn*, 1-17.

Thomas, A. (1988). Does leadership make a difference to organizational performance? *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 33: 388-400.

Vecchio (1987). Situational leadership theory: An examination of a prescriptive theory. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 72*, 444-451.

Howell, J., & Frost, P. 1989. A laboratory study of charismatic leadership. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 43*, 243-269.

Pfeffer, J., Cialdini, R., Hanna, B., & Knopoff, K. 1999. Faith in supervision and the self-enhancement bias: Two psychological reasons why managers don't empower workers. *Basic and Applied Social Psychology*.

House, R. (1996). Path-goal theory of leadership: Lessons, legacy, and a reformulated theory. *Leadership Quarterly, 7*, 323-352.

Messick, David M (Ed); Kramer, Roderick M (Ed). (2005). *The psychology of leadership: New perspectives and research.* Mahwah, NJ, US: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.

Class 11 - Demography and Diversity

Required Readings

Tsui, A., Egan, T., & O'Reilly, C. (1992). Being different: Relational demography and organizational attachment. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 37*, 549-579.

Jehn, K. A, Northcraft, G. B., & Neale, M. A. Why differences make a difference: A field study of diversity, conflict, and performance in workgroups. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 44*, 741-763.

Chatman, J. A., & O'Reilly, C.A. (2004). Asymmetric Reactions to Work Group Sex Diversity among Men and Women. *Academy of Management Journal, 47,* 93-208.

Brief, A. P., Dietz, J.,Cohen, R. R.; Pugh, S. D., & Vaslow, J. B. (2000). Just doing business: Modern racism and obedience to authority as explanations for employment discrimination. ***Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 81***, 72-97.

Ely, R. (1994). The effects of organizational demographics and social identity on relationships among professional women. ***Administrative Science Quarterly, 39***, 203-238.

Recommended Readings

Cummings, J. N. (2004). Work Groups, Structural Diversity, and Knowledge Sharing in a Global Organization. ***Management Science, 50***, 352-364.

Kanter, R.M. 1977. ***Men and Women of the Corporation***, New York: Basic Books.

O'Reilly, C.A., Caldwell, D.F., & Barnett, W.P. 1989. Work group demography, social integration, and turnover. ***Administrative Science Quarterly, 34***, 21-37.

Pelled, L. 1996. Demographic diversity, conflict, and work group outcomes: An intervening process theory. ***Organization Science, 7***, 615-631.

Pierce, J. 1995. ***Gender Trials: Emotional lives in contemporary law firms***. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Swann, W. B Jr.; Polzer, J. T., Seyle, D. C. , & Ko, S. J. (2004). Finding value in diversity: Verification of personal and social self-views in diverse groups. ***Academy of Management Review, 29***, 9-27.

Ibarra, H. (1995). Race, opportunity, and diversity of social circles in managerial networks. Academy of Management Journal, 38: 673-703.

van Knippenberg, D., De Dreu, C. K. W, & Homan, A. C. (2004). Work Group Diversity and Group Performance: An Integrative Model and Research Agenda. ***Journal of Applied Psychology, 89***, 1008-1022.

Class 12 - Groups and Teams

Required Readings

Cohen & Bailey, (1997). What makes teams work: Group effectiveness research from the shop floor to the executive suite. *Journal of Management*, 23, 239-290.

Bunderson, J. S. (2003). Recognizing and utilizing expertise in work groups: A status characteristics perspective. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 48, 557-591.

Hambrick, D.C. (1994). Top management groups: A conceptual integration and reconsideration of the "team" label. ***Research in organizational behavior***, 16, 171-213.

Jehn, K. A. (1995). A multimethod examination of the benefits and detriments of intragroup conflict. ***Administrative Science Quarterly, 40,*** 256-282.

Ericksen, J. & Dyer, L. (2004). Right from the Start: Exploring the Effects of Early Team Events on Subsequent Project Team Development and Performance. ***Administrative Science Quarterly, 49,*** 438-471.

Recommended Readings

Liu, D., & Fu, P. P. 2011. Motivating protégés' learning in teams: A multilevel investigation of autonomy orientation and autonomy support. ***Journal of Applied Psychology,*** 96: 1195-1208.

McGrath, J. E. 1997. Small group research, that once and future field: An interpretation of the past with an eye to the future. *Group Dynamics*, 1: 7-27.

Ancona, D., and Caldwell, D. 1992. Bridging the boundary: External activity and performance in organizational teams. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 37: 634-665.

Barker, J. R. (1993). Tightening the iron cage: Concertive control in self-managing teams. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 38, 408-437.

Guzzo, R. E., and Dickson, M. W. 1996. Teams in organizations: Recent research on performance and effectiveness. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 47: 307-338.

Gersick, C. 1988. Time and transition in work teams: Toward a new model of group development. *Academy of Management Journal*, 31: 9-41.

Gilson, L., Mathieu, J. E., Shalley, C. E., & Ruddy, T. R. 2005. Creativity and Standardization: Complementary or Conflicting Drivers of Team Effectiveness? ***Academy of Management Journal,*** 48: 521-531.

Johnson, M. D., Hollenbeck, J. R., Humphrey, S. E., Ilgen, D. R., Jundt, D. K., & Meyer, C. J. (2006). Cutthroat cooperation: Asymmetrical adaptation of team reward structures. *Academy of Management Journal,* 49, 103-119.

Levine, J. M & Moreland, R. L. (1998). Small groups. In Daniel T, Fiske, Susan T. and Lindzey, Gardner (Eds). ***The handbook of social psychology*** (Vol. 2, pp. 415-469). New York, NY, US: McGraw-Hill.

Sutton, R.I., & Hargadon, A. 1996. Brainstorming groups in context: Effectiveness in a product design firm. ***Administrative Science Quarterly***, 41: 685-718.

Turner, Marlene E (Ed). (2001). ***Groups at work: Theory and research***. Mahwah, NJ, US: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.

Nemeth, C. (1986). Differential contributions of majority versus minority influence. *Psychological Review*, 93: 23-32.

Moreland, R. L. & Argote, L. (2003). Transactive memory in dynamic organizations. Peterson, Randall S and Mannix, Elizabeth A (Eds). *Leading and managing people in the dynamic organization.* (pp. 135-162). Mahwah, NJ, US: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.

Argote, L., and McGrath, J. E. 1993. Group processes in organizations: Continuity and change. In C. L. Cooper and I. T. Robertson (eds.), *International Review of Industrial and Organizational Psychology, Vol. 8*, New York: Wiley.
Classes 13 and 14 - PRESENTATIONS