

ORGANIZATIONAL BEHAVIOR SEMINAR

SPRING 2009

Professor: Jean Phillips
Office: 212 Janice H. Levin Building
Email: jeanp@rci.rutgers.edu
Class meets: Thursdays, 1:30-4 in Room 106 Levin
Office hours: by appointment

Course Objectives

In this doctoral seminar we will take an in depth look at some of the major topics in organizational behavior that influence the study of human resource management. Because the field of OB is so large, it is impossible to cover it all in a single semester. Accordingly, one of the goals of this course is to *help you develop an understanding of the field of OB as a whole, and foundation knowledge of theory and research in several important areas of OB*. A second goal of this course is to *develop your analytical skills in critically evaluating and integrating research in the area of OB*. A third goal of the course is to *help you develop your ideas about your own possible research program in the area of OB*. Accomplishing these goals will require a great deal of reading and reflecting on your part. *It is critical that you read the assigned material before each class and reflect on the implications of each reading.*

OB draws on theory and research in a variety of fields, including management, sociology, industrial/organizational psychology, and social psychology to explore individual, interpersonal, and group processes in organizations. Each week we will focus on a particular topic within OB, beginning with micro topics including personality and moving into meso and macro issues such as group dynamics, leadership, justice, trust, diversity, and culture. Each week we will examine reviews of the topic and/or several empirical papers on the subject. This will give you a good foundation in each area and prepare you to contribute to the current dialogue in the field.

Course Requirements

Instead of exams, I am organizing this course as a seminar focused on class participation and discussion. Accordingly, *attendance is mandatory*. There are 6-9 readings assigned each class, which might seem like a lot, but remember that this is in lieu of formal examinations. Our focus will be on thoroughly understanding and integrating each week's material to accomplish the three goals of the course.

Class Preparation and Contributions: 70% of Final Grade

There are four components of this course requirement:

1. *Preparation and Participation: 10%* First, I expect you to be an active participant during each class. This requires reading and even re-reading the assigned articles and chapters to develop a firm understating of the purpose and logic for each assigned reading. You must also go beyond simple reactions to the readings and consider:

- What is good about this paper?

- What are the basic constructs used and the relationships among them, and what drives the theory? What are the theoretical foundations of the paper?
- What assumptions do the author(s) make? How tenable are these assumptions?
- What is the main contribution of this paper? What are the most interesting ideas?
- How could the research or theory be improved?
- Do you agree with the theory and the conclusions drawn from the data? If not, what would it take to convince you?
- What are the boundary conditions of the study? For whom and under what circumstances does the research or theory apply and not apply?
- How does each reading complement, extend, or contradict other readings this week or this semester? What are the critical differences between this author's argument and others you have read? Can these differences be resolved through an empirical test? What would that study look like?

Expect to spend several hours reading and reflecting on the assigned readings—do not save them for the night before class. Reread a reading or a section of a reading until you are certain you understand its basic premises and arguments and are comfortable discussing them. *This is the level of preparation I expect you to do each week before coming to class.*

To help facilitate our discussion, you must bring to each class *at least two questions or comments about the material.* Your questions/comments should tap into one or more of the issues listed above. Your questions/comments are essential to our class discussion. To facilitate this and to create a resource you can benefit from later, I strongly suggest *creating an annotated bibliography of each reading that includes a brief summary of the article and your reactions, questions, and comments.*

2. Discussion Leader: 25% Second, all students are responsible for helping to lead class discussions on multiple occasions. Your role is not merely to summarize that week's readings but to prepare discussion questions and observations that highlight the main issues, strengths, weaknesses, controversies, and gaps in the readings for that week. You should also *integrate* the readings in terms of themes, assumptions, and theoretical perspectives.

You will be responsible for leading the discussion of the topic and articles I assign for that week—you are not responsible for selecting additional readings (you may, however, find it useful to do some additional reading for your own purposes). You can begin by presenting your own synopsis of the topic and then what you feel are critical questions, fundamental flaws, or integrative models. While it is often useful to include a detailed analysis/critique of each article separately, it can also be appropriate to focus on a broad overview. You should assume that the other seminar participants have read the material carefully, so your job is to generate discussion, not to provide a lecture and summary. Plan on leading the class discussion for 90 minutes.

Possible questions you might consider when integrating the readings include:

- What is the general topic area? What does it cover and what is excluded?
- What are the common themes across the readings assigned?
- Are there distinct theoretical perspectives that you can identify from the readings for the given topic? What are the assumptions behind each perspective?

- What are the strengths and weaknesses of each approach? When and for whom would each approach be more appropriate?
- How does each reading complement, extend, or contradict other readings this week or this semester? What are the critical differences between this author's argument and others you have read? Can these differences be resolved through an empirical test? What would that study look like? Can you think of a new conceptual angle (or a new set of hypotheses) to examine outcomes or processes of the given topic?
- Can you identify any missing variables that could improve the model or theory?
- Can you draw and explain the causal model of some of the constructs?

3. *Research Briefing: 25%* Third, each student is responsible for providing a cutting edge research briefing on multiple occasions, but not the same week as when you are the discussion leader. This role requires you to go beyond the assigned readings to find the latest and most interesting directions of the topic area from that particular week. Your job will be to brief the rest of the class on what you see as the emerging directions and trends in the particular area we are covering that week. Such research will require searching recent (i.e., last 5 years) publications in A-level journals and in-press articles posted on the journals' website, the published meeting proceedings of the Academy of Management, American Psychological Association or American Sociological Association, working paper series posted on the web, and other relevant sources. Provide at least three additional articles and distribute an annotated bibliography to the class (and to me) via email at least two days before your assigned class.

4. *Reviewer: 10%* Lastly, you will serve as a reviewer for one of your classmates. One of the most important service duties of a scholar is to review colleagues' research. To hone your critical reviewing skills and get you in the practice of thinking and writing as a reviewer, you will serve as an anonymous reviewer for the final paper of one of your classmates and provide a constructively critical review of it (approximately 3-5 pages). This review will be due to me via email during finals week, and I will forward it to the author. The review process will be single-blind (i.e. I will not disclose the reviewer's identity to the author).

Research Proposal and Presentation: 30% of Final Grade

Your research paper will propose a plausible research study in the area of OB and should add new knowledge or bring a new perspective to old findings within the field. The paper should review relevant literature including prior research on your topic, then pose a set of hypotheses that would be worth pursuing in future research. It is expected that you will do some additional readings outside of the formal class list for this paper. The paper should also have a methods section describing a realistic empirical test of your hypotheses, and a brief discussion section that outlines the limitations of your paper and methods, and its theoretical and practical contributions.

Overall, the proposal should be 15-25 double-spaced typed pages and submitted to me via email. You should develop this proposal with the expectation that it will become a publishable paper.

An anonymous classmate will provide a constructive review of your paper. You will also deliver a 20-minute presentation of your research paper to the class. You should distribute an annotated bibliography representing the conceptual (and empirical) foundation for your proposal to the class (and to me) at least two days prior to your presentation.

Tips on Reading Academic Journal Articles

Reading journal articles can seem like a daunting task. They are usually densely written, full of jargon, complicated statistics and what seems like irrelevant and complex information. Journal articles are written so that researchers can replicate the authors' work, but often a reader's aim is just to find out what the authors did and what they found.

All of this information is important—it is how you can determine how much stock to put into the research findings. In particular, the methodological and statistical details give critical information for determining a study's strengths and weaknesses, and for determining whether it is good scholarship. Therefore it is important that you learn how to read journal articles so that you learn the relevant information with an eye to the paper's limitations.

Though you will develop your own strategy over time, here are some questions you should contemplate when reading a given journal article:

- What are the goals of the paper? What big picture, practical question is highlighted and what more focused research question is addressed?
- So what? Why is this research question important and why should anyone care?
- What do we already know about this research question based on past research?
- What is the theoretical foundation of the research question?
- How is this theoretical foundation and approach different from what we already know? Why should we care about taking this approach to the question?
- For empirical articles, who were the participants? What method was used? Are the sample and method appropriate to test the study's hypotheses?
- What were the major findings that are relevant to the aims of the study?
- How generalizeable are the findings? What are the boundary conditions? (i.e., for whom and under what conditions do the findings apply?)
- What conclusions did the authors draw? What theoretical and practical contributions are made?
- What do you think of the research? What do you see as its strengths and weaknesses?

Seminar Schedule and Reading List

<u>Sesssion</u>	<u>Date</u>
1	January 22
2	January 29
3	February 5
4	February 12 <i>A one-page description of your research proposal is due via email</i>
5	February 19
6	February 26
7	March 5
8	March 12
	<i>Spring Break</i>
9	March 26
10	April 2
11	April 9
12	April 16
13	April 23 Presentations <i>All research papers are due via email; you will receive a paper to review via email and must email me your constructive review by the next class</i>
14	April 30 Presentations
15	May 7 Presentations (if needed)

All Readings are Available on Sakai:

1. Go to: <http://sakai.rutgers.edu>
2. Login using your Rutgers netid and password
3. Click on the TAB “Organizational Behavior”
4. If you do not see the TAB “Organizational Behavior,” contact me at jeanp@rci.rutgers.edu as you may not be on the roster.
5. Click on “Resources” to download the files for the course.

Session 1

Setting the Stage – What is OB?

Barley, S.R. (2006). When I write my masterpiece: Thoughts on what makes a paper interesting. Academy of Management Journal, 49(1), 16-20.

Bartunek, J.M., S.L. Rynes, and R. D. Ireland (2006). What makes management research interesting and why does it matter? Academy of Management Journal, 49(1), 9-16.

Whetten, D.A. (1989). What constitutes a theoretical contribution? Academy of Management Review, 14(4), 490-495.

Mohrman, S.A., Gibson, C.B., Mohrman, A.M. (2001). Doing research that is useful to practice: A model and theoretical exploration. Academy of Management Journal, 44(2), 357-375.

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

Caza, B.B. & Caza, A. (2008). Positive Organizational Scholarship: A Critical Theory Perspective. Journal of Management Inquiry, 17, 21-33.

Mowday, R. T. and Sutton, R. I. (1993). Organizational behavior: Linking individuals and groups to organizational contexts. Annual Review of Psychology, 44, 195-229.

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

Baron, R.M. & Kenny, D.A. (1986). The moderator-mediator variable distinction in social psychological research: Conceptual, strategic, and statistical considerations. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 51(6), 1173-1182.

Session 2

Motivation and Job Design

Kanfer, R. (1990). Motivation theory and Industrial/Organizational psychology. In M. D. Dunnette and L. Hough (Eds.), Handbook of industrial and organizational psychology (Vol. 1, pp.75-170). Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.

Locke, E. A., & Latham, G. P. (2002). Building a practically useful theory of goal setting and task motivation: A 35-year odyssey. American Psychologist, 57, 705-717.

Oldham, G., & Hackman, J. R. (1980). Work design in the organizational context. In B. M. Staw and L. L. Cummings (Eds.), Research in Organizational Behavior (Vol. 2, pp. 247-278). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

Phillips, J.M., (2008). "The Role of Excess Cognitive Capacity in the Relationship Between Job Characteristics and Cognitive Task Engagement," Journal of Business and Psychology, 23, 11-24.

Wrzesniewski, A. & Dutton, J.E. (2001). Crafting a job: Revisioning employees as active crafters of their work. Academy of Management Review, 26, 179-201.

Deci, Koestner, & Ryan (1999). A meta-analytic review of experiments examining the effects of intrinsic vs. extrinsic motivation. Psychological Bulletin, 125, 627-88.

Kanfer, R., Wanberg, C. R., & Kantrowitz, T. M. (2001). Job search and employment: A personality-motivational analysis and meta-analytic review. Journal of Applied Psychology, 86, 837-855.

For reference only: July 2004 issue of Academy of Management Review, 29: 341-499.

Special issue on the “Future of Work Motivation Theory.” Authors of articles include Locke, Latham, Bartunek, Kanfer, and others.

For reference only: November 2004 issue of *Academy of Management Executive*, 18: 122-150. Short articles on goal-setting authored by Kerr, Locke, Latham, Landauer, Shaw, and other preeminent researchers in the goal-setting area.

Session 3

Socialization and Learning

Van Maanen, J., & Schein, E. H. (1979). Toward a theory of organizational socialization. In B. M. Staw (Ed.), Research in Organizational Behavior (Vol. 1, pp. 209-264). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

Louis, M. R. (1980). Surprise and sense making: What newcomers experience in entering unfamiliar organizational settings. Administrative Science Quarterly, 25, 226-251.

Kim, T. Y., Cable, D. M., & Kim, S. P. (2005). Socialization tactics, employee proactivity, and person-organization fit. Journal of Applied Psychology, 90, 232-241.

Kristof-Brown, A., Jansen, K.J. and Colbert, A. (2002). A Policy-capturing study of the simultaneous effects of fit with jobs groups, and organizations. Journal of Applied Psychology, 87 (5), 985-993.

Argote, L. & Ingram, P. (2000). Knowledge transfer: A basis for competitive advantage in firms, Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 82, 150-169.

Gully, S.M., & Phillips, J.M. (2005). A multilevel application of learning and performance orientations to individual, group, and organizational outcomes. In J. Martocchio (Ed.), Research in Personnel and Human Resources Management (Vol. 24, pp. 1–52). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press/Elsevier Science.

Weiss, H.M. (1990). Learning theory and Industrial/Organizational psychology. In M. D. Dunnette and L. Hough (Eds.), Handbook of industrial and organizational psychology (Vol. 1, pp. 171-221). Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.

Session 4

Commitment, Voice & Organizational Citizenship Behavior

O'Reilly, C., & Chatman, J. (1986). Organizational commitment and psychological attachment: The effects of compliance, identification, and internalization on prosocial behavior. Journal of Applied Psychology, 71, 492-499.

Allen, N. J., & Meyer, J. P. (1996). Affective, continuance, and normative commitment to the organization: An examination of construct validity. Journal of Vocational Behavior, 49, 252-276.

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

Detert, J. D., & Burris, E. (2007). Leadership influences on employee voice behavior: Is the door really open? Academy Management Journal, 50, 869-884.

Bergron, D. M. (2007). The potential paradox of organizational citizenship behavior: Good citizens at what cost? Academy of Management Review, 32, 1078-1095.

Bommer, W. H., Dierdorff, E. C., Rubin, R. S. (2007). Does prevalence mitigate relevance? The moderating effect of group-level OCB on employee performance. Academy of Management Journal, 50, 1481-1494.

Session 5

Climate and Culture

Schein, E.H. (1996). Culture: The missing concept in organization studies. Administrative Science Quarterly, 41, 229-240.

Wilkins, A.L. & Ouchi, W.G. (1983). Efficient cultures: Exploring the relationship between culture and organizational performance. Administrative Science Quarterly, 28, 468-481.

Bowen, D.E., & C. Ostroff. (2004). Understanding HRM-firm performance linkages: The role of the "strength" of the HRM system. Academy of Management Review, 29, 203-221.

O'Reilly, C. and J.A. Chatman (1996). Culture as social control: Corporations, cults, and commitment. In B. M. Staw and L. L. Cummings (eds), Research in Organizational Behavior, 18: 157-200. Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

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

Gelfand, M.J., Leslie, L.M., & Keller, K.M. (2008). On the etiology of conflict cultures, Research in Organizational Behavior, 28, 137-166.

Session 6

Identity and Identification

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

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 Week rankings. Administrative Science Quarterly, 41, 442-476.

Ashforth, B.E. & Kreiner, G.E. (1999). "How can you do it?": Dirty work and the challenge of constructing a positive identity, Academy of Management Review, 24, 413-434.

Wheeler, A.R., Buckley, M.R., Halbesleben, R.L.B., & Ferris, G., "The elusive criterion of fit" revisited: Toward an integrative theory of multidimensional fit," Research in personnel and human resources management, 24, 265-304.

Bartel, C. A. (2001). Social comparisons in boundary-spanning work: Effects of community outreach on members' organizational identity and identification. Administrative Science Quarterly, 46, 379-413.

Crocker, J. & Luhtanen, R. 1990. Collective self-esteem and ingroup bias. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 58, 60-67.

Earley, P.C. 1989. Social loafing and collectivism: A comparison of the U.S. and the People's Republic of China. Administrative Science Quarterly, 34, 565-581.

Session 7

Power and Influence

Emerson, R.M. (1962). Power-Dependence Relations. American Sociological Review, 27(1), 31-41.

Molm, L.D. (1989). Punishment power: A balancing process in power-dependence relations. American Journal of Sociology, 94(6), 1392-1418.

Portes, A. (1998). Social capital: Its origins and applications in modern sociology, Annual Review of Sociology, 24, 1-24.

Wood, W., Lundgren, S., Ouellette, J.A., Busceme, S., & Blackstone, T. (1994). Minority influence: A meta-analytic review of social influence processes, Psychological Bulletin, 115(3), 323-345.

Galinsky, A. D., Gruenfeld, D. H., & Magee, J. C. (2003). From power to action. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 85, 453-466.

Burt, R.S. (2000). The network structure of social capital, Research in Organizational Behavior, 22, 345-423.

Session 8

Fairness and Trust

Colquitt, J. A., Conlon, D. E., Wesson, M. J., Porter, C. O. L. H., & Ng, K. Y. (2001). Justice at the millennium: A meta-analytic review of 25 years of organizational justice research. Journal of Applied Psychology, 86, 425-445.

Simons, T., & Roberson, Q. (2003). Why managers should care about fairness: The effects of aggregate justice perceptions on organizational outcomes. Journal of Applied Psychology, 88, 432-443.

Liao, H., & Rupp, D. E. (2005). The impact of justice climate and justice orientation on work outcomes: A cross-level multifoci framework, Journal of Applied Psychology, 90, 242-256.

Wiesenfeld, B., Brockner, J., Swann, W., & Bartel, C. A. (2007). Is more fairness always preferred? Self-esteem moderates reactions to procedural justice. Academy of Management Journal, 50(5), 1235-1253.

Kahneman, D., Knetsch, J. L., & Thaler, R. H. (1986). Fairness and the assumptions of economics. Journal of Business, 59, S285-300.

McAllister, D.J. (1995). Affect- and cognition-based trust as foundations for interpersonal cooperation in organizations. Academy of Management Journal, 38, 24-59.

Robinson, S. R. (1996). Trust and breach of the psychological contract. Administrative Science Quarterly, 41, 574-599.

Andersson, L.M. & Pearson, C.M. (1999). Tit for tat?: The spiraling effect of incivility in the workplace, Academy of Management Review, 24, 452-471.

Session 9

Individual Differences and Diversity

Barrick, M.R. & Mount, M. (1991). The big five personality dimensions & job performance: A meta-analysis. Personnel Psychology, 44, 1-26.

Judge, T.A. & Bono, J.E. (2001). Relationship of core self-evaluation traits – self-efficacy, locus of control, and emotional stability with job satisfaction and job performance: A meta-analysis, Journal of Applied Psychology, 86, 80-92.

Gully, S. M., & Chen, G. (in press). Individual differences, attribute-treatment interactions, and training outcomes. To appear in: S. W. J. Kozlowski & E. Salas (Eds.), Learning, training, and development in organizations. SIOP Organizational Frontiers Series. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Hambrick, D.C., Cho, T.S., & Chen, M.J. (1996). The influence of top management team heterogeneity on firms' competitive moves, Administrative Science Quarterly, 41, 659-684.

Van Knippenberg, D. & Schippers, M.C. (2007). Work group diversity. Annual Review of Psychology, 58, 515-541.

Milliken, F. J., & Martins, L. L. (1996). Searching for common threads: Understanding the multiple effects of diversity in organizational groups. Academy of Management Review, 21, 402-33.

Pelled, L. H., Eisenhardt, K. M., & Xin, K. R. (1999). Exploring the black box: An analysis of work group diversity, conflict, and performance. Administrative Science Quarterly, 44, 1-28.

Harrison, D.A., Price, K.H., Gavin, J.H., & Florey, A.T. (2002). Time, teams, and task performance: Changing effects of surface- and deep-level diversity on group functioning. Academy of Management Journal, 45(5), 1029-1045.

Liao, H., Chuang, A., & Joshi, A. (2008). Perceived deep-level dissimilarity: Personality antecedents and impact on overall job attitude, helping, work withdrawal, and turnover. Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 106, 106-124.

Session 10

Attitudes, Moods & Emotions

Salancik, G.R. & Pfeffer, J. (1978). A social information processing approach to job attitudes and task design. Administrative Science Quarterly, 23, 224-253.

Staw, B. M., & Barsade, S. G. (1993). Affect and managerial performance: A test of the sadder-but-wiser vs. happier-and-smarter hypotheses. Administrative Science Quarterly, 38, 304-331.

Rafaeli, A., & Sutton, R. I. (1987). Expression of emotion as part of the work role. Academy of Management Review, 12, 23-37.

Sutton, R. I., & Rafaeli, A. (1988). Untangling the relationship between displayed emotions and organizational sales: The case of convenience stores. Academy of Management Journal, 31, 461-487.

Bartel, C. A., & Saavedra, R. (200). The collective construction of work group moods. Administrative Science Quarterly, 45, 197-231.

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

Schaubroeck, J. & Merritt, D.E. (1997). Divergent effects of job control on coping with work stressors: The key role of self-efficacy. Academy of Management Journal, 40, 738-754.

Hareli, S., & Rafaeli, A. (2008). Emotion cycles: On the social influence of emotion in organizations. Research in Organizational Behavior, 28, 35-59.

Session 11

Groups and Teams

Shea, G.P. & Guzzo, R.A.(1987). Group effectiveness: What really matters? Sloan Management Review, 28 (3), 25-31.

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: Theory, Research, and Practice, 1, 7-27.

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

Salk, J.E., & Brannen, M.Y. (2000). National culture, networks, and individual influence in a multinational management team, Academy of Management Journal, 43, 191-202.

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

Edmondson, A. (1999). Psychological safety and learning behavior in work teams. Administrative Science Quarterly, 44, 350-383.

Colquitt, J.A., Zapata-Phelan, C.P. & Roberson, Q.M. (2005). Justice in teams: A review of fairness effects in collective contexts, Research in personnel and human resources management, 24, 53-94.

Humphrey, S.E., Hollenbeck, J.R., Meyer, C.J., and Ilgen, D.R. (2002). Hierarchical decision making teams. In Ferris and Martocchio (Eds.), *Research in Personnel and Human Resource Management*, pp. 175-213. Stamford, CT: JAI Press.

Session 12

Leadership

Phillips, J.M. (1995). Leadership since 1975: Advancement or inertia? Journal of Leadership Studies, 2, 58-80.

Bauer, T.N., Erdogan, B., Liden, R.C., & Wayne, S.J. (2006). A longitudinal study of the moderating role of extraversion: LMX, performance, and turnover during new executive development. Journal of Applied Psychology, 91, 298-310.

Ahearne, M., Mathieu, J., & Rapp, A. (2005). To empower or not to empower your sales force? An empirical examination of the influence of leadership empowerment behavior on

customer satisfaction and performance. Journal of Applied Psychology, 90, 945-955.

Judge, T. A., & Piccolo, R. F. (2004). Transformational and transactional leadership: A metaanalytic test of their relative validity. Journal of Applied Psychology, 89, 755-768.

Piccolo, R.F. & Colquitt, J.A. (2006). Transformational leadership and job behaviors: The mediating role of job characteristics, Academy of Management Journal, 49, 327-340.

Ensari, N., & Murphy, S. E. (2003). Cross-cultural variations in leadership perceptions and attribution of charisma to the leader. Organizational Behavior & Human Decision Processes, 92, 52-67.

Erdogan, B., Liden, R.C., & Kraimer, M.L., (2006). Justice and leader-member exchange: The moderating role of organization culture. Academy of Management Journal, 49, 395-406.

Session 13

Student presentations

Session 14

Student presentations