Seminar in Organizational Behavior

Professor Ingrid Fulmer
Office Hours: Email for an appointment
Janice H. Levin Building, #215B
ifulmer@smlr.rutgers.edu

Course Overview

This seminar is designed to familiarize PhD students with the range of topics, theories, and frustrations associated with the study of individual, interpersonal, and team behavior in organizations. Given the huge literature in organizational behavior[1], this course is not intended to be exhaustive or comprehensive. Instead is designed to provide a broad overview and then a more in-depth introduction to selected topic areas.

Readings will include articles and chapters that are conceptual/theoretical in nature, original empirical studies, research literature reviews, and meta-analyses. The seminar itself will be a collaborative effort between the students and instructor aimed at producing thoughtful analysis and discussion.

A key component of the class is individual, in-depth work on a specific topic. This is your chance to adapt the course to your own research interests by focusing on specific organizational behavior research topics that have relevance to your own research.

Readings

See syllabus for the list of readings for a particular week. There are a handful of articles and chapters throughout the term that are not available electronically through the library website. We will discuss those on the first day of class. NOTE: There are readings for the first day of class, so be sure to come to class prepared to discuss those readings.

---

[1] The domain statement of the Academy of Management OB Division notes: "Organizational behavior is devoted to understanding individuals and groups within an organizational context. The field focuses on attributes, processes, behaviors, and outcomes within and between individual, interpersonal, group, and organizational levels of analysis. Major topics include:
 • individual characteristics such as beliefs, values, personality, and demographic attributes, and individual processes such as learning, perception, motivation, emotions, and decision making
 • interpersonal processes such as trust, justice, power/politics, social exchange, and networks
 • group/team characteristics such as size, diversity, and cohesion, and group/team processes such as development, leadership, decision making, and cooperation and conflict
 • organizational processes and practices such as leadership, goal setting, work design, feedback, rewards, communication, and socialization
 • contextual influences on individuals and groups such as organizational and national culture, and organizational identity and climate
 • and the influence of all of the above on individual, interpersonal, group, and organizational outcomes such as performance, creativity, attachment, citizenship behaviors, stress, absenteeism, turnover, deviance, and ethical behavior."

Discussion leader schedule (see more detailed schedule of readings and due dates later in syllabus)

Date	Topic	Discussion leader
January 21	Intro to OB Impactful research in OB	Ingrid Fulmer
January 28	Individual differences	
February 4	Affect and emotion	
February 11	Attitudes and attributions	
February 18	Workplace behaviors	
February 25	Motivation I – classic theories	
March 4	Motivation II – contemporary themes	
March 11	Leadership	
March 25	Teams and networks	Mike Kukenberger and Jessica Methot (guest facilitators)
April 1	Contextual effects (other than national culture) in organizational behavior	
April 8	Negotiation and conflict	
April 15	Cross-cultural issues in OB	Leigh Anne Liu (guest facilitators)
April 22	How people see their work and see themselves at work (identity, job crafting, fit, psychological contracts)	
April 29	Student presentations	
May 6	Scholarly success Student presentations (if necessary)	Ingrid Fulmer

Deliverables and Expectations

Course grade:

Your course grade will be determined with reference to the following components:

1) Class participation and discussion leadership (40%)
2) Proposal and final paper   (40%)
3) Paper presentation (20%)

1) Class participation:

a. To make valuable contributions to the class, it is essential for ALL students to prepare for and participate actively in EACH class. This means reading and thinking critically about assignments BEFORE class. It means making quality contributions to class discussions by listening carefully to the comments of others and building on their ideas.

Each week, a participant will be responsible for facilitating the discussion and structure for the session (see "Discussion Leader" section below). This does not mean, however, that if it is not your week you are "off the hook"—you always need to come prepared.

Each week (except for the first class meeting and the week when you are the discussion leader), you will write a 1-2 page (single-spaced) memo/journal of typed notes and reflections on the readings. Submit your review (upload into the Sakai drop box) by **4 pm** the day before our class (put your last name and date in the document title).

In this memo, you should go beyond simply summarizing each paper. You can do summaries on your own if you like, but for the memo you turn in to me, I want you to develop and refine the habit of deeper critical thinking about the readings (i.e., understanding and perhaps questioning the assumptions in the papers, integrating and comparing across papers, thinking about implications for future research and for practice, etc.). You may want to highlight different points of view or apparent contradictions in the various readings, or relate the papers to previous weeks' readings, or go in depth on a particular concept or theme that shows up in several articles. You have flexibility here, but the point is to think deeply about the readings.

Also, your weekly write-up should always conclude with the following: (1) at least one or two points or questions you could raise to enrich the discussion in class, and (2) at least one research question or idea that comes to mind that is in some way related to the readings.

I review each of these write-ups every week to see how the members of the class are understanding the readings, etc. I will periodically comment on them, either in person or by email to you, highlighting some interesting insights or suggesting alternative ways to improve your critical thinking. I will not respond to every single write-up every week.

After class, all the write-ups for that day will be posted to Sakai and available for your classmates to read, in case you are interested in seeing how other people are interpreting the readings.

b. Class participation also includes providing high quality written feedback to other members of the class. This includes noting strengths and weaknesses (including suggestions for improvement) of the research paper proposal/outline that each student will do.

Important point: It is easy to be critical of others' work. The greater skill is in (1) developing the ability to give constructive criticism (How might it be done better?), and (2) recognizing that there are always trade-offs in research; every manuscript you read has both strengths and weaknesses. It is important to be able to recognize both, and not just point out the flaws. You will find that these skills come in handy as you review others' work, either informally, as a friendly reviewer, or formally, as a reviewer for a conference and/or journal.

c. Please let me know in advance if you will miss class. Absences may affect your participation grade.

2) Discussion leadership:

Each student will assume responsibility for leading class discussions on specific topics for one or two class meetings during the semester. The assignments for the semester will be determined on the first day of class. When you are discussion leader, you should be especially well prepared for class because you will guide our analysis and integration of the readings. See appendix of this syllabus for discussion leader guidelines.

As discussion leader, you will provide each member of the class with a 1-2 page handout that structures the class and summarizes key points. Please provide me with an outline of your plan for class and your handout by **4 pm** the day before class.

Be sure to structure our class time so we
  - discuss individual readings (briefly—allocate more time to the following. . .)
  - compare and contrast perspectives
  - summarize primary themes and contributions of the overall set of readings
  - identify gaps and potential areas for future research.

Be sure you provide thought-provoking discussion questions that stimulate engaging class interaction.   In addition, as discussion leader, be sure to facilitate the participation of all class members and manage the discussion so we stay focused on the topic. Plan the class discussion so that we focus on comparison, contrast, and integration during at least the last 15 minutes of class. In other words, you should make sure we do not run out of time to do this part.

3) Paper

Each seminar participant will prepare a scholarly paper on a specific research topic related to organizational behavior that develops a new perspective. This paper should be your own original work and should not be part of a larger project that involves other people (although it can be part of a planned future project). In other words this should be new material, not written or developed by anyone else but yourself. This paper should NOT simply be a summary or review of the literature. Instead, it should be a conceptual paper that develops a new idea or the novel integration of two previously separate perspectives, topics, or theories. Your paper should draw on existing theoretical and empirical organizational behavior literature to develop a set of theoretically-based propositions. Although your paper should include an in-depth review of the literature on your specific topic, the primary focus of the paper should be your own unique contribution, insights, and extension of prior research. (See paper guidelines at the end of this syllabus).

Process and deadlines:

You will first prepare a proposal of your idea and paper outline and submit to me and to the class for feedback. The proposal and outline for the paper is due on **March 4, 2014**. This written proposal should include a 2-3 page description of your specific research topic, how it will contribute to the literature, and why you think the idea is interesting, and a rough, 1 page outline

of the paper. If you have a theoretical model in mind, go ahead and include a figure if you like. Submit 3 copies of your proposal, one for me and one for each of two classmates who will be providing feedback.

At the next class meeting (**March 11, 2014**), each member of class will bring two copies of **written feedback** on strengths, weaknesses, and suggestions (2 pages single-spaced) on the proposals of two other students. One copy of your feedback is for me, and the other for the students whose proposal you read.

Two copies of your final written paper (20 – 30 pages, double-spaced in 12 point font, with 1 inch margins – page length does not include references and attachments) accompanied by your proposal and outline (with my original feedback attached) are **due by 5:00 p.m. on Friday, May 9.**

4) Paper Presentations (April 29)

You should plan to prepare a PowerPoint presentation of your paper, similar to what you would do for an academic conference or job talk (except shorter, probably 12-15 minutes). We'll talk specifics closer to presentation time.

At the beginning of the presentation, provide each class member with a two-page, single-spaced written handout (not an outline) that describes the key points in your paper, including a figure of your model.

During the presentation, describe your specific research topic, your model, proposed relationships, the theoretical justification for your propositions, and the key contributions of your paper. Your goal is to stimulate our thinking and class discussion. You should be prepared for questions from the audience.

The presentations are intentionally scheduled about 10 days before the paper is due so that you can incorporate any feedback or address any issues that arise as a result of preparing and presenting the paper.

Due Dates

Assignments are due when specified. If you do not turn in an assignment on time, this may result in a grade of zero for that component of the course. Exceptions will be considered o y under critical extenuating circumstances that you discuss with me in advance of the due date and time.

Word to the wise OB students

You will need to prepare for qualifying exams in the future, and one way to help yourself in this endeavor is to begin to develop good study and organizational habits now. I would advise that you find some way that works for you to organize your readings in this course (and other seminars), perhaps even preparing outlines as you go, so that you will be somewhat more organized when you are studying for qualifying exams. Check with more senior students to see what they have done in this regard (or what they wish they had done in hindsight!).

Seminar Schedule

Date	Topic and readings

January 21, Week 1	**1. Overview of the course**
	
	2. Trends
	
	Miner, J.B. (2003). The rated importance, scientific validity, and practical usefulness of organizational behavior theories: A quantitative review. Academy of Management Learning and Education, 2, 250-268.
	
	3. Some characteristics of good OB scholarship (some of these you may have read if you took Susan's class last summer; if you haven't read these, then go ahead and get familiar with them)
	
	Klein, K.J., & Zedeck, S. (2004). Theories in applied psychology: Lessons (Re)learned. Journal of Applied Psychology, 89, 931-933.
	
	Bacharach, S. 1989. Organizational theories: Some criteria for evaluation. Academy of Management Review, 4: 496-515.
	
	Edmondson, A.C., & McManus, S.E. (2007). Methodological fit in management field research. Academy of Management Review, 32, 1155-1179.
	
	Davis, M.S. (1971) That's interesting! Philosophy of the Social Sciences, I, 309-344.
	
	3. Questions – Be prepared to discuss in class
	  1. What causes research topics to become "interesting" and then less interesting?
	  2. What areas of organizational behavior interest you the most at this time? Explain.
	
	(Note: See additional optional readings in appendix.)

January 28, Week 2	**Individual differences** *Individual differences in a sampling of recent research:* Grant, Gino, & Hofmann, 2011. Reversing the extraverted leadership advantage: The role of employee proactivity. Academy of Management Journal, 54: 528-550. Judge & Hurst, 2008. How the rich (and happy) get richer (and happier): Relationship of core self-evaluations to trajectories in attaining work success. Journal of Applied Psychology, 93, 849-863. O'Boyle, E.H. Forsyth, D.R., Banks, G., McDaniel, M.A. 2012. A meta-analysis of the dark triad and work behavior: A social exchange perspective. Journal of Applied Psychology, 97: 557-579. *The debate about whether individual differences matter (skim these for background):* House, Shane, and Herold (1996). Rumors of the death of dispositional research are vastly exaggerated. Academy of Management Review, 21, 203-224. Davis-Blake and Pfeffer (1989). Just a mirage: The search for dispositional effects in organizational research. *Academy of Management Review*, 14, 385-400. *Review article on GMA (a "classic"):* Schmidt & Hunter (2004). General mental ability in the world of work: Occupational attainment and job performance. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 96, 162-173 *"Classic" article on personality (the most highly cited article ever in PP)* Barrick and Mount (1991). The Big Five personality dimensions and job performance: A meta-analysis. *Personnel Psychology*, 44: 1-26. Optional: Mayer, Roberts, Barsade (2008). Human abilities: Emotional intelligence. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 59, 507-536. (Regulatory focus) Higgins, T. 1997. Beyond pleasure and pain. American Psychologist, 52: 1280-1300.
February 4, Week 3	**Affect and emotion** *Review article:* Hillary Anger Elfenbein (2007) 7 Emotion in Organizations, The Academy of Management Annals, 1:1, 315-386, DOI: 10.1080/078559812 (**let me know if you cannot get this through library)

	Two short articles giving two sides of debate on experienced emotion and cognition:
	Zajonc (1984). On the primacy of affect. *American Psychologist, 39:* 117-123.
	Lazarus (1984). On the primacy of cognition. *American Psychologist, 39:* 124-129.
	Affect infusion model (one theoretical approach to relationship between cognition and affect)
	Forgas & George (2001). Affective influences on judgments and behavior in organizations: An information processing perspective. Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 86, 3-34.
	Emotional labor – example qualitative and quantitative studies
	Sutton, 1991. Maintaining norms about expressed emotions: The case of bill collectors. Administrative Science Quarterly, 36, 245-268.
	Judge, Woolf, & Hurst 2009. Is emotional labor more difficult for some than for others? A multi-level, experience sampling study. Personnel Psychology, 62: 57-88.
	New and interesting -- from psychology and neuroscience to OB: implicit (unconscious) affect --(just skim to get the idea)
	Barsade, Ramarajan & Weston 2009. Implicit affect in organizations. Research in Organizational Behavior, 29: 135-162.
	Optional:
	(Trait (or dispositional) affectivity) George (1992). The role of personality in organizational life: Issues and evidence. Journal of Management, 18, 185-213.
	Izard, C.E. 2009. Emotion theory and research: Highlights, unanswered questions, and emerging issues. Annual Review of Psychology, 60:1-25.
February 11, Week 4	**Social cognitive processes: Attitudes and attributions**
	Recent empirical study disentangling "work engagement" from other job attitudes constructs (e.g., satisfaction):
	Christian, Garza, Slaughter, 2011. Work engagement: A quantitative review and test of its relations with task and contextual performance. Personnel Psychology, 64: 89-136.
	Example of attribution concepts used in OB (focus on the role of attributions as you read)
	LePine and Van Dyne (2001). Peer responses to low performers: An attributional model of helping in the context of groups. Academy of Management Review, 26, 67-74.

	Social attitudes and job attitudes Bohner & Dickel (2011). Attitudes and attitude change. *Annual Review of Psychology, 62:391-417* *Judge & Kammeyer-Mueller 2012. Job attitudes. Annual Review of Psychology, 63: 341-67 (this article includes a section that explains difference/relationship between social attitudes and job attitudes)* *One well-known social psychological theory on the link between attitudes and behaviors:* Ajzen (1991). The theory of planned behavior. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 50, 179-211. *Attribution theories – Review article:* Mitchell (1982). Attributions and actions: A note of caution. *Journal of Management*, 8, 65-75. *Optional:* *Locus of control-- individual differences in attributions:* *Rotter (1966). Generalized expectancies for internal versus external control of reinforcement. Psychological Monographs, 80(1, Whole No. 609).* *Dispositions and job attitudes* Staw, Bell and Clausen (1986). The dispositional approach to job attitudes: A lifetime longitudinal test. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 31*: 56-78. Gerhart (1987). How important are dispositional factors as determinants of job satisfaction: Implications for job design and other personnel programs. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 72,366-373.
February 18, Week 5	**Workplace behaviors (task performance, citizenship behaviors, deviance)** *Do happier workers perform better?* Riketta (2008). The causal relation between job attitudes and performance: A meta-analysis of panel studies. *Journal of Applied Psychology,* 93,472-481. *Organizational Citizenship Behaviors (OCB)* Ilies, R., Scott, B.A., & Judge, T.A. (2006). The interactive effects of personal traits and experienced states on intraindividual patterns of citizenship behavior. *Academy of Management Journal,* 49, 561-575. Bergeron, D.M., Shipp, A., Benson, R., Furst, S.A. 2013. Organizational citizenship behavior and career outcomes: The cost of being a good citizen. Journal of Management, 39: 958-984.

	Deviant workplace behaviors Wang, Liao, Zhan, & Shi (2011). Daily customer mistreatment and employee sabotage against customers: Examining emotion and resource perspectives. *Academy of Management Journal*, 54:312-334. Berry, C. M., Ones, D. S., & Sackett, P. R. (2007). Interpersonal deviance, organizational deviance, and their common correlates: A review and meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 92,* 410-424. Optional: Brayfield and Crockett (1955). Employee attitudes and employee performance. *Psychological Bulletin, 52,* 396-424. Remus Ilies, Ingrid Smithey Fulmer, Matthias Spitzmuller, and Michael Johnson (2009). Personality and citizenship behavior: The role of job satisfaction. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 94*, 945-959.
February 25, Week 6	**Motivation in the workplace I (overview and a sampling of classic theories)** *Review:* 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. *Job characteristics:* Hackman & Oldham (1976). Motivation through the design of work. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 16*, 250-279. Fried & Ferris (1987). The validity of the job characteristics model: A review and meta-analysis. *Personnel Psychology*, 40, 287-322. *Goal setting theory:* Locke & Latham (2002). Building a practically useful theory of goal setting and task motivation. *American Psychologist*, 57:705-717. *Equity theory:* Adams (1965). Inequity in social exchange. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, pp. 267-299. *Expectancy theory:* Vroom (1964). Chapters 2 and 3 of *Work and Motivation*. New York: John Wiley & Sons. Optional:

	Latham & Locke, 1991. Self-regulation through goal-setting. Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 50, 212-247.
March 4, Week 7 **Proposal and outline for final paper due**	**Motivation II – Contemporary themes - Self-regulation (individuals and teams), new approaches to job design (relational job design)**
	Self-regulation
	Review article:
	Lord, Diefendorff, Schmidt, & Hall. 2010. Self-regulation at work. Annual Review of Psychology, 61:543-68.
	Team motivation and self-regulation:
	Gersick, 1988. Time and transition in work teams. Academy of Management Journal, 31: 9-41. (interesting, documents naturally occurring patterns in teams)
	Park, Spitzmuller, & DeShon 2013. Advancing Our Understanding of Team Motivation: Integrating Conceptual approaches and content areas. Journal of Management, 2013 39: 1339-1379.
	Relational job design:
	Grant (2007). Relational job design and the motivation to make a prosocial difference. Academy of Management Review, 32: 393-417.
	Optional:
	Smither, London & Reilly (2005). Does performance improve following multisource feedback? A theoretical model, meta-analysis, and review of empirical findings. Personnel Psychology, 58, 33-66.
	Uhl-Ben, M. & Graen 1998. Individual self-management: Analysis of professionals' self-managing activities in functional and cross-functional work teams, Academy of Management Journal, 41, 340-350
	Ashford, Blatt, & VandeWalle (2003). Reflections on the looking glass: A review of research on feedback-seeking behavior in organizations. Journal of Management, 29, 773-799.
March 11 Week 8 **Feedback on others' proposals and outlines due**	**Leadership**
	Recent or semi-recent interesting papers
	Grant 2012. Leading with Meaning: Beneficiary Contact, Prosocial Impact, and the Performance Effects of Transformational Leadership. Academy of Management Journal, 55: 458-476.
	Epitropaki O, Martin R. 2005. From ideal to real: a longitudinal study of the role of implicit leadership theories on leader-member exchanges and

employee outcomes. J. Appl. Psychol. 90:659–76

Review of leadership theories (skim):

Avolio, B.J., Walumbwa, F.O., & Weber, T.J. 2009. Leadership: Current theories, research and future directions. Annual Review of Psychology, 60: 421-449.

Hollander & Offerman (1990). Power and leadership in organizations. *American Psychologist*, 45, 179-189.

Leader-member exchange (LMX):

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

Individual differences and leadership:

Judge, Colbert, & Ilies (2004). Intelligence and leadership: A quantitative review and test of theoretical propositions. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 89, 542-552.

Optional:

Judge et al (2002). Personality and leadership: A qualitative and quantitative review . *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87, 765-780.

Daan van Knippenberg & Sim B. Sitkin (2013) A Critical Assessment of Charismatic—Transformational Leadership Research: Back to the Drawing Board?, The Academy of Management Annals, 7:1, 1-60, DOI: 10.1080/19416520.2013.759433

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

Eagly et al (2003). Transformational, transactional, and laissez-faire leadership styles: A meta-analysis comparing women and men. *Psychological Bulletin*, 129-569-591.

Van Vugt, Hogan, & Kaiser (2008). Leadership, followership, and evolution. *American Psychologist*, 63, 182-196

Burke et al. (2006). What type of leadership behaviors are functional in teams?: A meta-analysis. *Leadership Quarterly,17, 288-307.*

Bono, J.E., & Judge, T.A. (2004). Personality and transformational and transactional leadership: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 89, 901-910.

Ilies, R., Nahrgang, J.D., & Morgeson, F.P. (2007). Leader-member exchange and citizenship behaviors: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 92, 269-277.

March 25 Week 9	**Teams and networks (Jessica Methot and Mike Kukenberger, guest facilitating)** READINGS TO BE DETERMINED Optional: *Review article* Martin Kilduff & Daniel J. Brass (2010) Organizational Social Network Research: Core Ideas and Key Debates , The Academy of Management Annals, 4:1, 317-357, DOI: 10.1080/19416520.2010.494827
April 1, Week 10	**Contextual Effects (other than national culture) in OB (cross-cultural context coming up in 2 weeks!)** Background and theory about how context can matter: Johns, G. 2006. The essential impact of context on organizational behavior. Academy of Management Review, 31:386-408. Virtual settings: Barry, B., & Fulmer, I.S. 2004. The medium and the message: The adaptive use of communication media in dyadic influence. Academy of Management Review, 29, 272-292. Naquin, C.E., Kurtzberg, T., R., & Belkin, L.Y. 2010. The finer points of lying o ine: E-Mail versus pen and paper. Journal of Applied Psychology, 95: 387-394. Organizational control systems (outcome-based vs. behavior-based): Bergeron, D., Shipp, A.J., Rosen, B., & Furst, S. 2013. Organizational Citizenship Behavior and Career Outcomes: The Cost of Being a Good Citizen. Journal of Management, 39: 958-984 Organizational differences and paid vs. volunteer workers: Pearce, J.L. 1983. Job Attitude and Motivation Differences Between Volunteers and Employees From Comparable Organizations. Journal of Applied Psychology, 68: 646-652. Contextual factors influencing team diversity-performance relationship Joshi, A., & Roh, H. 2009. The role of context in work team diversity research. Academy of Management Journal, 52: 599-627.

	Optional: *Organizational climates:* Priesemuth, M., Schminke, M., Ambrose, M., & Folger, R. (in press). Abusive supervision climate: A multiple-mediation model of its impact on group outcomes. Academy of Management Journal. *Another short background article:* Rousseau, D., & Fried, Y. 2001. Location, location, location: contextualizing organizational research. Journal of Organizational Behavior, 22: 1-13.
April 8, Week 11	**Negotiation and Conflict** A couple of recent articles: Lelieveld, et al., 2012. Why Anger and Disappointment Affect Other's Bargaining Behavior Differently: The Moderating Role of Power and the Mediating Role of Reciprocal and Complementary Emotions. Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 38: 1209-___. de Wit, Jehn, & Scheepers, 2013. Task conflict, information processing, and decision-making: The damaging effect of relationship conflict. Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processing, 122:177-189. *Negotiation - Review:* Thompson, Wang, & Gunia. 2010. Negotiation. Annual Review of Psychology, 61:491-515. *Task/relationship conflict debate:* Jehn (1995). A multimethod examination of the benefits and detriments of intragroup conflict. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 40*, 256-282. De Dreu and Weingart (2003). Task versus relationship conflict, team performance, and team member satisfaction: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 88, 741-749. *Deception:* Shapiro & Bies (1994). Threats, bluffs, and disclaimers in negotiations. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 60,* 14-__. Optional-classics: Barry & Friedman (1998). Bargainer characteristics in distributive and integrative negotiation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 74*, 345-359. Thompson & Hastie (1990). Social perception in negotiation. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 47*, 98-123.
April 15,	**Cross-cultural issues in OB (Leigh Anne Liu, Guest Facilitator)**

Week 12	*First, three articles on cultural frameworks:*
	
	House, R. et al., 2004. Chapter 3. A Nontechnical summary of GLOBE findings. In House, R. J., Hanges, P.J., Javidan, M., Dorfman, P.W., & Gupta, V. 2004 (eds.), Leadership, Culture, and Organizations: The GLOBE Study of 62 Societies. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage. [see pdf]
	
	Schwartz, S.H. 2006. Basic human values: Theory, measurements, and applications. *Revue française de sociologie, 47/4.* [see pdf]
	
	Gelfand, M., Raver, J., Nishii, L., Leslie, L., & Lun, J., and colleagues 2011. Differences between tight and loose societies: A 33-nation study. *Science, 33:* 1100-1104.
	
	      Article: http://www.sciencemag.org/content/332/6033/1100.full.pdf
	      Supporting Materials:
	      http://www.gelfand.umd.edu/Gelfand.SOM.pdf
	      *Theoretical Background: Gelfand, M.J., Nishii, L.H., & Raver, J.L. (2006). On the nature and importance of cultural tightness-looseness. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 91*: 1225-1244.
	
	Second, three articles on culture's dynamic influence on cognition and behavior:
	
	Kirkman, B. L., Chen, G., Farh, J. L., Chen, Z. X., & Lowe, K. B. 2009. Individual power distance orientation and follower reactions to transformational leaders: A cross-level, cross-cultural examination. *Academy of Management Journal, 52*: 744-764.
	
	Hong, Y., Morris, M. W., Chiu, C., & Benet-Martinez, V. (2000). Multi-cultural minds: A constructivist approach to culture and cognition. *American Psychologist, 55*: 709-720.
	
	Liu, L. A., Friedman, R., Barry, B., Gelfand, M. J., & Zhang, Z. X. (2012). The Dynamics of consensus building in intracultural and intercultural negotiations. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 57*(2): 269-304.
	
	**see Appendix for long list of optional readings in this area if you are interested

April 22 Week 13	**How people see their work and see themselves at work (identity, job crafting, fit, psychological contracts)** **Identity** 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. **Job crafting** Wrzesniewski, A., & Dutton, J.E. (2001). Crafting a job: Revisioning

employees as active crafters of their work. Academy of Management Review, 26, 179-201.

Person-organization fit, social exchange, psychological contracts

P.O. Fit

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

Sluss & Thompson 2012. Socializing the newcomer: The mediating role of leader–member exchange. Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 119:114-125.

Psychological contracts:

Rousseau (1990). New hire perceptions of their own and their employer's obligations: A study of psychological contracts. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 11, 389-400.

Zhao et al (2007). The impact of psychological contract breach on work-related outcomes. *Personnel Psychology*, 60, 647-680.

Optional

P-O fit:

Kristoff-Brown, et al. (2005). Consequences of individuals' fit at work: A meta-analysis of person-job, person-orgaization, person-group, and person-supervisor fit. Personnel Psychology, 58, 281-342.

Exchange relationships more generally:

Coyle-Shapiro & Conway (2005). Exchange relationships: Examining psychological contracts and perceived organizational support, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 90, 774-781.

Flynn (2005). Identity orientations and forms of social exchange in organizations. *Academy of Management Review*, 30, 737-750.

Job design/job crafting:

Morgeson, Delaney-Klinger, & Hemingway (2005). The importance of job autonomy, cognitive ability, and job-related skill for predicting role breadth and job performance. Journal of Applied Psychology, 90, 399-406.

Grant, A.M., Campbell, E.M., Chen, G., Cottone, K., Lapedis, D., & Lee, K. (2007). Impact and the art of motivation maintenance: The effects of contact with beneficiaries on persistence behavior. Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 103, 53-67.

McAllister, D.J., Kamdar, D., Morrison, E.W., & Turban, D.B. (2007). Disentangling role perceptions: How perceived role breadth, discretion, instrumentality, and efficacy relate to helping and taking charge. Journal of Applied Psychology, 92, 1200-1211.

Thatcher, S.M.B., & Zhu, X. (2006). Changing identities in a changing workplace: Identification, identity enactment, self-verification, and

	telecommuting. Academy of Management Review, 31, 1076-1088.
April 29 Week 14	Student presentations

May 6
Week 15
	Student presentations (if necessary),
	
	Making an Impact; Scholarly Success
	
	Hollenbeck, J.R., & Mannor, M.J. (2007). Career success and weak paradigms: The role of activity, resiliency, and true scores. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 28*, 933-942.
	
	Trevino, L.K. (2008). Why review? Because reviewing is a professional responsibility. *Academy of Management Review*, 33, 8-10.
	
	Judge, T.A., Cable, D.M., Colbert, A.E., & Rynes, S.L. 2007. What causes a management article to be cited—Article, author, or journal? Academy of Management Journal, 50: 491-506.
	
	Optional:
	Gulati, R. (2007). Tent poles, tribalism, and boundary spanning: The rigor-relevance debate in management research. *Academy of Management Journal*, 50, 775-782.
	
	Leung, K. (2007). The glory and tyranny of citation impact: An East Asian perspective. *Academy of Management Journal*, 50, 510-513.
	
	Tushman, M., & O'Reilly, C. III. (2007). Research and relevance: Implications of Pasteur's quadrant for doctoral programs and faculty development. *Academy of Management Journal*, 50, 769-774.
	
	Questions – Scholarly Processes (jot down your answers and be prepared to discuss in class):
	    1. What aspects of being an academic are most intrinsically motivating to you now?
	    2. How might this change over the next ten years?
	    3. Develop a five year plan for yourself as a scholar.
	    4. Describe a research question that you would pursue if you had u imited resources.

Due date: May 9 ***Final paper due by 5:00**	

p.m.	

Discussion Leader Guidelines

Discussion Leader GOAL: To structure and guide high quality scholarly interaction

      1. Establish the order for our discussion of the papers (organizing framework)
          Make sure we review / critique each paper (strengths and weaknesses)

      2. Manage the discussion
          So that everyone has a chance to participate
          To keep us focused on academic aspects of the topic, not just personal anecdotes
          To provide discussion questions to stimulate engaging interaction

      3. Focus the last 15 minutes of class on conclusions that integrate across all papers
          Facilitate summary, comparison, and contrast
          Discuss observations about future research

      4. Prepare a short (1-2 page) handout with your organizing framework and summary of the topic.
          Include strengths and weaknesses of the literature on this topic

As a group, our goal is to listen carefully to each other and build on prior comments. We will concentrate on depth of thinking and critique (not on simple summaries or descriptions of the papers)

1. Title
       a. Attract interest and attention to your idea
       b. Specify key theories and/or constructs so readers can anticipate your topic

2. Topic and research focus
       a. In one sentence, summarize your theory building research project
       b. Focus on a particular aspect of the topic (choose a relatively narrow topic)
       c. Explain why this is an important topic

3. Theoretical framework
       a. State the one theory that provides the foundation for your work
       --This theory should be the source of the key constructs in your model,
              dimensions of key concepts, proposed relationships, etc.
       b. Provide citations to the original theory
       c. Indicate other theoretical perspectives that you considered

4. Key concepts and definitions of key concepts
       a. Predictors
       b. Outcomes
       c. Mediators
       d. Moderators

5. Proposed relationships
       a. State the propositions in your model.
       b. Support these proposed relationships based on theory.
       c. Attach a model/diagram that summarizes your propositions and depicts proposed relationships.

6. Boundary conditions
       a. Describe the focus and limits of your theory building
       b. Describe the contexts where will your proposed relationships should be relevant.
       --This could include type of organization, group, job, geographic location, cultural values, etc.

7. Level of conceptualization
       For example - is your primary focus on actions, decisions, individuals, groups, or organizations?

8. Empirical test of your model
       While the primary focus of this paper is on developing and communicating theory, you should also devote a bit of thought to how someone (maybe you) might test this idea in the future. What sort of sample and study design would be appropriate? What challenges could you anticipate running into?
       -- This section should be one page long, two at the most.

Paper Guidelines (p. 2 of 2)

9. That's interesting; potential contributions

Explain why your theory building is interesting
Link your model back to your theoretical foundation and back to practical issues
Explain the potential contribution of your model to research and to practice

Miscellaneous

Make sure your final product has been proofed, spell-checked, and is in proper format, including the reference list. You may use the format specified in the *Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association* ("APA format"), or you may use another style guide/format that is appropriate and accepted for top journals in your area (e.g., the format used for Academy of Management journals. To find this, see the information for authors at the AMJ website and dow oad the style guide there.).

Appendix- optional additional readings on various topics:

Week 1: Introduction

Johns, G. 2006. The essential impact of context in OB. Academy of Management Review, 31:386-408.

Fiske, S.T. 2004. Mind the gap: In praise of informal sources of formal theory. Personality and Social Psychology Review, 8:-132-137.

Van de Ven, A.H., & Johnson, P.E. (2006). Knowledge for theory and practice. *Academy of Management Review*, 31, 802-821.

Alvesson, M., & Karreman, D. (2007). Constructing mystery: Empirical matters in theory development. *Academy of Management Review*, 32, 1265-1281.

Klein, K.J., & Zedeck, S. (2004). Introduction to the special section on theoretical models and conceptual analysis. Theories in applied psychology: Lessons (Re)learned. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 89, 931-933.

Palmer, D. (2006). Taking stock of the criteria we use to evaluate one another's work: ASQ 50 years out. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 51, 535-559.

McGahan, A.M. (2007). Academic research that matters to managers: On zebras, dogs, lemmings, hammers, and turnips. Academy of Management Journal, 50, 748-753.

Alvesson, M., & Sandberg, J. 2011. Generating research questions through problematization. Academy of Management Review, 37: 247-271.

Week 12: Cross-cultural issues in OB:

Further readings:
Cultural Frameworks & Overviews of Cross-Cultural Research
1. Taras, V., Kirkman, B. L., & Steel, P. 2010. Examining the impact of Culture's consequences: A three-decade, multilevel, meta-analytic review of Hofstede's cultural value dimensions. Journal of Applied Psychology, 95(3), 405-439.
   *Also check out: http://geert-hofstede.com/national-culture.html
2. Schwartz, S. H. 1994. Beyond individualism/collectivism: New cultural dimensions of values. In U. Kim et al. (Eds.) Individualism and collectivism: Theory, method, and applications: 85-119.
3. Swidler, A. 1986. Culture in Action: Symbols and Strategies. American Sociological Review, 51, 273-286.
4. Tsui, A.S., Nifadkar, S. & Ou, Y. 2007. Cross-national cross-cultural organizational behavior research: Advances, gaps, and recommendations. Journal of Management, 28(3): 277-305.

Etic vs. Emic Perspectives, Indigenous Approaches to Culture
5. Morris, M. W., Leung, K., Ames, D., & Lickel, B. 1999. Views from inside and outside: Integrating emic and etic insights about culture and justice judgment. Academy of Management Review, 24(4): 781-796.

6. Oyserman, D., M. Kemmelmeier & H. Coon. 2002. Cultural Psychology, a New Look: Reply to Bond (2002), Fiske (2002), Kitayama (2002), and Miller (2002). Psychological Bulletin, 128: 110-117.
7. Sanchez-Burks, J. 2002. Protestant Relational Ideology and (In)Attention to Relational Cues in Work Settings. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 83:4, 919-929.
8. Luo, Y. & Shenkar O., 2006. The Multinational Corporation as a Multilingual Community: Language and Organization in a Global Context Journal of International Business Studies, 37, 321-339.
9. Chinese Culture Connection. 1987. Chinese Values and the Search for Culture-Free Dimensions of Culture. Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 18: 143-164.
10. Farh, J.L., Hackett, R.D. & Liang, J. 2007. Individual-Level Cultural Values as Moderators of Perceived Organizational Support-Employee Outcome Relationships in China: Comparing the Effects of Power Distance and Traditionality. Academy of Management Journal, 50: 715-729.

Cross-Cultural Cognition & Behaviors

11. Nisbett, R., Peng, K., Choi, I., & Norenzayan, A. 2001. Culture and systems of thought: Holistic versus analytic cognition. Psychological Review, 108, 291-211.
12. Zou, X., Tam, K., Morris, M. W., Lee, S., Lau, I. Y., & Chiu, C. (2009). Culture as common sense: Perceived consensus versus personal beliefs as mechanisms of cultural influence. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *97*: 579-597.
13. Iyengar, S. S., & Lepper, M. R. (1999). Rethinking the Value of Choice: A Cultural Perspective on Intrinsic Motivation. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology. 76, 349-366.
14. Gibson, C.B., & Zellmer-Bruhn, M. 2002. Metaphors and meaning: An intercultural analysis of the concept of teamwork. Administrative Science Quarterly, 46: 274-303.

Multiculturalism, CQ, Global Identity, and Competence

15. Levy O., Beechler S., Taylor S., Boyacigiller N. 2007. What We Talk about When We Talk about 'Global Mindset': Managerial Cognition in Multinational Corporations Journal of International Business Studies, 38, 231-258.
16. Ang, S., & Van Dyne, L. 2008. Conceptualization of cultural intelligence: Definition, distinctiveness, and nomological network. In S. Ang, & L. Van Dyne, (Eds.) ***Handbook on Cultural Intelligence: Theory, Measurement and Applications*** (pp. 3-15). Armonk, NY: M.E. Sharpe. (http://www.culturalq.com/docs/Ang%20&%20Van%20Dyne%202008%20Handbook%20Ch%201%20Conceptualization%20of%20CQ.pdf)
17. Van Dyne, L., Ang, S., Ng, K.-Y., Rockstuhl, T., Tan, M.L., & Koh, C. 2012. Sub-dimensions of the four factor model of cultural intelligence: Expanding the conceptualization and measurement of cultural intelligence (CQ). ***Social and Personal Psychology: Compass***, 6/4, 295-313. (http://www.culturalq.com/docs/Compass%202012%20Van%20Dyne%20et%20al%20Sub-dimensions.pdf)
18. Erez, M. & E. Gati. 2004. A Dynamic Multi-Level Model of Culture: From the Micro Level of the Individual to the Macro Level of a Global Culture. Applied Psychology: An International Review, 53(4): 583-598.
19. Bird, A., Mendenhall, M. E., Stevens, M. J., Oddou, G. 2010. Defining the domain of intercultural competence for global leaders. Journal of Managerial Psychology, 25(8), 810-828.

20. Leung, A. K-y., Maddux, W. W., Galinsky, A. D., & Chiu, C-y. (2008). Multicultural experience enhances creativity: The when and how? *American Psychologist, 63*, 169-181.