Doctoral Seminar in Advanced Organizational Behavior McCombs School of Business Fall 2009

Professor Caroline Bartel

Phone: 471-8314

Email: Caroline.Bartel@mccombs.utexas.edu

SEMINAR OVERVIEW

The field of Organizational Behavior stretches far and wide. An important challenge that you face as a doctoral student is developing your own "mental map" of this field. My role in this course is to provide a (partial) guided tour through the field of Organizational Behavior so that you can begin to develop this map.

The objective of the course is to provide foundation knowledge in Organizational Behavior, including classic and contemporary theories, ongoing controversies, and ground breaking empirical studies. In a single semester it is impossible to complete an exhaustive tour of the field, thus we will explore select research domains that will give you a sufficient lay of the land. My goals are to help you to gain broad familiarity with theory and research concerned with micro-organizational processes, and to help you develop the analytical skills necessary to critically evaluate and integrate work in this area. I will also encourage you to use the course to hone your own research agenda. In the end, my intent is to prepare you to contribute to the current dialogue in the field.

To accomplish these objectives will require a great deal of reading on your part. It is critical that you read the material before class, as well as spend some time thinking about the implications of the readings. In the course schedule that follows, there will be a set of assigned readings for each class. I suggest that you read them in the order listed. Sometimes "optional readings" are listed that provide examples of other exemplary papers on the topic, though I will not expect that you will have read them. It normally will be your responsibility to locate the material on-line or in the library; if the material is difficult to obtain, I will post a PDF on Blackboard.

Most people refer to the key journals in the field simply by acronyms; here's a list of acronyms you may not yet be familiar with:

- AMJ: Academy of Management Journal
- AMR: Academy of Management Review
- ASQ: Administrative Science Quarterly
- JAP: Journal of Applied Psychology
- JOB: Journal of Organizational Behavior
- JOM: Journal of Management
- JPSP: Journal of Personality and Social Psychology
- OBHDP: Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes
- OS: Organization Science
- Psych Bull: Psychological Bulletin
- PSPB: Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin
- ROB: Research in Organizational Behavior

SEMINAR REQUIREMENTS

CLASSROOM NORMS

This is a discussion-based seminar that requires your active involvement. Accordingly, attendance is required for every class session. Also, please be on time. Because enrollment in this seminar is intentionally restricted to create an intimate forum for discussion, coming late to class is highly disruptive to everyone.

Each week you will be asked to read 5 or 6 journal articles or book chapters. Our goal each week is to generate a high quality discussion that promotes understanding of some of the central issues, concepts and debates in the field of organizational behavior. In class we will aim to cover as many readings as time permits. However, on some occasions we will not be able to discuss each reading in depth. You should not view a failure to cover every reading as a shortcoming of the class discussion.

EVALUATION CRITERIA

Seminar requirements and evaluation criteria include the following:

- Class preparation and contributions (40%)
- Short papers (30%)
- Research proposal (30%)

Class preparation and contributions (40%)

There are four components of this course requirement, which comprise 40% of your final grade:

- 1. First, I expect you to be an active and constructive participant during each session. This requires reading and often re-reading the assigned articles and chapters. In general, you should seek a firm understating of the purpose and logic for a given paper. More importantly, you should strive to reach beyond basic reactions to the readings and instead consider:
 - What is good about this paper?
 - What is the basic formulation of the theory (constructs and relationships among them), and what drives the theory? What are the theoretical foundations of the research?
 - What assumptions do different perspectives make about people? About organizations? How tenable are the assumptions?
 - What is the main contribution of this paper? What are the interesting ideas?
 - What could have been improved in the paper?
 - Do you believe the arguments (about the theory and the conclusions drawn from the data)? What would it take to convince you?
 - What are the boundary conditions of the argument? In other words, for whom and under what circumstances does the argument apply and not apply?
 - 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?

Overall, expect to spend long hours dissecting the assigned readings. Go over a reading until you are certain you understand its basic premises and arguments (see "Tips for Reading Academic Journal Articles" on page 5) 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 will submit two questions or comments about the material by Monday evening. You can post these directly on our Blackboard site so that everyone has a chance to examine them before class. Your questions/comments should tap into one or more of the issues listed above. These questions/comments are very important as they will be the stimuli that get our class discussion going.
- 2. Second, all seminar participants are responsible for helping to lead our discussions on multiple occasions. In our second class meeting we will assign the dates for which you will help lead our discussion. Your role is *not* merely to summarize readings but, rather, to prepare discussion questions and observations that highlight the main issues, strengths, weaknesses, controversies, and gaps in the readings for that week. This role, obviously, requires an integrated and thorough understanding of the readings.

Generally speaking, you will be responsible for leading the discussion of the topic—you are <u>not</u> responsible for selecting additional readings (you may, however, find it useful to do some additional reading for your own purposes). You may begin by providing your own synopsis of the topic and then presenting what you feel are the critical questions, fundamental flaws, or promising new research directions in the area. While it is often useful to include a detailed analysis/critique of each article separately, some people prefer to instead focus on a broad overview. You should assume that the other seminar participants have also read the material carefully, so your job is primarily to generate discussion, not to provide a lecture and summary.

- 3. Third, each student is responsible for providing a cutting edge research briefing on multiple occasions (assigned the second week of class), 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, as well as working paper series posted on the web.
- 4. Lastly, you will serve as a reviewer for one of your classmates. Your job will be to read a draft of that classmate's final paper and provide a constructive review of it. You should plan on writing 2-3 pages single spaced. The objectives of this assignment are: (1) to hone your critical reviewing skills; (2) to get you in the practice of thinking and writing as though you are a reviewer of your own work. You will receive a paper to review on Saturday December 5th and your completed review is due via on Wednesday December 9th.

To summarize, your class preparation and contributions include:

- Being on time and thoroughly prepared for class, and being an active participant
- Submitting two questions/comments on Blackboard the Monday before each class session
- Serving as a discussion facilitator on one or more occasions
- Providing a research briefing to the class on one or more occasions
- Serving as a reviewer for a fellow colleague

Weekly position papers and innovation papers (30%)

Weekly position papers provide additional opportunities for you to thoughtfully reflect upon key concepts or theories raised by the readings of the week. These papers should NOT be a summary of the main ideas and findings in the readings. Rather, it is your chance to think about the implications of the readings. For example, what do they make you wonder about? What lines of inquiry might they open up? How do the readings relate to each other and to readings from previous weeks? **You are responsible for writing 6 position papers.** You can choose any six sessions to write about, beginning with Session 3 (11 total

options, sessions 3-13). Your position paper (maximum 2 double-spaced pages) is due at the <u>beginning</u> of the session; no late papers will be accepted.

Innovation papers provide opportunities for you to practice constructing testable hypotheses. You will prepare two innovation papers (3-4 double-spaced pages). These papers will be brief presentations of novel hypotheses. I will provide the details for each paper approximately one week in advance of its due date. These papers are due on October 6th and November 3rd.

Research proposal and presentation (30%)

This paper will be an analysis of a topic of your choosing and should add new knowledge or bring a new perspective to old findings within the field. The paper should review prior research on your topic or related literatures (if your topic is quite new), and then should 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 short "Method" section describing how you would empirically test your hypotheses, and a brief "Implications" section that outlines the limitations of your paper and methods, and its theoretical and practical contributions.

Overall, the proposal or paper should be 15-20 double-spaced typed pages and please use 12-point font.

- A one-page description of your research proposal is due via email on November 13th by 5pm, which I will promptly return in the next class session.
- On December 1st, you will make a brief presentation of your ideas to the class.
- A complete draft of your paper is due via email on Friday December 4th.
- Your review of a classmate's draft is due on Wednesday December 9th.
- Your completed paper is due via email on Monday December 14th.

Tips on Reading Academic Journal Articles

It's typical that seminar participants differ in their experience with reading journal articles. Reading journal articles often can seem like a daunting task. They are usually full of domain-specific 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.

Thus, a lot of the information given may seem irrelevant—but it is not. This information will help you to determine how much stock to put into the research. The methodological and statistical details, in particular, provide vital information for determining an article's strengths and weaknesses, and generally for determining whether it is an example of "good scholarship." Therefore it is important that you learn how to read journal articles so that you gain the relevant information, yet be aware of their limitations.

Though you will develop your own strategy over time, here are some questions you should aim to answer when reading a given paper:

- What is the aim of the research? Specifically, what "big picture" practical question is highlighted and what more focused research question is addressed?
- Why is this research question important? Meaning, why should anyone care?
- What do we already know about this research question? That is, what does past research on this issue say?
- What is the author's approach to the research question? (i.e., what is the theoretical foundation)?
- How is this approach different from what we already know? Why should anyone 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 given 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 does the research offer?
- What do you think of the research? What do you see as its strengths and weaknesses?

Seminar Outline

<u>Session 1: September 1</u> Setting the Stage – What is OB?

Cappelli, P., & Scherer, P. D. (1991). The missing role of context in OB: The need for a meso-level approach. In L. L. Cummings and B. M. Staw, <u>Research in Organizational Behavior</u> (Vol. 13, 55-110). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

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

Heath, C., & Sitkin, S. (2000). Big-B versus Big-O: An examination into what is distinctly organizational about organizational behavior. Journal of Organizational Behavior, 22 (1): 1-16.

Supplementary (optional) reading you may find useful:

Rousseau, D. M. (1997). Organizational behavior in the new organizational era. <u>Annual Review of</u> Psychology, 48: 515-546.

Cascio, W. F. & Aguinis, H. 2008. Research in industrial and organizational psychology from 1963 to 2007: Changes, choices, and trends. Journal of Applied Psychology, 93(5): 1062-1081.

Session 2: September 8

Motivation—Classic Perspectives

Roethlisberger, F. J. (1941). The Hawthorne experiments. In F. J. Roethlisberger, <u>Management and morale</u>. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Vroom, V. H. (1964). Work and motivation. New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Adams, J. S. (1965). Inequity in social exchange. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), <u>Advances in Social Psychology</u>, 2: 267-299. New York: Academic Press.

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

Landy, F., & Becker, S. (1987). Motivation theory reconsidered. In B. M. Staw and L. L. Cummings (Eds.), Research in Organizational Behavior (Vol. 9, pp. 1-38). JAI Press, Greenwich, CT.

Staw, B., & Boettger, R. (1990). Task revision: A neglected form of work performance. <u>Academy of Management Journal</u>, 33: 534-559.

For your own reference (optional), two excellent reviews:

Pittman, T. S. (1998). Motivation. In D. T. Gilbert, S. T. Fiske, and G. Lindzey (Eds.), <u>The handbook of social psychology</u> (4th Ed., pp. 549-590). New York: McGraw-Hill.

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

Session 3: September 15

First Encounters with Organizations -- Entry & Socialization

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.

Chatman, J. (1991). Matching people and organizations: Selection and socialization in public accounting firms. Administrative Science Quarterly, 36: 459-484.

Morrison, E. W. (1993). Longitudinal study of the effects of information seeking on newcomer socialization. Journal of Applied Psychology, 78: 173-183.

Optional (not really!) reading:

I strongly suggest reading this paper –it will be helpful in interpreting papers throughout the semester.

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

Session 4: September 22

Above & Beyond what is Required -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. <u>Journal of Applied Psychology</u>, 71: 492-499.

Allen, N. J., & Meyer, J. P. (1996). Affective, continuance, and normative commitment to the organization: An examination of construct validity. <u>Journal of Vocational Behavior</u>, 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.

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.

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

Session 5: September 29

Self-Presentation and Impression Management in Organizations

Swann, W. B. Jr. (1987). Identity negotiation: Where two roads meet. <u>Journal of Personality and Social Psychology</u>, 53: 1038-1051.

Ibarra, H. (1999). Provisional selves: Experimenting with image and identity in professional adaptation. <u>Administrative Science Quarterly</u>, 44: 764-791.

Kilduff, M., & Day, D. (1994). Do chameleons get ahead? The effects of self-monitoring on managerial careers. <u>Academy of Management Journal</u>, 37: 1047-1060.

Becker, T. E. & Martin, S. L. (1995). Trying to look bad at work: Methods and motives for managing poor impressions in organizations. Academy of Management Journal, 38: 174-199.

Bolino, M. C. (1999). Citizenship and impression management: Good soldiers or good actors? <u>Academy of Management Review</u>, 24: 82-98.

For your reference (optional), an excellent review:

Schlenker, B. R. (2003). Self-presentation. In M. R. Leary and J. P. Tangey (Eds.), <u>Handbook of self and identity</u> (pp. 492-518). New York: Guilford Press.

Session 6: October 6

What Does It Mean To Identify With An Organization?

** Innovation Paper # 1 due

Tajfel, H., & Turner, J. C. (1986). The social identity theory of intergroup behavior. In S. Worchell and W. G. Austin (Eds.), <u>Psychology of intergroup relations</u> (pp. 7-24). Chicago: Nelson-Hall.

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

Brewer, M. B. (1991). The social self: On being the same and different at the same time. <u>Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin</u>, 17: 475-482.

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.

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.

For your reference (optional), an excellent review:

Pratt, M. G. (1998). To be or not to be? Central questions in organizational identification. In D. A. Whetten and P. C. Godfrey (Eds.), <u>Identity in organizations</u>: <u>Building theory through conversations</u> (pp. 171-207). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Session 7: October 13

Dynamics of Power and Status

French, J. R. P. Jr., & Raven, B. (1959). The bases of power. In D. P. Cartwright (Ed.), <u>Studies in social power</u> (pp. 150-167). Ann Arbor, MI: Institute for Social Research, The University of Michigan.

Ibarra, H. (1993). Network centrality, power and innovation involvement: Determinants of technical and administrative roles. Academy of Management Journal, 36: 471-501.

Lee, F., & Tiedens, L. (2001). Is it lonely at the top? The independence and interdependence of power holders. Research in Organizational Behavior, 23: 43-91.

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

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

Session 8: October 20

Equity and Justice in the Workplace

Greenberg, J. (1990). Employee theft as a reaction to underpayment inequity: The hidden cost of pay cuts. <u>Journal of Applied Psychology</u>, 75: 561-568.

Brockner, J., & Wiesenfeld, B. M. (1996). An integrative framework for explaining reactions to decisions: Interactive effects of outcomes and procedures. <u>Psychological Bulletin</u>, 120: 189-208.

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. <u>Journal of Personality and Social Psychology</u>, 70: 913-930.

Ambrose, M. L., Seabright, M. A., Schminke, M. (2002). Sabotage in the workplace: The role of organizational injustice. <u>Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes</u>, 89: 947-965.

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

Session 9: October 27

Being Different - Diversity and Organizational Experiences

O'Reilly, III, C. A., Caldwell, D. F., & Barnett, W. P. (1989). Work group demography, social integration, and turnover. <u>Administrative Science Quarterly</u>, 34: 21-37.

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

Chatman, J. A., Polzer, J. T., Barsade, S. G., & Neale, M. A. (1998). Being different yet feeling similar: The influence of demographic composition and organizational culture on work processes and outcomes. Administrative Science Quarterly, 43: 749-780.

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

Ely, R. J., & Thomas, D. A. (2001). Cultural diversity at work: The effects of diversity perspectives on work group processes and outcomes. Administrative Science Quarterly, 46: 229-273.

For your reference:

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

Williams, K.Y., & O'Reilly III, C. A. (1998). Demography and diversity in organizations. In B. M. Staw and R. I. Sutton (Eds.), <u>Research in Organizational Behavior</u> (Vol. 20, pp. 77-140). Stamford, CT: JAI Press.

<u>Session 10: November 3</u> *Mood & Emotion in Organizational Life*

** Innovation Paper #2 due

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

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

Amabile, T. M., Barsade, S., Mueller, J. S., & Staw, B. (2005). Affect and creativity: A daily longitudinal test. Administrative Science Quarterly, 50: 367-403.

Bartel, C. A., & Saavedra, R. (2001). The collective construction of work group mood. <u>Administrative Science</u> Quarterly, 45: 197-231.

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

Session 11: November 10

Groups in Organizations: Part 1

Short description of Final Paper by Friday November 13th via email by 5pm

Asch, S. E. (1955). Opinions and social pressure. Scientific American, 193: 31-35.

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

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

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.

Gersick, C. J. G., & Hackman, J. R. (1990). Habitual routines in task-performing groups. <u>Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes</u>, 47: 65-97.

Also for your own reference (optional), excellent reviews:

McGrath, J. E. (1997). Small group research, that once and future field: An interpretation of the past with an eye to the future. <u>Group Dynamics: Theory, Research, and Practice</u>, 1: 7-27.

Levine, J. M., & Moreland, R. L. (1998). Small groups. In D. T. Gilbert, S. T. Fiske, and G. Lindzey (Eds.), The Handbook of Social Psychology (4th Ed., pp. 415-469). New York: McGraw-Hill.

Hackman, J. R. (1992). Group influences on individuals in organizations. In M. D. Dunnette & Hough, L. M. (Eds.), <u>Handbook of Industrial and Organizational Psychology</u> (Vol. 3, pp. 199-268). Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.

Session 12: November 17

Groups in Organizations: Part 2

Wageman, R. (1995). Interdependence and group effectiveness. Administrative Science Quarterly, 40: 145-180.

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. <u>Administrative Science</u> Quarterly, 44: 350-383.

<u>Lewis</u>, K., Lange, D., & Gillis, L. (2005). Transactive memory systems, learning, and learning transfer. <u>Organization Science</u>, 16: 581-598.

November 24th – No Class Thanksgiving break

Session 13: December 1 Student Presentations

You will deliver a 10-15 minute presentation of your research ideas to the class.

You should bring and distribute to the class a handout that includes:

- Title
- Abstract (maximum 200 words). The abstract should summarize the paper and convey its broader implications and be devoid of mathematical symbols, acronyms, citations, or technical jargon.
- Reference list. This should represent the conceptual (and empirical) foundation for your proposal.

NOTE: Draft 1 of your final paper is due via email on Friday, December 4th.

NOTE: You will receive a paper to review via email on Saturday morning, December 5th.

NOTE: Your written review of a classmate's paper is due on Wednesday December 9th. Email your review directly to your classmate and copy me on the message.

NOTE: Your completed paper is due via email on Monday December 14th.