BUSMHR 8601   **Ben Tepper**
Organizational Behavior Part One   **Fisher 700**
Spring 1 2018   **tepper.15@osu.edu**
Monday 11:30 to 2:15

Overview: The purpose of this seminar is to introduce students to theory and empirical research in the field of micro-organizational behavior (OB). We will do this through thoughtful examination of conceptual, empirical, and review articles and chapters that address core topics pertaining to individual work behavior and social processes. Our goals are to understand and move beyond historical trends and prevailing views. You will be challenged to think creatively about OB constructs and processes by applying different perspectives and theoretical lenses. The knowledge base is a "work-in-progress" to which doctoral-level students are expected to contribute. This seminar is not intended to be exhaustive in its coverage. The OB field is huge and growing and it is safe to assume that we will not get to many interesting and important topics. You are therefore encouraged to treat the assigned readings as merely a starting point for a deeper examination of central OB topics and, of course, those that evoke your intrinsic interest.

Readings: The reading assignment for each week will consist of approximately 150 pages of journal text. These will be stored on a folder that all students can access. If you have any problems accessing the readings, let me know right away.

Student Evaluation: You will be evaluated on the following criteria.
In-seminar contributions: 20%
Weekly integrative reviews of the assigned readings: 50%
Final paper and presentation: 30%

Involvement in Seminar Discussion: I expect you to be an active participant in each session's discussion. It is critical that you read and digest the assigned material before coming to class and that you spend time thinking about the readings' implications. This requires reading and often re-reading the assigned papers. As you prepare to discuss each of the assigned papers you will find it helpful to think about the following questions:

- What is the paper's primary contribution? What do you find most interesting about the paper?
- Are the arguments convincing? How do the authors' arguments differ from those made by other authors?
- For empirical papers, upon what theories do the authors draw, what methodological features are sound and what could be done better, and what are the boundary conditions for the conclusions that the authors draw?
- What are the most compelling questions that have not been addressed in prior research and how would you test them?

Weekly integrative reviews: Each week, you will submit a 5-page (double-spaced) overview that explains how and why the field changed over time and where you believe the field is going or should go next. Your goal is not to restate what is said in particular papers, but to offer an integrative understanding of themes and trends. A strong write-up will review the major theoretical perspectives and relevant empirical evidence, and convey your knowledge of historical trends, prevailing views, and future directions. Your integrative review will conclude with a novel hypothesis – a prediction that has not been previously tested and which would not seem immediately obvious to others – and supporting arguments. In evaluating the reviews, I will use the following five-point scale:

4 = Exceptional work
3 = Good work
2 = Modest work; a re-write is optional
1 = Weak work: must redo

Final Paper and Presentation: Students will write a conceptual paper that strives to modify and/or extend how we think about one of the topics that the seminar covers. Strong papers will not merely review existing theory and research, but leverage prior literature to develop new insights and propositions. This paper must be original work and should not be part of another project that involves coauthors. Papers will be 15 to 20 double-spaced pages and be prepared in accordance with the Academy of Management style guide. As you prepare your paper and corresponding presentation, please be mindful of the following dates:

February 12: students will share their respective paper topics with the class; bring to the class meeting a one page outline of what the paper will cover and be prepared to provide an overview to classmates.

Date TBD: students will submit final course papers and do a ten minute, power-point presentation; bring a two page handout that describes the paper's key points and includes a depiction of your model; we will nail down the date for these activities at our first class meeting.

Academic Integrity: All university and college regulations concerning academic honesty shall apply. In general, students are expected to recognize and uphold standards of intellectual and academic integrity. The university assumes as a minimum standard of conduct in academic matters that students be honest and that they submit for credit only the products of their own efforts. It is particularly important that students read and understand the portions of the *Ohio State University's Code of Student Conduct* that relate to plagiarism, unauthorized collaboration, falsification, and multiple submissions. The Code of Student Conduct is available online. This Policy represents a core value of the University. All members of the University community are responsible for knowing and abiding by its tenets. Students are expected to carefully review the online Policy prior to undertaking any research or other assignments. Students are encouraged to discuss freely with faculty any questions they may have pertaining to the provisions of the Code prior to submitting assignments. Lack of knowledge of the contents of the University Policy on Academic Honesty is not an acceptable defense to any charge of academic dishonesty**.**

Schedule

January 8: Person versus Situation

Kenrick, D. T., & Funder, D. C. (1988). Lessons from the person-situation debate. *American Psychologist*, 43: 23-32.

Davis-Blake & Pfeffer (1989). Just a mirage: The search for dispositional effects in organizational research. *Academy of Management Review*, 14: 385-400.

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

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

Schneider, Goodstein, & Smith (1995). The ASA framework: An update. *Personnel Psychology*, 48, 747-773.

Schmidt, F., & Hunter, J. (2004). General mental ability in the world of work: Occupational attainment and job performance. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 84: 162-173.

Edwards, J. R., Cable, D., Williamson, I., Lambert, L., & Shipp A. (2006). The phenomenology of fit: Linking the person and the environment to the subjective experience of fit. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 91: 802-827.

Chatterjee, A., & Hambrick, D. (2007). It's all about me: Narcissistic chief executive officers and their effects on company strategy and performance. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 52: 351-386.

January 22: Attitudes

Judge, Weiss, Kammeyer-Mueller, & Hulin (2017). Job attitudes, job satisfaction, and job affect: A century of continuity and change. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 102, 356-374.

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

Ajzen (1991). The theory of planned behavior. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 50: 179-211

Judge, Thoresen, Bono, & Patton (2001). The job satisfaction-job performance relationship: A qualitative and quantitative review. *Psychological Bulletin*, 127-407.

Schneider, Hanges, Smith, & Salvaggio (2003). Which comes first: Employee attitudes or organizational financial and market performance? *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 88: 836-851.

Staw & Cohen-Charash (2005). The dispositional approach to job satisfaction: More than a mirage, but not yet an oasis. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 26, 59-78.

Gerhart (2005). (The affective) dispositional approach to job satisfaction: Sorting out the policy implications. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 25: 79-97.

January 29: Motivation

Kanfer, Frese, & Johnson (2017). Motivation related to work: A century of progress. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 102: 338-355.

Vardi & Wiener (1996) Misbehavior in organizations: A motivational framework. Organization Science, 7, 151-165.

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

Brett, J., & Stroh, L. (2003). Working 61 plus hours a week: Why do managers do it? *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 88: 67-78.

Tolli & Schmidt (2008). The role of feedback, causal attributions, and self-efficacy in goal revision. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 93, 692-701.

Grant (2008). The significance of task significance: Job performance effects, relational mechanisms, and boundary conditions. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 93, 108-124. Also read Grant, 2009, IOP. Putting self-interest out of business? Contributions and unanswered questions from use-inspired research on prosocial motivation. *Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, 2, 94-98.

Lanaj, Johnson, & Lee (2016). Benefits of transformational behaviors for leaders: A daily investigation of leader behaviors and need fulfillment. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 101: 237-251.

February 5: Justice

Rupp, Shapiro, Folger, Skarlicki, & Shao (2017). A critical analysis of the conceptualization and measurement of organizational justice: Is it time for reassessment? *Academy of Management Annals*, 11, 919-959.

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

Kray & Lind (2002). The injustices of others: Social reports and the integration of others' experiences in organizational justice judgments. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 89, 906-924.

Goldman & Cropanzano (2015). "Justice" and "fairness" are not the same thing. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 36, 313-318.

Ganegoda & Folger (2015). Framing effects in justice perceptions: Prospect theory and counterfactuals. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 126, 27-36.

Colquit, Long, Rodell, & Halvorsen-Ganepola (2015). Adding the "in" to justice: A qualitative and quantitative investigation of the differential effects of justice rule adherence and violation. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 100, 278-297.

Matta, Scott, Colquitt, Koopman, & Passantino (2017). Is consistently fair better than sporadically fair? An investigation of justice variability and stress. *Academy of Management Journal*, 60, 743-770.

February 12: Leadership

Lord et al. (2017). Leadership in applied psychology: Three waves of theory and research. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 102: 434-451.

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

Erdogan & Bauer (2010). Differentiated leader-member exchanges: The buffering role of justice climate. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 95, 1104-1120.

Glynn & Raffaelli (2010). Uncovering mechanisms of theory development in an academic field: Lessons from leadership research. *Academy of Management Annals*, 4, 359-401.

Johnson, Venus, Lanaj, Mao, & Chang (2012). Leader identity as an antecedent of the frequency and consistency of transformational, consideration, and abusive leadership behaviors. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 97, 1262-1272.

Van Vugt & Ronay (2014). The evolutionary psychology of leadership: Theory, review, and roadmap. *Organizational Psychology Review*, 4: 74-95.

Carter, DeChurch, Braun, & Contractor (2015). Social network approaches to leadership: An integrative conceptual review. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 100, 597-622.

February 19: Power and Influence

Kipnis, Schmidt, & Wilkinson (1980). Intraorganizational influence tactics: Explorations in getting one's way. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 65: 440-452.

Kipnis, Schmidt, Price, & Stitt (1981). Why do I like thee: Is it your performance or my orders? *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 66, 324-328.

Yukl, Kim, & Falbe (1996). Antecedents of influence outcomes. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 81, 309-317.

Galinsky, Magee, Gruenfeld, Whitson, & Liljenquist (2008). Power reduces the press of the situation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 95, 1450-1466.

Smith et al. (2008). Lacking power impairs executive functions. *Psychological Science*, 19, 441-447.

Tost, Gino, & Larrick (2012). Power, competitiveness, and advice taking: Why the powerful don't listen. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 117, 53-65.

Blader & Chen (2012). Differentiating the effects of status and power: A justice perspective. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 102, 994-1014.

Laurin, Kay, Proudfoot, & Fitzsimons (2013). Response to restrictive policies: Reconciling system justification and psychological reactance. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 122, 152-162.

TBD: Paper Submission and Presentations