RUTGERS UNIVERSITY
GRADUATE BUSINESS SCHOOL

SPECIAL TOPICS: ADVANCED OB (26:620:685)
Dr. Chao C. Chen, 1097 Washington Park; (Tel): 973-353-5425; (Fax): 973-353-1664;
Email: chaochen@business.rutgers.edu

CLASS HOURS: Tuesday 2:00-4:50pm, Room 502 1 WP
OFFICE HOUR: Tuesday: 1:00-2:00pm or by appointment
FOR INCLEMENT WETHER: NW: 973-353-1766; NB: 732-932-1766

Objectives

This doctoral seminar is designed to focus on special topics of interest to those students who have a reasonable level of familiarity with the basic areas of organizational behavior. Drawing on theory and research in psychology, social psychology, and organizational behavior, we shall explore in greater depth current topics of organization and management identified as most interesting to the participating students. The emphasis will be on theoretical model development on the basis of literature review of previous theories and empirical research. Students will also identify the appropriate research design to test all or some of the hypotheses that they have developed. The theory and method thus make up a research proposal that is ready for research execution and is competitive for an AOM Conference submission.

Students will read current and foundational theories and research surrounding selected topics of their own and of their peers. The readings are grouped under required and recommended readings. For the development of one's own individual research proposal, the reading list usually includes both the required and the recommended and even more. For class discussion, it is important that everyone read the required readings for every topic before class and spend time reflecting so as to come up with research ideas on the topic. The effectiveness of this class depends heavily on not only independent work on one's own topic but also providing critical and constructive comments on fellow students' topics.

Course Requirements

Class Participation	20%
Weekly submission	20%
Review for colleagues	20%
Research proposal (term paper)	40%

Class participation (20%)

Class participation is based on: (1) active engagement in classroom discussion and (2) acting as a session leader.

1. **Active engagement in class discussion.** Each student must be prepared to discuss all the required readings for each class session. As you review each reading, you might want to consider the following issues:

- What is the basic formulation of the theory (constructs and relationships among them), and what drives the theory?
- What are the underlying assumptions?
- What is the main contribution of this paper? What are the interesting ideas?
- Do you agree with the argument made? What would it take to convince you?
- What are the boundary spanning conditions of the argument; in other words, 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?

And, for empirical papers, you might also consider:

- How are the variables operationalized? Is this consistent with the theory?
- Are the data analyzed and interpreted effectively?

2. **Session leader.** Each student will lead a session once during the semester. The session consists of two major parts: 1) commenting and discussing the readings, 2) identifying new research ideas, and 3) presenting a theoretical model for guiding future research in a specific area. For leading the discussion, the session leader provides an organizing framework summarizing the week's readings and exploring similarities, differences, contributions, and gaps in the readings. For identifying new research ideas, the session leader solicits and encourages class participants for different and novel research topics. And finally present the theoretical model with hypotheses and a figure that illustrates the hypothesized relationships.

Weekly submissions (20%)

Except for the week when you serve as the session leader, each student submits a one single spaced page to summarize new ideas inspired by the readings. A new idea is usually made up of a few inter-related hypotheses that are defensible from theory, logic, and previous empirical research if any. The new idea should, in your judgment, contribute to the existing literature in some way, whether it further refines and clarifies some conceptual and theoretical ambiguity, fills some gap, solves some tension or conflict, or challenges some convention.

Peer Reviews (20%)
One of the duties of a scholar is to review research from colleagues. To hone your critical reviewing skills and get you in the practice of thinking and writing as though you are a reviewer of your own work, you will be asked to serve as a reviewer for two classmates. Your job will be to read the papers and provide a constructive, critical review of each paper (approximately 3 pages). Two copies of each review will be submitted on the day of the presentation after the proposal is presented: one for the author, the other one for me.

Research proposal (40%)

The research proposal is due in two weeks after the student's initially presented his or her research model. The research proposal provides each student the opportunity to conceive and plan a study on the topic of the student's choice. In the proposal, you should provide a literature review of the related work to-date, a theoretical framework consisting of hypotheses, and methodology to be used for testing the hypotheses (for the format, use AMJ publications as examples). The paper should be in no more than 15 double-spaced pages of text. Each student will give a 20 minutes presentation of his or her proposal on the day of the submission. The final proposal will be submitted on the last day of the class and should be accompanied with a point by point response that details how you address the issues raised by the peer reviews. You do not have to always agree with the reviewers' comments but no point should be left unaddressed.

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

OUTLINE OF CLASSES

Overview

1 – Sept 7	Class Introduction
2 – Sept 14	Multilevel theory and research
3 – Sept 21	Peer reviews
4 – Sept 28	Culture and cognition
5 – Oct 05	Faultlines and subgroup formation
6 – Oct 12	Ethical leadership
7 – Oct 19	Organizational justice
8 – Oct 26	Leadership and motivatioin
9 – Nov 02	Presentations
10 – Nov 09	Work and family
11 – Nov 16	Presentations
12 – Nov 23	Topic to be arranged
13 – Nov 30	Topic to be arranged
14 – Dec. 07	Presentation and final submissions

Class 1 – Introduction and Planning

Each student identify one topic of research to be focused in this course, report prior work on this topic, assess familiarity with the literature and an action plan for completing a research proposal within the course of this class. We will also schedule the sequence of the topics to be covered in this class. Following is a tentative schedule.

Class 2 Multilevel Theory Building

1. Klein, K., Tosi, H., & Cannella Jr, A. (1999). MULTILEVEL THEORY BUILDING: BENEFITS, BARRIERS, AND NEW DEVELOPMENTS. *Academy of Management Review*, *24*(2), 248.

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

3. Kim, P., Dirks, K., & Cooper, C. (2009). THE REPAIR OF TRUST: A DYNAMIC BILATERAL PERSPECTIVE AND MULTILEVEL CONCEPTUALIZATION. *Academy of Management Review*, *34*(3), 401-422.

4. Hitt, M., Beamish, P., Jackson, S., & Mathieu, J. (2007). BUILDING THEORETICAL AND EMPIRICAL BRIDGES ACROSS LEVELS: MULTILEVEL RESEARCH IN MANAGEMENT. *Academy of Management Journal*, *50*(6), 1385-1399.

5. Taggar, S. (2002). INDIVIDUAL CREATIVITY AND GROUP ABILITY TO UTILIZE INDIVIDUAL CREATIVE RESOURCES: A MULTILEVEL MODEL. *Academy of Management Journal*, *45*(2), 315-330.

Recommended Readings

1. Hongseok, O., Labianca, G., & Myung-Ho, C. (2006). A MULTILEVEL MODEL OF GROUP SOCIAL CAPITAL. *Academy of Management Review*, *31*(3), 569-582.

2. Multilevel theorizing about creativity in organizations: A sensemaking perspective. Drazin, R., Glynn M.A., & Kazanilan, *Academy of Management Review,*

Class 3 Conducting Peer Review

Class 4. Culture and Cognition

1. Markus, H., & Kitayama, S. (1991). Culture and self: Implications for cognition, emotion, &motivation. Psychological Review, 98. *Read pages 224-235.*

2. Morris, M. W., & Peng, K. (1994). Culture and cause: American and Chinese attributions for social and physical events. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 67, 949-971.

3. 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.

4. Friedman et al. 2007. Causal Attribution for Inter-firm Contract Violation: A Comparative Study of Chinese and American Commercial Arbitrators. Journal of Applied Psychology.

5. Thomas, D. C., & Ravlin, E. C. (1995). Responses of employees to cultural adaptation by a foreign manager. Journal of Applied Psychology, 80, 133-146.

Recommended Readings

1. Morris, M.W. & Fu, H.Y (2001). How does culture influence conflict resolution? A dynamic constructivist analysis. Social Cognition, 19 (3), 324-349.

2. Nisbett, R., Peng, K., Choi, I., & Norenzayan, A (2001). Culture and systems of thought: Holistic versus analytic cognition. Psychological Review, 108, 291-211.

Class 5 Faultlines and Subgroup Formation (Jamie)

1. Jehn, K. and Bezrukova, K. (In press). The Faultline Activation Process and the Effects of Activated Faultlines on Coalition Formation, Conflict, and Group Outcomes. Forthcoming in Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes.

2. Bezrukova, K., Jehn, K., Zanutto, E., and Thatcher, S.M.B. (2009). Do workgroup faultlines help or hurt? A moderated model of faultlines, team identification, and group performance. Organization Science, 20(1), 35-50.
3. Homan, A.C., Van Knipperberg, D.V., Van Kleef, G.A, & DeDreu, C.K.W. (2007). Briding faultlines by valuing diversity: Diversity beliefs, information elaboration, and performance in diverse work groups. Journal
of Applied Psychology, 92,1189-1199.

4. Lau, Dora C. and J. Keith Murnighan. 1998. Demographic Diversity and Faultlines: The Compositional Dynamics of Organizational Groups. Academy of Management Review. 23(2): 325-340.

5. Pearsall, M.J., Ellis, A.P.J, & Evans, J.M. (2008). Unlocking the effects of gender faultlines on team creativity: Is activation the key? Journal of Applied Psychology, 93, 225-234.

6. Zellmer-Bruhn, M.E., Maloney, M.M., Bhappu, A.D., Salvador, R. (2008). When and how do differences matter? An exploration of perceived similarity in teams. Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 107,41-59.

Recommended Readings

1. Homan, A.C., Hollenbeck, J.R., Humphrey, S.E., Van Knipperberg, D.V., Ilgen, D.R., & Van Kleef, G.A. (2008). Facing differences with an open mind: Openness to experience, salience of intragroup differences, and performance of diverse work groups. Academy of Management Journal, 51, 1204-1222.

2. Sawyer, J.E., Houlette, M.A., & Yeagley, E.L. (2006). Decision performance and diversity structure: Comparing faultlines in convergent, crosscut, and racially homogeneous groups. Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 90, 1-15.

3. Lau, D.C. & Murnighan, J.K. (2005). Interactions within groups and subgroups: The effects of demographic faultlines. Academy of Management Journal, 48, 645-659

Class 6. Ethical Leadership (Ali)

Required Readings

1. Brown, M. E., L. K. Treviño. 2006. Ethical leadership: A review and future directions. Leadership Quart. 17 595-616.

2. Brown, M. E., Treviño, L. K. & Harrison, D. A. 2005. Ethical leadership: A social learning perspective for construct development and testing. Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 97, 117–134.

3. Mayer, D. M., Kuenzi, M., Greenbaum, R., Bardes, M. & Salvador, R. 2009. How low does ethical leadership flow? Test of a trickle-down model. Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 108: 1-13.

4. Mitchell, M. S. & Ambrose, M. L. (2007). Abusive supervision and workplace deviance and the moderating effects of negative reciprocity beliefs. Journal of Applied Psychology, 92(4), 1159–1168.

5. Tepper, B. J. (2007). Abusive supervision in work organizations: Review, synthesis, and directions for future research. Journal of Management, 33, 261–289.

6. Tepper, B. J., Carr J, C., Breaux, D. M., Geider S., Hu C. & Hua, W. (2009). Abusive supervision, intentions to quit, and employees' workplace deviance: A power/dependence analysis. Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 109, 156–167.

Recommended Readings

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

8. Trevino & Youngblood (1990) Bad apples in bad barrels: a causal analysis of ethical decision-making behavior. Journal of Applied Psychology, 75, 447-476.

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

10. Warren (2003) Constructive and destructive deviance in organzations. Academy of Management Review, 28, 622-632.

11. Spicer, A, Dunfee, T. & Bailey, W. 2004. Does National Context Matter in Ethical Decision Making? An Empirical Test of Integrative Social Contract Theory. Academy of Management Journal 47: 610-620.

12. Schewietzer et al., (2004). Goal setting as a motivator of unethical behavior. Academy of management journal, 47(3), 422-432.

Class 7. Organizational Justice (Aparna)

1. Choi J. (2008); Event Justice Perceptions and Employees' Reactions: Perceptions of Social Entity Justice as a Moderator; Journal of Applied Psychology; 93,3,513-528
2. Scott B.,Colquitt J. and Paddock L. (2009); An Actor-Focused Model of Justice Rule Adherence and Violation: The Role of Managerial Motives and Discretion, *Journal of Applied Psychology* , Vol. 94, No. 3, 756–769
3. Tyler T.R, Degoey P. and Smith H.(1996). Undersanding why the justice of the group procedures matters: A test of the psychological dynamics of the group value model. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology 70, 913-930.
4. Van-Dijke M., De-Cremer D. and Meyer D.(2010), The Role of Authority Power in Explaining Procedural Fairness Effects, *Journal of Applied Psychology* , Vol. 95, No. 3, 488–502
5. Van den Bos, K., Lind, E. A., Vermunt, R., & Wilke, H. (1997). How do I judge my outcome when I don't know the outcomes of others: The psychology of the fair process effect. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, **72,** 1034–1046.
6. Zapata-Phelan C. P., Colquitt J. A., Scott B. A., Livingston B.(2009); Procedural justice, interactional justice, and task performance: The mediating role of intrinsic motivation, Organization *Behavior and Human Decision processes*, 108 ,93–105

Recommended:
1. Ambrose, M. L., Harland, L. K., & Kulik, C. T. (1991). Influence of social comparisons on perceptions of organizational fairness. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, **76,** 239–246.
2. Folger, R. (1977). Distributive and procedural justice: Combined impact of voice and improvement on experienced inequity. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, **35,** 108–119.
3. Folger, R., & Konovsky, M. A. (1989). Effects of procedural and distributive justice on reactions to pay raise decisions. *Academy of Management Journal*, **32,** 115–130.
4. Folger, R., Rosenfield, D., Grove, J., & Corkran, L. (1979). Effects of "voice" and peer opinions on responses to inequity. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, **37,** 2253–2261.
5. Greenberg, J. (1994). Using socially fair treatment to promote acceptance of a work site smoking ban. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, **79,** 288–297.

6. Greenberg, J. (1993b). Stealing in the name of justice: Informational and interpersonal moderators of theft reactions to underpayment inequity. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, **54,** 81–103.
7. Greenberg, J. (1990).Employee theft as a reaction to underpayment inequity: The hidden cost of pay cuts. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, **75,** 561–568.
8. Greenberg, J. (1990).Organizational Justice: Yesterday, today and tomorrow; Journal of Management,16,2, 399-432
9. Skarlicki, D. P., & Folger, R. (1997). Retaliation in the workplace: The roles of distributive, procedural, and interactive justice. *Journal of Applied Psychology,* **82,** 434–443.
10. Van den Bos, K., Vermunt, R., & Wilke, H. A. M. (1997). Procedural and distributive justice: What is fair depends more on what comes first than on what comes next. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, **72,** 95–104.
11. Van den Bos, K., Wilke, H. A. M., Lind, E. A., & Vermunt, R. (1998). Evaluating outcomes by means of the fair process effect: Evidence for different processes in fairness and satisfaction judgments. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 74*, 1493–1503.

Class 8. Motivation (Vincent)

Required Readings

1. Cultivating competence, self-efficacy, and intrinsic interest through proximal self-motivation, Bandura, A. & Schunk, D.H., Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1981
2. The determinants of goal commitment, Locke, E.A., Latham, G.P., & Erez, M., Academy of Management Review, 1988
3. Approach & avoidance achievement goals and intrinsic motivation: a mediational analysis, Elliot, A.J., & Harackiewicz, Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1996
4. Social identity, self-categorization, and work motivation: rethinking the contribution of the group to positive and sustainable organizational outcomes, Haslam S.A, Powell, C. & Turner, J.C., Applied Psychology, 2000
5. Integrating theories of motivation, Steel, P. & Konig, C.J., Academy of Management Review, 2006
6. Commitment & motivation at work: the relevance of employee identity and regulatory focus, Johnson, R.E., & Yang, L-Q., Academy of Management Review, 2010

Recommended Readings

1. Motivating individuals & groups at work: a social identity perspective on leadership and group performance, Ellemers, N., de Gilder, D. & Haslam, S.A., Academy of Management Review, 2004
2. Does intrinsic motivation fuel the prosocial fire? Motivational synergy in predicting persistence, performance, and productivity, Grant, A., Journal of Applied Psychology, 2008
3. Self determination theory and the facilitation of intrinsic motivation, social development, and well-being, Ryan, R.M., & Deci, E.L., American Psychologist, 2000
4. Building a practically useful theory of goal setting and task motivation, A 35-year odyssey, Locke, E.A., & Latham, G.P., American Psychologist, 2002

Class 9. Submission and presentation by Jamie and Ali

Class 10. Work and Family (Mohammed)

Class 11. Submission and presentation by Aparna and Vincent

Class 12. Organizational Justice (Marina)

1. Clayton S. and Opotow S. (2003); Justice and Identity: Changing Perspectives on What Is Fair; Personality and Social Psychology Review , Vol. 7, No. 4, 298–310
2. Colquitt, J. A, Greenberg, J., & Zapata-Phelan, C. P. (2005).What Is Organizational Justice? A Historical Overview. In Greenberg, J. and Colquitt, J. A (Eds). Handbook of organizational justice. (pp. 3-56). Mahwah, NJ, US: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.
3. Colquitt, J. A., Noe, R. A., & Jackson, C. L. (2002). Justice in teams: Antecedents and consequences of procedural justice climate. *Personnel Psychology, 58*, 83–109.
4. Deutsch, M. (1975). Equity, equality and need: What determines which value will be used as the basis for distributive justice? Journal of social issues, 31, 137-149
5. Greenberg, J. (1987). Reactions to procedural injustice in payment distributions: Do the means justify the ends? *Journal of Applied Psychology*, **72,** 55–61.
6. Kim T-Y. and Leung K. (2007), Forming and reacting to overall fairness: A cross-cultural comparison, *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes* ,104, 83–95

Class 13. Leadership (Akwasi)

Required Readings

1. The ambiguity of leadership, Pfeffer, J., Academy of Management Review, 1977
2. Charismatic leadership, Conger, J.A., & Kanungo, R.M., Academy of Management Review, 1987
3. The motivational effects of charismatic leadership: a self-concept based theory, Shamir, B., House, R.J., & Arthur, M.B., Organization Science, 1993
4. Leadership - current theories, research and future directions, Avolio, B.J., Walumbwa, F.O., & Weber, T.J., Annual Review of Psychology, 2009
5. The bright and dark sides of leader traits: A review and theoretical extension of the leader trait paradigm, Judge, T.A., Piccolo, R.F., & Kosalka, T., The Leadership Quarterly, 2009
6. Focusing on followers: The role of regulatory focus and possible selves in visionary leadership, Stam, D., van Knippenberg, D., & Wisse, B. The Leadership Quarterly, 2010

Recommended Readings

1. How do leaders promote cooperation? The effects of charisma and procedural fairness. De Cremer, D. & van Knippenberg, D., Journal of Applied Psychology, 2002
2. Leadership, self, and identity: A review and research agenda, van Knippenberg, D., van Knippenberg, B., De Cremer, D., & Hogg, M.A., The Leadership Quarterly, 2004

3. Personality, Leader-Member Exchanges and Work Outcomes, Harris, K.J., Harris, R.B & Eplion, D.M., Journal of Behavioral and Applied Management, 2007
4. Leader vision, Griffin, Parker & Mason, Journal of Applied Psychology, 2009
5. Consequences of differentiated leadership in groups, Wu, J.B., Tsui, A.S. & Kinicki, A.J., Academy of Management Journal, 2010
6. Leader-member exchange, shared values, and performance: Agreement and levels of analysis do matter, Markham, S.E., Yammarino, F.J., Murry, W.D., & Palanski, M.E., The Leadership Quarterly, 2010

Class 14. Presentation by Mohammed and final submissions by all

Author Reviewer Match (To be arranged in Class 1)

Author	Reviewer 1	Reviewer 2
Jamie		
Ali		
Aparna		
Vincent		
Mohammed		
Marina		
Akwasi		