

Seminar in Organizational Behavior

(BUS 721)

Department of Management
University of North Carolina at Greensboro
Spring 2020

Professor: Aichia Chuang
Synchronous session: 8 pm - 9:40 pm Eastern Time, Tuesdays
(see course schedule for specific dates)
Office: 365 Bryan Building
Office hours: By appointment
Tel: 336-256-0437
E-mail: achuang@uncg.edu
Web: <https://bryan.uncg.edu/faculty-and-staff/aichia-chuang/>
TA: Ranjan Shrestha (r_shrest@uncg.edu)

I am eager to talk to you about any concerns, questions, and ideas you may have. E-mail is probably the best way to initially get a hold of me, either to ask questions directly or to set up an appointment.

Course Goals:

This course is designed to provide academic insights into major areas of organizational behavior. The course addresses issues that every researcher interested in organizational behavior has to study, including: identity, motivation, emotion, leadership, teams, and diversity. Helping students generate research ideas along the class is an integral part of the course. Therefore, students are to submit a workable research proposal at the end of the semester and think about new research ideas emerging from the readings assigned.

Student Learning Outcomes:

Upon successful completion of this course, students should be able to do the following in the field of organizational behavior:

- Generate new research ideas and develop a research proposal for several important topics
- Conduct a constructive peer review for a proposal
- Lead a meaningful discussion session on a topic
- Critique research articles

Grading:

Items	Percentage of Semester Grade
Research Proposal	30%

Peer Review of Proposal	15%
Discussion Leadership	15%
Thought Papers (2 papers)	30% (15% each)
Class Participation	10%
<hr/>	
Total	100%

The following grading scale will be used in this course:

Numeric	Letter
94-100	A
90-93.99	A-
86-89.99	B+
82-85.99	B
78-81.99	B-
74-77.99	C+
70-73.99	C
< 70	F

Research Proposal:

The research proposal will be an individual effort working towards accomplishing a regular proposal capable of being further developed to become a paper to be submitted to a major management journal outlet. The topic can be any related to organizational behavior such as those outlined in this syllabus. There are several stages and requirements related to this proposal. Let me describe them one by one below.

Description of Proposal. Each student is to submit a 1-2 page (double-spaced) description of the proposal to include 1) the phenomenon that interests you, 2) the research questions you propose, 3) possible theoretical lens (you can briefly preview the theories mentioned in the Readings section), 4) a graphic research framework as possible (note that not every study has a research framework that can be pictured, but try your best. Often times when you are unable to present your study with a graphic framework, it is because you are not clear about what model you are testing), 5) potential sample and anticipated procedure, 6) possible empirical method (e.g., interviews, surveys, and/or experiments), and 7) potential measures and analysis strategy (for quantitative research only). The writing expectation is more conversational at this point, but if you want to write an academic piece, feel free. This description is due (in Word document) to me by email at 11:59 p.m. on 1/28. This description of proposal will not be graded towards your final semester grade, but feedback will be provided. Note now that you have finished the quantitative research methods course, you should be able to develop a more well-thought out description of the proposal than the one you submitted for the methods course. Try your best!

Complete Draft of Proposal. A draft proposal is to be submitted for a peer to help you out and for you to learn how to respond to reviewer comments. The draft proposal and the final proposal will include, but is not limited to, the following sections: introduction, literature review, theory and hypotheses, and proposed methods. The draft proposal will count no less than 6 pages (double-spaced) excluding tables,

figures, references, and appendices. Font 12 is required. You will be paired with another student from the class who will be reviewing your draft proposal to provide constructive comments. This draft proposal is due (in Word document) to me and your reviewer by email at 11:59pm on 4/7. The draft proposal will not be graded. Because I will provide you with feedback on your description of proposal and the final proposal, feedback will not be provided for this draft proposal. You can always ask me questions during the development process.

Peer Review. A scholar has to develop himself/herself to be a good reviewer to serve the community and help it grow. Hence, having students practice reviewing manuscripts is an integral goal of this course. For this reason, each student will be paired with another student to review each other's draft proposal to help out each other. For how to conduct constructive reviews, recall that AMJ has a website for reviewer resources (<https://aom.org/Publications/AMJ/AMJ-Reviewer-Resources.aspx>). In that website, you will see the second large section is "Sample Reviews Written by the Editors" where sample micro and macro manuscripts are posted and sample review comments for them are also provided, respectively. Because organizational behavior investigates phenomena at the micro-level, for the purpose of this course, you may study and learn from the micro papers and review comments. READ THOSE MATERIALS CAREFULLY and immerse yourself in the reading process. For this class review, you should plan on writing 1-2 single-spaced pages (common length of actual manuscript review). The peer review is due to me (in Word document) via Canvas and the author by email at 11:59pm on 4/14. Late reviews will be penalized by 10 points for each day late. This peer review will be graded and feedback will be provided as necessary. The grading criteria include how the reviews are critical (pointing out important issues) and constructive (providing developmental suggestions).

Response Letter and Final Proposal. Scholars are responsible for responding to reviewers' comments during a paper's revise and resubmit process. Therefore, in addition to learning to be an effective reviewer, in this course, students are also provided the opportunity to practice how to respond to reviewers' comments. Authors of the proposals will respond to each comment raised by the reviewer. You do not have to agree on every comment, but no point should be left unaddressed to show your respect on the review process and your ability to defend your paper. You will address the comments by preparing a response letter, which details how you address the issues raised by the reviewer, and by modifying your proposal. There is no page limit on the response letter. A sample response letter will be provided to you in the class. The final proposal will count no less than 8 pages (double-spaced) excluding tables, figures, references, and appendices. Font 12 is required. Both the response letter and the final proposal are due at 11:59 p.m. on 4/29. Late papers will be penalized by 10 points (out of 100 points for the paper) for each day late. To mimic how a revised paper is organized in a real revise and resubmit process, you will combine these two documents in ONE Word document, with the response letter preceding the final proposal. Please send this one document to me via Canvas. Plagiarizing, which means representing as your own work any part of work done by another, will result in a score of zero for the paper. Canvas does a plagiarism review automatically once a paper is submitted. It compares your submission against a wide range of repository and offers a percentage of overlap. A paper involving model already existing in the literature or having been submitted to another course is not

acceptable. Because I will use the limited time towards the end of the semester focusing on grading and providing feedback to your final proposal, the response letter will not be graded and feedback will not be provided.

Presentation. Presenting your work after it is done is a natural step in a research process where more feedback will be obtained to improve the work. On 5/5, we will have at most 4 students presenting their proposal. Each will present 30 minutes including a 10-min Q&A. Presenting your proposal is entirely on a voluntary basis and no extra credit will be extended. This is an opportunity for those who are intrinsically motivated to see themselves grow and learn. If there are not enough students who volunteer to present, I will then randomly select and invite students. The students can decide to decline the invitation. Presenting students are to email their presentation materials to me by 6 p.m. on 5/5. The class is responsible for providing constructive feedback on the proposals.

You need to cite literature in your proposal; a section at the end of the proposal containing a list of reference of the literature should be provided. The format of the citation in the paper and the reference should follow the publication rules in the field of organizational behavior. Two of the most commonly adopted rules are APA style and AMJ style. For APA style, follow Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association which is available at the university library. For AMJ style, follow the AMJ Style Guide that you should be able to easily locate in Google.

Discussion Leadership:

It is important that scholars are skillful at organizing and leading a discussion session on a topic they are an expert in. This skill is essential for effective teaching and also helps foster an environment for new research ideas. Thus, this practice has become a standard course item adopted in doctoral seminars of OB in a majority of top schools. As such, students will have an opportunity to pick ONE topic (assigned between 2/4-4/28 in the course schedule) of their interest and lead a synchronous session with it. The leadership will be a team effort and each team will discuss a topic from those listed in the course schedule. Session leaders should assume that the other participants have also read the materials carefully, so their job is primarily to generate discussion, not to provide a lecture or a summary. There are several general responsibilities involved in the role of a session leader: creating an engaging class structure, facilitating learning, and facilitating the generation of new research ideas. Specifically,

1. A session leader gets the class to think deeply regarding the topic of the week. Particularly, directions to ponder may include: Why is this topic important theoretically and practically? What is the historic development and current status of the topic? Why is the theory involved so important in understanding this topic in real world? What are the similarities and differences in the stories, theoretical bases, approaches, methods and conclusions of the readings? What are the issues, challenges and dilemmas raised in the readings? What are your life experiences regarding the topic? What do you see as future directions of this topic?

2. A session leader reads beyond the readings assigned for the session in order to get themselves familiar with the topic. For example, if empirical articles of a theory are not assigned (due to the limitation of 4 articles per session), try to locate such articles.
3. A session leader designs the session in a way to engage people for meaningful dialogues and brainstorming. For example, a session leader may start with asking questions or an exercise and/or may design a debate in between.
4. A session leader may read students' thought papers in order to develop an overall integration. Because the thought papers are not due until a day before the synchronous session, this integration is optional, but you may want to make time to read them before the session.

Session leaders are to send any materials (e.g., handouts, PowerPoint slides, session leading plans...) they wish to use in class to the instructor by 6pm on the day of the session. The discussion leadership will be assessed based on the leaders' level of understanding of the assigned topic and their ability to engage the class to think.

Thought Papers:

The ability to critically analyze a field, including synthesizing its literature and coming up with new research ideas is an essential tool to possess as a scholar. To that end, each individual student is to pick TWO topics (assigned between 2/4-4/28 in the course schedule) to submit a thoughtful analysis of the required readings for each week, except for those who serve as leaders.

With the thought paper, the tasks of each student are to 1) address a few of the possible directions outlined in point 1 of the "Discussion Leadership" section above AND 2) summarize new ideas inspired by the readings. Students are encouraged to read beyond the readings assigned. For example, if empirical articles of a theory are not assigned (due to the limitation of 4 articles per session), try to locate such articles. A new idea normally fills some gap or challenges status quo. For this new idea, you will come up with a model (a research framework if possible), briefly describe the theory you will use, briefly explain why this idea is interesting, and tell me how it contributes to the field.

Although you are not required to submit a thought paper for each week's topic, you are nevertheless required to read all assigned readings, to ensure that everyone has the same deep understanding of the topic. In the beginning of every session, I will invite 3 students who did not choose to write thought papers of the week to summarize their thoughts verbally to us.

The analysis will be in 1-2 double-spaced pages and is due at 11:59 pm on the day before the synchronous session day for that specific topic. For example, the thought papers for synchronous session II (Identity and Identification) is due at 11:59 pm on 2/10. You will need to send your paper (in Word document) to me and all the students via Canvas (See the pinned Discussion Board in Canvas for how to submit your thought paper.). Late papers will not be accepted. The papers will be graded and feedback provided. The evaluation criteria include how the paper has critically analyzed the topic and the quality of the new ideas proposed.

Class Participation:

Student participation in all online activities is an integrated part of the course. As you see, there will be a substantial amount of online discussion of assigned materials. Read the materials assigned prior to the online class. The class participation grading will be based on the quality of the individual's contribution to the online discussions, which should indicate both acquaintance with the assigned materials and consideration of the issues raised by the materials.

Synchronous Sessions:

There will be eight synchronous sessions where we will meet to discuss the materials assigned that you learned for that week. For example, in synchronous session II in Week 5, we will cover materials assigned in Week 4 (Identity and Identification). Please read the materials in great detail so that we will be able to have an informative discussion.

Email Policy:

It is required by the school that you use your uncg email address for all communications regarding school affairs, including class information. Thus please make sure that you check your uncg email often. There will be fair amount of discussions of materials for this course. I strongly suggest that you subscribe the "Discussions" section in Canvas so that you receive notifications of the discussions from your email to keep up with the class, if you don't visit Canvas often. To subscribe, go to "Discussions" in Canvas; there is a subscribe sign to the right of each thread where you can click. Alternatively, you may go into each thread and hit the Subscribe button.

Course Schedule

Week	Date	Topic	Notes
1	1/14	Introduction	
2	1/21	Overview of Organizational Behavior	
3	1/28	Synchronous Session I	- <i>Description of Proposal due at 11:59 p.m. on 1/28.</i>
4	2/4	Identity and Identification	
5	2/11	Synchronous Session II (Identity and Identification)	
6	2/18	Motivation	
7	2/25	Synchronous Session III (Motivation)	
8	3/3	<i>Spring Break!</i>	
9	3/10	Affect and Emotions	
10	3/17	Synchronous Session IV (Affect and Emotions)	
11	3/24	Leadership	
12	3/31	Synchronous Session V (Leadership)	
13	4/7	Groups and Teams	- <i>Complete Draft of Proposal Due to Reviewer and Instructor at 11:59 p.m. on 4/7.</i>
14	4/14	Synchronous Session VI (Groups and Teams)	- <i>Peer Review Due to Author and Instructor at 11:59 p.m. on 4/14.</i>
15	4/21	Diversity	
16	4/28	Synchronous Session VII (Diversity)	- <i>Final Proposal Due for All Students at 11:59 p.m. on 4/29.</i>
17	5/5	Synchronous Session VIII <i>Proposal Presentations</i>	- <i>At most 4 Presenters</i>

Readings

For each topic, I tried to identify the most commonly adopted theories. For the required readings for each theory, either a seminal or theoretical paper is assigned, with empirical articles selected if space allows. Students are encouraged to read the assigned articles in the order of which they are listed. For the recommended readings, they are categorized by sub-topics when appropriate. Students are encouraged to read those articles.

1/14 and 1/21: Introduction and Overview of Organizational Behavior

Required

Heath, C., & Sitkin, S. (2001). Big-B versus Big-O: What is organizational about organizational behavior? *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 22, 43-58.

Pillutla, M., & Thau, S. (2013). Organizational sciences' obsession with "that's interesting!": Consequences and an alternative. *Organizational Psychology Review*, 3, 187-194.

Kim, P. H., Ployhart, R. E., & Gibson, C. B. (2018). Editors' comments: Is organizational behavior overtheorized? *Academy of Management Review*, 43, 541-545.

Johns, G. (2006). The essential impact of context on organizational behavior. *Academy of Management Review*, 31, 386-408.

Gelfand, M. J., Aycan, Z., Erez, M., & Leung, K. (2017). Cross-cultural industrial organizational psychology and organizational behavior: A hundred-year journey. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 102, 514-529.

Recommended

Dutton, J. E., & Dukerich, J. M. (2006). The relational foundation of research: An underappreciated dimension of interesting research. *Academy of Management Journal*, 49, 21-26.

House, R. J., Rousseau, D. M., & Thomas-Hunt, M. J. (1995). The meso paradigm: A framework for the integration of micro and macro organizational behavior. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 17, 71-114.

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

Rousseau, D. (1997). Organizational Behavior in the new organizational era. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 48, 515-546.

Rousseau, D. M., & Fried, Y. (2001). Location, location, location: Contextualizing organizational research. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 22, 1-13.

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

2/4: Identity and Identification

Theories to Learn:

Social Identity Theory
Self-Categorization Theory

Related Theory:

Social Comparison Theory

Required

Hogg, M. A., & Terry, D. J. (2000). Social identity and self-categorization processes in organizational contexts. *Academy of Management Review*, 25, 121-140.

Wittman, S. (2019). Lingering identities. *Academy of Management Review*, 44, 724-745.

Grant, A. M., Berg, J. M., & Cable, D. M. (2014). Job titles as identity badges: How self-reflective titles can reduce emotional exhaustion. *Academy of Management Journal*, 57, 1201-1225.

Pratt, M., Rockmann, K. W., & Kaufmann, J. B. (2006). Constructing professional identity. *Academy of Management Journal*, 49, 235-262.

Recommended

Ashforth, B. E., Harrison, S. H., & Corley, K. G. (2008). Identification in organizations: An examination of four fundamental questions. *Journal of Management*, 34, 325-374.

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

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

Campbell, E. M., Liao, H., Chuang, A., Zhou, J., & Dong, Y. (2017). Hot shots and cool reception? An expanded view of social consequences for high performers. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 102, 845-866.

Cooper, D., Rockmann, K. W., Moteabbed, S., & Thatcher, S. M. B. (in press). Integrator or gremlin? Identity partnerships and team newcomer socialization. *Academy of Management Review*.

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.

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

Mell, J. N., DeChurch, L. A., Contractor, N., & Leenders, R. T. A. J. (in press). Identity asymmetries: An experimental investigation of social identity and information exchange in multiteam systems. *Academy of Management Journal*.

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

Tajfel, H., & Turner, J. C. (1985). The social identity theory of intergroup behavior. In S. Worchel & W. G. Austin (Eds.), *Psychology of intergroup relations* (2nd ed., pp. 7-24). Chicago, IL: Nelson-Hall.

2/18: Motivation

Theories to Learn:

Social Cognitive Theory

Self-determination Theory (Intrinsic Motivation vs. Extrinsic Motivation)

Related Theories:

Job Crafting Theory

Goal Setting Theory

Social Information Processing Theory. The origin of this theory is Salancik and Pfeffer (1978) listed below. You are not to confuse this theory with that with the same name appearing in the field of Information Science.

Required

Bandura, A. (1989). Human agency in social cognitive theory. *American Psychologist*, 44, 1175-1184.

Liao, H., Liu, D., & Loi, R. (2010). Looking at both sides of the social exchange coin: A social cognitive perspective on the joint effects of relationship quality and differentiation on creativity. *Academy of Management Journal*, 53, 1090-1109.

Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2000). Self-determination theory and the facilitation of intrinsic motivation, social development and well-being. *American Psychologist*, 55, 68-78.

Derfler-Rozin, R., & Pitesa, M. (in press). Motivation purity bias: Expression of extrinsic motivation undermines perceived intrinsic motivation and engenders bias in selection decisions. *Academy of Management Journal*.

Recommended

Social Cognitive Theory:

Dweck, C. S., & Leggett, E. L. (1988). A social-cognitive approach to motivation and personality. *Psychological Review*, *95*, 256-273.

Gielnik, M. M., Bledow, R., & Stark, M. S. (in press). A dynamic account of self-efficacy in entrepreneurship. *Journal of Applied Psychology*.

Self-determination Theory:

Gagné, M., & Deci, E. L. (2001). Self-determination theory and work motivation. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, *26*, 331-362.

Rockmann, K. W., & Ballinger, G. A. (2017). Intrinsic motivation and organizational identification among on-demand workers. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *102*, 1305-1316.

Job Crafting:

Wrzesniewski, A., & Dutton, J. E. (2001). Crafting a job: Revisioning employees as active crafters of their work. *Academy of Management Review*, *26*, 179-200.

Grant, A. M. (2007). Relational job design and the motivation to make a prosocial difference. *Academy of Management Review*, *32*, 393-417.

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

Kooij, D. T. A. M., van Woerkom, M., Wilkenloh, J., Dorenbosch, L., & Denissen, J. J. A. (2017). Job crafting towards strengths and interests: The effects of a job crafting intervention on person-job fit and the role of age. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *102*, 971-981.

Goal Setting Theory:

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

Social Information Processing Theory:

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

Bhave, D. P., Kramer, A., & Glomb, T. M. (2010). Work–family conflict in work groups: Social information processing, support, and demographic dissimilarity. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 95*, 145-158.

3/10: Affect and Emotions

Theories to Learn:

Affective Events Theory

Emotion Regulation

Emotions as Social Information (EASI) Theory (van Kleef)

Required

Weiss, H., & Cropanzano, R. (1996). Affective events theory: A theoretical discussion of the structure, causes, and consequences of affective experiences at work. *Research in organizational behavior, 18*, 1-74.

Totterdell, P., & Holman, D. (2003). Emotion regulation in customer service roles: Testing a model of emotional labor. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 8*, 55-73.

Grant, A. M. (2013). Rocking the boat but keeping it steady: The role of emotion regulation in employee voice. *Academy of Management Journal, 56*, 1703-1723.

Van Kleef, G. A. (2017). Emotions as agents of social influence: Insights from Emotions as Social Information (EASI) theory. In S. G. Harkins, K. D. Williams, & J. M. Burger (Eds.), *The Oxford handbook of social influence* (pp. 237-255). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Recommended

Affective Events Theory:

Lanaj, K., & Jennings, R. (in press). Putting leaders in a bad mood: The affective costs of helping followers with personal problems. *Journal of Applied Psychology*.

Emotions as Social Information (EASI) Model:

Van Kleef, G. A. (2009). How emotions regulate social life: The emotions as social information (EASI) model. *Current Directions in Psychological Science, 18*, 184-188.

Wang, Z., Singh, S. N., Li, Y. J., Mishra, S., Ambrose, M., & Biernat, M. (2017). Effects of employees' positive affective displays on customer loyalty intentions: An emotions-as-social-information perspective. *Academy of Management Journal, 60*, 109-129.

Emotion Regulation:

Chuang, A., Judge, T. A., & Liaw, Y. J. (2012). Transformational leadership and customer service: A moderated mediation model of negative affectivity and emotion regulation. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology, 21*, 28-56.

Côté, S. (2005). A social interaction model of the effects of emotion regulation on work strain. *Academy of Management Review, 30*, 509-530.

Grandey, A. (2000). Emotion regulation in the workplace: A new way to conceptualize emotional labor. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 5*, 95-110.

Grandey, A. (2003). When “the show must go on”: Surface acting and deep acting as determinants of emotional exhaustion and peer-rated service delivery. *Academy of Management Journal, 46*, 86-96.

Emotion Display/Expression:

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

Russell, J. A. (1994). Is there universal recognition of emotion from facial expression? A review of the cross-cultural studies. *Psychological Bulletin, 115*, 102-141.

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

Creativity:

Amabile, T. M., Barsade, S. G., Mueller, J. S., & Staw, B. M. (2005). Affect and creativity at work. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 50*, 367-403.

Emotion Contagion:

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

Identification:

Conroy, S. A., Becker, W. J., & Menges, J. I. (2017). The meaning of my feelings depends on who I am: Work-related identifications shape emotion effects in organizations. *Academy of Management Journal, 60*, 1071-1093.

Emotional Intelligence:

Côté, S., & Miners, C. T. H. (2006). Emotional intelligence, cognitive intelligence, and job performance. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 51*, 1-28.

Others:

Barsade, S. G., Brief, A. P. & Spataro, S. E. (2003). The affective revolution in

organizational behavior: The emergence of a paradigm. In J. Greenberg (Ed.) *Organizational behavior: The state of the science* (2nd ed., pp. 3-52). Mahwah, NJ. Lawrence Erlbaum.

Barsade, S. G., Ward, A. J., Turner, J. D. F., & Sonnenfeld, J. A. (2000). To your heart's content: A model of affective diversity in top management teams. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 45, 802-836.

Parke, M. R., & Seo, M. (2017). The role of affect climate in organizational effectiveness. *Academy of Management Review*, 42, 334-360.

Yang, M. Y., Cheng, F. C., & Chuang, A. (2015). The role of affects in conflict frames and conflict management. *International Journal of Conflict Management*, 26, 427-449.

3/24: Leadership

Theories to Learn:

Transformational Leadership vs. Transactional Leadership
Leader-Member Exchange (LMX)
Abusive Supervision

Relevant Theories:

Full Range Leadership Model
Substitutes for Leadership Theory
Shared Leadership
Servant Leadership
Empowering Leadership
Ethical Leadership

Required

Liao, H., & Chuang, A. (2007). Transforming service employees and climate: A multi-level multi-source examination of transformational leadership in building long-term service relationships. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 92, 1006-1019

Li, A. N., & Liao, H. (2014). How do leader-member exchange quality and differentiation affect performance in teams? An integrated multilevel dual process model. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 99, 847-866.

Yu, A., Matta, F. K., & Cornfield, B. (2018). Is leader-member exchange differentiation beneficial or detrimental for group effectiveness? A meta-analytic investigation and theoretical integration. *Academy of Management Journal*, 61, 1158-1188.

Barnes, C. M., Lucianetti, L., Bhave, D. P., & Christian, M. S. (2015). "You wouldn't like me when I am sleepy": Leaders' sleep, daily abusive supervision, and work unit engagement. *Academy of Management Journal*, 58, 1419-1437.

Recommended

General:

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

Thomas, A. (1988). Does leadership make a difference to organizational performance? *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 33, 388-400.

Transformational Leadership:

Grant, A. M. (2012). Leading with meaning: Beneficiary contact, prosocial impact, and the performance effects of transformational leadership. *Academy of Management Journal*, 55, 458-476.

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

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

Liaw, Y. J., Chi, N. W., & Chuang, A. (2010). Examining the mechanisms linking transformational leadership, employee customer orientation, and service performance: The mediating roles of perceived supervisor and coworker support. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 25, 477-492.

Tepper, B. J., Dimotakis, N., Lambert, L. S., Koopman, J., Matta, F. K., Park, H. M., & Goo, W. (2018). Examining follower responses to transformational leadership from a dynamic, person-environment fit perspective. *Academy of Management Journal*, 61, 1343-1368.

Vogel, R. M., & Bolino, M. (in press). Recurring nightmares and silver linings: Understanding how past abusive supervision may lead to posttraumatic stress and posttraumatic growth. *Academy of Management Review*.

Leader-Member Exchange:

Cropanzano, R., Dasborough, M. T., & Weiss, H. M. (2017). Affective events and the development of leader-member exchange. *Academy of Management Review*, 42, 233-258.

Dienesch, R. M. S., & Liden, R. C. (1986). Leader-member exchange model of leadership: A critique and further development. *Academy of Management Review*, 11, 618-634.

Gerstner, C. R., & Day, D. V. (1997). Meta-Analytic review of leader-member exchange theory: Correlates and construct issues. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 82, 827-844.

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

Liao, Z., Liu, W., Li, X., & Song, Z. (2019). Give and take: An episodic perspective on leader-member exchange. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 104, 34-51.

Schriesheim, C. A., Castro, S. L., & Cogliser, C. C. (1999). Leader-member exchange (LMX) research: A comprehensive review of theory, measurement, and data-analytic practices. *Leadership Quarterly*, 10, 63-113.

Wilson, K. S., Sin, H. P., & Conlon, D. E. (2010). What about the leader in leader-member exchange? The impact of resource exchanges and substitutability on the leader. *Academy of Management Review*, 35, 358-372.

Abusive Supervision:

Tepper, B. J. (2000). Consequences of abusive supervision. *Academy of Management Journal*, 43, 178-190.

Oh, J. K., & Farh, C. I. C. (2017). An emotional process theory of how subordinates appraise, experience, and respond to abusive supervision over time. *Academy of Management Review*, 42, 207-232.

Leader Emergence:

DeRue, D. S., & Ashford, S. J. (2010). Who will lead and who will follow? A social process of leadership identity construction in organizations. *Academy of Management Review*, 35, 627-647.

Lanaj, K., & Hollenbeck, J. R. (2015). Leadership over-emergence in self-managing teams: The role of gender and countervailing biases. *Academy of Management Journal*, 58, 1476-1494.

Ethical Leadership:

Mayer, D. M., Aquino, K., Greenbaum, R. L., & Kuenzi, M. (2012). Who displays ethical leadership, and why does it matter? An examination of antecedents and consequences of ethical leadership. *Academy of Management Journal*, 55, 151-171.

Fehr, R., Yam, K. C., & Dang, C. (2015). Moralized leadership: The construction and consequences of ethical leader perceptions. *Academy of Management Review*, 40, 182-209.

Shared Leadership:

Carson, J. B., Tesluk, P. E., Marrone, J. A. (2007). Shared leadership in teams: An investigation of antecedent conditions and performance. *Academy of Management Journal*, 50, 1217-1234.

Others:

Dong, Y., Liao, H., Chuang, A., Zhou, J., & Campbell, E. M. (2015). Fostering employee service creativity: Joint effects of customer empowering behaviors and supervisory empowering leadership. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 100, 1364-1380.

George, J. M. (2000). Emotions and leadership: The role of emotional intelligence. *Human Relations*, 53, 1027-1055.

Hogg, M. A., van Knippenberg, D., & Rast, D. E. III. (2012). Intergroup leadership in organizations: Leading across group and organizational boundaries. *Academy of Management Review*, 37, 232-255.

Kerr, S., & Jermier, J. M. (1978). Substitutes for leadership: Their meaning and measurement. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 22, 375-403.

Mohammed, S., & Nadkarni, S. (2011). Temporal diversity and team performance: The moderating role of team temporal leadership. *Academy of Management Journal*, 54, 489-508.

4/7: Groups and Teams

Required

Farh, C. I. C., Oh, J. K., Hollenbeck, J. R., Yu, A., Lee, S. M., & King, D. D. (in press). Token female voice enactment in traditionally male-dominated teams: Facilitating conditions and consequences for performance. *Academy of Management Journal*.

Grijalva, E., Maynes, T. D., Badura, K. L., & Whiting, S. W. (in press). Examining the “I” in team: A longitudinal investigation of the influence of team narcissism composition on team outcomes in the NBA. *Academy of Management Journal*.

Li, N., Kirkman, B. L., & Porter, C. O. L. H. (2014). Toward a model of work team altruism. *Academy of Management Review*, 39, 541-565.

Li, Y., Li, N., Li, C., & Li, J. (in press). The boon and bane of creative “stars”: A social network exploration of how and when team creativity is (and is not) driven by a star teammate. *Academy of Management Journal*.

Recommended

Diversity:

Joshi, A. (2006). The influence of organizational demography on the external

networking behavior of teams. *Academy of Management Review*, 31, 583-595.

Polzer, J. T., Milton, L. P., & Swann, W. B. Jr. (2002). Capitalizing on diversity: Interpersonal congruence in small work groups. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 47, 296-324.

Reinwald, M., & Kunze, F. (in press). Being different, being absent? A dynamic perspective on demographic dissimilarity and absenteeism in blue-collar teams. *Academy of Management Journal*.

Schubert, T., & Tavassoli, S. (in press). Product innovation and educational diversity in top and middle management teams. *Academy of Management Journal*.

Team effectiveness:

Ericksen, J., & Dyer, L. (2004). Right from the start: Exploring the effects of early team events on subsequent project team development and performance. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 49, 438-471.

Gilson, L., Mathieu, J. E., Shalley, C. E., & Ruddy, T. R. (2005). Creativity and standardization: Complementary or conflicting drivers of team effectiveness? *Academy of Management Journal*, 48, 521-531.

Jehn, K. A., & Mannix, E. A. (2001). The dynamic nature of conflict: A longitudinal study of intragroup conflict and group performance. *Academy of Management Journal*, 44, 238-251.

Sutton, R. I., & Hargadon, A. (1996). Brainstorming groups in context: Effectiveness in a product design firm. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 41, 685-718.

Others:

Carton, A. M., & Cummings, J. N. (2012). A theory of subgroups in work teams. *Academy of Management Review*, 37, 441-470.

Crawford, E. R., & LePine, J. A. (2013). A configural theory of team processes: Accounting for the structure of taskwork and teamwork. *Academy of Management Review*, 38, 32-48.

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

4/21: Diversity

Theory to Learn:

Faultline Theory

Related Theories:

Relational Demography
Social Identity Theory
Self-Categorization Theory

Required

Lau, D. C., & Murnighan, J. K. (1998). Demographic diversity and faultlines: The compositional dynamics of organizational groups. *Academy of Management Review*, 23, 325-340.

Leslie, L. M. (2019). Diversity initiative effectiveness: A typological theory of unintended consequences. *Academy of Management Review*, 44, 538-563.

Leslie, L. M., Manchester, C. F., & Dahm, P. C. (2017). Why and when does the gender gap reverse? Diversity goals and the pay premium for high potential women. *Academy of Management Journal*, 60, 402-432.

Chattopadhyay, P., George, E., Gupta, V., & Li, J. (in press). Geographical dissimilarity and team member influence: Do emotions experienced in the initial team meeting matter? *Academy of Management Journal*.

Recommended

Relational Demography:

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

Gender:

Ely, R. & Padavic, I. (2007). A feminist analysis of organizational research on sex differences. *Academy of Management Review*, 32, 1121-1143.

Joshi, A. (2014). By whom and when is women's expertise recognized? The interactive effects of gender and education in science and engineering teams. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 59, 202-239.

Niederle, M., & Vesterlund, L. (2006). Do women shy away from competition? Do men compete too much? *Quarterly Journal of Economics*.

Race:

Brief, A. P., Dietz, J., Cohen, R. R., Pugh, S. D., & Vaslow, J. B. (2000). Just doing business: Modern racism and obedience to authority as explanations for employment discrimination. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 81, 72-97.

Norton, M. I., Sommers, S. R., & Apfelbaum, E. P. (2012). Color blindness and interracial interaction: Playing the political correctness game. *Psychological Science*, 17, 949-953.

Identity:

Leigh, A., & Melwani, S. (2019). #Blackemployeesmatter: Mega-threats, identity fusion, and enacting positive deviance in organizations. *Academy of Management Review*, *44*, 564-591.

Others:

Brief, A. P. & Barsky, A. (2000). Establishing a climate for diversity: The inhibition of prejudiced reactions in the workplace. *Research in Personnel and Human Resource Management*, *19*, 91-129.

Desai, S. D., Chugh, D., & Brief, A. P. (2014). The implications of marriage structure for men's workplace attitudes, beliefs, and behaviors toward women. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, *59*, 330-365.

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.

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

Liao, H., Joshi, A., & Chuang, A. (2004). Sticking out like a sore thumb: Employee dissimilarity and deviance at work. *Personnel Psychology*, *57*, 969-1000.

Tasheva, S., & Hillman, A. J. (2019). Integrating diversity at different levels: Multilevel human capital, social capital, and demographic diversity and their implications for team effectiveness. *Academy of Management Review*, *44*, 746-765.