



SEMINAR IN MICRO ORGANIZATIONAL BEHAVIOR

Spring 2023

Tuesdays 3:00pm-5:40pm, Janice Levin 219

Professor Jessica Methot

Office: JLB 209

Office hours: By Appointment

Email: jmethot@smlr.rutgers.edu

GENERAL COURSE INFORMATION

Course Description

This is a doctoral level seminar on the major approaches to the field of micro organizational behavior (OB), which can be coarsely defined as the study of the thoughts, feelings, attributes, and behavior of individuals in organizations (see the Academy of Management OB Domain statement for details: <https://ob.aom.org/about-us/about-the-ob-division>).

Topics include but are not limited to:

- Individual characteristics such as beliefs, values, personality, and demographic attributes, and individual processes such as learning, perception, motivation, emotions, and decision making
- Interpersonal processes such as trust, justice, power/politics, social exchange, and networks
- Outcomes such as performance, creativity, attachment, citizenship behaviors, stress, absenteeism, turnover, deviance, and ethical behavior.

This is a survey seminar, and accordingly, the main objective is to familiarize students with the major assumptions, concepts and theories that ground the field. As you will soon see, there are many different concepts and theories that have been used by scholars to understand why people in organizations think, feel and behave the way they do. One semester is not enough time to cover everything with a high level of depth and detail. Therefore, I highly encourage you to explore the relevant journals on your own and to think deeply about how the concepts and theories are connected. This will help you achieve the more specific end goal of this course: *To help PhD students develop a mental model of micro OB that is elaborated, cohesive, and internally consistent.*

Course Objectives

After completing this course, you should be able to:

- Describe and synthesize content from the various OB content areas
- Understand the various methodological approaches relevant to research on OB topics
- Generate and evaluate research ideas that incorporate OB content areas

Changes to the syllabus: The course syllabus is a general plan for the course; if deviations become necessary, they will be clearly communicated to the class.

COURSE OVERVIEW

Date	Topic	Discussion leader (students will lead on open days)
January 17	OB: Introduction and Overview	Professor Methot
January 24	What is theory?	Professor Methot
January 31	Job Performance	
February 7	Commitment, Withdrawal, & Turnover	
February 14	NO CLASS	-----
February 21	Mood, Emotions, and Attitudes	
February 28	Stress, Stressors, and Strain	
March 7	Motivation I	
March 14	*** SPRING BREAK – NO CLASS***	-----
March 21	Motivation II	
March 28	Trust and Justice	
April 4	Individual Differences	
April 11	Identity, Time, Meaningful Work	
April 18	Relationships and Social Networks	
April 25	Paper Presentations	-----

COURSE REQUIREMENTS**Individual Contributions and Deliverables**

Due Date	Contribution/Deliverable	Points
Every Class	Class Participation	60 points
TBD	Discussion Leadership	40 points
2/21	Viable Topic Worksheet (I will return with feedback by 3/7)	20 points
3/21	Article Review	30 points
3/28	Initial Paper Submission (I will return with feedback by 4/11)	50 points
4/25	Paper Presentation	40 points
5/10	Final Paper + Response Letter Submission	60 points
	Total	300 points

Scale for Determining Overall Performance. Your course grade will be based on the total points you earned during the course, using the scale below.

270 - 300 points (90-100%) A
 255 - 269 points (85-89.9%) B+
 240 - 254 points (80-84.9%) B
 225 - 239 points (75-79.9%) C+
 210 - 224 points (70-74.9%) C
 209 or fewer points (0-69.9%) F

1. **Class Participation (60 points).** Your participation will be assessed on a weekly basis. During each class meeting, you are expected to actively participate in class discussions in ways that show a firm grasp of the reading material and critical evaluation of any assigned questions. You are also expected to actively listen and respectfully respond to others' comments. Everyone is expected to contribute in substantive ways during each class meeting. Scholarly work in OB is such that reasonable people can be expected to disagree on the nature of the constructs, processes proposed by theorists, and interpretation of data. Thus, everyone is expected to form opinions, and to share and defend them in class. In assessing participation efforts, I aim to be mindful of the quality of student participation and not just quantity.

You will be responsible for reading the weekly assigned articles in depth. The “optional” articles are provided in order to give you an opportunity to read more on a given topic and to “go above and beyond” during the discussions if you so choose.

You will need to email a question(s)/comment(s) to the discussion leader (and copy me on the email) by noon on the day before class each week, so that she/he has time to integrate appropriately into the discussion plan: Each week, it's expected that you briefly note something that you would like integrated into the discussion about one or more of the articles from that week. For example, you might note something that stood out to you or that you found interesting, something you were confused about, something you agreed or disagreed with from the readings, or anything else that comes up for you. These weekly questions/comments are both meant to give everyone some ownership over weekly discussion content, and also to give the discussion leader some advanced insight and the opportunity to integrate your burning thoughts and questions most effectively. These questions/comments should be thoughtful, but should not be a daunting task when it comes to writing or managing them (as a discussion leader). In that spirit, please keep them concise—you will have plenty of time to elaborate during the discussion on the following day.

2. **Discussion Leadership (40 points).** During selected class sessions, you will be asked to lead the discussion. When you are discussion leader, you will structure our time together and guide our analysis and integration of the readings, and should be prepared to integrate the discussion as it unfolds and point it in useful directions.
 - A. To help prepare for your role as discussion leader and to help you facilitate our class discussion, it is suggested that you use a tactic called the “**6 word synthesis.**” First, describe each article in 200 words, then 100 words, then 25 words, then 6 words. This tactic is derived from the 6-word

story in the flash fiction genre (a fictional work of extreme brevity that still offers character and plot development), inspired by Ernest Hemingway's famous challenge and first six-word story, "For sale: baby shoes, never worn. This gives you a chance to distill the essence of an article and to consider how the addition and deletion of words and information can impact the narrative. You are encouraged to draft a document with these details, and you should plan to distribute the document to the class by the time class starts on the day of discussion. The information should be presented in such a way that it is useful for all members in the discussion.

- B.** In your role as discussion leader, you will facilitate the participation of other class members. This goes beyond asking other students to summarize articles. Your responsibilities will include deciding in what order we discuss the articles and making sure that we compare and contrast perspectives, discuss key themes and contributions of the research, identify gaps and potential areas for future research, and keep us focused on the topic. Keep in mind that the purposes of the discussions are to provide a brief overview and contributions of assigned readings, address theoretical status while noting the quality of the available empirical evidence for the assigned topic, highlight any interesting new developments, and share ideas on future directions for the topic. You have free reign in determining the exact format for the discussion, but at a minimum, the discussion should be facilitated to cover:
- key terms
 - key theory and underlying theoretical mechanisms
 - key measures, research design, and methodology used
 - basic grasp of the research findings and contribution of the work discussed
 - quality of the work
 - how (as we progress) this week's topic/readings relate to those discussed in previous weeks
 - gaps and future directions
- C.** In addition to organizing the discussion around the focal articles, you will be responsible for integrating "optional" articles with the discussion in such a way that presents these articles to the class.
- D.** You will also be responsible for identifying an article published in a peer-reviewed journal that you find interesting and that is relevant for your topic week. The article you select should meet the following criteria: a) it cannot be a paper already included on our reading list, b) it must have been published in the last two years, and c) it should be a paper that you find interesting. You will need to email a copy of the article to all of us by Monday of the week you're scheduled to lead the discussion.
- 3. Short Paper (130 points total; see points breakdown in A-C below). Write the opening (i.e., hook or introduction) of an empirical journal article surrounding an original idea—one that is yours and yours alone.** It should read like pp. 3-6, assuming the first two pages are the title and abstract pages. This section should be around 1000 words, all inclusive, and should refer the reader to a figure depicting a model. That model should have a predictor(s) → mediator(s) → outcome(s) structure where the mediators represent mechanisms from some theory covered in this course. Put differently, the reasons behind why your predictor(s) explain variance in your outcome(s) should be supplied by

some theory we covered. This is typical of theory grounded work in OB—the theory typically “lives” more in the mediator space than in either the predictor or outcome spaces. Your opening paper should articulate the mystery, puzzle, dissensus, or problem that motivates your study before positioning that inspiration in some existing conversation among scholars. You should then describe how you are contributing to that conversation while laying out the theory that you are using to ground your work.

Following the introduction, please list out your formal hypothesis statements.

Following your formal hypothesis statements, include a brief methodological section that includes your proposed design, sample, procedure, and measurement choices.

You should include a reference section for any cited work and your paper should be prepared in accordance with AMJ’s Style Guide for Authors (see the journal’s website). Adherence to this style guide will be one factor in your grade.

While you are not required to read any of the following, you might find one or more these sources helpful in developing your topic and writing the introduction:

Alvesson, M., & Sandberg, J. 2011. Generating research questions through problematization. *Academy of Management Review*, 36: 247-271.

Bodemer, N., & Ruggeri, A. 2012. Finding a good research question, in theory. *Science*, 335: 1439.

Bergh, D. D. 2003. Thinking strategically about contribution. *Academy of Management Journal*, 46: 135-136.

Davis, M. S. 1971. That's interesting! Towards a phenomenology of sociology and a sociology of phenomenology. *Philosophy of the Social Sciences*, 1: 309-334.

Grant, A. M., & Pollock, T. G. 2011. Publishing in AMJ – Part 3: Setting the hook. *Academy of Management Journal*, 54(5): 873-879.

Gray, K., & Wegner, D. M. 2013. Six guidelines for interesting research. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 8(5): 549-553.

Locke, K. & Golden-Biddle, K. 1997. Constructing opportunities for contribution: Structuring intertextual coherence and ‘problematizing’ in organizational studies. *Academy of Management Journal*, 40(5): 1023-1062.

Podsakoff, P.M., Podsakoff, N.P., Mishra, P., & Escue, C. 2018. Can Early-Career Scholars Conduct Impactful Research? Playing “Small Ball” vs “Swinging for the Fences”. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 17: 496-531

Rynes, S. 2002. Some reflections on contribution. *Academy of Management Journal*, 45: 311-313.

Sandberg, J. & Alvesson, M. 2011. Ways of constructing research questions: gap-spotting or problematization? *Organization*, 18(1): 23-44.

- A. Viable Topic Worksheet (20 points).** A copy of this worksheet can be found in Appendix A of this syllabus. This worksheet is intended to help in developing your paper topic and should be completed in that spirit. Keep in mind that your topic may shift from the ideas initially submitted in this worksheet, but this should help you get the ball rolling. I will give individual feedback on the ideas presented in this worksheet.

Viable Topic Worksheets should be submitted to the course Canvas site (and will be filtered through TurnItIn software) by 11:59pm on February 21th.

- B. Initial Paper Submission (50 points).** After you've received feedback on the viable topic worksheet and you've settled on a topic and model, complete an initial version of the paper as described above (introduction/hook, formal hypothesis statements, brief methodological section). Please keep in mind that this paper is not a "rough" draft. It should be logical, legible, and represent your best effort at a first stab of the paper.

Initial Paper Submission should be submitted to the course Canvas site (and will be filtered through TurnItIn software) by 11:59pm on March 28th.

- C. Final Paper Submission + Response Letter (60 points).** After you've received feedback on your initial paper submission, you'll need to respond to my comments, just as you would respond to reviewer comments on a manuscript you've submitted for publication that's been given a "revise and resubmit" decision. We will look at examples, discuss any of your own experiences in drafting responses to reviewers, and talk more about how you might craft your response letter together in class.

In addition to the letter, you should make any edits to the actual paper that you deem necessary prior to submitting a final copy.

Final Paper and Response Letter should be submitted to the course Canvas site (and will be filtered through TurnItIn software) as two separate files by 11:59pm on May 10th.

- 4. Paper Presentation.** Students will present their research papers to the class on April 25th (but all final presentations are due to me via email before class on April 25th). Presentations should be no longer than 15 minutes (time may be adjusted depending on the number of students who enroll in the seminar)—you will be stopped if you go over. Students need to convey the (a) motivation for the paper (what important theoretical question are you trying to resolve and why existing theories and research cannot be used to address this question), (b) the theoretical foundation guiding your choice of constructs/relationships, (c) the key constructs and relationships, (d) overview of the method. Please submit your PowerPoint deck (via Canvas) by 4pm the day before class (I want to have these loaded on my computer so that we can quickly transition between presentations). You will be graded based on your ability to *clearly communicate* the aspects of your paper as described in the details for your "Short Paper" (#3), above, and to provide thoughtful answers to questions.

5. **Article Review.** One component of service to our scholarly field is serving as a blind reviewer for articles submitted to academic journals. As Sullivan, Baruch, and Schepmyer (2010) recently noted, “Reviewing has long been recognized as a critical part of the academic process of knowledge creation, development, and dissemination. However, as evidenced by recent findings from focus groups and an international survey, the relative lack of effective formal training in management PhD programs on how to review is surprising given the impact that reviewing has on the management field.” Therefore, this activity is intended to give you insight into the process of reviewing a quantitative manuscript.

I will provide an unpublished manuscript for which you will craft a critical yet constructive review. There are at least 5 key responsibilities of good reviewers:

1. Ensure the literature review is current and comprehensive, the topic under study is impactful, and the paper adds value to the field
2. Ensure the journal’s mission statement is upheld
3. Safeguard that scientific principles are upheld and that ethical standards are enforced
4. Ensure that the quantitative or qualitative methods used fit with the research question, are rigorous, and that data are analyzed properly
5. Provide constructive, developmental feedback

While you are not required to read any of the following, you might find one or more these sources helpful in providing guidance:

Baugh, G. B., Hunt, J. G., & Scandura, T. A. 2006. Reviewing by the numbers: Evaluating quantitative research. In Y. Baruch, S. E. Sullivan, & H. Schepmyer (Eds.), *Writing reviews: A guide for evaluating scholarly writing*. NY: Palgrave Macmillan.

Desrosiers, E. I., Sherony, K., Barros, E., Ballinger, G. A., Senol, S., & Campion, M. A. 2002. Writing research articles: Update on the article review checklist. In S. G. Rogelberg (Ed.), *Handbook of research methods in I/O psychology*: 459-478. Malden, MA: Oxford.

Kohler et al. 2020. Supporting robust, rigorous, and reliable reviewing as the cornerstone of our profession: Introducing a competency framework for peer review. *Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, 13(1): 1-27.

Sullivan, S. E., Baruch, Y., & Schepmyer, H. 2010. *The why, what, and how of reviewer education: A human capital approach*. Journal of Management Education, 34: 393-429.

Your review should be submitted via Canvas as a PDF file by 11:59pm on March 21, 2023.

COURSE TOPICS AND READINGS

Week 1 – January 17th: Organizational Behavior: Introduction and Overview

1. Rousseau, D. M. 1997. Organizational behavior in the new organizational era. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 48: 515-546.
2. Porter, L. W. 2008. Organizational psychology: A look backward, outward, and forward. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 29: 519-526.
3. Heath, C., & Sitkin, S. B. 2001. Big-B versus Big-O: What is *organizational* about organizational behavior. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 22: 43-58.
4. Podsakoff, P.M., MacKenzie, S.B., Bachrach, D.G., & Podsakoff, N.P. 2005. The influence of management journals in the 1980s and 1990s. *Strategic Management Journal*, 26:473-488.
5. Klein, K. J., Dansereau, F., & Hall, R. J. 1994. Levels issues in theory development, data collection, and analysis. *Academy of Management Review*, 19: 195-229.

Week 2 – January 24th: What is Theory? The role of theory in scientific research

1. Bacharach, S. 1989. Organizational theories: Some criteria for evaluation. *Academy of Management Review*, 4: 496-515.
2. Colquitt, J. A. & Zapata-Phelan, C. 2007. Trends in theory building and theory testing: A five-decade study of the Academy of Management Journal. *Academy of Management Journal*, 50: 1281-303.
3. Kerlinger, F. N., & Lee, H. B. 2000. Science and the scientific approach. In *Foundations of behavioral research*, Ch. 1: 1-21. Forth Worth, TX: Harcourt.
4. Sutton, R. I., & Staw, B. M. 1995. What theory is not. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 40: 371-384.
5. Weick, K. E. 1989. Theory construction as disciplined imagination. *Academy of Management Review*, 14: 516-531.

Week 3 – January 31st: Job Performance

1. Dalal, R. S., Bhawe, D. P., & Fiset, J. 2014. Within-person variability in job performance: A theoretical review and research agenda. *Journal of Management*, 40: 1396-1436.
2. Motowidlo, S. J., Borman, W. C., & Schmit, M. 1997. A theory of individual differences in task and contextual performance. *Human Performance* 10, 71-83.

3. Organ, D. W. 1997. Organizational citizenship behavior: It's construct cleanup time. *Human Performance* 10: 85-97.
4. Podsakoff, N. P., Whiting, S. W., Podsakoff, P. M., & Blume, B. D. 2009. Individual- and organizational-level consequences of organizational citizenship behaviors: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology* 94: 122-141.
5. LePine, J. A., & Van Dyne, L. 2001. Peer responses to low performers: An attributional model of helping in the context of groups. *The Academy of Management Review*, 26: 67-84.
6. Van Dyne, L. & LePine, J. A. 1998. Helping and voice extra-role behavior: Evidence of construct and predictive validity. *Academy of Management Journal* 41: 108-119.

Optional Readings:

7. Call, M. L., Nyberg, A. J., & Thatcher, M.B. 2015. Stargazing: An Integrative Conceptual Review, Theoretical Reconciliation, and Extension for Star Employee Research. *Journal of Applied Psychology* 100: 623-640.
8. Hoffman, B. J., Blair, C.A., Meriac, J. P., & Woehr, D. J. 2007. Expanding the criterion domain? A quantitative review of the OCB literature. *Journal of Applied Psychology* 92: 555-566.
9. Pulakos, E. D., Arad, S., Donovan, M. A., Plamondon, K. E. 2000. Adaptability in the workplace: Development of a taxonomy of adaptive performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology* 85: 612-624.
10. Rotundo, M., & Sackett, P. R. 2002. The relative importance of task, citizenship, and counterproductive performance to global ratings of job performance: A policy capturing approach. *Journal of Applied Psychology* 87: 66-80.

Week 4 – February 7th: Commitment, Withdrawal, and Turnover

1. Allen, N. J., & Meyer, J. P. 1990. The measurement and antecedents of affective, continuance, and normative commitment to the organization. *Journal of Occupational Psychology* 63: 1-18.
2. Felps, W., Mitchell, T.R., Hekman, D. R., Lee, T.W., Holtom, B. C., & Harman, W. S. 2009. Turnover contagion: How coworker's job embeddedness and job search behaviors influence quitting. *Academy of Management Journal* 52: 545-561.
3. Hom, P.W., Lee, T.W., Shaw, J.D., & Hausknecht, J.P. 2017. One hundred years of employee turnover theory and research. *Journal of Applied Psychology* 102: 530-535.
4. Klein, H. J., Molloy, J. C., & Brinsfield, C. T. 2012. Reconceptualizing workplace commitment to redress a stretched construct: Revisiting assumptions and removing confounds. *Academy of Management Review* 37: 130-151.

5. Lee, T. W., Burch, T.C., & Mitchell, T.R. 2014. The story of why we stay: A review of Job embeddedness. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior*, 1: 199-216.
6. Withey, M.J., & Cooper, W.H. 1989. Predicting exit, voice, loyalty, and neglect. *Administrative Science Quarterly* 34: 521-539.

Optional Readings:

7. Johns, G. The psychology of lateness, absenteeism, and turnover. 2001. In N. Anderson, D. S. Ones, H.K. Sinangil, & C. Viswesvaran (eds.), *Handbook of Industrial, Work, and Organizational Psychology*: 232-252. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Week 5 – February 14th – NO CLASS

Week 6 – February 21st: Mood, Emotions, and Attitudes

1. Barsade, S. G., & Gibson, D. E. 2007. Why does affect matter in organizations? *Academy of Management Perspectives*, 21: 36-59.
2. Bass, J., De Dreu, C. K. W., & Nijstad, B. A. 2008. A meta-analysis of 25 years of Mood—creativity research: Hedonic tone, activation, or regulatory focus? *Psychological Bulletin* 134: 779-806.
3. Harrison, D. A., Newman, D. A., & Roth, P. L. 2006. How important are job attitudes? Meta-analytic comparisons of integrative behavioral outcomes and time sequences. *Academy of Management Journal* 49: 305-325.
4. Judge, T.A., Weiss, H.W., Kammeyer-Mueller, J.D., & Hulin, C.L. 2017. Job attitudes, job satisfaction, and job affect: A century of continuity and of change. *Journal of Applied Psychology* 102: 356-374.
5. Rothbard, N. P., & Wilk, S. L. 2011. Waking up on the right or wrong side of the bed: Start-of-workday mood, work events, employee affect, and performance. *Academy of Management Journal*, 54: 959-980.
6. Watson, D., & Clark, L. A. 1997. The measurement and mismeasurement of mood: Recurrent and emergent issues. *Journal of Personality Assessment* 86, 267–296.
7. Weiss, H. M., & Cropanzano, R. 1996. An affective events approach to job satisfaction. In B. M. Staw & L. L. Cummings (Eds.), *Research in Organizational Behavior*, Vol. 18: 1- 74. Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

Optional Readings:

1. 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*: 3-52. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
2. Brief, A. P., & Weiss, H. M. 2002. Organizational behavior: Affect in the workplace. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 53: 279-307.
3. Elfenbein, H. A. 2007. Emotion in organizations: A review and theoretical integration. *The Academy of Management Annals*, 1: 315-386.
4. Todorova, G., Bear, J. B., & Weingart, L. R. 2014. Can conflict be energizing? A study of task conflict, positive emotions, and job satisfaction. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 99: 451-467.
5. Russell, J. A. 1980. A circumplex model of affect. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 39: 1161-1178.

Week 7 – February 28th: Stress, Stressors, and Strain

1. Bliese, P.D., Edwards, J.R., & Sonnentag, S. 2017. Stress and well-being at work: A century of empirical trends reflecting theoretical and societal influences. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 102: 389-402.
2. Crawford, E.R., LePine, J.A., & Rich, B.L. 2010. Linking job demands and resources to employee engagement and burnout: A theoretical extension and meta-analytic test. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 95: 834-848.
3. Lanaj, K., Johnson, R. E., & Barnes, C. M. 2014. Beginning the workday yet already depleted? Consequences of late-night smartphone use and sleep. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 124: 11-23.
4. LePine, J. A., Podsakoff, N.P., & LePine, M.A. 2005. A meta-analytic test of the challenge stressor-hindrance stressor framework: An explanation for inconsistent relationships among stressors and performance. *Academy of Management Journal*, 48: 764-775.
5. Maslach, C. Schaufeli, W.B., & Leiter, M. P. 2001. Job burnout. *Annual Review of Psychology* 52: 397-422.
6. Cohen, S., & Wills, T. A. 1985. Stress, social support, and the buffering hypothesis. *Psychological Bulletin*, 98: 310-357.
7. Trougakos, J. P., Beal, D. J., Green, S. G., & Weiss, H. M. 2008. Making the break count: An episodic examination of recovery activities, emotional experiences, and positive affective displays. *Academy of Management Journal*, 51: 131-146.

Optional Readings:

8. Bolino, M.C., Hsiung, H., Harvey, J., & LePine, J.A. 2015. “Well I’m tired of tryin’!” Organizational Citizenship Behavior and Citizenship Fatigue. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 100, 56-74.
9. Latack, J.C., & Havlovic, S. J. 1992. Coping with Job Stress: A Conceptual Evaluation Framework for Coping Measures. *Journal of Organizational Behavior* 13: 479–508.
10. Nohe, C., Meier, L.L., Sonntag, K., & Michel, A. 2015. The chicken or the egg? A meta-analysis of panel studies of the relationship between work-family conflict and strain. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 2015: 522-536.
11. Podsakoff, N.P., LePine, J.A., & LePine, M.A. 2007. Differential challenge stressor-hindrance stressor relationships with job attitudes, turnover intentions, turnover, and withdrawal behavior: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 92: 438-454.

Week 8 – March 7th: Motivation I – The Classics

1. Ajzen, I. 1991. The theory of planned behavior. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 50: 179-211.
2. Bandura, A. 1991. Social cognitive theory of self-regulation. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 50: 248-287.
3. Deci, E. L., Koestner, R., & Ryan, R. M. 1999. A meta-analytic review of experiments examining the effects of extrinsic rewards on intrinsic motivation. *Psychological Bulletin* 125: 627-668.
4. Fried, Y., & Ferris, G. R. 1987. The validity of the job characteristics model: A review and meta-analysis. *Personnel Psychology*, 40: 287-322.
5. Gagné, M., & Deci, E. L. 2005. Self-determination theory and work motivation. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 26: 331-362.
6. Latham, G. P., & Pinder, C. C. 2005. Work motivation theory and research at the dawn of the twenty-first century. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 56: 485-516.
7. Stajkovic, A. D., & Luthans, F. 1998. Self-efficacy and work-related performance: A meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin*, 124: 240-261.

Optional Readings:

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

9. Stajkovic, A. D., & Luthans, F. 2001. Differential effects of incentive motivators on work performance. *Academy of Management Journal*, 44: 580-590.
10. Van Eerde, W., & Thierry, H. 1996. Vroom's expectancy models and work-related criteria: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 81: 575-586.
11. Weiner, B. 1985. An attributional theory of achievement motivation and emotion. *Psychological Review*, 92: 548-573.

Week 9 – March 14th: SPRING BREAK

Week 10 – March 21st: Motivation II – Contemporary Themes

1. Grant, A. M. 2007. Relational job design and the motivation to make a prosocial difference. *Academy of Management Review*, 32: 393-417.
2. Grant, A. M. 2008. Does intrinsic motivation fuel the prosocial fire? Motivational synergy in predicting persistence, performance, and productivity. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 93: 48-58
3. Huang, S., Etkin, J., & Jin, L. 2017. How winning changes motivation in multiphase competitions. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 112: 813-837.
4. Kanfer, R., Frese, M., & Johnson, R. E. 2017. Motivation related to work: A century of progress. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 102: 338-355.
5. Lee, K. Y., Duffy, M. K., Scott, K. L., & Schippers, M. C. 2018. The experience of being envied at work: How being envied shapes employee feelings and motivation. *Personnel Psychology*, 71: 181-200.
6. Locke, E. A., & Latham, G. P. 2006. New directions in goal-setting theory. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 15: 265-268.
7. Lord, R. G., Diefendorff, J. M., Schmidt, A. M., & Hall, R. J. 2010. Self-regulation at work. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 61: 543-68.
8. Woolley, K., & Fishbach, A. 2018. It's about time: Earlier rewards increase intrinsic motivation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 114: 877-890.

Week 11 – March 28st: Trust and Justice

1. Colquitt, J. A., Scott, B. A., & LePine, J. A. 2007. Trust, trustworthiness, and trust propensity: A meta-analytic test of their unique relationships with risk taking and job performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 92: 909-927.

2. Colquitt, J. A., Scott, B. A., Rodell, J. B., Long, D. M., Zapata, C. P., Conlon, D. E., & Wesson, M. J. 2013. Justice at the millennium, a decade later: A meta-analytic test of social exchange and affect-based perspectives. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 98: 199-236.
3. Cropanzano, R., & Mitchell, M. S. 2005. Social exchange theory: An interdisciplinary review. *Journal of Management* 31: 874-900.
4. Goodman, P. S., & Friedman, A. 1971. An examination of Adams' Theory of Inequity. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 16: 271-288.
5. Mayer, R. C., & Gavin, M. B. 2005. Trust in management and performance: Who minds the shop while the employees watch the boss? *Academy of Management Journal*, 48: 874-888.
6. McAllister, D.J. 1995. Affect- and cognition-based trust as foundations for interpersonal cooperation in organizations. *Academy of Management Journal*, 38: 24-59.
7. Tepper, B.J., Duffy, M.K., Henle, C.A., Lambert, L.S. 2006. Procedural injustice, victim precipitation, and abusive supervision. *Personnel Psychology*, 28: 101-123.

Optional Readings:

8. Baer, M. D., Dhensa-Kahlon, R. K., Colquitt, J. A., Rodell, J. B., Outlaw, R., & Long, D.M. 2015. Uneasy lies the head that bears the trust: The effects of being trusted on emotional exhaustion. *Academy of Management Journal*, 58: 1637-1657.
9. Colquitt, J. A., Long, D. M., Rodell, J. B., & Halvorsen-Ganepola, M. D. K. 2015. Adding the 'in' to justice: A qualitative and quantitative investigation of the differential effects of justice and injustice. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 100: 278-297.

Week 12 – April 4th: Individual Differences in Personality and Ability

1. Gonzalez-Mule, E., Mount, M.K., and Oh, I. 2014. A meta-analysis of the relationship between general mental ability and non-task performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 99: 1222-1243.
2. Harrison, S.H., Sluss, D.M., & Ashforth, B.E. 2011. Curiosity adapted the cat: The role of trait curiosity in newcomer adaptation. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 96: 211-220.
3. Ilies, R., Arvey, R.D., & Bouchard, T.J. 2006. Darwinism, behavioural genetics, and organizational behavior: A review and agenda for future research. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 27:121-141.
4. Judge, T. A., & Bono, J.E. 2001. Relationship of core self-evaluations traits—self-esteem, generalized self-efficacy, locus of control, and emotional stability—with job satisfaction and job performance: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86: 80-92.

5. Judge, T.A., Higgins, C.A., Thoreson, C.J., & Barrick, M.R. 1999. The big five personality traits, general mental ability, and career success across the life span. *Personnel Psychology*, 52: 621-652.
6. Mayer, J.D., Roberts, R.D., & Barsade, S. G. 2008. Human abilities: Emotional Intelligence. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 59: 507-536.
7. Meyer, R. D., Dalal, R. S., & Hermida, R. 2010. A review and synthesis of situational strength in the organizational sciences. *Journal of Management*, 36: 121-140.

Optional Readings:

8. Joseph, D. L., Jin, J., Newman, D.A., & O'Boyle, E.H. 2015. Why does self-reported emotional intelligence predict job performance? A meta-analytic investigation of Mixed EI. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 100: 298-342.
9. Lubinski, D. 2004. Introduction to the special section on cognitive abilities: 100 years after Spearman's (1904) "'General Intelligence,' Objectively Determined and Measured" *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 86: 96-111.
10. Judge, T. A., Rodell, J.B., Klinger, R.L., Simon, L.S., & Crawford, E.R. 2013. Hierarchical representations of the five-factor Model of personality in predicting job performance: Integrating three organizing frameworks with two theoretical perspectives. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 98: 875-925.
11. Schmidt, F. L., & Hunter, J. E. 2004. General mental ability in the world of work: Occupational attainment and job performance. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 96: 162-173.

Week 13 – April 11th: Identity, Person-organization fit, Time, and Meaningful Work

Identity

1. Ashforth, B.E., & Kreiner, G.E. 1999. "How can you do it?": Dirty work and the challenge of constructing a positive identity. *Academy of Management Review*, 24: 413-434.
2. Ashforth, B. E. & Shinoff, B. S. 2016. Identity under construction: How individuals come to define themselves in organizations. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior*, 3,111-137.

Time and Temporal Processes

3. Methot, J. R., Lepak, D. P., Shipp, A. J., & Boswell, W. R. 2017. Good Citizen Interrupted: Calibrating a Temporal Theory of Citizenship Behavior. *Academy of Management Review*, 42, 10-31.
4. Mitchell, T. R., & James, L. R. 2001. Building better theory: Time and the specification of when things happen. *Academy of Management Review*, 26: 530–547.

5. Roy, D. F. 1959. "Banana time": Job satisfaction and informal interaction. *Human Organization*, 18(4): 158–168.
6. Shipp, A. J., & Cole, M. S. 2015. Time in individual-level organizational studies: What is it, how is it used, and why isn't it exploited more often? *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior*, 2: 237–260.

Job Crafting, Meaningful Work, and Mindfulness

7. Bunderson, J. S., & Thompson, J. A. 2009. The call of the wild: Zookeepers, callings, and the double-edged sword of deeply meaningful work. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 54: 32–57.
8. Wrzesniewski, A., & Dutton, J. E. 2001. Crafting a job: Revisioning employees as active crafters of their work. *Academy of Management Review*, 26: 179-201.

Optional Readings:

9. Ashforth, B. E. 2016. Exploring identity and identification in organizations: Time for some course corrections. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*, 23: 361-373.
10. Carton, A. M. 2018. "I'm not mopping the floors, I'm putting a man on the moon": How NASA leaders enhanced meaningfulness of work by changing the meaning of work. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 63: 1-47.
11. Kristoff-Brown, A. L., Zimmerman, R. D., & Johnson, E. C. 2005. Consequences of individuals' fit at work: A meta-analysis of person-job, person-organization, person-group, and person-supervisor fit. *Personnel Psychology*, 58:281-342.
12. Schneider, B. 1987. The people make the place. *Personnel Psychology*, 40: 437-453.
13. Tims, M., Derks, D., & Bakker, A. B. 2016. Job crafting and its relationships with person-job fit and meaningfulness: A three-wave study. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 92: 44-53.
14. Zaheer, S., Albert, S., & Zaheer, A. 1999. Time scales and organizational theory. *Academy of Management Review*, 24: 725–741.

Week 14 – April 18th: Interpersonal Workplace Relationships and Social Networks

1. Borgatti, S. P., & Foster, P. C. 2003. The network paradigm in organizational research: A review and typology. *Journal of Management*, 29: 991-1013.
2. Bradbury, H. & Lichtenstein, B. M. B. 2000. Relationality in organizational research: Exploring the space between. *Organization Science*, 11: 551-564.
3. Brass, D. J. 1984. Being in the right place: A structural analysis of individual influence in an organization. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 29: 518-539.

4. Ferris, G. R., Liden, R. C., Munyon, T. P., Summers, J. K., Basik, K. J., & Buckley, M. R. 2009. Relationships at work: Toward a multidimensional conceptualization of dyadic work relationships. *Journal of Management*, 35: 1379-1403.
5. Mehra, A., Kilduff, M., & Brass, D. J. 2001. The social networks of high and low self-monitors: Implications for workplace performance. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 46(1): 121-146.
6. Methot, J. R., LePine, J. A., Podsakoff, N. P., & Christian, J. L. 2016. Are workplace friendships a mixed blessing? Exploring tradeoffs of multiplex relationships and associations with job performance. *Personnel Psychology*, 69: 311-355.
7. Stephens, J. P., Heaphy, E., & Dutton, J. 2011. High Quality Connections. In K. Cameron and G. Spreitzer (Eds.), *Handbook of Positive Organizational Scholarship*, New York: Oxford University Press.
8. Venkataramani, V. & Dalal, R.S. 2007. Who Helps and Harms Whom? Relational antecedents of interpersonal helping and harming in organizations. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 92: 952-966.

Optional Readings:

9. Carmeli, A., Brueller, D., & Dutton, J. E. 2009. Learning behaviors in the workplace: The role of high-quality interpersonal relationships and psychological safety. *Systems Research & Behavioral Science*, 26, 81-98.
10. Casciaro, T., & Lobo, M. S. 2008. When competence is irrelevant: The role of interpersonal affect in task related ties. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 53: 655-684.
11. Cotton, R. D., Shen, Y., & Livne-Tarandach, R. 2011. On becoming extraordinary: The content and structure of the development networks of major league baseball hall of famers. *Academy of Management Journal*, 54: 15-46.
12. Sluss, D. M., & Ashforth, B. E. 2007. Relational identity and identification: Defining ourselves through work relationships. *Academy of Management Review*, 32: 9-32.

Week 15 – April 25th : Student Presentations

Appendix A

Do I have a viable research topic?

Use no more than a few sentences to answer the following 10 questions. You should be able to answer all 10 questions if you have a viable research topic and have immersed yourself in the relevant literatures.

1. What topic do you want to study?
2. Why is it important to study the topic you're interested in studying?
3. Who has studied this topic previously (what fields/ communities / or subdisciplines, if any, have studied it)?
4. What do we clearly know about this topic?
5. What gaps exist in the literature that you hope to address? That is, what don't we know? In other words, what is your core, overarching research question?
6. Why should we care about this gap/question? That is, why is it important to begin to address and close this gap / answer this question?
7. What theoretical frameworks or prior research will you draw on to close this gap / answer these questions? That is, what literature will you rely on to develop your hypotheses?
8. In brief, what is your core idea? For example, fill in the blanks: Drawing on _____, I argue that _____.
9. How will you test your core idea?
10. Assuming your research is wildly successful, how would the *New York Times* describe your fascinating results?