New York University, Stern School of Business
Department of Management & Organizations
MGMT-GB.3381.01:
Advanced Research Seminar in Organizational Behavior
Fall 2025

Professor: Gavin Kilduff
Office Phone: (212) 998-0253

E-mail: gkilduff@stern.nyu.edu

Class meetings: Thursdays 10 - 1
Classroom: Tisch 720
Office hours: By appointment
Office: KMC 7-63

COURSE DESCRIPTION AND OBJECTIVES

The purpose of this course is to familiarize you with the theories, methods, and approaches that characterize the study of organizational behavior (OB), which involves the "micro" psychological foundations of organization science. I hope that you will gain a preliminary understanding of the field of OB and begin to develop the necessary skills to become a productive contributor to research in the field. Toward this end, we will explore classic and contemporary theories, enduring controversies and debates, and empirical research on a variety of major topics in OB. We will also learn how to interpret, evaluate, integrate, and extrapolate from research on topics in OB and beyond. The course will not culminate in a comprehensive understanding of every single thing there is to know about the field; that would be impossible for a semester-long course. Rather, I'd like us to cover some highlights of the field— some "classics" and noteworthy recent papers—that, when put together, give a broad introduction into what has been done and what is left to do in OB. In tandem with this, the course is designed to hone your ability to generate research ideas that can make meaningful contributions to the field.

For those students who plan on pursuing a career as an OB researcher, I hope this course will help you begin to cultivate your own research agenda. For those students planning on a career in another research area, I hope this course will enable you to integrate some of the approaches and insights from OB to your own area of research, and to be able to "speak" with your colleagues in OB. **For PhD students in Management and Organizations, your OB minor comprehensive exam will be based on the content of this course.**

COURSE REQUIREMENTS AND GRADING

The goals described above can only be achieved through a great deal of reading, processing, and focused analysis. It is critical that all students read the assigned material before each class. However, reading is only the beginning; it is also critical that students spend time *reflecting on*, *analyzing*, and *evaluating* what they have read. Simply knowing the "gist" is not enough to benefit from authors' insights. Rather, you must think through the points raised by the authors, question those points, consider the underlying motivations of the authors, and connect the work to the broader literature. As such, you should not leave all the reading for the evening before a particular class session; rather, I highly encourage you to read the articles over the 2-3 days prior to class. In the course schedule that follows, you will find a listing of the readings assigned for

each class meeting. <u>You are expected to do ALL the reading assigned for a particular day</u>, except that, for a few of the topics, I have provided a list of 'optional' readings which I recommend if you find this topic particularly interesting and/or are considering pursuing research in this area (and upon which you will be expected to have some basic knowledge for the OB Majors exam).

Specific Course Requirements and Grading

Class participation:	**35%**
Weekly Research briefs:	**30%**
Research proposal:	**35%**

A note on attendance

Given the nature of this course, it is essential that you attend every class meeting. Much of the learning that takes place in this course occurs during our class meetings where we discuss the readings at length. If you must miss a class meeting, please discuss that with me in advance. Of course, if something serious arises (e.g., sickness, significant event for a close relative/friend, etc.), we can adjust accordingly. In addition, part of showing up to class involves **showing up on time**. It is inconsiderate to your classmates to be late for a class meeting and to miss a portion of the class discussion.

Class Participation

Though attendance is essential, active participation is also critical—you must be both physically and mentally in attendance. Your primary assignment in this course is to actively engage in class discussions. This means immersing yourself in the readings and showing up prepared to have a lively, vigorous discussion about the readings. I also want you to take risks in your contributions to our discussion and to not shy away from controversial points. *To help guide you through reading and digesting an academic article, focus on the questions in the "tips on reading academic journal articles" on pp. 3-4 of this syllabus.*

More specifically, your class participation grade will be based on your 1) engagement in class discussion, 2) acting as a session facilitator for at least two of our class meetings, and 3) evaluation of each of your colleague's research papers near the end of the semester.

1. <u>Engagement in class discussion:</u> You are required to be prepared to discuss <u>all </u>the required readings for each class session. The essence of this seminar is contained in the quality of the classroom discussion. A list of questions to guide you in your reading appears later in this syllabus.

   It is my expectation that students will not skim any of the week's readings. In addition to completing the assigned readings, students should think carefully about specific papers and the set of readings as a whole. Class participation is based on the quality of your contributions to our discussion, with an emphasis on critical thinking, constructive critique, and thoughtful questioning. Quality participation is about adding value, sharing insights, building upon the ideas of your peers, and encouraging others to participate. At the same time, students are discouraged from dominating the conversation. Put another way, although we will have a discussion leader each week, everyone should be thoroughly prepared to discuss all assigned readings. Indeed, students will be directly asked for their

opinions, their ideas, and their general thoughts about the papers and themes each week.

2. <u>Session facilitator</u>: You will act as a session facilitator for 3-4 of our class meetings during the semester. The role of the session facilitator is to be the informal leader for the discussion, at least in the beginning. This <u>does not mean simply summarizing the readings</u>, but rather being prepared to offer a few questions and comments that hopefully begin a discussion of the main issues, strengths, weaknesses, controversies, and gaps in each of the readings for a particular week. <u>As session facilitator, you should email me with a list of 2-4 discussion questions in a Word document, by 1 pm the day before class (i.e., on Wednesday)</u> These questions can relate to the topic as a whole or be focused on specific readings.

Generally, session leaders begin by providing their own <u>brief</u> synopsis of each reading and then guide the discussion. To facilitate this, <u>session leads should prepare a slide deck with a 1 slide summary of each article, which will be shared with the class.</u> This may include some discussion of what they they feel are the critical questions, fundamental flaws, and/or promising new research directions in the area. However, again, this will brief; session leaders are not expected to engage in substantially more discussion than non-session leaders. Session leaders should assume that the other seminar participants have also read the material carefully, so their job is primarily to generate discussion, not to provide a lecture or summary of each article. We will assign session leader positions as the semester moves on.

<u>Some suggestions for leading discussions include:</u>
• Have prepared questions on each article, as well as integrating the articles
• Be flexible with the questions and deviate as necessary if the questions are not prompting discussion or if the discussion takes an unexpected, but interesting, turn
• Consider how future research could build upon this article
• Moderate the discussion somewhat equally across all individuals
• Avoid losing control of the discussion if it goes in a nonacademic direction
• Be a leader, and do not rely on the professor to moderate the discussion

3. <u>Generating discussion questions:</u> Although the session leader for each week will take a leading role in generating discussion questions, I encourage the other students each week to also bring discussion questions to class.

4. <u>Evaluation of a colleague's paper:</u> You will serve as a reviewer for each of your classmates. The peer review process is at the very foundation of academic research, and this is meant as an opportunity to beginning learning these skills and to help out your classmates. Your job will be to read a draft of each classmate's research proposal at the end of the semester and provide a constructive review of it. You should plan on writing 1-2 single-spaced pages.

<u>Weekly Research Briefs</u>

You will write a research brief in advance of each of our class meetings, to be submitted to me via email by 8 am the day of class (i.e., Thursday). You do not need to submit a research brief for the first week of class, and you can select two other weeks for which you will skip this assignment. This means that you will submit 10 research briefs, in total. In these briefs, you should build on the week's readings to put forward an idea for a research project. Briefly summarize (no more than three sentences) the idea from the reading(s) that you find relevant/interesting/important, and then briefly 1) state your idea, 2) describe the logic behind it (e.g., behind any hypotheses or propositions your are putting forth), 3) explain how it could extend what is known / add to the literature, and 4) indicate the method and the kind of data you could imagine collecting to test your idea. **Keep your research brief to a maximum of 1.5 pages, double-spaced, one inch margins, 12 pt Times New Roman font, in Microsoft Word.**

This exercise will be helpful for training your ability to generate and identify research ideas, one of the most important skills for success in the field. For those of you in the Management & Organizations department, this sort of thinking and writing is also useful practice for the OB Minor Comprehensive Exam.

In each research brief, please also include one question related to the week's readings (can focus on the topic as a whole, or individual readings) that you think would be helpful/interesting to pose to the group, for discussion. This can be on a separate page.

Research briefs will be graded out of 10 points.

Research Proposal

You will write a research proposal over the course of the semester, in which you will propose some hypotheses that develop new knowledge in the field of OB. Research proposals will be approximately 15 double-spaced pages (12-point Times New Roman font, 1-inch margins). The proposal should be formatted using the style guide for the Academy of Management Journal (https://aom.org/research/publishing-with-aom/author-resources/editorialstyle-guides). You will need to use this formatting when submitting to the Academy of Management journals and conferences, so it is a good idea to learn it now. As with the briefs, assignments that significantly exceed the page limit will not be accepted.

Your final proposal will include the following sections, in order:
- A title page (does not count toward page limit).
- An abstract. This should be a brief overview of your proposal (does not count toward page limit).
- An introduction. The goal of this section is to introduce the research question and why it is important, provide a brief summary of the main arguments that follow in the research proposal, and articulate how the proposal advances knowledge in the field of OB (~3-4 pages).
- A background section. The goal of this section is to review prior relevant research on your research topic. It is expected that you will do significant additional reading outside of the formal class list for this review. The goal of the review is to lay out what is known and what remains unknown about your topic. This section is meant to

help the reader understand how and why the novel hypotheses that follow advance understanding in an important way (~3-4 pages).

- A theory development section. The goal of this section is to offer 2-3 novel hypotheses and to present compelling theory (i.e., explanatory logic) in support of those hypotheses. The hypotheses ought to be novel and worth pursuing in future research (~5-6 pages).
- A methods section. The theory and hypotheses should be the primary focus of your proposal. However, you should also include a method section that describes at least one study that could be run to test your hypotheses (~2 pages).
- A discussion section. Briefly discuss any limitations associated with your theorizing and proposed methods (~1 page).
- A figure. You should depict your hypotheses using a "box and arrow" style figure (does not count toward page limit).
- A reference section (does not count toward page limit).

The goal is to have the proposal be of national conference quality (e.g., it would be accepted at the Academy of Management meeting, which is a desirable outcome of this activity, should any subsequent data collection yield results that are supportive on some level). There are several intermediate deadlines to help you achieve this goal:

- November 15: An initial description of your research proposal is due. It should be 2 pages (double-spaced, 12-point Times New Roman font) and describe the topic, the main research question, at least one hypothesis, and your proposed method. You are welcome to choose a topic for your proposal that we have not yet covered when you turn in your initial description. Please email me your description. It is perfectly acceptable for your proposal (and eventual paper) to be based on one of your research briefs.
- December 11: A complete draft of your paper is due. You will email the draft to one classmate who will provide a peer review (TBD). Please copy me on the email. I will not read this draft.
- December 16: Peer reviews are due. Email your peer review to me. Please also email your peer review to the person whose paper you read and copy me.
- January 15: A final draft of your paper is due after the holiday break, which should incorporate the feedback from the peer review you receive into your final draft.

- *Note: All deadlines are 11:59PM Eastern Time. Also, deadlines for M&O PhD students might change based on scheduling of comprehensive exams.*

HONOR CODE AND ETHICAL GUIDELINES

All students are expected to follow the Stern policy on academic integrity, which specifies your duty to acknowledge the work and efforts of others when submitting work as your own. Ideas, data, direct quotations, paraphrasing, creative expression, or any other incorporation of the work of others must be clearly referenced. Any attempt to represent the work of others as your

own will be referred to the Stern discipline committee. Penalties for plagiarism range from academic probation to expulsion. Please see me if you are uncertain about what represents plagiarism.

TIPS ON READING ACADEMIC JOURNAL ARTICLES

A primary goal of this course is to hone your skill at reading academic journal articles, which can seem like a daunting task. Academic articles are often full of domain-specific jargon, complicated statistics, and what seems like unnecessary and complex information. Thus, a lot of the information may seem irrelevant—but it (usually) is not. The details that are presented will help you to determine how much stock to put into the research. In particular, for empirical articles, the methodological and statistical details provide vital information for determining an article's strengths and weaknesses, and for evaluating the article's contribution to the field. The coherence of the authors' reasoning toward their hypotheses and/or conclusions is also of vital importance. We will discuss these issues at various points throughout the course, and you should feel free to ask any questions that you have.

Though you will develop your own strategy over time, it is useful to keep the following questions in mind when reading a given paper. To be clear, you do not need to answer every single one of these for every single paper.

- What is the aim of the research? Specifically, what "big picture" question is highlighted and what more focused research question is addressed?
- What do we already know about this research question? That is, what does past research say?
- Why is this research question important? Meaning, why should anyone care? Why was this research published? (Clearly the editor saw something that was valuable) How can exploring this research question extend existing theory in the literatures within which it is situated? What, if any, are the practical/organizational/policy implications?
- What are the underlying assumptions that the authors make about people or organizations?
- To what degree are the hypotheses obvious versus novel?
- What conclusions are drawn? What theoretical/practical contributions does the research offer?
- For empirical articles, what sample and method were used? Are the sample and method appropriate given the study's hypotheses?
  - What were the major empirical findings that are relevant to the aims of the study? Do you believe them? If not, what would you have found more convincing?
  - Do construct operationalizations follow their conceptualizations? (look at the example items, or go find the entire measure. Does it seem to fit with the theory?)
  - What alternative explanations can you think of for the empirical findings? What might the authors argue back with regards to these alternate explanations?
  - How generalizable are the findings? What are the boundary conditions? (i.e., for whom and under what conditions do the findings apply? When might they not apply?)
- Is there anything confusing or contradictory in the manuscript?

- What strengths of the paper stand out to you? What weaknesses stand out to you (as something you might want to avoid)?
- Does this article inform other articles we read that week? Or, so far this semester? How?
- 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?
- Can you think of any interesting or important directions for future research that would extend the current paper?

Remember, there is no perfect paper. In almost all cases, even relatively poor research has a kernel of merit to it, and even the very best research has its problems. Recognizing the strengths of a study while still keeping a critical eye, and recognizing the weaknesses of an otherwise top-notch piece of scholarship, is one of the most important skills you need to develop as an academic. Overall, expect to spend long hours dissecting the assigned readings.

Finally, below is a "code list" for acronyms and shortened version of the names of some of the journals and edited volumes in the field (there are many others of course!):

- AJS: *American Journal of Sociology*
- AMD or "Discoveries": *Academy of Management Discoveries*
- AMJ: *Academy of Management Journal*
- AMR: *Academy of Management Review*
- Advances: *Advances of Experimental Social Psychology*
- Annals: *Academy of Management Annals*
- Annual Review of OP&OB: *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior*
- ASR: *American Sociological Review*
- ASQ: *Administrative Science Quarterly*
- Current Directions: *Current Directions in Psychological Science*
- The Handbook: *Handbook of Social Psychology* (usually)
- JAP: *Journal of Applied Psychology*
- JEP: Usually refers to *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General* but could also refer to the related journals *JEP: Applied*, or one of several others
- JESP: *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*
- JMS: *Journal of Management Studies*
- JOB: *Journal of Organizational Behavior*
- JOM: *Journal of Management*
- JPSP: *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*
- JSI: *Journal of Social Issues*
- OBHDP: *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*
- Org Science: *Organization Science*
- P Psych: *Personnel Psychology*
- Perspectives: *Perspectives on Psychological Science*
- PNAS: *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*

- Psych Bull: *Psychological Bulletin*
- Psych Inquiry: *Psychological Inquiry*
- Psych Review: *Psychological Review*
- Psych Science: *Psychological Science*
- PSPB: *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*
- PSPR: *Personality and Social Psychology Review*
- ROB: *Research in Organizational Behavior*
- SPPS: *Social Psychological and Personality Science*

Week 1 – September 4 – Introduction, Writing & Theory Building

Readings
- Sutton, R.I., & Staw, B.M. 1995. What theory is not. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 40*, 371-384.

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

- Pollock, T. G., & Bono, J. E. (2013). Being scheherazade: The importance of storytelling in academic writing. *Academy of Management Journal, 56*, 629-634.

- Lange, D., & Pfarrer, M. D. (2017). Editors' comments: Sense and structure—The core building blocks of an AMR article. *Academy of Management Review, 42*, 407-416.

- Godart, F. C., Maddux, W. W., Shipilov, A. V., & Galinsky, A. D. (2015). Fashion with a foreign flair: Professional experiences abroad facilitate the creative innovations of organizations. *Academy of Management Journal*, *58*(1), 195-220.

Optional readings
- Strunk Jr, W., & White, E. B. (2007). *The Elements of Style Illustrated*. Penguin.

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

Week 2 – September 11 – Individuals in Organizations / Personality

Readings

- Mischel, W. (2004). Toward an integrative science of the person. *Annual Review of Psychology*, *55*, 1-22.

- Judge, T., & Zapata, C. (2015). The person-situation debate revisited: Effect of situation strength and trait activation on the validity of the big five personality traits in predicting

job performance. *Academy of Management Journal, 58,* 1149-1179.

- Judge. T. A. (2009). Core self-evaluations and work success. *Psychological Science,* 58-62.

- Tasselli, S., Kilduff, M., & Landis, B. (2018). Personality change: Implications for organizational behavior. *Academy of Management Annals, 12*, 467-493.

- Higgins, E. T., & Pinelli, F. (2020). Regulatory Focus and Fit Effects in Organizations. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior, 7*, 25-48.

Optional readings

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

Staw, B. M., Bell, N. E., and Clausen, J. A. (1986), "The dispositional approach to job attitudes: A lifetime longitudinal test," *Administrative Science Quarterly, 31*, 56-77.

Week 3 – September 18 – Motivation

Readings
- Kerr, S. (1975). On the folly of rewarding "A" while hoping for "B". *Academy of Management Journal, 18,* 769-783.

- Deci, E. L., Olafsen, A. H., & Ryan, R. M. (2017). Self-determination theory in work organizations: The state of a science. *Annual Review of organizational psychology and organizational behavior, 4*, 19-43.

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

- Grant, A. M. (2008). Does intrinsic motivation fuel the prosocial fire? Motivational synergy in predicting persistence, performance, and productivity. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 93*(1), 48–58.

- Menges, J. I., Tussing, D. V., Wihler, A., & Grant, A. M. (2017). When job performance is all relative: How family motivation energizes effort and compensates for intrinsic motivation. *Academy of Management Journal, 60*, 695-719.

Optional readings

- 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.

- To, C., Kilduff, G. J., & Rosikiewicz, B. L. 2020. When interpersonal competition helps and when it harms: A review and integration via challenge and threat. *Academy of Management Annals, 14,* 849-875.

Week 4 – September 25 – Self and Identity

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

- Elsbach, K. D., & Kramer, R. M. (1996). Members' responses to organizational identity threats: Encountering and countering the Business Week rankings. *Administrative Science Quarterly,* 442-476.

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

- Ramarajan, L., Rothbard, N. P., & Wilk, S. L. (2017). Discordant vs. harmonious selves: The effects of identity conflict and enhancement on sales performance in employee–customer interactions, *The Academy of Management Journal, 6*, 2208-2238.

- Rogers, K. M., Corley, K. G., & Ashforth, B. E. (2017). Seeing more than orange: Organizational respect and positive identity transformation in a prison context. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 62*, 219-269.

Week 5 – October 2 – Judgement and Decision-Making

Readings
- Tversky, A., & Kahneman, D. (1974). Judgment under uncertainty: Heuristics and biases. *Science, 185*, 1124-1131.

- Staw, B. M., & Hoang, H. (1995). Sunk costs in the NBA: Why draft order affects playing time and survival in professional basketball. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 474-494.

- Milkman, K. L., Rogers, T., & Bazerman, M. H. (2008). Harnessing our inner angels and demons: What we have learned about want/should conflicts and how that knowledge can help us reduce short-sighted decision making. *Perspectives on Psychological Science, 3,* 324-338.

- Welsh, D. T., Ordóñez, L. D., Snyder, D. G., & Christian, M. S. (2015). The slippery slope: how small ethical transgressions pave the way for larger future transgressions. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 100, 114.

- Kang, S., & Kim, J. W. (2022). The fragility of experts: A moderated-mediation model of expertise, expert identity threat, and overprecision. *Academy of Management Journal*, *65*(2), 577-605.

Week 6 – October 9 – Affect and Emotions

Readings
- Côté, S., & Miners, C. T. (2006). Emotional intelligence, cognitive intelligence, and job performance. *Administrative science quarterly*, *51*(1), 1-28.

- Grandey, A. 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.

- 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.

- Yu, A., Berg, J. M., & Zlatev, J. J. (2021). Emotional acknowledgment: How verbalizing others' emotions fosters interpersonal trust*. Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 164*, 116-135.

- Bellet, C. S., De Neve, J. E., & Ward, G. (2024). Does employee happiness have an impact on productivity?. *Management science*, *70*(3), 1656-1679.

Week 7 – October 156 – Dyadic Interactions and Relationships

Readings
- Colquitt, J. A., LePine, J. A., Zapata, C. P., & Wild, R. E. (2011). Trust in typical and high-reliability contexts: Building and reacting to trust among firefighters. *Academy of Management Journal*, *54*(5), 999-1015.

- Brett, J. M., Shapiro, D. L., & Lytle, A. L. (1998). Breaking the bonds of reciprocity in negotiations. *Academy of Management Journal, 41*(4), 410-424.

- Owens, B. P., Baker, W. E., Sumpter, D. M., & Cameron, K. S. (2016). Relational energy at work: Implications for job engagement and job performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *101*(1), 35-49.

- Kilduff, G. J., Elfenbein, H. A., & Staw, B. M. (2010). The psychology of rivalry: A relationally dependent analysis of competition. *Academy of Management journal*, *53*(5), 943-969.

- Schinoff, B. S., Pillemer, J., Rogers, K. M., & Petriglieri, J. L. (2025). Blurring Boundaries in Coworker Relationships: How a Nonwork Setting Becomes a Relational Holding Environment. *Organization Science (in press).*

Week 8 – October 23 – Leadership

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

- Carton, A. M., Murphy, C., & Clark, J. R. (2014). A (blurry) vision of the future: How leader rhetoric about ultimate goals influences performance. *Academy of Management Journal*, *57*(6), 1544-1570.

- Owens, B. P., & Hekman, D. R. (2016). How does leader humility influence team performance? Exploring the mechanisms of contagion and collective promotion focus. *Academy of Management Journal, 59*(3), 1088-1111.

- Martin, S. R., Côté, S., & Woodruff, T. (2016). Echoes of our upbringing: How growing up wealthy or poor relates to narcissism, leader behavior, and leader effectiveness. *Academy of Management Journal*, *59*(6), 2157-2177.

- Shim, S. H., Livingston, R. W., Phillips, K. W., & Lam, S. S. (2021). The impact of leader eye gaze on disparity in member influence: Implications for process and performance in diverse groups. *Academy of Management Journal, 64*(6), 1873-1900.

Optional readings
- Klein, K.J., Ziegert, J.C, Knight, A.P. & Xiao, Y. (2006). Dynamic delegation: Shared, hierarchical, and deindividualized leadership in extreme action teams. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 51*: 590-621.

Week 9 – October 30 – Groups and Teams

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

- Barrick, M. R., Stewart, G. L., Neubert, M. J., & Mount, M. K. (1998). Relating member ability and personality to work-team processes and team effectiveness. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *83*(3), 377-391.

- 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.

- Balkundi, P., & Harrison, D. A. (2006). Ties, leaders, and time in teams: Strong inference about network structure's effects on team viability and performance. *Academy of Management Journal*, *49*(1), 49-68.

- Nederveen Pieterse, A., Van Knippenberg, D., & Van Dierendonck, D. (2013). Cultural diversity and team performance: The role of team member goal orientation. *Academy of Management Journal*, *56*(3), 782-804.

Optional readings
- Knight, A. P., Greer, L. L., & De Jong, B. (2020). Start-up teams: A multidimensional conceptualization, integrative review of past research, and future research agenda. *Academy of Management Annals*, *14*(1), 231-266.

- Li, J., & Hambrick, D. C. (2005). Factional groups: A new vantage on demographic faultlines, conflict, and disintegration in work teams. *Academy of Management Journal*, *48*(5), 794-813.

Week 10 – November 6 – Climate and Culture

Readings
- O'Reilly III, C. A., Chatman, J., & Caldwell, D. F. (1991). People and organizational culture: A profile comparison approach to assessing person-organization fit. *Academy of management journal*, *34*(3), 487-516.

- Schneider, B., Ehrhart, M. G., & Macey, W. H. (2013). Organizational climate and culture. *Annual review of psychology*, *64*, 361-388.

- Srivastava, S. B., Goldberg, A., Manian, V. G., & Potts, C. (2018). Enculturation trajectories: Language, cultural adaptation, and individual outcomes in organizations. *Management Science*, *64*(3), 1348-1364.

- Gelfand, M. J., Raver, J. L., Nishii, L., Leslie, L. M., Lun, J., Lim, B. C., ... & Yamaguchi, S. (2011). Differences between tight and loose cultures: A 33-nation study. *Science*, *332*(6033), 1100-1104.

- Yao, J., Li, H., Zhang, Z. X., & Brett, J. M. (2025). Information Exchange in Negotiations: Trust Level, Trust Radius, and Harmony Concern in East Asia versus West. *Academy of Management Journal*, in press.

Week 11 – November 13 – Justice

Readings
- Deutsch, M. (1975). Equity, equality, and need: What determines which value will be used as the basis of distributive justice. *Journal of Social Issues*, 31: 137-149.

- Greenberg, J. (1988). Equity and workplace status: A field experiment. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *73*(4), 606.

- Matta, F. K., Scott, B. A., Colquitt, J. A., Koopman, J., & Passantino, L. G. (2017). Is consistently unfair better than sporadically fair? An investigation of justice variability and stress. *Academy of Management Journal, 60*(2), 743-770.

- Sherf, E. N., Venkataramani, V., & Gajendran, R. S. (2019). Too busy to be fair? The effect of workload and rewards on managers' justice rule adherence. *Academy of Management Journal*, *62*(2), 469-502.

- Koopman, J., Lin, S. H., Lennard, A. C., Matta, F. K., & Johnson, R. E. (2020). My coworkers are treated more fairly than me! A self-regulatory perspective on justice social comparisons. *Academy of Management Journal*, *63*(3), 857-880.

Week 12 – November 20 – Hierarchy

Readings
- **[READ ONLY UP TO P. 365]** Magee, J.C., & Galinsky, A.D. (2008). Social hierarchy: The self-reinforcing nature of power and status. *Academy of Management Annals*, 2: 351-398.

- Marr, J. C., & Thau, S. (2014). Falling from great (and not-so-great) heights: How initial status position influences performance after status loss. *Academy of Management Journal*, *57*(1), 223-248.

- Cheng, J. T. (2020). Dominance, prestige, and the role of leveling in human social hierarchy and equality. *Current opinion in psychology*, *33*, 238-244.

- Yu, S., & Kilduff, G. J. (2020). Knowing where others stand: Accuracy and performance effects of individuals' perceived status hierarchies. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *119*(1), 159-184.

- Hoff, M., Galinsky, A. D., & Rucker, D. D. (2024). The vicious cycle of status insecurity. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*.

<u>Optional:</u>

- Keltner, D., Gruenfeld, D. H., & Anderson, C. (2003). Power, approach, and inhibition. *Psychological review*, *110*(2), 265.

- Anderson, C., John, O. P., Keltner, D., & Kring, A. M. (2001). Who attains social status? Effects of personality and physical attractiveness in social groups. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *81*(1), 116-132.

- Bunderson, J. S. (2003). Recognizing and utilizing expertise in work groups: A status characteristics perspective. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, *48*(4), 557-591.

- Hays, N. A., & Bendersky, C. (2015). Not all inequality is created equal: Effects of status versus power hierarchies on competition for upward mobility. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *108*(6), 867.

Week 13 – December 4 – Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion

Readings
- Hall, E. V., Hall, A. V., Galinsky, A. D., & Phillips, K. W. (2019). MOSAIC: A model of stereotyping through associated and intersectional categories. *Academy of Management Review*, *44*(3), 643-672.

- Leslie, L. M., Flynn, E., Foster-Gimbel, O. A., & Manchester, C. F. (2024). Happy talk: Is common diversity rhetoric effective diversity rhetoric?. *Academy of Management Journal*, *67*(3), 595-624.

- Akinola, M., Martin, A. E., & Phillips, K. W. (2018). To delegate or not to delegate: Gender differences in affective associations and behavioral responses to delegation. *Academy of Management Journal*, *61*(4), 1467-1491.

- Phillips, L. T., Stephens, N. M., Townsend, S. S., & Goudeau, S. (2020). Access is not enough: Cultural mismatch persists to limit first-generation students' opportunities for achievement throughout college. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *119*(5), 1112.

- Preston, M. C. (2025). The Moral Case Revisited: Moral Framing as a Double-Edged Sword for Motivating Majority Group Leaders to Support DEI. *Academy of Management Journal* (in press).

<u>Optional:</u>

- Harrison, D. A., Price, K. H., Gavin, J. H., & Florey, A. T. (2002). Time, teams, and task performance: Changing effects of surface-and deep-level diversity on group functioning. *Academy of management journal*, *45*(5), 1029-1045.

- Carton, A. M., & Rosette, A. S. (2011). Explaining bias against black leaders: Integrating theory on information processing and goal-based stereotyping. *Academy of Management Journal*, *54*(6), 1141-1158.

- Leslie, L. M. (2019). Diversity initiative effectiveness: A typological theory of unintended consequences. *Academy of Management Review*, *44*(3), 538-563.

- Lu, J. G., Nisbett, R. E., & Morris, M. W. (2020). Why East Asians but not South Asians are underrepresented in leadership positions in the United States. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, *117*(9), 4590-4600.

- Martin, A. E., & North, M. S. (2022). Equality for (almost) all: Egalitarian advocacy predicts lower endorsement of sexism and racism, but not ageism. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *123*(2), 373-399.

- Kanze, D., Huang, L., Conley, M. A., & Higgins, E. T. (2018). We ask men to win and women not to lose: Closing the gender gap in startup funding. *Academy of Management Journal*, *61*(2), 586-614.