

Organisational Behaviour Doctoral Seminar
Chia-Yen (Chad) Chiu, Ph.D.
Associate Professor in Leadership, Adelaide Business School
Meeting Time: Thursday from 1 to 4pm, 4 April to 20 June

Brief Description

This seminar is designed to assist doctoral students in developing a comprehensive understanding of classic and contemporary research in the field of organisational behaviour. It is crucial that you read the required readings before class and spend some time contemplating the research implications of the readings, both individually and as a group. We will utilise these readings to gain a sense of the significant perspectives and approaches in the field, viewing them not merely as a set of findings to be digested or summarised.

Expectations

Attendance and Preparation

The general expectation is for you to attend all 12 seminars and actively participate in discussions. Each week, I will provide a set of representative journal articles (**4-6 articles per week**) to stimulate discussions on the covered topics. It is essential that students read all assigned articles before the scheduled seminar.

This doctoral seminar's success depends on everyone being prepared and making meaningful contributions to class discussions. All participants are accountable for such contributions during each session. Class discussions will typically focus on the assigned readings, as well as supplemental articles or assignments.

While I do not expect you to have all the answers, I do expect you to contribute meaningful perspectives and questions that naturally arise from good preparation for class. By completing the assigned readings and spending time reflecting on them along with your own experiences and research before class, you will be ready to make informed and meaningful contributions during our sessions.

Weekly Thought Papers

Each week, students are required to complete a thought paper (2-3 pages). The focus is on generating your own creative ideas rather than merely summarising existing content. Specifically, I am interested in understanding how each reading can contribute to your own research topic.

This is the opportunity to let your thinking be uninhibited. Don't hesitate if your ideas sound a little unconventional. Remember, these thought papers are not intended to be mere article summaries. Utilise your engagement with the literature to identify gaps in our knowledge, inconsistencies in results requiring resolution, and challenges for theory and research. Ideally, each thought paper should serve as the foundation for an important and needed piece of theoretical or empirical research. Avoid treating them as book reports; instead, ensure they reflect critical and developmental thinking on your part.

Discussion Leaders

From Week 3, a student discussion leader will be assigned each week. All students are expected to lead discussion 1-2 times over the entire seminar series. As a discussion leader, you should be especially well prepared for class, as you will be responsible for guiding the analysis and integration of the readings. As discussion leader, students should be prepared to structure the session so that we:

- Discuss individual readings
- Compare and contrast perspectives
- Summarize primary themes and contributions of the overall set of readings
- Identify gaps and potential areas for future research

One of the most useful tools of the discussion leader is a set of thought-provoking discussion questions (prepared in advance) to stimulate engaging class interaction. This is a recommended suggestion, but not necessarily required. It is also the duty of the discussion leader to promote full participation by all members of the class, to keep the discussion on topic, to encourage thoughtful debate, and to keep the class conversation moving forward.

As you read each article, take notes and outline its major points. Please be sure to follow these tips on writing high-quality discussion questions.

- Good discussion questions often begin with "why" or "how" (rather than with "who," "when," or "where.")
- Good discussion questions guide others to see patterns, to make connections, and to identify contradictions or differences across readings.
- Good discussion questions are open-ended (rather than close-ended).
- Discussion questions can focus on an individual article, multiple articles, or the topic as a whole (e.g., how the readings relate to each other and other material previously covered in the class).
- Avoid questions that are vague or that do not contribute much to the discussion such as those that ask how much others liked the article, ask how much they "believed" it, or ask what the authors' major finding was.
- Example of good discussion questions: How do the findings from article X fit in with the existing body of literature? What are the implications of article X for research in organizational behavior? How does the theme of article X compare or contrast with article Y? How do the implications of article X compare or contrast with article Y?

This is a safe environment where ideas can be tested, opinions are respected, and confusion is expected from time to time. It is your responsibility to speak, listen, question, and move the class discussion forward in a meaningful way. This is your class. Take full ownership and get the most you can from our time together.

Article Summaries

While not mandatory, I highly recommend that you write a brief research summary and document these summaries for your future studies. If you don't have a preferred journal article summary template, consider including the following items:

- State the research question and explain its significance in one sentence.
- Explain how this study is relevant to your own research topic in 1-2 sentences.
- State the proposed hypothesis/hypotheses and the supporting theories (1-3 sentences).
- Briefly describe the methods, including design, participants, materials, procedure, manipulated variables, measured variables, and data analysis (1-3 sentences).
- Describe the significant differences found in the results (1-3 sentences).
- Explain the key implications of the results and identify potential direct and indirect beneficiaries of the research conclusions (1-2 sentences).
- Ensure that the results and their interpretation directly relate to the hypothesis (1 sentence).

You can see more details here: https://psych.uw.edu/storage/writing_center/summarizing.pdf

Seminar Schedule

Date	Room	Topic	Discussion Leader
4 April	706	What is OB & Level of Analysis	Chad
11 April	706	Theory Writing	Chad
18 April	704/705	Person-Situation Debates and Fit	Cecilia
2 May	706	Behavioural, Attitudinal, and Wellbeing Outcomes	Imogen
	706	Emotion and Affect	Roxie
9 May	706	Motivation	Ryan
16 May	706	Organisational Justice	Johan
23 May	706	Interpersonal Dynamics and Teams	Ryan
30 May	901	Leadership - 1	Olivia
6 June	No Class		
20 June	901	Leadership - 2	Cecilia
	901	Power and Politics	Huiting

Week 1: What is OB & Level of Analysis

- Rousseau, Denise M. (1997). Organizational behavior in the new organizational era. *Annual Review of Psychology*, Vol 48. pp. 515-546.
- Porter, L.W. & Schneider, B. (2014). What was, what is, and what may be in OP/OB. *The Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior*, 1, 1-21.
- Klein, K. J., & Kozlowski, S. W. J. (2000). From micro to meso: Critical steps in conceptualizing and conducting multilevel research. *Organizational Research Methods*, 3, 211–236. <https://doi.org/10.1177/109442810033001>
- Aguinis, H., Pierce, C. A., Bosco, F. A., & Muslin, I. S (2009). First decade of Organizational Research Methods: Trends in design, measurement, and data-analysis topics. *Organizational Research Methods*, 12, 69-112.

Week 2: Theory Writing

- Grant, A. M., & Pollock, T. G. (2011). Publishing in AMJ—Part 3: Setting the hook. *Academy of Management Journal*, 54(5), 873-879.
- Fisher, G., Mayer, K., & Morris, S. (2021). From the editors—Phenomenon-based theorizing. *Academy of Management Review*, 46(4), 631-639.
- Thatcher, S. M., & Fisher, G. (2022). From the Editors—The Nuts and Bolts of Writing a Theory Paper: A Practical Guide to Getting Started. *Academy of Management Review*, 47(1), 1-8.
- Pillutla, M. & Thau, S. (2013). Organizational sciences’ obsession with “that’s interesting!”: Consequences and an alternative. *Organizational Psychology Review*, 3, 187–194.
- Shepherd, D., & Suddaby, R. (2017). Theory building: A review and integration. *Journal of Management*, 43(1), 59-86. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206316647102>

Week 3: Person-Situation Debates and Fit

- Chatman, J.A. (1989). Improving interactional organizational research: A model of person-organization fit. *Academy of Management Review*, 14, 333-349.
- Edwards, J.R. (2008). Person-environment fit in organizations. An assessment of theoretical progress. *The Academy of Management Annals*, 2. 167-230.
- Shipp, A.J., & Jansen, K.J. (2011). Reinterpreting time in fit theory: Crafting and recrafting narratives of fit in medias res. *Academy of Management Review*, 36, 76-101.
- Davis-Blake, A., & Pfeffer, J. (1986). Just a mirage: The search for dispositional effects in organizational research. *Academy of Management Review*, 14, 385-400.

Week 4: Behavioural, Attitudinal, and Wellbeing Outcomes

- Campbell, J. P., & Wiernik, B. M. (2015). The modeling and assessment of work performance. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior*, 2, 47-74.
- Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., Paine, J. B., & Bachrach, D. G. (2000). Organizational citizenship behaviors: A critical review of the theoretical and empirical literature and suggestions for future research. *Journal of Management*, 26, 513-563.

- Morrison, E. W. (2014). Employee voice and silence. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior*, 1, 173-197.
- Carpenter, N. C., & Berry, C. M. (2017). Are counterproductive work behavior and withdrawal empirically distinct? A meta-analytic investigation. *Journal of Management*, 43(3), 834-863.
- Judge, T. A., & Kammeyer-Mueller, J. D. (2012). Job attitudes. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 63, 341-367.
- 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(3), 389-402. <https://doi.org/10.1037/apl0000109>

Week 5: Emotion and Affect

- Brief, A. P., & Weiss, H. M. (2002). Organizational behavior: Affect in the workplace. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 53, 279-307.
- 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.
- Ashkanasy, N. M., & Dorris, A. D. (2017). Emotions in the workplace. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior*, 4(1), 67-90. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-orgpsych-032516-113231>
- Barsade, S. G. (2002). The ripple effect: Emotional contagion and its influence on group behavior. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 47(4), 644-675. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3094912>

Week 6: Motivation

- Kanfer, R., Frese, M., & Johnson, R. E. (2017). Motivation related to work: A century of progress. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 102(3), 338-355. <https://doi.org/10.1037/apl0000133>
- Seijts, G. H., Latham, G. P., Tasa, K., & Latham, B. W. (2004). Goal setting and goal orientation: An integration of two different yet related literatures. *Academy of Management Journal*, 47(2), 227-239. <https://doi.org/10.5465/20159574>
- Grant, A.M. (2008). The significance of task significance: Job performance effects, relational mechanisms, and boundary conditions. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 93, 108-124.
- Walsh, D.T., & Ordonez, L.D. (2014). The dark side of consecutive high performance goals: Linking goal setting, depletion, and unethical behavior. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 123, 79-89.
- Derfler-Rozin, R., & Pitesa, M. (2020). Motivation purity bias: Expression of extrinsic motivation undermines perceived intrinsic motivation and engenders bias in selection decisions. *Academy of Management Journal*, 63(6), 1840-1864.

Week 7: Organisational Justice

- Cropanzano, R. & Rupp, D.E. 2003. An overview of organizational justice: implications for work motivation. In R. M. Steers, L. W. Porter & G. A. Bigley (Eds.), *Motivation and Leadership at Work*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Desai, S. D., Sondak, H., & Diekmann, K. A. (2011). When fairness neither satisfies nor motivates: The role of risk aversion and uncertainty reduction in attenuating and reversing the fair process effect. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 116, 32-45.
- Valentine, M. (2018). When equity seems unfair: the role of justice enforceability in temporary team coordination. *Academy of Management Journal*, 61(6), 2081-2105.
- Zapata, C. P., Carton, A. M., & Liu, J. T. (2016). When justice promotes injustice: Why minority leaders experience bias when they adhere to interpersonal justice rules. *Academy of Management Journal*, 59(4), 1150-1173.

Week 8: Interpersonal Dynamics and Teams

- Mathieu, J. E., Maynard, M. T., Rapp, T., & Gilson, L. (2008). Team effectiveness 1997-2007: A review of recent advancements and a glimpse into the future. *Journal of Management*, 34, 410-476.
- De Wit, F. R., Greer, L. L., & Jehn, K. A. (2012). The paradox of intragroup conflict: A meta-analysis. *Journal of applied psychology*, 97(2), 360-390.
- Joshi, A., & Roh, H. (2009). The role of context in work team diversity research: A meta-analytic review. *Academy of Management Journal*, 52: 599-627.
- 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.

Week 9: Leadership - 1

- Meindl, J., Ehrlich, S. & Dukerich, J. (1985). The romance of leadership. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 30, 78-102.
- Lord, R. G., Day, D. V., Zaccaro, S. J., Avolio, B. J., & Eagly, A. H. (2017). Leadership in applied psychology: Three waves of theory and research. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 102(3), 434-451.
- DeRue, D. S., Nahrgang, J. D., Wellman, N., & Humphrey, S. E. (2011). Trait and behavioral theories of leadership: An integration and meta-analytic test of their relative validity. *Personnel Psychology*, 64, 7–52. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6570.2010.01201.x>
- Vroom, V. H., & Jago, A. G. (2007). The role of the situation in leadership. *American Psychologist*, 62, 17-24.
- Martin, R., Thomas, G., Legood, A., & Dello Russo, S. (2018). Leader–member exchange(LMX) differentiation and work outcomes: Conceptual clarification and critical review. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 39(2), 151-168. <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.2202>

Week 10: Leadership – 2

- Steffens, N. K., Munt, K. A., van Knippenberg, D., Platow, M. J., & Haslam, S. A. (2021). Advancing the social identity theory of leadership: A meta-analytic review of leader group prototypicality. *Organizational Psychology Review*, 11(1), 35–72. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2041386620962569>
- Eagly, A. H., Johannesen-Schmidt, M. C., and van Engen, M. (2003). “Transformational, Transactional, and Laissez-Faire Leadership Styles: A Meta-Analysis Comparing Women and Men.” *Psychological Bulletin*, 95, 569-591.
- Lemoine, G. J., Hartnell, C. A., & Leroy, H. (2019). Taking stock of moral approaches to leadership: An integrative review of ethical, authentic, and servant leadership. *Academy of Management Annals*, 13(1), 148-187.
- 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.

Week 11: Power and Politics

- Magee, J. C., & Galinsky, A. D. (2008). Social hierarchy: The self-reinforcing nature of power and status. *Academy of Management Annals*, 2(1), 351-398.
- Foulk, T. A., Lanaj, K., Tu, M. H., Erez, A., & Archaibeau, L. (2018). Heavy is the head that wears the crown: An actor-centric approach to daily psychological power, abusive leader behavior, and perceived incivility. *Academy of Management Journal*, 61(2), 661-684.
- Ferris, G.R., Adams, G., Kolodinsky, R.W., Hochwarter, W.A., & Ammeter, A.P. (2002). Perceptions of organizational politics: Theory and research directions. In F.J. Yammarino & F. Dansereau (Eds.), *Research in multi-level issues, Volume 1: The many faces of multi-level issues* (pp. 179-254). Oxford, UK: JAI Press/Elsevier Science.
- Valle, M.P., & Perrewé, P.L. (2000). Do politics perceptions relate to political behaviors? *Human Relations*, 53, 359-386.
- Ammeter, A., Douglas, C., Gardner, W., Hochwarter, W., & Ferris, G. (2002). Toward a political theory of leadership. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 13, 751-796.

Week 12: Organisational Culture, Climate, and Change (Optional)

- Schneider, B., Ehrhart, M. G., & Macey, W. H. (2013). Organizational climate and culture. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 64(1), 361–388. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-psych-113011-143809>
- Burnes, B. (2004). Kurt Lewin and the planned approach to change: A re-appraisal. *Journal of Management Studies*, 41(6), 977–1002. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-6486.2004.00463.x>
- Schneider, B., González-Romá, V., Ostroff, C., & West, M. A. (2017). Organizational climate and culture: Reflections on the history of the constructs in the Journal of Applied Psychology. *Journal of applied psychology*, 102(3), 468.
- Fulmer, C. A., & Ostroff, C. (2016). Convergence and emergence in organizations: An integrative framework and review. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 37, S122-S145.