

### Washington State University MAJOR CURRICULAR CHANGE FORM - - COURSE REVISION

- Please attach rationale for your request, a complete syllabus, and explain how this impacts other units in Pullman and other campuses (if applicable).
- Obtain all required signatures with dates.
- Provide original stapled packet of signed form/rationale statement/syllabus PLUS 10 stapled copies of complete packet to the Registrar's Office, campus mail code 1035.
- Submit one electronic copy of complete packet to [wsu.curriculum@wsu.edu](mailto:wsu.curriculum@wsu.edu).

Requested Future Effective Date: Fall 2016 (term/year) Course Typically Offered: full year, summer

**DEADLINES:** For fall term effective date: **October 1<sup>st</sup>**; for spring or summer term effective date: **February 1<sup>st</sup>**. See instructions.

**NOTE:** Items received after deadlines may be put to the back of the line or forwarded to the following year. Please submit on time.

**Current course** [List course as it currently appears in the catalog]:

MgtOp		589	Seminar in Management	
course subject/crosslist		course no.	title	
3	( )	Admission to the MBA, Master of Accounting, or Business PhD programs		
Credit hrs	lecture hrs per week	lab or studio hrs per week	prerequisite	

**Requested Change(s):** Check all that apply and list proposed change.

- Change subject: Mgmt       Change course number: \_\_\_\_\_       Change credit to: \_\_\_\_\_
- Change lecture-lab ratio to: ( \_\_\_\_\_ - \_\_\_\_\_ )       Variable credit: \_\_\_\_\_       Repeat credit (cum. max. hrs): \_\_\_\_\_
- New/change crosslisting\*: \_\_\_\_\_       Conjoint listing (400/500): \_\_\_\_\_
- Special Grading:  S, F;  A, S, F (PEACT only);  S, M, F (VET MED only);  H, S, F (PHARMACY, PHARDSCI only)
- Other (please list request): \_\_\_\_\_

**NOTE:** If only requesting a change to title, prerequisite, and/or description, please use a **Minor Curriculum Change** form.

- Title change: \_\_\_\_\_       Prerequisite change: \_\_\_\_\_
- Change catalog description to: \_\_\_\_\_

The following items require prior submission to other committees/depts. (SEE INSTRUCTIONS.)

- Request to meet Writing in the Major [M] requirement (Must have All-University Writing Committee Approval.)
- Request to meet UCORE in \_\_\_\_\_ (Must have UCORE Committee Approval >> See instructions.)
- Special Course Fee \_\_\_\_\_ (Must submit request to University Receivables)

Contact: Gene Lai Phone number: (509) 335-7197 Campus mail code: 4746

Email: genelai@wsu.edu Instructor, if different: \_\_\_\_\_

Gene Lai 8/11/15      Ly W WT 9/21/15      \_\_\_\_\_

Chair/date      Dean/date      All-University Writing Com / date

\_\_\_\_\_  
Chair (if crosslisted/interdisciplinary)\*      Dean (if crosslisted/interdisciplinary)\*      UCORE Committee Approval Date

\_\_\_\_\_  
Catalog Subcommittee Approval Date      GSC or AAC Approval Date      Faculty Senate Approval Date

**\*If the proposed change impacts or involves collaboration with other units, use the additional signature lines provided for each impacted unit and college.**

**Mgmt 589**  
**Seminar in Management**  
**Spring 2016**

Professor: Dr. Ken Butterfield  
Office: Todd 442  
Office Hours: Tuesdays and Wednesdays 12-1:30pm and by appointment  
Telephone: 509-335-3078  
Email: kdb@wsu.edu  
Course website: <https://learn.wsu.edu>  
Class schedule: Tuesdays and Thursdays 10:35 - 11:50pm, Todd 409  
Prerequisite: Admission to the Carson College of Business Ph.D. Program

### **Course Overview and Objectives**

This is a doctoral-level seminar in which we will examine various theories in the field of management and their application to empirical research. The course draws on diverse theories from a number of social and organization sciences.

### **Learning Objectives**

The overarching goal is to help doctoral students become independent scholars who are knowledgeable in the field of management. Specifically, students will be able to:

1. Develop an understanding of key concepts, theories, and extant research (assessed by class participation, mini comp, final exam, conceptual/thought paper, empirical research paper)
2. Stimulate your interest in employing one or more of these theories to analyze a management-related phenomenon in which you are interested and develop propositions (assessed by class participation, conceptual/thought paper)
3. Develop the skills necessary to critically evaluate, constructively review, integrate, and ultimately *contribute* to the research in management (assessed by class participation, mini comp, final exam, conceptual/thought paper, empirical research paper)
4. Develop new ideas and/or approaches that advance research and that might serve as starting points for *your* publishable research papers (assessed by class participation, conceptual/thought paper, empirical research paper)
5. Establish a level of knowledge that will enable you to pass the comprehensive examination; (assessed by class participation, mini comp, final exam, conceptual/thought paper, empirical research paper)
6. Meet Academy of Management's Vision, Mission, Objectives and Values outlined on the site below—these are important for success in an academic career:  
<http://aom.org/About-AOM/Vision,-Mission,-Objectives---Values.aspx> (assessed by class participation, empirical research paper)

### **Social contract and teaching philosophy**

The course instructor's role will be to serve as a teacher, coach, guide, inquisitor, mentor, and fellow participant who adds to knowledge-base, facilitates learning and motivates knowledge creation.

As a student, you are committing to: 1) enhance the knowledge base of the group including your own; and 2) create new knowledge. You will complete all the assignments to the best of your ability. This includes reviewing and critically evaluating assigned articles, presenting those effectively and share your knowledge as a participant or discussion leader.

Together, first and foremost, we will perform our duties to develop *the foundation* necessary for creating new knowledge. This is a process that begins with learning from extant knowledge in the field. Our efforts will be reflected by participation in and quality of discussions during class sessions.

Second, building on the foundation, we will strive to develop new ideas and/or approaches that advance strategic management research. This will be reflected in the papers you write during the course.

Third, as a courtesy to our fellow scholars, we will turn off all potentially distracting devices and platforms such Internet, mobile phones, watch alarms, or other electronic devices prior to the classroom, and refrain from any distracting behavior during the class.

## COURSE REQUIREMENTS

- **Class Attendance and Participation.** To maximize your learning, you should attend all regularly-scheduled class sessions. If, for some reason, you must miss a class (or arrive late or leave early), please contact me via email prior to class to explain the situation.
  - If you miss a class, it is your responsibility to ask your classmates what was covered, and to get notes. Absences are excused only for religious holidays and **documented** illnesses or family emergencies.
  - If you are having trouble in class (e.g. with participation, assignments, other team members, etc.), I want to know about it **as soon as possible**. I will do my best to help students who, despite a sincere effort, are experiencing difficulty. Please do NOT bring such issues to me at the end of the semester when nothing can be done to help you.

The following rubric will be used to assess class participation:

Category	High Level	Moderate Level	Low Level
<b>Relevance</b>	Consistently related to discussion topic, reflect an understanding of the readings and independent research.	Comments are occasionally off topic; reflect an understanding of readings but not independent research.	Comments are frequently off-topic, fail to reflect an understanding of the readings.
<b>Expression</b>	Opinions and ideas expressed in a clear, concise, and well supported manner.	Opinions and ideas are unclear or are stated clearly but lack supporting evidence.	No opinions or ideas expressed.
<b>Contribution to the Learning Community</b>	Presents creative approaches to topic; attempts to motivate group discussion.	Adds some original thought to discussion; makes moderate effort to become involved with group.	Contributes no new thoughts to discussion; is indifferent to the development of the group.

- **Article Summaries.** Article summaries will be presented using PowerPoint slides by

assigned students. This presentation will be of the quality of an academic conference or job market paper. Typically, half the members of the class will be assigned an article each that they present to the class. Other half of the class is assigned to develop original research ideas based on the readings from the class for that week.

- **Session Mechanics and structure.** We will use the structure used in the academic societies' meetings (AOM, SMS, AMA, ICIS, Babson etc.).
  - a. First, every session will be driven by two leaders: Session chair and Discussant. I will be the session chair for most of the sessions accompanied by a discussant or the discussion leader for the day. The session chair and discussion leader work together and prepare subject matter on the topic of the week. Session chair focuses on highlighting the key tenets of the theory.
  - b. Discussion leader highlights key issues addressed in focal papers (say, a core theme for each of the papers) and drives the session smoothly (based on the core theme). The discussion leader is responsible for providing articles and posting PowerPoint summaries on Dropbox/ Angel platform. Assigned students will complete their summary and others will identify research questions each week.
- **Original Research Ideas:** Beginning session 7, students will take turn in twos and each student will present her or his original research ideas in about 15 minutes—students will take turn such that every students gets an opportunity to discuss the nature of the idea in terms of a clear research question and the motivation behind it (e.g., theoretical gap, an extension of existing research, an interesting phenomenon, etc.). Presenters need to specify the theory or theories which would be used to explain their ideas. Presenter must develop specific hypotheses and discuss source of the data, operationalization of variables, potential analysis and contribution.
- **Conceptual paper.** A quality conceptual manuscript aims to provide new theoretical insights. It develops novel and insightful ideas into theoretical frameworks. These papers should be no longer than seven pages of content (exclusive of references, exhibits, tables, and figures, among others) and the quality should be adequate for submitting it to a national meeting (say, *Academy of Management Conference, 2014*) with the goal that it could be submitted to the *Academy of Management Review*, after further revision.
- **Empirical Research Paper.** An empirical research often defines relationships, demonstrates cause and effect and uses data derived from actual observation or experimentation to test hypotheses. You are required to submit an empirical research paper (25 to 30 pages approximately) similar to a dissertation proposal or your second year paper that could be submitted to a journal. The purpose of this paper is to apply one (or more) of the theories discussed during the term to a phenomenon of interest to you.

#### **COURSE EVALUATION:**

There will be three major evaluations of student performance. Grades will be weighted among these evaluations as follows:

<b>1. Conceptual/ Thought Paper</b>	<b>10%</b>
<b>2. Empirical Research Paper</b>	<b>40%</b>
<b>3. Class Preparation and Participation</b>	<b>40%</b>
<b>i. Article Summary and Presentation</b>	<b>20%</b>
<b>ii. Original research ideas</b>	<b>10%</b>
<b>iii. Class participation</b>	<b>10%</b>
<b>4. Mini-Comp/ Final exam</b>	<b>10%</b>

*Tentative Grading Scale:*

100 – 93.0 = A	86.9 – 83.0 = B	76.9 – 73.0 = C	66.9 – 60.0 = D
92.9 – 90.0 = A-	82.9 – 80.0 = B-	72.9 – 70.0 = C-	59.9 – 0 = F
89.9 – 87.0 = B+	79.9 – 77.0 = C+	69.9 – 67.0 = D+	

I do not grant “incomplete” grades, except under very unusual circumstances. Therefore, you can expect that your grade will be determined on the basis of the material submitted by the due date.

**Important Dates:**

- 1) Last Tuesday of February: Outline of empirical paper is due.
- 2) Last Tuesday of March: Conceptual paper is due.
- 3) First Tuesday of April: First draft of empirical paper is due.
- 4) First Tuesday of May: Completed empirical paper is due

**NOTES**

**A. Students with Disabilities:** I am committed to providing assistance to help you be successful in this course. Reasonable accommodations are available for students with a documented disability. If you have a disability and may need accommodations to fully participate in this class, please visit the Access Center (Washington Building 217) to schedule an appointment with an Access Advisor. All accommodations **MUST** be approved through the Access Center. Additional information is available on the DRC website is [www.drc.wsu.edu](http://www.drc.wsu.edu). In case of any doubt, please feel free to contact an Access Advisor at the Access Center at (509) 335-3417 or email [AccessCenter@wsu.edu](mailto:AccessCenter@wsu.edu).

**B. WSU's Academic Integrity Statement.** As an institution of higher education, Washington State University is committed to principles of truth and academic honesty. All members of the University community share the responsibility for maintaining and supporting these principles. When a student enrolls in Washington State University, the student assumes an obligation to pursue academic endeavors in a manner consistent with the standards of academic integrity

adopted by the University. To maintain the academic integrity of the community, the University cannot tolerate acts of academic dishonesty including any forms of cheating, plagiarism, or fabrication. Washington State University reserves the right and the power to discipline or to exclude students who engage in academic dishonesty. Academic Integrity Statement and link to WSU's policy:

[www.conduct.wsu.edu/default.asp?PageID=343](http://www.conduct.wsu.edu/default.asp?PageID=343)

[www.wsulibs.wsu.edu/plagiarism/main.html](http://www.wsulibs.wsu.edu/plagiarism/main.html)

**C. Classroom Etiquette:** Please do yourself and everyone else a favor by conducting yourself professionally in class. If you anticipate an emergency or sense urgency in terms of the nature of message, please go outside the classroom and connect with the outside world in privacy

#### **D. Re-grading**

I work to ensure that all your submissions are graded fairly, based on the quality of your work. If, after careful consideration, you are thoroughly convinced that a particular grade of yours should be reviewed, you must provide me with a written justification of your argument and two copies of all supporting material, including your submission/ paper.

Except in the case of obvious administrative errors, no re-grading will take place before the end of the term. Where your re-grading request does not flow from an administrative error, I will first determine whether your request is justified. If your request is justified, and if I determine by the end of the semester that the number of points involved is large enough that it could change your letter grade, then I will review your complete assignment at the end of the semester. If an assignment is re-graded, I may adjust the grade downward, upward, or not at all, depending upon my fair assessment of the assignment's quality. This procedure ensures that cases where re-grading could change the student's overall final grade get maximum attention and that problems that affect the class as a whole are taken into account in a fair, thorough and prompt manner.

#### **E. Campus Safety:**

Washington State University is committed to maintaining the safety of the students, faculty, staff, and visitors to the Pullman campus. Further, WSU community should always be prepared to take steps to maintain their own safety during any emergency situation. Please review the information at the following links to be better prepared:

<http://safetyplan.wsu.edu>;

<http://oem.wsu.edu/emergencies>

## COURSE SCHEDULE

<u>Week</u>		<u>Topic</u>
1	Jan 14	Introduction
2	Jan 21	Overview of OB & Theory
3	Jan 28	Motivation 1
4	Feb 4	Motivation 2
5	Feb 11	Justice
6	Feb 18	Teams & Group Dynamics
7	Feb 25	Perception & Attitudes
8	March 4	Trust
9	March 11	Conflict
10	March 25	Judgment & Decision-Making
11	April 1	Negotiations & Utility
12	April 8	Power & Influence
13	April 15	Leadership
14	April 22	Individual Differences
15	April 29	Future of OB: Teaching & Research

## January 21 - Overview of OB & Theory

Davis, M.S.	1971	<i>Philosophy of Social Sciences</i>	That's Interesting!	1(4), 309-344.
Kilduff, M. & Mehra, A.	1997	<i>Academy of Management Review</i>	Post-modernism and org'l research	22(2), 453-481
Lundeberg, C.	1976	<i>Academy of Management Review</i>	Hypothesis creation in OB	1, 5-12
Pfeffer, J.	1993	<i>Academy of Management Review</i>	Barriers to the advance of org'l science: Paradigm development as a dependent variable	
Porter, L.	1996	<i>Administrative Science Quarterly</i>	Forty years of organization studies: Reflections from a micro perspective.	41, 262-269
Sutton, R. & Staw. B.	1995	<i>Administrative Science Quarterly</i>	What theory is not	40, 371-384.
Weick, K.	1999	<i>Academy of Management Review</i>	Theory construction as disciplined reflexivity: Trade-offs in the 90's	24(4), 797-806
Wilpert, B.	1995	<i>Annual Review of Psychology</i>	Organizational Behavior.	46, 59-90.

## January 28 - Motivation 1

Eccles, J.S., & Wigfield, A.	2002	<i>Annual Review of Psychology</i>	Motivational beliefs, values, and goals	51, 109-132
Kanfer, R.	1990	<i>Handbook of Industrial &amp; Org'l Psych</i>	Motivation theory and industrial and organizational psychology	75-170
Kerr, S.	1995	<i>Academy of Management Executive</i>	On the folly of rewarding A while hoping for B	9, 7-15
Klein, H.	1991	<i>Organizational Behavior &amp; Human Decision Processes</i>	Further evidence on the relationship between goal setting and expectancy theories	49, 230-257
Landy & Becker	1987	<i>Research on Organizational Behavior</i>	Motivation theory reconsidered	9, 1-38
Locke et al.	1981	<i>Psychological Bulletin</i>	Goal setting and task performance: 1969-1980	90, 125-152
Mento et al	1987	<i>Organizational Behavior &amp; Human Decision Processes</i>	A meta-analytic study of the effects of goal-setting on task performance: 1966-1984	39, 52-83
Mitchell, T.	1974	<i>Psychological Bulletin</i>	Expectancy models of job satisfaction, occupational preference, and effort: A theoretical, methodological, and empirical appraisal.	81, 1053-1077

## **February 4 - Motivation 2**

Arvey et al.	1989	<i>Journal of Applied Psychology</i>	Job satisfaction: environmental and genetic components	74, 187-192
Campion & McClelland	1993	<i>Journal of Applied Psychology</i>	Follow-up and extension of the interdisciplinary costs and benefits of enlarged jobs	78, 339-351
Deci et al	1999	<i>Psychological Bulletin</i>	A Meta-Analytic Review of Experiments Examining the Effects of Extrinsic Rewards on Intrinsic Motivation	
Ellingson et al.	1998	<i>Journal of Applied Psychology</i>	Factors related to the satisfaction and performance of temporary employees	83, 913-921
Graen et al.	1986	<i>Journal of Applied Psychology</i>	A field experimental test of the moderating effects of growth need strength on productivity	71, 484-491
Hackman et al.	1975	<i>California Management Review</i>	A new strategy for job enrichment	71-98
Hogan, & Martell	1987	<i>Organizational Behavior &amp; Human Decision Processes</i>	A confirmatory structural equations analysis of the job characteristics model	80-103
Locke, E.	1976	<i>Handbook of Industrial &amp; Organizational Psychology</i>	The nature and causes of job satisfaction	165-207
Maslow, A.	1943	<i>Psychological Review</i>	A theory of human motivation	370-396
Salancik, G., & Pfeffer, J.	1977	<i>Administrative Science Quarterly</i>	An examination of need-satisfaction models of job attitudes	22, 427-456
Wahba & Bridwell	1976	<i>Organization Behavior and Human Resources</i>	Maslow reconsidered: A review of research on the need hierarchy theory.	15, 212-240

## February 11 - Justice

Adams, J.	1965	<i>Advances in experimental social psychology</i>	Inequity in social exchange.	2, 267-299
Bies, R.	2001	<i>Advances in organization behavior</i>	Interactional (in)justice: The sacred and the profane.	
Brockner & Weisenfeld	1996	<i>Psychological Bulletin</i>	An integrative framework for explaining reactions to decisions: Interactive effects of outcomes and procedures.	120, 189-208
Degoey, P.	2000	<i>Research in Organizational Behavior</i>	Contagious justice: Exploring the social construction of justice in organizations	22, 51-102.
Deutsch, M.	1975	<i>Journal of Social Issues</i>	Equity, equality, and need: What determines which value will be used as the basis of distributive justice?	31, 137-149
Greenberg, J.	2000	<i>SIOP Presentation</i>	Organizational Justice Tutorial	
Greenberg, J.	1980	<i>Social Psychology Quarterly</i>	Overcoming egocentric bias in perceived fairness through self-awareness	46, 152-156
Leventhal, G.	1980	<i>Social exchange: Advances in theory and research</i>	What should be done with equity theory?	167-218
Lind, E.A. & Tyler, T.	1988	<i>The Social Psychology of Procedural Justice</i>	selected chapters	Chs. 2 & 3
Lind, E.A. & Van den Bos, K.	2002	<i>Research in Organizational Behavior</i>	When fairness works: Toward a general theory of uncertainty management	24, 181-223
Tyler, T. & Lind, E.A.	1992	<i>Advances in Experimental Social Psychology</i>	A relational model of authority in groups.	

## February 18 - Teams & Group Dynamics

DeDreu & Weingart	2002	<i>Academy of Management</i>	Task vs. relationship conflict: A meta-analysis	
Eisenhardt, et al.	1998	<i>Harvard Business Review</i>	How management teams can have a good fight	July-August, 77-85
Galinsky & Kray	2002	<i>International Association of Conflict Management</i>	From thinking about what might have been to sharing what we know: The role of counter-factual mind-sets in information sharing groups.	
Guzzo & Dickson	1996	<i>Annual Review of Psychology</i>	Teams in organizations.	47, 307-338
Katzenback & Smith	1993	<i>book</i>	The Wisdom of Teams	selected chapters
Neuman & Wright	1999	<i>Journal of Applied Psychology</i>	Team effectiveness: Beyond skills and cognitive ability	84, 376-389
Pelled et al	1999	<i>Administrative Science Quarterly</i>	Exploring the Black Box: An Analysis of Work Group Diversity, Conflict, and Performance	44, ??
Thompson	2000	<i>book</i>	Making the Team	selected chapters

## **February 25 - Perception & Attitudes**

Fiske & Taylor	1991	<i>book</i>	Social Cognition	selected chapters
Hilton & von Hippel	1996	<i>Annual Review of Psychology</i>	Stereotypes	47:237-271.
Kramer	2001	<i>Research in Organizational Behavior</i>	Organizational paranoia,: Origins & dynamics	23, 1-42
Macrae & Bodenhausen	2000	<i>Annual Review of Psychology</i>	Social cognition: Thinking categorically about others	51, 93-120
Mitchell et al.	1981	<i>Research on Organizational Behavior</i>	An attributional model of leadership and the poor performing subordinate: development and validation	3, 197-234
Wood	2000	<i>Annual Review of Psychology</i>	Attitude Change: Persuasion and Social Influence	51, 539-570

## **March 4 - Trust**

Dirks, K.T.	1999	<i>Journal of Applied Psychology</i>	The effects of interpersonal trust on work group performance	84, 445-455
Kramer	1999	<i>Annual Review of Psychology</i>	Trust and distrust in organizations: emerging perspectives, enduring questions	50, 569-598
McAlister, D.	1995	<i>Academy of Management Journal</i>	Affect- and cognition-based trust as foundations for interpersonal cooperation in organizations.	38, 24-59
McAlister et al.	1998	<i>Academy of Management Review</i>	Trust and distrust: New relationships and realities	23, 438-458
Schweitzer et al.	2002	<i>Working Paper</i>	Promises and Lies: Restoring violated trust	

## **March 11 - Conflict**

Allred et al.	2002	<i>Working Paper</i>	Partisan misperceptions and conflict escalation: survey evidence from a tribal/local government conflict	
Ambrose et al.	2002	<i>Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes</i>	Sabotage in the workplace: The role of organizational injustice	
Anderson & Bushman	2002	<i>Annual Review of Psychology</i>	Human Aggression	53, 27-51
Cronin et al	2002	<i>International Association of Conflict Management</i>	How conflict results from perceptual gaps in the shared knowledge problem.	
Felstiner et al.	1981	<i>Law &amp; Society Review</i>	The emergence and transformation of 15, 631-644 disputes: Naming, blaming, and claiming.	
Friedman & Currall	2002	<i>Working Paper</i>	E-mail escalation: Dispute exacerbating elements of electronic communication	
Goldman	2002	<i>Academy of Management</i>	A rage for justice: An application of referent cognitions theory to legal claiming by terminated workers	
Miller, D.T.	2001	<i>Annual Review of Psychology</i>	Disrespect & Experience of Injustice	52, 527-553
O'Leary et al.	1996	<i>Academy of Management Review</i>	Organization-motivated aggression: A research framework	21, 225-253.
Robinson & Bennett	1995	<i>Academy of Management Journal</i>	A typology of deviant workplace behaviors: A multi-dimensional scaling study	38, 555-572
Tripp and Bies	1997	<i>Research on Negotiations in Organizations</i>	What's good about revenge?	6, 145-160

## March 25 - Judgment & Decision-Making

Cohen et al.	1972	<i>Administrative Science Quarterly</i>	A garbage can model of decision-making	17, 1-25
Loewenstein et al.	2001	<i>Psychological Bulletin</i>	Risk as feelings	127, 267-286
March & Shapira	1992	<i>Decision Making: Alternatives to rational choice models</i>	Behavioral decision theory and org'l decision theory	273-303
Mellers et al.	1998	<i>Annual Review of Psychology</i>	Judgment and Decision Making	49, 447-477
Plous	1993	<b>book</b>	The psychology of judgment and decision making	selected chapters
Tenbrunsel et al.	2000	<i>Academy of Management Journal</i>	Understanding the influence of environmental standards on judgments and choices	43, 854-868
Tetlock, P	2000	<i>Administrative Science Quarterly</i>	Cognitive Biases and Organizational Correctives: Do Both Disease and Cure Depend on the Politics of the Beholder?	
Weick, K	1993	<i>Administrative Science Quarterly</i>	The collapse of sense-making in org's: The Mann Gulch disaster	38, 628-652

## April 1 - Negotiations & Utility

Axelrod, R	1997	<i>book</i>	The Complexity of Cooperation: Agent-Based Models of Competition and Collaboration	selected chapters
Bazerman et al	2000	<i>Annual Review of Psychology</i>	Negotiation	51, 279-314
Clyman & Tripp	2000	<i>Group Decision &amp; Negotiation</i>	Discrepant values and measures of negotiator performance	9, 251-274
Galinsky et al.	2002	<i>Working Paper</i>	Disconnecting outcomes and evaluations: The role of negotiator reference points	
Greenhalgh, L.	2002	<i>Working Paper</i>	Managing anxiety in negotiated decision-making	
Kahneman, D.	1999	<i>Well-Being: The Foundations of Hedonic Psychology</i>	Objective happiness	3-25
Loewenstein & Schkade	1999	<i>Well-Being: The Foundations of Hedonic Psychology</i>	Wouldn't it be nice? Predicting future feelings	85-105
Hardin, G.	1968	<i>Science</i>	Tragedy of the commons	162, 1243-1248
Morris & Keltner	2000	<i>Research in Organizational Behavior</i>	How emotions work: The social functions of emotional expression in negotiations	22, 1-50
Neale & Bazerman	1989	<i>book</i>	Cognition and Rationality in Negotiation	Chs 1, 2
Ryan & Deci	2001	<i>Annual Review of Psychology</i>	Happiness and human potentials: A review of research on hedonic and eudaimonic well-being.	52, 141-166
Thompson	1990	<i>Psychological Bulletin</i>	Negotiation behavior and outcomes	108, 515-532

## April 8 - Power & Influence

Bies & Tripp	1998	<i>Power and Influence in Organizations</i>	Two faces of the powerless: Coping with tyranny in organizations	Ch. 9, 203-219
Emerson, R.	1962	<i>American Sociological Review</i>	Power-dependence relations	27, 31-41
Hickson et al.	1971	<i>Administrative Science Quarterly</i>	A strategic contingencies theory of intraorganizational power	16, 216-229
Kipnis & Schmidt	1988	<i>Administrative Science Quarterly</i>	Upward Influence styles: Relationship with performance, evaluations, salary, and stress	33, 528-542
Kipnis & Schmidt	1980	<i>Journal of Applied Psychology</i>	Intraorg'l influence tactics: Explorations in getting one's way	65, 440-452
Lee & Tiedens	2001	<i>Research in Organizational Behavior</i>	Is it lonely at the top? The independence and interdependence of power holders.	23, 43-91
Messick & Ohme	1998	<i>Power and Influence in Organizations</i>	Some ethical aspects of the social psychology of getting one's way	Ch. 8, 181-202
Pfeffer, J.		<b>book</b>	Managing with power	Chapter 8
Raven & Kruglanski	1970	<i>The Structure of Conflict</i>	Conflict and Power	69-109

## April 15 - Leadership

Bass	1988	<i>Charismatic leadership: The elusive factor in organizational effectiveness</i>	Evolving perspectives on charismatic leadership	40-77
Engle & Lord	1997	<i>Academy of Management Journal</i>	Implicit theories	40, 988-1010
Greenberg & Baron	1997	<i>Behavior in Organizations</i>	Ch. 13: Leadership	432-463
House & Mitchell	1974	<i>Journal of Contemporary Business</i>	Path-goal theory of leadership	4, 81-97
Meindl et al	1985	<i>Administrative Science Quarterly</i>	The romance of leadership	30, 78-102
Pfeffer, J.	1977	<i>Academy of Management Review</i>	The ambiguity of leadership	2, 104-112

### **April 22 - Individual Differences**

Greenberg, J.	2002	<i>Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes</i>	Who Stole the Money, and When? Individual and Situational Determinants of Employee Theft	
O'Conner & Arnold	2002	<i>International Association of Conflict Management</i>	Walking away from the table: How negotiator self-efficacy affects decision-making	
Motowidlo, S.J.	1996	<i>Individual Differences and Behavior in Organizations</i>	Orientation toward the job and organization: A theory of individual differences in job satisfaction	76, 825-837
Riley & Valley	2002	<i>Academy of Management</i>	When does gender matter in negotiations?	
Skarlicki, et al	1999	<i>Academy of Management Journal</i>	Personality as moderator in the relationship between fairness and retaliation	100-108
Douglas & Martinko	2001	<i>Journal of Applied Psychology</i>	Exploring the role of individual differences in the prediction of workplace aggression	86, 547-559

### **April 29 - Future of OB: Teaching & Research**

Brief & Weiss	2002	<i>Annual Review of Psychology</i>	Organizational behavior: Affect in the workplace	53, 279-307
Gallagher, M	1994	<i>Annual Review of Psychology</i>	New Models of Teaching and Learning	45, 171-19
Nickerson, R.	1999	<i>Psychological Bulletin</i>	How We Know—and Sometimes Misjudge—What Others Know: Imputing One's Own Knowledge to Others	
O'Reilly, CA	1991	<i>Annual Review of Psychology</i>	Organizational behavior: where we've been, where we're going.	42, 427-58
Rousseau, D.	1997	<i>Annual Review of Psychology</i>	Organizational Behavior in the new Organizational Era	48, 515-546

