

**Independent Study<sup>1</sup>**  
**Seminar in Organizational Behavior**  
**University of Texas at El Paso**  
**Syllabus**

**Day/Time: Wednesday 3:30 p.m.**

**Instructor: Prajya R. Vidyarthi**

**Room: 252**

**Email: prvidyarthi@utep.edu**

**Overview**

This seminar will introduce you to the field of Organizational Behavior (OB). The seminar is designed for Ph.D. students and emphasizes the behavior of individuals and groups in organizations. We will focus on current research that emphasizes both the social context of organizational behavior and the psychology of the individual. Organizational behavior, for purposes of this class, concerns the set of approaches to the understanding of how people in organizations think, feel, and act both as individuals and in concert with others.

We have several goals in this course:

- to provide you with an initial exposure to OB theory and research
- to learn to *think* about OB theory
- to integrate across concepts and theories
- to identify weaknesses and research opportunities in current theorizing
- to develop your own ideas for advancing theory and research in OB

To achieve these goals, you will be engaged in the following:

- 1. Reading and Participation.** This is a seminar in which students are expected to actively participate in discussions. Doctoral seminars provide us the opportunity to play with ideas and concepts in a small group. This is a process that you will repeat as you develop research ideas and projects with colleagues. Learning to jump into these discussions and to communicate and develop your ideas is one of the most important outcomes of this class.

---

<sup>1</sup> This independent study course syllabus is based on regular doctoral seminar. Important revision in content/substance, pedagogy, readings, assessment and grading is likely to follow on-going discussion and mutual agreement between the instructor and the student.

To contribute effectively, you must come to class having read thoughtfully and critically all the class readings. You should come to class prepared to question, defend, debate, disagree, apply, integrate, develop, etc. Valuable contributions:

- are unique,
- move the discussion forward,
- are relevant,
- avoid the “I feel” problem or “when I was working at X...”

While reading, a good strategy is to include a list of the most interesting and/or puzzling points in the articles, the strengths and weaknesses of the articles, future research ideas and so forth. This is a much better and more active technique than simply underlining/highlighting material. In addition, I encourage you to bring to the class's attention other, related research that you find interesting or that you are working on.

**Examples of Questions and Issues you should be prepared to discuss during seminar (*adapted from J. Pearce*)**

*For each reading:*

- What are the authors' claims? What is the research question? (if empirical paper)
- Are the claims well-grounded in the literature?
- Is the topic or question interesting?
- What are the causal claims?
- What are the independent and dependent variables?
- What is the nature of the proposed relationship between variables? (e.g., main effect, moderator, mediator...)
- Do you agree with the claims made? Why or why not?
- What are the strengths of the paper?
- What are the weaknesses?
- What are the practical implications?

*For empirical papers only:*

- Is the sample adequate? (generalizability and power issues)
- How are the variables operationalized? Do the measures adequately represent the conceptual variables?
- What is the research design?
- Can you think of any plausible alternative interpretations of the results?
- How were the data analyzed? (Please ask questions if you don't understand the procedures used.)
- Overall, were the claims supported?

*For the topical reading set:*

- In what ways do the readings build on, support, or contradict one another?
- How do they relate to earlier readings in the course?

Note to those new to OB: Because we start at a rather advanced point in this class and because many of your classmates are quite familiar with the body of research and may have even taught an OB course at the undergraduate level, I encourage those who haven't had an OB course to obtain an OB textbook as a supplement to the readings.

- 2. Thought Papers.** To help you prepare for this seminar, you will write four (4) "thought paper." These are to be typed, double-spaced, and 3-5 pages in length. They are due at 1:30 p.m. sharp, in class on weeks that you have indicated to write.

The purpose of the thought paper is for you to analyze and/or share your reactions to two or more readings for that week. You can critique theoretical or empirical approaches, propose and justify new research questions that spin off from the readings, or take some other philosophical or analytical direction related to the topic and readings for that week. However, you should not simply restate the purpose or the main ideas of the articles. As well as handing in a hard copy to me, you'll need to be prepared to share your analyses orally with the other students as appropriate. Please note that these writings should be treated as important works, as they are in large part a key indicator of your progress in the course.

- 3. Seminar Leadership.** On the assigned/selected class periods, you will guide the rest of your classmates through the readings by providing some structure to discussion. Try to be creative when leading the discussion. For example, ask students to draw models, to debate, to propose new studies and so on. You are required to have at least three questions prepared from each reading to ask the class.

You are responsible for posting your week's readings on Blackboard for the other students in the class. Do this as early as possible in the semester as some, especially older, articles may be difficult to locate in electronic format. I provided the readings for week 1. Please follow a similar format when naming the files.

- 4. Assignment/Exam.** There will be one or more special assignments (e.g., reviewing a paper) that would aid learning to do research. It will be explained and student(s) will be selected to execute it. Some assignments will evolve as we progress in the semester. I will seek your active participation and assess your involvement. While doing the assignment your overall contribution to learning in the class will be a factor in my assessment of your assignment grade.

There is an optional written Exam. This Exam will cover topics discussed in the seminar. This exam may help prepare you for the comprehensive exam. Further details of the Exam will be discussed in the class.

- 5. Research Paper.** You are required to submit an original 15-25 page (excluding references, tables, and figures) research manuscript. I encourage you to write a complete paper relating to one or more of the topics we covered in the course. I expect your paper to include an approximately 100-word abstract, a review of relevant literature, hypotheses, method(s),

results, discussion and suggestions for future research. Please refer to a recent article in the *Journal of Applied Psychology* to model your format. If you choose to write a theoretical paper you may refer to recent issues of the *Academy of Management Review* to model your paper. All papers must be original and not papers revised or modified from prior courses. A's will be given to only those papers which would likely receive a "revise and resubmit" at a top-tier management conference/journal.

**6. Paper Presentation.** You will present your paper to the class on a day determined in the class. There will be an initial or preliminary presentation in the middle of the semester when you can seek feedback. The final presentation will be in the week(s) towards the end of the semester. You should follow the format of presentations typically followed at the Academy of Management annual meetings. That is, this is a formal presentation utilizing PowerPoint. You must also be prepared to field questions from fellow classmates and me.

**Course Requirements\***

<u>Grading Criteria</u>	<u>Date</u>	<u>% Overall Grade</u>
Thought Papers	Four weeks in the semester	20%
Class Participation & Discussion Leadership	Ongoing and when you lead the discussion	20%
Assignment/Exam	To be determined	20%
Research Paper	Last 2 weeks	30%
Paper Presentation	Last 2 weeks	10%

- Letter grades for this course will be given as follows: A=90-100; B=80-89; C=70-79; D=60-69.
- Failing to complete one or more of the above requirements will result in an F for the course.

## Course Topics

(Based on the progress and interest I reserve the right to modify, add, or drop articles from the reading list.)

### **Topic 1: Introduction to OB and Theory**

Sutton, & Staw (1995). What theory is not. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 40, 371-384.

Klein, K. J., & Zedeck, S. (2004). Theory in applied psychology: Lessons (re)learned. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 89, 931-933.

Bartunek, J.M., Rynes, S.L., & Ireland, R.D. (2006). What makes management research interesting, and why does it matter? *Academy of Management Journal*, 49, 9-15.

Cascio, W. F. & Aguinis, H. 2008. Research in industrial and organizational psychology from 1963 to 2007: Changes, choices, and trends. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 93(5): 1062-1081.

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

### **Topic 2: Social Exchange theory and Leadership**

Cropanzano, R., & Mitchell, M. S. (2005). Social exchange theory: An interdisciplinary Review. *Journal of Management*, 31, 874-900.

Avolio, B. J., Walumbwa, F. O., & Weber, T. J. (2009) Leadership: current theories, research, and future directions. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 60, 421–449.

Joshua B.; Tsui, Anne S.; Kinicki, Angelo J (2010) Consequences Of Differentiated Leadership In Groups. *Academy of Management Journal*, 53 (1) 90-106.

Wayne, S. J., Shore, L. M., & Liden, R. C. (1997). Perceived organizational support and leader-member exchange: A social exchange perspective. *Academy of Management Journal*, 40, 82-111.

Erdogan, B. & Liden, R. C. (2002) Social exchange in the workplace: a review of recent developments and future research directions in leader-member exchange theory. In L. L. Neider & C. A. Schriesheim (eds), *Leadership*. Greenwich, CT: Information Age Publishing, pp. 65–114.

### **Topic 3: Leader-Member Exchange Theory**

Anand, S., Hu, J., Liden, R.C., & Vidyarathi, P.R. (2011). Leader-member exchange: Recent research findings and prospects for the future. In A. Bryman, D. Collinson, K. Grint, B. Jackson, & M. Uhl-Bien (Eds.), *The Sage Handbook of Leadership*, Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Bauer, Erdogan, Liden, & Wayne (2006). A longitudinal study of the moderating role of extraversion: Leader-member exchange, performance, and turnover during new executive development. *JAP*, 91, 298-310.

Anand S., Vidyarathi, P. R., & Park, H. S. (2015). LMX differentiation: Understanding relational leadership at the group level. In T. Bauer & B. Erdogan (Eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Leader-member Exchange*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Vidyarthi, P. R., Liden, R. C., Anand, S., Erdogan, B., & Ghosh, S. (2010). Where do I stand? Examining the effects of leader-member exchange social comparison on employee work behaviors. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 95, 849-861.

Liden, R. C., Anand, S., & Vidyarathi, P. R. (2016). Dyadic relationships. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior*, 3, 139-166.

### **Topic 4: Context and Multi-level issues**

Rousseau, D. (1985) Issues of level in organizational research: Multi-level and cross-level perspectives. In L. Cummings & B. Staw (eds.) *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 7, Greenwich, CT: JAI, pp. 1-37.

Hofmann, D. A., Griffin, M. A., & Gavin, M. B. (2000) The Application of Hierarchical Linear Modeling to Organizational Research. In Kozlowski, S. & Klein, K. (Eds.) *Multilevel theory, research, and methods in organizations*. 467-511. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Johns (2008) *The Essential Impact of Context on Organizational Behavior*, *Academy of Management Review*, 31(2), 386-408.

Vidyarthi, P. R., Erdogan, B., Anand, S., Liden, R. C., & Chaudhry, A. (2014). One member, two leaders: Extending leader-member exchange theory to a dual leadership context. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 99, 463-483.

Hofmann, D. A., Morgeson, F. P., & Gerras, S. J. (2003). Climate as a moderator of the relationship between leader-member exchange and content specific citizenship: Safety climate as an exemplar. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 88, 170-178.

### **Topic 5: Attachment, Turnover and Job Embeddedness**

Mitchell, T. R., Holtom, B. C., Lee, T. W., Sablinski, C. J. & Erez, M. (2001). Why people stay: Using job embeddedness to predict voluntary turnover. *Academy of Management Journal*, 44, 1102-1121.

Lee, T. W., Mitchell, T. R., Sablinski, C. J., Burton, J. P., & Holtom, B. C. (2004). The effects of job embeddedness on organizational citizenship, job performance, volitional absences, and voluntary turnover. *Academy of Management Journal*, 47, 711-722.

Allen, D. G. (2006). Do organizational socialization tactics influence newcomer embeddedness and turnover? *Journal of Management*, 32, 237-256.

Crossley, C. D., Bennett, R. J., Jex, S. M., & Burnfield, J. L. (2007). Development of a global Measure of job embeddedness and integration into a traditional model of voluntary turnover. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 92, 1031-1042.

Felps, W., Mitchell, T. R., Hekman, D. R., Lee, T. W., Holtom, B. C., & Harman, W. S. (2009). Turnover contagion: How coworkers' job embeddedness and job search behaviors influence quitting. *Academy of Management Journal*, 52, 545-561.

### **Topic 6: New Employment Relationship: Idiosyncratic Deals**

Anand, S., Vidhyarthi, P. R., Liden, R. C., & Rousseau, D. M. (2010) Good Citizens in Poor-Quality Relationships: Idiosyncratic Deals as a Substitute For Relationship Quality. *Academy of Management Journal*, 53(5), 970-988.

Lai, L., Rousseau, D. M., & Chang, T. T. 2009. Idiosyncratic deals: Coworkers as interested third parties. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 94: 547–556.

Anand S. & Vidhyarthi, P. R. (2015). I-deals in the group context. In P. M. Bal and D. M. Rousseau (Eds.), *Idiosyncratic deals between Employees and Organizations: Conceptual Issues, Applications, and the Role of Coworkers*. Routledge, UK: Psychology Press.

Vidyarthi, P. R., Singh, S., Erdogan, B., Chaudhry, A., Posthuma, R. A., & Anand, S. (2016). Individual deals within teams: Investigating the role of relative i-deals for employee performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 101, 1536-1552.

Rousseau, D. M., Ho, V. T., & Greenberg, J. 2006. I-deals: Idiosyncratic terms in employment relationships. *Academy of Management Review*, 31: 977–994.

### **Topic 7: Issues in Organization Research - Moderation and Mediation**

Barron, R. M. & Kenny, D. A. (1986). The Moderator-Mediator Variable Distinction in Social Psychological Research: Conceptual, Strategic, and Statistical Consideration, *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 51 (6), 1173-1182.

Muller, D., Judd, C. M., & Yzerbyt, V. Y. (2005). When Moderation is mediated and Mediation is moderated. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 89 (6) 852-863.

Edwards, J. R., & Lambert, L. S. (2007). Methods for Integrating Moderation and Mediation: A General Analytical Framework using Moderated Path Analysis, 12 (1), 1-22.

Venkataramani, V., & Tangirala, S. (2010). When and why do central employees speak up? An examination of mediating and moderating variables. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 95, 582-591.

TBA

### **Topic 8: Individual Differences and Attitudes**

Barrick & Mount (1991). The Big Five personality dimensions and job performance: A meta-analysis. *Personnel Psychology*, 44, 1-26.

Tepper, Duffy, & Shaw (2001). Personality moderators of the relationship between abusive supervision and subordinates' resistance. *JAP*, 86, 974-983.

Anand, S., Vidyarthi, P., Singh, S., & Ryu, S. (2015). Family interference and employee dissatisfaction: Do agreeable employees better cope with stress? *Human Relations*, 68, 691-708.

Rich, Bruce Louis; Lepine, Jeffrey A.; Crawford, Eean R. (2010) Job Engagement: Antecedents And Effects On Job Performance. *Academy of Management Journal*, 53 (3) 617-635.



Chen, Ployhart, Thomas, Anderson, & Bliese. (2011) The Power of Momentum: A New Model of Dynamic Relationships between Job Satisfaction Change and Turnover Intentions.. *Academy of Management Journal*, 54 (1), 159-181.

### **Topic 9: Motivation, Affect and Emotion**

Barrick, Stewart, & Piotrowski (2002). Personality and job performance: Test of the mediating effects of motivation among sales representatives. *JAP*, 87, 43-51

Staw & Barsade (1993). Affect and managerial performance: A test of the sadder but-wiser vs. happier-and-smarter hypotheses. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 38, 304-331.

Grandey, Fisk, Mattila, Jansen, & Sideman (2005). Is service with a smile enough? Authenticity of positive displays during service encounters. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 96, 38-55.

Lawler (2001). An affect theory of social exchange. *American Journal of Sociology*, 107, 321-351.

Duffy, Michelle K., Shaw, Jason D., Hoobler, Jenny M., & Tepper, Bennett J. 2010. A time-based perspective on emotion regulation in emotional labor performance. *Research in Personnel and Human Resources Management*, vol. 29.

### **Topic 10: Justice and social learning**

Robinson & O'Leary-Kelly (1998). Monkey see, monkey do: The influence of work groups on the antisocial behavior of employees. *Academy of Management Journal*, 41, 658-672.

Rupp, D. E., & Cropanzano, R. (2002). The mediating effects of social exchange relationships in predicting workplace outcomes from multifoci organizational justice. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 89(1), 925-946.

Simons & Roberson (2003). Why managers should care about fairness: The effects of aggregate justice perceptions on organizational outcomes. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 88, 432-444.

Tepper, Lockhart, & Hoobler (2001). Justice, citizenship, and role definition effects. *JAP*, 86, 789-796.

Ambrose, Maureen L., & Schminke, Marshall (2009). The role of overall justice judgments in organizational justice research: A test of mediation. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 94(2), 491-500.

### **Topic 11: Groups and Teams**

Cohen & Bailey (1997). What makes teams work: Group effectiveness research from the shop floor to the executive suite. *Journal of Management*, 23, 239-290.

Hu, J., & Liden, R. C. (2015). Making a difference in the teamwork: Linking team prosocial motivation to team processes and effectiveness. *Academy of Management Journal*, 58, 1102-1127.

Harrison, Price, Gavin, & Florey (2002). Time, teams, and task performance: Changing effects of surface- and deep-level diversity on group functioning. *Academy of Management Journal*, 45, 1029-1045.

Shapiro, Furst, Spreitzer, Glinow, & Von (2002). Transnational teams in the electronic age: Are team identity and high performance at risk? *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 23, 455-467.

Martin, K. & Brass, D. J. (2010) Job design: A social network perspective. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 31, 309–318

### **Topic 12: The Good (positive) and Bad (negative) OB**

Bath (2006). On being positive: Concerns and counterpoints. *AMR*, 31, 270-291.

Wayne & Liden (1995). A longitudinal study on the effects of impression management on performance ratings. *Academy of Management Journal*, 38, 232-260.

Bolino (1999). Citizenship and impression management: Good soldiers or good actors? *Academy of Management Review*, 24, 82-98.

Tepper, Duffy, Henle, & Schurer Lambert (2006). Procedural injustice, victim precipitation, and abusive supervision. *Personnel Psychology*, 59, 101-123.

Lim & Cortina (2005). Interpersonal mistreatment in the workplace: The interface and impact of general incivility and sexual harassment. *JAP*, 90, 483-496.