# 15.341  Individuals, Groups, and Organizations

Prof. Jared Curhan
Office: E62-320
Email: curhan@mit.edu
Phone: 617-253-5219

Course Administrator:
Jane Braunsky
Office: E62-331A
Email: janeb485@mit.edu
Phone: 617-253-3831

This course covers classic and contemporary theories and research related to individuals, groups, and organizations.  The course is intended for doctoral students who wish to familiarize themselves with research by psychologists and management scholars in the area commonly known as "micro" organizational behavior.  Topics include self-presentation, motivation, affect & emotions, behavioral decision theory, negotiation & conflict management, social cognition, power, influence & compliance, group dynamics, equity & organizational justice, and intergroup conflict.  (See below for a list of topics and readings for each week.)

The course strikes a balance between classic and contemporary research, with students playing an integral role in selecting contemporary readings and guiding class discussion to cover relevant topics related to their research.  The syllabus sets forth a series of topics illustrated by classic papers to be read by all students and discussed at the beginning of each class.  Student discussion leaders expand the conversation by reviewing contemporary extensions and applications of this classic research.  In this way, the reading list for the course grows to meet the interests of the particular students in the class.  These interests, in turn, will lead to the development of original research ideas, presented orally in class.

COURSE OBJECTIVES:

1. Review classic and contemporary approaches to the study of individuals, groups, and organizations.

2. Become critical consumers of social science research.

3. Learn to track the evolution of theories and research over time and identify gaps in the literature.

4. Build a reading list that combines topics from this class with students' own specific research interests.

5. Practice designing empirical studies to extend theory and/or apply theory to real world phenomena.

ASSIGNMENTS:

There are four assignments in this class, listed below and detailed on the following page.

1) Classroom participation (worth 30% of your grade)

2) Reaction papers (worth 30% of your grade)

3) Session leadership (worth 40% of your grade)
    a) Review of contemporary scholarship
    b) Oral research proposal

*Classroom participation*.  All students are expected to attend all class meetings and to arrive prepared (i.e., complete all required readings in advance of every class meeting). Students are expected to contribute to in-class discussions.  The use of laptops in class is not permitted by anyone except the presenter.

If you cannot attend one or two classes, your grade will not be penalized as long as you do the following: (1) notify the course administrator at least 7 days prior to the class that you will miss; (2) write a reaction paper for the missed class -- this reaction paper will be addition to the number of reaction papers required for the course (see reaction paper requirements detailed below).  This policy does not apply to missing class on the day when you are scheduled to lead the class; missing that class obviously would hinder the learning of your classmates and substantially lower your session leadership grade (see session leadership details below).

*Reaction papers*.  There are 11 weeks of readings (excluding the first class), and there are 6 reaction papers required (plus 2 additional reaction papers if you are leading only one session or 4 additional reaction papers if you are not leading any sessions – see below – and 1 additional reaction paper for each missed class).  Students may choose which weeks to submit reaction papers and which weeks to skip (if applicable).  Papers should be 1-2 pages, double-spaced and should include the following components: (1) explain in your own words the most interesting (in your opinion) single point or insight of each required reading and make a compelling case for why it's important and/or how it relates to other literature; (2) select at least one required reading and indicate how you think it could have been improved and why; (3) select at least one required reading (doesn't need to be same reading as #2) and indicate how you think it could be applied in an organizational context; and (4) suggest at least one relevant thought question or topic that you would like us to discuss in class.  Reaction papers should be **saved as PDF and uploaded to on Canvas by Mon night at 11:59PM**.  If you encounter any difficulties, please email Jane Braunsky <janeb485@mit.edu>.

Papers will be graded by the professor, with input from that week's session leader(s), according to the following categories: 1 (unacceptable), 2 (needs work), 3 (good), 4 (great), 5 (extraordinary).  In other words, '1' is equivalent to a failing grade; '2' is equivalent to a 'check-minus' or B, meaning that parts of the assignment were incorrect or omitted; '3' is equivalent to a 'check' or B+/A-, meaning that the assignment was carried out well; '4' is equivalent to a 'check-plus' or a straight A, meaning that the assignment was done very well; and '5' is equivalent to an A+, an extremely unusual grade reserved for a stroke of genius.

*Session leadership*.  The professor will lead the first half of each class (typically focusing discussion on classic readings) and one or more students will split up and lead the second half of each class (typically focusing on more contemporary readings).  On the first day of class, we will determine session leadership assignments.  MIT Sloan doctoral students are required to lead at least 2 sessions.  Non-Sloan students or non-Doctoral students may or may not have the opportunity to lead sessions, depending on the number of session leadership slots available.  As indicated above, those students who lead fewer than two sessions will be required to submit additional reaction papers.

Each student session leader is expected to do the following:

1) Identify 3 articles demonstrating how theories, findings, and topics of this week's required readings have been applied or refuted in subsequent (or in rare cases prior) literature.  In the first class session we will discuss some techniques that you can use to search for relevant literature.  Feel free to solicit advice from colleagues and classmates.  Please be sure to include among your 3 examples at least one of the starred ("*") readings from the recommended list.  In addition, feel free to include any non-starred readings from the recommended reading list or, if you prefer, you are welcome to obtain and use additional readings not on the list.  Article selections should be coordinated in advance with the other session leader and the professor to ensure that there is no overlap (see details in #5 below).

2) Prepare and photocopy for the class a handout that includes the full reference (in APA format) of every reading that you intend to discuss in class.  Leave space on the handout right below each reading to make it easier for students to use your handout to take notes during class.  In addition, please upload an electronic copy of this handout (in MS Word) as well as electronic copies of your readings (in PDF) and your slides (in PDF or PPT) to the relevant readings folder on Canvas by 24 hours prior to class time.  Obviously, you need not provide electronic copies of any readings already posted on our course website.

3) In class, for each of your 3 articles, provide a brief oral summary of the basic methodology used and key take-away points.  Feel free to use Power Point.  Obviously, you won't have time to describe every point of the article or every study within it.  Instead, limit your presentation to only what you deem the *most important* methodological features and findings of each article.  This segment of your presentation should take no more than 15 mins (approximately 5 mins per article).

4) Come to class prepared with an original idea for a new empirical study in this area.  Explain in class how your idea fills a gap in the literature, extends theory, or applies theory to a real-world phenomenon or problem.  This segment of your presentation should include the following 3 parts, and should take 25 minutes (approx 5 mins for part 'a', 15 mins for part 'b', and 5 mins for part 'c'):

   a. Set the stage for your idea and why you think it's important.  For example, if your research idea fills a gap in the extant literature, then begin by describing this gap and why you think it's problematic.  If your research idea extends theory, then begin by describing the theory and its current limitations.  If your research applies theory (or extant research) to a phenomenon or problem, then describe the phenomenon or problem and why you think the theory will ameliorate it, or at least help us understand it better.  Ideally, one or more of the articles you selected in #1 will have set the stage for your original research idea, saving time for part (b).

   b. Explain how you would design an empirical study.  Be specific about the participants, methods, and procedure you would employ.  What would be your hypotheses?

   c. Solicit and respond to feedback.  Allow several minutes for your classmates to provide constructive suggestions or ask you questions.  Do your best to respond and, if applicable, suggest tweaks and changes to your study design.

5) In preparation for your session leadership, please discuss your plans with the professor (and, if applicable, with the other session leader to ensure there is no overlap among articles covered) **during the last 20 minutes of the class prior to your session**.

6) Finally, please read the reaction papers submitted by your classmates and feel free to reference them during your session**.  By the end of the day on the Friday immediately following your session leadership**, please rank the reaction papers that were submitted for the class that you led and email this ranking to the professor.  Ties are allowed if necessary, but please do your best to distinguish among the papers submitted (e.g., best, second-best, third-best).  Also, please include in your email to the professor 1-2 sentences about each paper, indicating what you liked most and what you think could have been improved.

Note: Your in-class research proposal should be original and not one that you have already submitted for another course or degree requirement.  It may build on an earlier paper that you turned in for a grade. However, if it builds on a prior paper, the earlier paper must be submitted to the professor in advance.  It is fine for your topic/presentation to be part of your progress toward other graduate program requirements (e.g., proposals, dissertations, etc.).  Indeed, this seminar is designed in part to further your progress toward a doctoral degree.


READINGS:

Copies of all required readings and most recommended readings can be found on our Canvas course website: **URL to be provided later**

Readings marked with "*" will be summarized by the assigned session leader(s).

Students are expected to have completed at least the "required" readings listed for that meeting *prior* to each class meeting.  Readings may be changed or added by the professor up to the class meeting prior to the date on which the readings are due.

SCHEDULE/READINGS:

**Class #1:  Wed, Feb 8**
**Introduction to Organizational Behavior; Self-presentation and Impression Formation**

Required:

Heath, C., & Sitkin, S. (2000). Big-B versus Big-O: An examination into what is distinctly organizational about organizational behavior. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 22* (1): 1-16.

Jones, E.E., & Pittman, T.S. (1982). Toward a general theory of strategic self-presentation. In J. Suls (Ed.), *Psychological Perspectives on the Self* (Vol. 1, pp. 231–262). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Recommended:

Astley, W. G. & Van de Ven, A. H. (1983).  Central perspectives and debates in organization theory. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 28*, 245-273.

O'Reilly, C. 1991. Organizational behavior: Where we have been, where we're going.  *Annual Review of Psychology*, Palo Alto, CA: Annual Reviews, Inc.

Hackman, R. J. 2003. Learning more by crossing levels: Evidence from airplanes, hospitals, and orchestras. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 24*: 1-18.

Goffman, E. (1973). On face-work: An analysis of ritual elements in social interaction. In W. G. Bennis, D. E. Berlew, E. H. Schein, & F. I. Steele (Eds.), *Interpersonal dynamics* (3rd ed., pp. 175-189).

Weick, K. E. (1993). Sensemaking in organizations: Small structures with large consequences. In J. K. Murnighan (Ed.), *Social psychology in organizations* (pp. 10-37).

Ambady N., & Rosenthal, R. (1993).  Half a minute: Predicting teacher evaluations from thin slices of nonverbal behavior and physical attractiveness.  *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 64*, 431-441.

Swann, W. B. Jr. (1987). Identity negotiation: Where two roads meet. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 53*, 1038-1051.

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

Kilduff, M., & Day, D. (1994). Do chameleons get ahead? The effects of self-monitoring on managerial careers. *Academy of Management Journal, 37*, 1047-1060.

Becker, T. E. & Martin, S. L. (1995). Trying to look bad at work: Methods and motives for managing poor impressions in organizations. *Academy of Management Journal, 38*, 174-199.

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

Schlenker, B. R. (2003). Self-presentation.  In M. R. Leary and J. P. Tangey (Eds.), *Handbook of self and identity* (pp. 492-518). New York: Guilford Press.

**Class #2:  Wed, Feb 15**
**Motivation**

Required:

Maslow, A. H. (1943). A theory of human motivation. *Psychological Review, 50*, 370-396.

McGregor, D. M. (1957). The human side of enterprise. In H. J. Leavitt, L. R. Pondy & D. M. Boje (Eds.), Readings in Managerial Psychology   (Chicago:  The University of Chicago Press, 1980).

Festinger, L., & Carlsmith, J. M. (1959). Cognitive consequences of forced compliance. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 58*, 203-210.

Recommended:

*Locke, E., & Latham, G.P. (1990).  *A theory of goal-setting and task performance*.  Prentice-Hall, Chapters 1&2.

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

Lepper, M.R.  (1983).  Social control processes and the internalization of social values: An attributional perspective.  In E. T. Higgins, D. N. Ruble, & W. W. Hartup (Eds.), *Social cognition and social development* (pp. 294-330).  Cambridge University Press.

Aronson & Carlsmith (1963).  The effect of the severity of threat on the devaluation of forbidden behavior. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 66*, 584-588.

Aronson & Mills (1959).  The effects of severity of initiation on liking for a group.  *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 59*, 177-181.

Darley & Cooper (1972).  Cognitive consequences of forced noncompliance.  *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 24*, 321-326.

Bem, D. J. (1967). Self-Perception: An Alternative Interpretation of Cognitive Dissonance Phenomena. *Psychological Review, 74*, 183-200.

Deci, E., & Ryan, R.  1980.  The empirical exploration of intrinsic motivation processes. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), *Advances in experimental Social Psychology*, Vol. 13, Academic Press.

Roethlisberger, F. J. (1941). The Hawthorne experiments. In F. J. Roethlisberger, *Management and morale*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

McClelland, D.  *The Achieving Society*.  Van Nostrand Reinhold, 1961.

Iyengar, S.S., & Lepper, M.R. (1999). Rethinking the Value of Choice: A Cultural Perspective on Intrinsic Motivation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 76*, 349-366.

**Class #3:  Wed, Feb 22**
**Behavioral Decision Theory**

Required:

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

Grether, D. M. & Plott, C. R. (1979). Economic theory of choice and the preference reversal phenomenon. American Economic Review, 69, 623-38.

March, J.G., & Simon, H.  1958.  *Cognitive limits on rationality, Organizations*, Chapter 6, pp. 136-171, Wiley.

Recommended:

*Kahneman, D., Knetsch, J. L., & Thaler, R. H. (1990). Experimental tests of the endowment effect and the Coase Theorem. Journal of Political Economy, 98(6), 1325-1348.

*Taylor, S. E., & Brown, J. D. (1988). Illusion and well-being: A social psychological perspective on mental health. *Psychological Bulletin, 103*(2), 193-210.

Kahneman, D., & Tversky, A. (1979). Prospect Theory: An Analysis of Decision Under Risk.  *Econometrica, 47*, 263-291.

Fischhoff, B. (1975). Hindsight is not equal to foresight: The effect of outcome knowledge on judgment under uncertainty. Journal of Experimental Psychology: Human Perception and Performance, 1(3), 288-299.

Wilson, T. D., Lisle, D., Schooler, J., Hodges, S. D., Klaaren, K. J., & LaFleur, S. J. (1993).  Introspecting about reasons can reduce post-choice satisfaction. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 19*, 331-339.

Wilson, T.D.., & Schooler J.W.. (1991).  Thinking too much: Introspection can reduce the quality of preferences and decisions?. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology. 60*, 181-192.

**Class #4:  Wed, March 1**
**Social Cognition**

Required:

Fiske, S. T. & Taylor, S. E. *Social Cognition*, 2e. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley, 1991. Chapter 2 (Attribution Theory), pp. 22-56.

Ross, L. (1977). The intuitive psychologist and his shortcomings: Distortions in the attribution process. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), Advances in experimental social psychology (Vol. 10, pp. 173-220). New York: Academic.

Steele, C. M. (1997). A threat in the air: How stereotypes shape intellectual identity and performance. American Psychologist, 52(6), 613-629.

Recommended:

*Bargh, J. A., Chen, M., & Burrows, L. (1996). Automaticity of social behavior: Direct effects of trait construct and stereotype activation on action. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 71, 230-244.

*Moreland, R. L., Argote, L., & Krishnan, R. (1996). Socially shared cognition at work:
Transactive memory and group performance. In J. L. Nye & A. M. Brower (Eds.), What's social
about social cognition? Research on socially shared cognition in small groups (Pp.
57-84). Thousand Oaks, CA.: Sage.

Jones, E.E., & Nisbett, R.E.  (1971).  The actor and the observer: Divergent perceptions of the causes of behavior. In E.E. Jones, D.E. Kanouse, H.H. Kelley, R.E. Nisbett, S. Valins, & B. Weiner (Eds.), Attribution: Perceiving the causes of behavior (pp. 1-16).  General Learning Press.

Nisbett, R. E. & Wilson, T. D. (1977). Telling more than we can know: Verbal reports on mental processes. *Psychological Review*, 84, 231-259.

Kray, L. J., Galinsky, A. D., & Thompson, L. (2002). Reversing the gender gap in negotiations: An exploration of stereotype regeneration. Organizational Behavior & Human Decision Processes, 87(2), 386-409.

**Class #5: Wed, March 8**
**Negotiation and Conflict Management**

Required:

Platt, J. (1973). Social traps. American Psychologist, 28, 641-651.

Ross, L. & Ward, A. (1996). Naïve realism in everyday life: Implications for social conflict and misunderstanding. In E. S. Reed & E. Turiel (eds.), *Values and Knowledge* (pp. 103-35). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Jehn, K. (1995). A multimethod examination of the benefits and detriments of intragroup conflict. Administrative Science Quarterly, 40, 256-282.

Recommended:

* Babcock, L., Loewenstein, G., Issacharoff, S., & Camerer, C. (1995). Biased judgments of fairness in bargaining. *American Economic Review, 85*(5), 1337-1343.

*Moore, D. A., Kurtzberg, T. R., Thompson, L., & Morris, M. W. (1999). The long and short routes to success in electronically-mediated negotiations: Group affiliations and good vibrations. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 77*, 22-43.

Thompson, L., & Loewenstein, G. (1992). Egocentric interpretations of fairness and interpersonal conflict. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 51*(2), 176-197.

Ross, M. and F. Sicoly. (1979). Egocentric biases in availability and attribution. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 37*, 322-336.

De Dreu, C. K. W., & Weingart, L. R. (2003). Task versus relationship conflict and team effectiveness: A meta-analysis. Journal of Applied Psychology, 88, 741-749.

Bazerman, M. H., Curhan, J. R., & Moore, D. A. (2001). The death and rebirth of the social psychology of negotiation. N G. J. O. Fletcher & M. S. Clark (eds.) Blackwell Handbook of Social Psychology: Interpersonal Processes (pp. 196-228). Oxford, England: Blackwell.

Bazerman, M. H., Curhan, J. R., Moore, D. A., & Valley, K. L. (2000). Negotiation. Annual Review of Psychology, 51, 279-314.

**Class #6: Wed, March 15**
**Culture (Prof. Jackson Lu)**

Required:
Markus, H. R., & Kitayama, S. (1991). Culture and the self: Implications for cognition, emotion, and motivation. *Psychological Review, 98*, 224.

Morris, M. W., Chiu, C. Y., & Liu, Z. (2015). Polycultural psychology. *Annual Review of Psychology, 66*, 631-659.

Lu, J. G. & Benet-Martínez, V. (forthcoming). A Biological-Socioecological Framework of Culture and Personality: Their roots, trends, and interplay. *Annual Review of Psychology*.

Recommended:
Chiu, C.-Y., Gelfand, M. J., Yamagishi, T., Shteynberg, G., & Wan, C. (2010). Intersubjective Culture: The Role of Intersubjective Perceptions in Cross-Cultural Research. *Perspectives on Psychological Science, 5*(4), 482–493

Leung, A. K. Y., & Cohen, D. (2011). Within-and between-culture variation: Individual differences and the cultural logics of honor, face, and dignity cultures. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 100*(3), 507-526.

Maddux, W. W., Lu, J. G., Affinito, S. J., & Galinsky, A. D. (2021). Multicultural experiences: A systematic review and new theoretical framework. *Academy of Management Annals, 15*(2), 345-376.

Swidler, A. (1986). Culture in action: Symbols and strategies. *American Sociological Review*, 273-286.

**NO CLASS on Wed, March 22 (Sloan Innovation Period)**

**NO CLASS on Wed, March 29 (MIT Spring Break)**

**Class #7:  Wed, April 5**
**Power**

Required:

French, J. R. P. Jr., & Raven, B. (1968). The bases of social power. In Cartwright & Zander (pp. 259-269).

Emerson, R. M. (1962). Power-dependence relations. *American Sociological Review, 27*, 31-40.

Salancik, G. R., & Pfeffer, J. (1977, Winter). Who gets power—and how they hold on to it: A strategic-contingency model of power. *Organizational Dynamics*, 3-21.

Recommended:

*Wageman, R., & Mannix, E. A. (1998). Uses and misuses of power in task-performing teams.  In R. M. Kramer & M. A. Neale (Eds.), *Power and influence in organizations* (pp. 261-285). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

*Keltner, D., Gruenfeld, D. H., & Anderson, C. (2003). Power, approach, and inhibition. Psychological Review, 110(2), 265-284.

Galinsky, A. D., Gruenfeld, D. H., & Magee, J. C. (2003). From power to action. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 85(3), 453-466.

Galinsky, A. D., Magee, J. C., Inesi, M. E., & Gruenfeld, D. H. (2006). Power and perspectives not taken. *Psychological Science, 17*(12): 1068-1074.

Blau, P.  1964. Exchange and power in social life.  New York: Wiley.

Molm, Linda. Coercive power in social exchange. Cambridge University Press.

**Class #8:  Wed, April 12**
**Influence and Compliance**

Required:

Asch, S. E. (1955). Opinions and social pressure. *Scientific American, 19*, 31-35.

Milgram, S. (1964).  Some conditions of obedience and disobedience to authority. *Human Relations, 18*, 57-76.

Petty, R. E. & Cacioppo, J. T. (1981).  Chapter 9: Epilog: A General Framework for Understanding Attitude Change Processes*.*  In *Attitudes and Persuasion: Classic and Contemporary Approaches*. Dubuque, IA: W. C. Brown.  Pp. 255-269.

Recommended:

*Rousseau, D. M. (1990).  New hire perceptions of their own and their employer's obligations: A study of psychological contracts. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 11*, 389-400.

*Van Maanen, J. (1990). "The Smile Factory: Work at Disneyland," from *Reframing Organizational Culture*, edited by Peter J. Frost, et al., Sage, pp. 58-76.

Bettenhausen, K.L. & Murnighan, J.K.  1985. The emergence of norms in competitive decision making groups. Administrative Science Quarterly, 30: 350-372.

Markus, H. R., & Kitayama, S. (1991). Culture and the self: Implications for cognition, emotion, and motivation. Psychological Review, 98, 224-253.

Petty, R. E. & Wegner, D. T. (1999). The elaboration likelihood model: Current status and controversies. In S. Chaiken & Y. Trope (Eds). Dual process theories in social psychology (pp. 41-72). New York: Guilford Press.

Sherif, M. (1935). A study of some social factors in perception. *Archives of Psychology, 27*, 187.

Cialdini, R. B. (1984). Influence: The psychology of persuasion. New York: William Morrow.

Cialdini, R. B., Vincent, J. E., Lewis, S. K., Catalan, J., Wheeler, D., Darby, B. L. (1975).  A reciprocal concessions procedure for inducing compliance: The door-in-the-face technique.  *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 31*, 206-215.

Freedman, J. L., & Fraser, S. C. (1966).  Compliance Without Pressure: The foot-in-the-door technique.  *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology,4*, 196-202.

Cialdini, R. B., & Schroeder, D. A. (1976). Increasing compliance by legitimizing paltry contributions: When even a penny helps. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 34*, 599-604.

Cialdini, R. B., Cacioppo, J. T., Bassett, R., Miller, J. A. (1978).  Low-ball procedure for producing compliance: Commitment then cost.  *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 36*, 463-476.

**Class #9:  Wed, April 19**
**Group Dynamics**

Required:

Zajonc, R. B. (1965). Social facilitation. Science, 149, 269-274.

Brown, R. (1986). Social psychology (2nd ed.). New York: Free Press. See Chapter 6 (pp. 200-248)

Janis, I. L. Groupthink. In H. J. Leavitt, L. R. Pondy & D. M. Boje (Eds.), Readings in Managerial Psychology (Chicago:  The University of Chicago Press, 1980).
Janis, I. L. Groupthink. Reading 36 in Hackman-Lawler-Porter, Perspectives on behavior in organizations (2nd ed.).

Latane, B., Williams, K., & Harkins, S. (1979). Many hands make light the work: The causes and consequences of social loafing. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 37, 822-832.

Recommended:

*Ancona, D. G. & Caldwell, D. F. (1992). Bridging the boundary: External activity and perfomance in organizational teams. Administrative Science Quarterly, 37, 634-65.

*Gersick, C. J. G. (1988). Time and transition in work teams: Toward a new model of group development. Academy of Management Journal, 31, 9-41.

Tuckman, Bruce W. (1965) 'Developmental sequence in small groups',  Psychological Bulletin, 63, 384-399.

Ancona, D., & Chong, C. L. (1999). Cycles and synchrony: The temporal role of context in team behavior. In R. Wageman (Ed.), Groups in context. Stamford, CT: JAI Press, pp. 3-46.

Perlow, L. 1999. The time famine: Toward a sociology of work time. Administrative Sciences Quarterly, 44: 57-81.

**Class #10:  Wed, April 26**
**Equity and Organizational Justice**

Required:

Greenberg, J. 1987. A taxonomy of organizational justice theories. *Academy of Management Review*, 12: 9-22.

Lind, E. A., Kanfer, A., & Earley, P. C. (1990). Voice, control, and procedural justice. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 59*, 952-959.

Tyler 2003 Psychology of Procedural Justice.

Recommended:

*Rousseau, D., & McLean Parks, J.M. 1993.  The contracts of individuals and organizations.  *Research in organizational behavior*, 15, 1-43.

*Kahneman, D., Knetsch, J. & Thaler, R. (1986). Fairness as a Constraint on Profit Seeking:  Entitlements in the Market.  *American Economic Review*, September.

Brockner, J., & Wiesenfeld, B.M. 1996. An integrative framework for explaining reactions to decisions: The interactive effect of outcomes and procedures. *Psychological Bulletin*, 120: 189-208.

Adams, J.S. 1965. Inequity in social exchange. *Adv. Exp. Soc. Psychol. 62*, 335-343.

Lind, E.A. & Tyler, T. 1988. *The social psychology of procedural justice.*  (Chapters 2, 6, 10)

Greenberg, J. (1990). Employee theft as a reaction to underpayment inequity: The hidden cost of pay cuts. Journal of Applied Psychology, 75: 561-568.

Skarlicki & Folger. (1997). Retaliation in the Workplace: The roles of distributive, procedural, and interactional justices.  *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *82*, 434-443.

Mowday, R.T. 1991.  Equity theory predictions of behavior in organizations. In R. Steers & L. Porter (Eds.) *Motivation and Work Behavior*, McGraw-Hill.

Pfeffer, J., & Langton, N.  1993.  The effect of wage dispersion on satisfaction, productivity, and working collaboratively.  *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 40, 495-523.

Greenberg, J. 1988. Equity & workplace status: A field experiment.  *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 73: 606-613.

Blader, S., & Tyler, T. R. (in press). How can theories of organizational justice explain the impact of fairness? In J. Greenberg & J. A. Colquitt (Eds.), *Handbook of Organizational Justice*.

Greenberg, J. (1990). Employee theft as a reaction to underpayment inequity: the hidden cost of pay cuts. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 75*, 561-568.

Pfeffer, J. & Langton, N. (1993). The Effect of Wage Dispersion on Satisfaction, Productivity, & Working Collaboratively.  *Administrative Science Quarterly, 38*, 382-407.

Bies. Interactional (In)Justice: The Sacred and the Profane. In J. Greenberg & R. Cropanzano (Eds.), *Advances in Organizational Behavior*.

Folger & Konovsky. (1989). Effects of Procedural and Distributive Justice on Reactions to Pay Raise Decisions. *Academy of Management Journal*, *32*, 115-130.

Huseman, et al. (1987). A New Perspective on Equity Theory: The Equity Sensitivity Construct. *Academy of Management Journal*, *12*, 232-234.

Colquitt, J. A. (2001). On the dimensionality of organizational justice: A construct validation of a measure. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 86*, 386–400.

**Class #11:  Wed, May 3**
**Intergroup Conflict**

Required:

Sherif, M. (1971). Superordinate goals in the reduction of intergroup conflict. In B. L. Hinton
& Pages 394-401 in B. L. Hinton & H. J. Reitz (Eds.), Groups and organizations (pp.
394-401). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

Hastorf, A. H., & Cantril, H. (1954). They saw a game: A case study. Journal of Abnormal
and Social Psychology, 49, 129-134. It's Harvard vs. Dartmouth in November of 1951.

Tajfel, H. (1970). Experiments in intergroup discrimination. *Scientific American, 223*, 96-102.

Recommended:

*Brewer M. (1991). The social self: On being the same and different at the same time. Personality and Social
Psychology Bulletin, 17, 475-482.

*Brown, R. (1986). Social psychology (2nd ed.). New York: Free Press. See Chapter 17 (pp.
610-626)

Siegel, A. E., & Siegel, S. (1968). Reference groups, membership groups, and attitude
change. In D. Cartwright & A. Zander (Eds.), Group dynamics (3rd ed., pp. 74-79).

Tajfel, H., & Turner, J. C. (1986). The social identity theory of intergroup behavior. In S. Worchell and W. G.
Austin (Eds.), Psychology of intergroup relations (pp. 7-24). Chicago: Nelson-Hall.

Tice, D. M. (1992). Self-concept change and self-presentation: The looking glass self is also a magnifying glass.
Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 63, 435-451.

**Class #12:  Wed, May 10**
**Students' Choice!**

**This is our last class meeting of the course.**
**Students will help select the subject matter and assigned readings for this session.**

**APPENDIX:  Doctoral Student Resources**

Adler and Van Doren (1972).  *How to Read a Book*.  Simon & Schuster.

Becker, H.  *Writing for social scientists*.

Bem, Writing the Research Report.

Bem, Writing an Empirical Article.

Bem, Writing the Empirical Journal Article.

Daft, Why I Recommended That Your Manuscript Be Rejected and What You Can Do About It.

Davis, That's Interesting! Towards a Phenomenology of Sociology and a Sociology of Phenomenology.

Myers, Exploring Social Psychology: Doing Social Psychology

Myers, Exploring Social Psychology: Did You Know It All Along?

Editorial, 1993.  A criterion checklist for reviewing research articles.  *Personnel Psychology*, 45, 705-718.

Melesky, T.  1991.  The mechanics of the Ph.D.  *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 27, 444-451.

Sutton & Staw (1995). What Theory Is Not, ASQ.

Weick (1995). What Theory Is Not, Theorizing Is, ASQ.

*Ethical principles in the conduct of research with human participants*.  Ad hoc committee on Ethical Standards in Psychological Research, (pp. 1-17).  Washington, D.C.: APA.

*Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association*. Washington, D.C.: APA.

Strunk, W., & White, E.B.  1979. *The elements of style.*  (3rd Edition). Boston: Allyn and Bacon Publishers.

Kennedy, P.  *A guide to econometrics*.  (3rd Edition).  Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Vogt, W.P.  1993.  *Dictionary of statistics and methodology: A nontechnical guide for the social sciences*. Newbury Park: Sage.

Zanna, M., & Darley, J.  1987.  *The compleat academic*.  New York: McGraw-Hill, Inc.

Zinser, W.  1987. *On writing well (4th Ed.).*  New York: Harper.