

Management**Course Number: 26:620:555****Course Title: Theory & Research in Organizational Behavior**

LEARNING GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

This doctoral seminar is designed for new doctoral students to gain an understanding of classic and contemporary research that addresses fundamental issues of organizational behavior. Drawing on theory and research in psychology, social psychology, and organizational behavior, we shall explore individual, interpersonal, and group processes in work organizations. Our emphasis will be on the development of theory and research. It is critical that you read the required readings before class and spend time thinking about the research implications of the readings, both individually and as a group. We will use these readings to gain a sense of the important perspectives and approaches in the field, not just as a set of findings that are to be digested or summarized. The class will also explore more current OB research topics published in top tier journals.

COURSE MATERIALS

You must read all required readings posted on Canvas. The recommended readings could be useful for your research papers for this class. For those who are interested, more extensive lists of references to OB topics and history are posted under Course Information on Canvas.

COURSE REQUIREMENTS

<u>Session Leader</u>	15%
<u>Weekly synthesis</u>	20%
<i>Theory building exercise</i>	25%
<u>Term paper</u>	40%

Session Leader (15%)

The success of this course depends on how students are actively engaged. Each student must be prepared to discuss all the required readings for each session. Students take turns to act as a session leader for seminar discussions.

A session leader for each class will be assigned in our first class. The session leader makes a power point presentation of the assigned readings and the current research in the topic area of the week. Leading the discussion requires a deeper understanding of the major research questions, the strengths, weaknesses, controversies, and gaps in the readings as well as a literature review of current research literature. Specifically, the session leader should:

1. Provide an organizing framework for class discussion of theories and empirical research
2. Compare & contrast (as appropriate) theories or themes of research covered within a given session or between sessions
3. Comment on the strengths and weaknesses of the week's readings and lastly
4. Report to class emerging theories and research in recent years in the topic area of the week and recommend to the class 2 best emerging papers. For this part of the presentation, you need to conduct a literature review on relevant articles in recent five years (2017-2022) in the journals of *Academy of Management Journal*, *Academy of Management Review*, *Administrative Science Quarterly*, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *Organizational Science*, and *Journal of International Business Studies*.

Please upload your presentation to Canvas under Session Leading PPT and the recommend articles under Recommended Articles.

Weekly one-page syntheses (starting with the first week) (20%)

Except for the weeks when you submit your theory building exercise or when you are the session leader, you are required to submit a one-page (single spaced, 12-point font) summary of the readings each week reflecting on the following questions. Please submit your assignment to Canvas by midnight on the day prior to the class.

1. What are the major research questions and findings of the papers?
2. What are the basic theoretical models (constructs and relationships among them), and the foundational theories upon which the theoretical models are built?
3. Do the papers address similar or different questions, and hold similar or different perspectives?
4. What do you like and don't like in these papers? What new research questions you can think of by building on the papers, filling gaps, or resolving tensions?

Theory building exercise: Developing an innovative idea (25%) (In 4-6 double-spaced, 12-point font pages) (Please bring copies to class)

This is an innovative idea (in the form of hypotheses) that you have developed. It should not be already known or immediately obvious to OB researchers. State your hypotheses and present a theoretical justification about why it is an innovative idea and how it resolves puzzles (conflicting theories or findings) in existing literatures or answers important questions that researchers have overlooked (in 3-4 pages). You should also state how you might test your ideas (in 1-2 pages). Please include a figure or a table that help illustrate the hypotheses. Figures

and/or tables are not included in the page limit. Please use the format as directed in the Term paper guideline.

You do not need to do an elaborate literature search to make sure that your idea is new; the course readings and a quick computer search will suffice. Please also relate your idea to theories covered in this class in a substantive and novel manner. Articles assigned in the first class should serve as resources for you in finding an interesting topic and building the case for its importance.

Here are some questions that might spark your creativity:

1. Is there a theory that did not fit with your personal work or life experiences? If so, how it might be modified and tested?
2. Did any of the theories seem to contradict each other? How can the contradiction be resolved, and the amended theory be tested?
3. Is there a setting in which you could test a theory we read about and find opposite results, or no results at all (i.e., context may matter)? Describe how you would revise the theory and test the amended theory.
4. Was there a theory that you found to be wrong? Why? Describe how you would revise the theory and test the amended theory.

Term paper (40%) (In no more than 15 double-spaced 12-point font pages).

The term paper is a research proposal due in the last class. The research proposal provides an opportunity for students to conceive and plan a study on some issue within the domain of the course. An initial one-page proposal for your study is due in Class 11. In the term paper, provide a literature review of the related work to-date, a theoretical model consisting of hypotheses, and methodology to be used for testing the hypotheses (for the format, use AMJ publications as examples). Each student will give a 15-minutes presentation of his or her term paper in the last class.

It is important that you appropriately cite all references within the text of your proposal, as well as including a reference list at the conclusion of your paper (for the format of referencing, see AMJ publication guides). Sentences that are paraphrased and ideas that are adopted from another work must be appropriately cited. If you are including a sentence or passage verbatim from another work (published or unpublished), you must indicate this with the appropriate quotation marks and citation.

A note about the term paper. While you must incorporate what you have learned from this course in your final paper, I aim to be flexible on the topic you choose to write on. The last thing I want is for you to write a paper that you are not interested in developing further. Indeed, my hope is that this paper will eventually develop into a publishable journal article (e.g., for *Academy of Management Review*, or the basis for an empirical paper for a top tier journal submission).

ACADEMIC INTEGRITY

I do NOT tolerate cheating. Students are responsible for understanding the RU Academic Integrity Policy (<http://academicintegrity.rutgers.edu/>). I will strongly enforce this Policy and pursue *all* violations. On all examinations and assignments, students must sign the RU Honor Pledge, which states, “On my honor, I have neither received nor given any unauthorized assistance on this examination or assignment.” [I will screen all written assignments through *SafeAssign* or *Turnitin*, plagiarism detection services that compare the work against a large database of past work.] Don’t let cheating or plagiarism destroy your hard-earned opportunity to learn and advance. See business.rutgers.edu/ai for more details.

You do not have permission to distribute my course materials to any other person or republish any of my content to a third-party platform like Course Hero, Quizlet, etc.

Guidance on the use of AI at Rutgers

As noted in [Rutgers Academic Integrity Policy 10.2.13](#), the principles of academic integrity require that students make sure that all submitted coursework be “the student’s own and created without the aid of impermissible technologies, materials, or collaborations.

COURSE SCHEDULE

Sessions	Topics
1	Introduction to OB and theorizing
2	Person-situation debate
3	Groups and teams
4	Diversity
5	Leadership
6	Motivation
7	Affect and Emotion
8	Journal review process Theory Building Exercise due
9	Organizational identification and commitment
10	Ethical issues at work
11	Organizational justice Term paper proposal due
12	Decision making
	Recess
13	Social networking
14	Presentation

Session 1 – Introduction to OB and theorizing

Required Readings

1. Sutton, R. I. & Staw, B. M. 1995. What theory is not. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 40: 371-384.
2. Whetten, D. (1989). What constitutes theory? *Academy of Management Review*, 14: 490-495.
3. Weick, K. (1989). Theory construction as disciplined imagination. *Academy of Management Review*, 14, 516-531.
4. Podsakoff, P.M., MacKenzie, S.B. & Podsakoff, N.P. 2016. Recommendations for creating better concept definitions in the organizational, behavioral and social sciences. *Organizational Research Methods*, 19: 159-203.
5. Farh, C.I.C., Li, J. & Lee, T.W. 2024. Towards a contextualized view of voice quality, its dimensions, and its dynamics across newcomer socialization. *Academy of Management Review*.
6. 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, 1, 9-15.

Recommended Readings

Okhuysen, G. & Bonardi, J. P. 2011. Editor's comments: The challenges of building theory by combining lenses. *Academy of Management Review*, 36 (1), 6-11.

Davis, M. (1971). That's interesting! *Philosophy of Social Science*, 309-344.

Corley, K.G. & Gioia, D. A. 2011. Building theory about building theory: What constitutes a theoretical contribution? *Academy of Management Review*, 36 (1), 12-32.

Staw, B. 1995. Repairs on the road to relevance and rigor. In Cummings & Frost (eds.) *Publishing in the organizational sciences* (2nd. Ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage: 96-107.

Locke, K., & Golden-Biddle, K. 1997. Constructing opportunities for contribution: Structuring inter-textual coherence and "problematizing" organizational studies. *Academy of Management Journal*, 40, 1023-1062.

Pfeffer, J. 1998. Understanding organizations: Concepts and controversies. *Handbook of social psychology*.

Pfeffer, J. 1993. Barriers to the advancement of organizational science: Paradigm development as a dependent variable. *Academy of Management Review*, **18**, 599-620.

Kerr, Norbert L. 1998. HARKing: Hypothesizing after the results are known. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, **2**: 196-217.

Hitt, M., Beamish, P., Jackson, S., & Mathieu, J. (2007). Building theoretical and empirical bridges across levels: Multilevel research in management. *Academy of Management Journal*, **50**(6), 1385-1399.

Greenberg, J.& Tomlinson, E. (2004). Situated experiments in organizations. *Journal of Management*, **30**, 703-724.

Overview of Organizational Behavior Research

Staw, B. 1984. Organizational behavior: A review and reformulation of the field's outcome variables. Annual Review of Psychology, **35**, 627-666.

Griffin, R. and Kacmar, K. M. 1991. Laboratory research in management: Misconceptions and missed opportunities. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, **12**: 301-311.

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

Mowday, R. T. and Sutton, R. I. 1993. Organizational behavior: Linking individuals and groups to organizational contexts. *Annual Review of Psychology*, Vol. **44**.

Porter, L. (1996). Forty years of organization studies: Reflections from a micro perspective. Administrative Science Quarterly, **41**: 262-269.

Rousseau, Denise M. 1997. Organizational behavior in the new organizational era. *Annual Review of Psychology*, Vol **48**. pp. 515-546.

Session 2 - Person-Situation Debate

Required Readings

1. Chatman, J.A. 1989. Improving interactional organizational research: A model of person-organization fit. *Academy of Management Review*, **14**, 333-349.
2. Davis-Blake, A., & Pfeffer, J. 1986. Just a mirage: The search for dispositional effects in organizational research. *Academy of Management Review*, **14**, 385-400.

3. Schneider, B. 1987. The people make the place. *Personnel Psychology*, **40**, 437-453.
4. Chatman, J., & Barsade, S. 1995. Personality, culture, and cooperation: Evidence from a business situation. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, **40**, 423-443.
5. Gupta, A. Nadkarni, S., & Mariam, M. 2019. Dispositional sources of managerial discretion: CEO ideology, CEO personality, and firm strategies. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, **64** (4), 855-893.

Recommended Readings

Chng et al. 2012. When does incentive compensation motivate managerial behaviors? An experimental investigation of the fit between incentive compensation, executive core self-evaluation, and firm performance. *Strategic Management Journal, Strat. Mgmt. J.*, **33**: 1343–1362.

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

Snyder, Mark & Ickes, William. 1995. Personality and Social Behavior (Chapter 28). In

Lindzey, G. & Aronson, E. (Eds.) Handbook of Social Psychology, 883-947.

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

Kenrick, & Funder, D. 1988. Profiting from controversy: Lessons from the person-situation debate. *American Psychologist*, **43**: 23-34.

Digman, J.M., 1990. Personality structure: Emergence of the five-factor model. *Annual Review of Psychology*, **41**: 417-440.

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

Staw, B.M., & Ross, J. 1985. The dispositional approach to job attitudes. *Journal of Applied Psychology*. 469-480.

House, R., Shane, & Arnold. 1996. Rumors of the death of dispositional research are vastly exaggerated. *Academy of Management Review*, **21**(1): 203-224.

Schneider, B., Smith, D.B., Taylor, S., & Fleenor, J. 1998. Personality and organizations: A test of the homogeneity of personality hypothesis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, **83**: 462-470.

Session 3 – Groups and Teams

Required Readings

1. Cohen & Bailey, (1997). What makes teams work: Group effectiveness research from the shop floor to the executive suite. *Journal of Management*, 23, 239-290.
2. Bunderson, J. S. (2003). Recognizing and utilizing expertise in work groups: A status characteristics perspective. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 48, 557-591.
3. Hambrick, D.C. (1994). Top management groups: A conceptual integration and reconsideration of the “team” label. *Research in organizational behavior*, 16, 171-213.
4. Nielsen and Nielsen (2013) “Top Management Team (TMT) Nationality Diversity and Firm Performance: A Multilevel Study” *Strategic Management Journal*, 34, 373-382.
5. 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.

Recommended Readings

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

Liu, D., & Fu, P. P. 2011. Motivating protégés’ learning in teams: A multilevel investigation of autonomy orientation and autonomy support. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 96: 1195-1208.

McGrath, J. E. 1997. Small group research, that once and future field: An interpretation of the past with an eye to the future. *Group Dynamics*, 1: 7-27.

Ancona, D., and Caldwell, D. 1992. Bridging the boundary: External activity and performance in organizational teams. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 37: 634-665.

Barker, J. R. (1993). Tightening the iron cage: Concertive control in self-managing teams. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 38, 408-437.

Guzzo, R. E., and Dickson, M. W. 1996. Teams in organizations: Recent research on performance and effectiveness. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 47: 307-338.

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

Gilson, L., Mathieu, J. E., Shalley, C. E., & Ruddy, T. R. 2005. Creativity and Standardization: Complementary or Conflicting Drivers of Team Effectiveness? *Academy of Management Journal*, 48: 521-531.

Johnson, M. D., Hollenbeck, J. R., Humphrey, S. E., Ilgen, D. R., Jundt, D. K., & Meyer, C. J. (2006). Cutthroat cooperation: Asymmetrical adaptation of team reward structures. *Academy of Management Journal*, 49, 103-119.

Levine, J. M & Moreland, R. L. (1998). Small groups. In Daniel T, Fiske, Susan T. and Lindzey, Gardner (Eds). *The handbook of social psychology* (Vol. 2, pp. 415-469). New York, NY, US: McGraw-Hill.

Sutton, R.I., & Hargadon, A. 1996. Brainstorming groups in context: Effectiveness in a product design firm. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 41: 685-718.

Turner, Marlene E (Ed). (2001). *Groups at work: Theory and research*. Mahwah, NJ, US: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.

Nemeth, C. (1986). Differential contributions of majority versus minority influence. *Psychological Review*, 93: 23-32.

Moreland, R. L. & Argote, L. (2003). Transactive memory in dynamic organizations. Peterson, Randall S and Mannix, Elizabeth A (Eds). *Leading and managing people in the dynamic organization*. (pp. 135-162). Mahwah, NJ, US: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.

Argote, L., and McGrath, J. E. 1993. Group processes in organizations: Continuity and change. In C. L. Cooper and I. T. Robertson (eds.), *International Review of Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, Vol. 8, New York: Wiley.

Session 4 – Diversity

Required Readings

1. Chatman, J. A., Greer L., Sherman, E. & Doerr, B. 2019. Blurred lines: How collectivism norm operates through perceive group diversity to boost or harm group performance in Himalayan Mountain climbing. *Organizational Science*.
2. Tsui, A., Egan, T., & O'Reilly, C. (1992). Being different: Relational demography and organizational attachment. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 37, 549-579.
3. Jehn, K. A, Northcraft, G. B., & Neale, M. A. (1999). Why differences make a difference: A field study of diversity, conflict, and performance in workgroups. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 44, 741-763.
4. Van Knippenberg, D. & J. N., Mell. 2016. Past, present, and potential future of team diversity research: From compositional diversity to emergent diversity, *OBHDP*, 135-145
5. Ely, R. (1994). The effects of organizational demographics and social identity on relationships among professional women. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 39, 203-238.

Recommended Readings

Chatman, J. A., & O'Reilly, C.A. (2004). Asymmetric Reactions to Work Group Sex Diversity among Men and Women. *Academy of Management Journal*, **47**, 93-208.

Brief, A. P., Dietz, J., Cohen, R. R.; Pugh, S. D., & Vaslow, J. B. (2000). Just doing business: Modern racism and obedience to authority as explanations for employment discrimination. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, **81**, 72-97.

Cummings, J. N. (2004). Work Groups, Structural Diversity, and Knowledge Sharing in a Global Organization. *Management Science*, **50**, 352-364.

Kanter, R.M. 1977. *Men and Women of the Corporation*, New York: Basic Books.

O'Reilly, C.A., Caldwell, D.F., & Barnett, W.P. 1989. Work group demography, social integration, and turnover. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, **34**, 21-37.

Pelled, L. 1996. Demographic diversity, conflict, and work group outcomes: An intervening process theory. *Organization Science*, **7**, 615-631.

Pierce, J. 1995. *Gender Trials: Emotional lives in contemporary law firms*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Swann, W. B Jr.; Polzer, J. T., Seyle, D. C. , & Ko, S. J. (2004). Finding value in diversity: Verification of personal and social self-views in diverse groups. *Academy of Management Review*, **29**, 9-27.

Ibarra, H. (1995). Race, opportunity, and diversity of social circles in managerial networks. *Academy of Management Journal*, **38**: 673-703.

van Knippenberg, D., De Dreu, C. K. W, & Homan, A. C. (2004). Work Group Diversity and Group Performance: An Integrative Model and Research Agenda. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, **89**, 1008-1022.

Session 5 – Leadership

Required Readings

1. Shim, S., Livingston, R.W., Phillips, K.W., & Lam, S.S.K. 2020. The impact of leader eye gaze on disparity in member influence: Implications for process and performance in diverse groups. *Academy of Management Journal*, 2020.
2. Lord, R.G., Gatti, P. & S.L.M. Chui, 2016. Social-cognitive, relational, and identity-based approaches to leadership, *OBHDP*, 119-134
3. Zhang, Y., Waldman, D., Han, Y., & Li, X. 2015. Paradoxical leadership behavior in people management: Antecedents and consequences. *Academy of Management Journal*, **58**, 538-566.

4. Waldman, D. A., Wang, D., Hannah, S. T., & Balthazard, P. A., 2017. A neurological and ideological perspective of ethical leadership. *Academy of Management Journal*, 1285-1306.
5. Wang, L. Li, J. O, Owens, B.P. Shi, L, Wang, M. In press. The humbling effect of significant relationships. *Organization Science*.

Recommended Readings

Chen, C.C. & Meindl, J.R. (1991). The construction of leadership images in the popular press: The case of Donald Burr and People Express. Administrative Science Quarterly, 36: 521-551.

Dvir, T., Eden, D., Avolio, B. J., & Shamir, B. (2002). Impact of transformational leadership on follower development and performance: A field experiment. *Academy of Management Journal*, 45, 735-744.

Tepper, B. J., Moss, S., & Duffy, M. K. 2011. Predictors of abusive supervision: Supervisor perceptions of deep-level dissimilarity, relationship conflict, and subordinate performance. *Academy of Management Journal*, 54: 279-294.

Van Vugt, M. 2006. Evolutionary origins of leadership and followership. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 10: 354-371.

Meindl, J. & Ehrlich, S 1987. The romance of leadership and the evaluation of organizational performance. *Academy of Management Journal*, 30, 91-109.

Bass, B.M. 1990. Handbook of leadership: Theory, research, and managerial applications. NY, NY: The Free Press. Ch. 13: Power and Leadership (225-251).

Bass, Avolio, Jung, & Bersen (2003). Predicting unit performance by assessing transformational and transactional leadership. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 88, 207-218.

Bono, J.E. & Judge, T.A. (2003). Self-concordance at work: Toward understanding the motivational effects of transformational leaders. *Academy of Management Journal*, 46, 554-571.

Conger & Kanungo. (1987). Toward a behavioral theory of charismatic leadership in organizational settings. *Academy of Management Review*, 12(4): 637-647.

Graen, G.B. & Uhl-Bien, M. (1995). Relationship-based approach to leadership: Development of leadership-member exchange (LMX) theory of leadership over 25 years: Applying a multi-level multi-domain perspective. *Leadership Quarterly*, 6, 219-247.

Howell, J. M., & Shamir, B. (2005). The role of followers in the charismatic leadership process: Relationships and their consequences. *Academy of Management Review*, 30, 96-112.

- Manz, C., & Sims, H. (1987). Leading workers to lead themselves: The external leadership of self-managing work teams. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 32: 106-129.
- Meindl, J., Ehrlich, S., & Dukerich, J. (1985). The romance of leadership. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 30, 78-102.
- House, R., Spangler, W., & Woycke, J. (1991). Personality and charisma in the U.S. presidency: A psychological theory of leader effectiveness. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 36: 364-396.
- Gerstner, C. R., & Day, D. V. (1997). Meta-Analytic review of leader-member exchange theory: Correlates and construct issues. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 82, 827-844.
- Schriesheim, C. A., Castro, S. L., & Cogliser, C. C. (1999). Leader-Member exchange (LMX) research: A comprehensive review of theory, measurement, and data-analytic practices. *Leadership Quarterly*, 10: 63-113.
- Sutton, R.I., & Galunic, D.C. 1996. Consequences of public scrutiny for leaders and their organizations. *Research in organizational behavior*. Vol. 18, 201-250.
- Stodgill (1974). Historical trends in leadership theory and research. *Journal of Contemporary Business, Autumn*, 1-17.
- Thomas, A. (1988). Does leadership make a difference to organizational performance? *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 33: 388-400.
- Vecchio (1987). Situational leadership theory: An examination of a prescriptive theory. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 72, 444-451.
- Howell, J., & Frost, P. 1989. A laboratory study of charismatic leadership. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 43, 243-269.
- Pfeffer, J., Cialdini, R., Hanna, B., & Knopoff, K. 1999. Faith in supervision and the self-enhancement bias: Two psychological reasons why managers don't empower workers. *Basic and Applied Social Psychology*.
- House, R. (1996). Path-goal theory of leadership: Lessons, legacy, and a reformulated theory. *Leadership Quarterly*, 7, 323-352.
- Messick, David M (Ed); Kramer, Roderick M (Ed). (2005). *The psychology of leadership: New perspectives and research*. Mahwah, NJ, US: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.

Session 6 – Motivation

Required Readings

1. Higgins, E.T. 1997. Beyond pleasure and pain. *American Psychologist*, 52(12), 1280-1300.
2. Kanfer, R. & Chen, G. 2016. **Motivation in organizational behavior: History, advances and prospects**. OBHDP, 6-19.
3. 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.
4. Grant, M. 2007. Relational job design and the motivation to make a prosocial difference. *Academy of Management Review*, 32, 393-417.
5. Carton, A.M. 2018. I'm not mopping the floors, I'm putting a man on the moon. How Nasa leaders enhanced the meaningfulness of work by changing the meaning of work. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 63 (2), 323-369.
6. Klein, E. 2024 NYTimes On Children, Meaning, Media and Psychedelics

Recommended Readings

Lockwood, P., Jordan, C. H., Kunda, Z. (2002). Motivation by positive or negative role models: Regulatory focus determines who will best inspire us. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 83, 854-864.

Steers, R. M, Mowday, R. T, & Shapiro, D. L. (2004). Introduction to special topic forum: The future of work motivation theory. *Academy of Management Review*, 29, 379-387. **(Also skim through other articles in this special topic volume.)**

Latham, G. P & Pinder, C. C. (2005). Work Motivation Theory and Research at the Dawn of the Twenty-First Century. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 56, 485-516.

Jin, P. (1993). Work motivation and productivity in voluntarily formed work teams: A field study in China. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 54, 133-155.

Igalens, J. & Roussel, P. (1999). A study of the relationships between compensation package, work motivation and job satisfaction. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 20, 1003-1025.

Katzell, R.A. & Thompson, D.E. 1990. Work Motivation: Theory and Practice. American Psychologist, 45, 2, 144-153.

Latham, G.P., Erez, M., Locke, E.A. 1988. Resolving scientific disputes by the joint design of crucial experiments by the antagonists: Application to the Erez-Latham dispute regarding participation in goal setting. Journal of Applied Psychology, 4(73), 753-772.

Deci, E. 1972. Intrinsic motivation, extrinsic reinforcement, and inequity. Journal of Personality

and *Social Psychology*, 22(1), April, 113-120.

Hackman, J.R. & Oldham, G.H. 1976. Motivation through the design of work. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 1976, 16, 250-279.

Eden, D. 1989. Expectations, motivation, and performance: Why do workers achieve what they expect? (Chapter 3) from *Pygmalion in Management*. Lexington, MA: Lexington Books

Dipboye, R.L. 1982. Self-fulfilling prophecies in the selection-recruitment interview. *Academy of Management Review*, 1982, 7, 4, 579-586.

Earley, P.C., Connolly, T., & Ekegren, G. 1989. Goals, strategy development, and task performance: Some limits on the efficacy of goal setting. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 74: 24-33.

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

Staw, B., & Boettger, R. 1990. Task revision: A neglected form of work performance. *Academy of Management Journal*, 33: 534-559.

Erez, M., Kleinbeck, U., Thierry, H. (2001). **Work motivation in the context of a globalizing economy**. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.

Session 7 – Affect and Emotion

1. Weiss, H., & Cropanzano, R. 1996. Affective events theory: A theoretical discussion of the structure, causes, and consequences of affective experiences at work. *Research in organizational behavior*, Vol. 18, 1-74.
2. Barsade, S. G. (2002). The ripple effect: Emotional contagion and its influence on group behavior. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 47, 644-675.
3. Rothbard, N.P. & Wilk, S.N. 2011. Waking up on the wrong side of bed: Start of workday mood, work events, and employee affect, and performance, *Academy of Management Journal*, 54, 959-980.
4. Amabile, T. M., Barsade, S. G., Mueller, J. S., & Staw, B. M. (2005). Affect and creativity at work. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 50, 367-403.
5. Grant, A. 2013. Rocking the boat but keeping it steady: The role of emotional regulation in employee voice. *Academy of Management Journal*, 56, 1073-1723.

Recommended Readings

Lazarus, R. 1982. Thoughts on the relations between emotion and cognition. *American Psychologist*, 37, 1019-1024.

Ellsworth, P. C., & Scherer, K. R. 2003. Appraisal processes in emotion. In R. J. Davidson, K. R. Scherer, & H. H. Goldsmith (Eds.), *Handbook of affective sciences*: 572–595. Oxford University Press.

Staw, B.M., & Barsade, S. (1991). Affect and managerial performance: A test of the sadder-but-wiser vs. happier-and-smarter hypotheses. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 38, 304-331.

Brief, A. P., & Weiss, H. M. (2002). Organizational behavior: Affect in the workplace. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 53, 279-307.

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

Keltner, D., & Haidt, J. 1999. Social functions of emotions at four levels of analysis. *Cognition and emotion*, Vol. 13(5), 505-521.

Sutton, R., 1991. Maintaining norms about expressed emotions: The case of bill collectors. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 36(2): 245-268.

Tiedens, L. Z. (2001). Anger and advancement versus sadness and subjugation: The effect of negative emotion expressions on social status conferral. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 80, 86-94.

Wong, & Law. (2002). The effects of leader and follower emotional intelligence on performance and attitude: An exploratory study. *Leadership Quarterly*, 13, 243-274.

Morris, M., & Keltner, D. (2000). How emotions work: An analysis of the social functions of emotional expression in negotiations. *Research in organizational behavior*, 22, 1-50.

Watson, D., & Slack, A.K. (1993). General factors of affective temperament and their relation to job satisfaction over time. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 54, 181-202.

Session 8- Getting familiar with the review process

Required Readings

1. AMJ Reviewer evaluation guideline
2. JAP-submission guidelines
3. Reviewing for the Annual Meeting
4. BEQ submissions, reviews and responses

Session 9 – Organizational Identification and Commitment

Required Readings

1. Hogg, M.A., & Terry, D.J. (2000). Social identity and self-categorization processes in organizational contexts. *Academy of Management Review*, 25, 121-140.
2. Meyer, J. P., Allen, N. J., & Smith, C. A. (1993). Commitment to organizations and occupations: Extension and test of a three-component conceptualization. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 78(4), 538–551.
3. Dutton, J. E., Dukerich, J. M., & Harquail, C. V. (1994). Organizational images and member identification. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 39, 239-263.
4. Caprar, D.V., Walker, B.W. & Ashforth, B.E. 2022. The dark side of strong identification in organizations: A conceptual review. *Academy of Management Annals*, 16, 759-805.
5. Pratt, M., Rockmann, K.W., & Kaufmann, J.B. 2006. Constructing professional identity. *Academy of Management Journal*, 49, 235-262.

Recommended Reading:

O'Reilly, C. and Chatman, J. (1986). Organizational commitment and psychological attachment: The effects of compliance, identification and internalization on pro-social behavior. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 3, 492-499.

Elsbach, K. D., & Kramer, R. M. (1996). Members' responses to organizational identity threats: Encountering and countering the Business Session rankings. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 41, 442-476.

Morrison, E. (1994). Role definitions and organizational citizenship behavior: The importance of the employee's perspective. *Academy of Management Journal*, 37, 1543-1567.

Tepper, B. J., Duffy, M. K., Hoobler, J. & Ensley, M. D. (2004). Moderators of the Relationships Between Coworkers' Organizational Citizenship Behavior and Fellow Employees' Attitudes. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 89, 455-465.

Organ, D. (1990). The motivational basis of organizational citizenship behavior. In L. Cummings & B. Staw, (Eds.) *Research in Organizational Behavior*. Vol. 12.

Van Dyne, L., Graham, J.W., & Dienesch, R.M. (1994). Organizational citizenship behavior: Construct redefinition, measurement, and validation. *Academy of Management Journal*, 37, 765-802.

Batson, C.D., et al. (1983). Influence of self-reported distress and empathy on egoistic vs. altruistic motivation to help. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 45, 706-718.

Bellah, R.N., Madsen, R., Sullivan, W.M., Swidler, A., & Tipton, S.M. (1985). *Habits of the heart*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Elsbach, K.D. (1999). An expanded model of organizational identification. In R.I. Sutton, & B.M. Staw (Eds.), *Research in organizational behavior* (Vol., 21, pp. 163-200). Stamford, CT: JAI Press.

Withey, M.J., & Cooper, W.H. (1989). Predicting exit, voice, loyalty, and neglect. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 34, 521-539.

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

Hui, C., Lee, C., Rousseau, D. M. (2004). Psychological Contract and Organizational Citizenship Behavior in China: Investigating Generalizability and Instrumentality. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 89, 311-321.

Meyer, J., Pauonen, S., Gellatly, I., Goffin, R. & Jackson, D. 1989. Organizational commitment and job performance: It's the nature of the commitment that counts. Journal of Applied Psychology, 74, 152-156.

Session 10 – Ethical issues at work

Required Readings:

1. Jones, T.M. (1991). Ethical decision making by individuals in organizations: An issue-contingent model. *Academy of Management Review*, 16, 366-395.

2. Solomon, R.C. (1992). Corporate roles, personal virtues: An Aristotelian approach to business ethics. *Business Ethics Quarterly*, 2, 317-339.
3. Treviño, L.K. (1986). Ethical decision-making in organizations: A person-situation interactionist model. *Academy of Management Review*, 11 (3): 601-617
4. Bazerman et al. (2016) Bounded awareness: Implications for ethical decision making. *OBHDP*, 95-105
5. Chen, CC, Sheldon, OJ, Chen, M. & Reynolds, SJ. 2023. For the sake of the ingroup: The double-edged effects of collectivism on workplace unethical behavior. *Business Ethics Quarterly*, 1-35

Recommended Readings

Chen, M., Chen, C. C., & Sheldon, O. J. 2016. Relaxing moral reasoning to win: How organizational identification relates to unethical pro-organizational behavior. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 101(8): 1082-1096.

Umphress, E. E., & Bingham, J. B. (2011). When employees do bad things for good reasons: Examining unethical pro-organizational behaviors. *Organization Science*, 22, 621-640.

Greenberg, J. (2002). Who stole the money, and when? Individual and situational determinants of employee theft. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 89: 985-1003.

Soule, E. (2002). Managerial moral strategies – in search of a few good principles. *Academy of Management Review*, 27, 77-97.

Warren, D. E. & Crowe-Smith, K. 2008. “Deciding what’s right: The role of external sanctions and embarrassment in shaping moral judgments in the workplace.” *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 28: 81-105.

Schminke, M. & Wells, D. (1999). Group processes and performance and their effects on individuals’ ethical frameworks. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 18, 367-381.

Detert, J. R., L. K. Treviño, V. L. Sweitzer. 2008. Moral disengagement in ethical decision making: A study of antecedents and outcomes. *J. Appl. Psych.* 93 374-391.

Salvador, R., R. G. Folger. 2009. Business ethics and the brain. *Business Ethics Quart.* 19 1-31.

Tripp, Bies, Aquino (2002). Poetic Justice or petty jealousy? The aesthetics of revenge. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*.

Weaver, G.R., & Agle, B.R. (2002). Religiosity and ethical behavior in organizations: A symbolic interactionist perspective. *Academy of Management Review*, 27, 77-97.

May, D.R., Chang, Y.K., & Shao R. (2015). Does ethical membership matter? Moral identification and its organizational implications. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 100(3), 681-694.

Session 11 – Organizational justice

Required Readings

1. Colquitt, J. A., Greenberg, J., & Zapata-Phelan, C. P. (2005). What Is Organizational Justice? A Historical Overview. In Greenberg, J. and Colquitt, J. A (Eds). ***Handbook of organizational justice***. (pp. 3-56). Mahwah, NJ, US: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.
2. Brockner, J., Wiesenfeld, B. M., Siegel, P. A., Bobocel, D. R., & Liu, Z. (2015). Riding the Fifth Wave: Organizational Justice as Dependent Variable. ***Research in Organizational Behavior***, 35, 103-121.
3. Stahl, T., Vermunt, R., & Ellemers, N. (2008). For love or money? How activation of relational versus instrumental concerns affect reactions to decision-making procedures. ***Journal of Experimental Social Psychology***, 44, 80-94.
4. Roberson, Q. M., & Williamson, I. O. (2012). Justice in self-managing teams: The role of social networks in the emergence of procedural justice climates. *Academy of Management Journal*, 55(3), 685-701.
5. Ambrose, M. L., & Schminke, M. (2009). The role of overall justice judgments in organizational justice research: a test of mediation. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 94(2), 491.

Recommended Readings

Schminke, M., Arnaud, A., & Taylor, R. (2015). Ethics, Values, and Organizational Justice: Individuals, Organizations, and Beyond. ***Journal of Business Ethics***, 130(3), 727-736.

Moore, D.A., Tetlock, P.E., Tanlu, L., & Bazerman, M.H. (2006). Conflicts of interest and the case of auditor independence: Moral seduction and strategic issue cycling. ***Academy of Management Review***, 31, 10-29.

Tepper, B.J., Duffy, M.K., Henle, C.A., & Lambert, L.S. (2006). Procedural injustice, victim precipitation, and abusive supervision. *Personnel Psychology*, 29: 101-123.

Yang, J., Mossholder, K. W., & Peng, T. K. (2007). Procedural justice climate and group power distance: An examination of cross-level interaction effects. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 92: 681-692.

Blader, S. L. & Tyler, T. R. (2003). A four-component model of procedural justice: Defining the meaning of a "fair" process. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 29, 747-758.

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

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

Lind, E. A., & Tyler, T. R. (1988). *The social psychology of procedural justice*. New York: Plenum Press.

Greenberg, J. & Colquitt, J.A. (2005). *Handbook of organizational justice (Ed)*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Van Prooijen, J., Van den Bos, K., & Wilke, H. A. M. (2005). Procedural justice and intragroup status: Knowing where we stand in a group enhances reactions to procedures. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, *41*, 664-676.

Scott, B. A., Colquitt, J.A., & Zapata-Phelan, C.P. (2007). Justice as a dependent variable: Subordinate charisma as a predictor of interpersonal and informational justice perceptions. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *92*, 1597-1609.

McFarlin, D. B., & Sweeney, P. D. (1992). Distributive and procedural justice as predictors of satisfaction with personal and organizational outcomes. *Academy of Management Journal*, *35*, 626-637.

Tyler, T., DeGoey, P., & Smith, H. (1996). Understanding why the justice of group procedures matters: A test of the psychological dynamics of the group –value model. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *70*, 913-930.

Session 12 – Decision-making

Required Readings

1. Tversky, A., & Kahneman, D. (1974). Judgment under uncertainty: Heuristics and biases. *Science*, *185*, 1124-1131.
2. Elsbach, K. D., Kramer, R. M. (2003). Assessing creativity in Hollywood pitch meetings: Evidence for a dual-process model of creativity judgments. *Academy of Management Journal*, *46*, 283-301.
3. Morris, M.W., Larrick, R. & Su, S. 1999. Misperceiving negotiation counterparts: Ascribing personality traits for situationally determined bargaining behaviors. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *77* (1)

4. Wong, E. M., Ormiston, M.E., & Tetlock, P.E. 2011. The effects of top management team integrative complexity and decentralized decision making on corporate social performance. *Academy of Management Journal*, 54, 1207-1228.
5. Sheldon, O. & Fishback, A. 2011. Resisting the temptation to compete: Self-control promotes cooperation in mixed-motive interactions. *Journal of Experimental Social psychology*, 47: 403-411.

Recommended Readings

Kunda, Z. (1990). The case for motivated reasoning. *Psychological Bulletin*, 108, 480-498.

Morris, M.W., Larrick, R. & Su, S. 1999. Misperceiving negotiation counterparts: Ascribing personality traits for situationally determined bargaining behaviors. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 77 (1)

Weick, K. 1993. The collapse of sense-making in organizations: The Mann Gulch disaster. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 38, 628-652.

Cohen, March, & Olsen, (1972). A garbage can model of organizational choice. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 17, 1-25.

Galinsky, A. D, Leonardelli, G. J, Okhuysen, G. A., Mussweiler, T. (2005). Regulatory Focus at the Bargaining Table: Promoting Distributive and Integrative Success. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 31, 1087-1098.

Bazerman, M. (1990). Biases. Chapter 2 of *Managerial Decision Making* (second edition). New York: John Wiley.

Buehler, R., Griffin, D., & Ross, M. (1994). Exploring the 'Planning fallacy': Why people underestimate their task completion times. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 67, 366-381.

Cohen, March, & Olsen, (1972). A garbage can model of organizational choice. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 17, 1-25.

Funder. (1987). Errors and mistakes: Evaluating the accuracy of social judgment. *Psychological Bulletin*, 101(1): 75-90.

Ilgén, M., & Tower. (1994). The cognitive revolution in organizational behavior. In J. Greenberg (Ed.) *Organizational behavior: The state of the science*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, p. 1-22.

Malle, B. 1999. How people explain behavior: A new theoretical framework. Personality and Social Psychology Review, 3 (1) 23-48.

Medvec, V.H., Madey, S.F., & Gilovich, T. (1995). When less is more: Counterfactual thinking and satisfaction among Olympic medalists. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, **69**, 603-610.

Miller, J. G., Bersoff, D. M., and Harwood, R. L. (1990). Perceptions of social responsibilities in India and the United States: Moral imperatives of personal decisions? *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, **58**: 33-47.

Northcraft, G.B., & Neale, M. (1987). Experts, amateurs, and real estate: An anchoring-and-adjustment perspective on property pricing decisions. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, **39**: 84-97.

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

Weber, E. U., Shafir, S., & Blais, A. (2004). Predicting Risk Sensitivity in Humans and Lower Animals: Risk as Variance or Coefficient of Variation. *Psychological Review*, **111**, 430-445.

Session 13 - Social Networking

Required Readings

1. Burt, Ronald S. (1992) "The social structure of competition." *Networks and organizations: Structure, form, and action*: 57-91.
2. Granovetter, Mark S. (1973) "The strength of weak ties." *American journal of sociology*:1360-1380.
3. Coleman, J.S. Social capital in the creation of human capital (1988). *American Journal of Sociology*: S95-S120.
4. Borgatti, Stephen P., and Daniel S. Halgin. (2011) "On network theory." *Organization Science* **22.5**: 1168-1181.
5. Perry-Smith, J., & Mannucci, P. V. (2015). From creativity to innovation: The social network drivers of the four phases of the idea journey. *Academy of Management Review*.

Recommended Readings

Tasselli, S., Kilduff, M., & Menges, J. I. (2015). The Microfoundations of Organizational Social Networks A Review and an Agenda for Future Research. *Journal of Management*, 0149206315573996.

Brass, Daniel J., et al. (2004) "Taking stock of networks and organizations: A multilevel perspective." *Academy of management journal* **47.6**: 795-817.

Reinholt, M., Pedersen, T., & Foss, N.J. (2011). Why a central network position isn't enough: the role of motivation and ability for knowledge sharing in employee networks. *Academy of Management Journal*.

Shah, Neha Parikh, Rob Cross, and Daniel Z. Levin. 2015. Performance Benefits from Providing Assistance in Networks Relationships That Generate Learning. *Journal of Management*: 0149206315584822

Session 14 - Presentation

SUPPORT SERVICES

If you need accommodation for a **disability**, obtain a Letter of Accommodation from the Office of Disability Services. The Office of Disability Services at Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey, provides student-centered and student-inclusive programming in compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990, the Americans with Disabilities Act Amendments of 2008, Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, Section 508 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1998, and the New Jersey Law Against Discrimination. More information can be found at ods.rutgers.edu.

[Rutgers University-New Brunswick ODS phone (848)445-6800 or email dsoffice@echo.rutgers.edu]

[Rutgers University-Newark ODS phone (973)353-5375 or email ods@newark.rutgers.edu]

If you are **pregnant**, the Office of Title IX and ADA Compliance is available to assist with any concerns or potential accommodations related to pregnancy.

[Rutgers University-New Brunswick Title IX Coordinator phone (848)932-8200 or email jackie.moran@rutgers.edu]

[Rutgers University-Newark Office of Title IX and ADA Compliance phone (973)353-1906 or email TitleIX@newark.rutgers.edu]

If you seek **religious accommodations**, the Office of the Dean of Students is available to verify absences for religious observance, as needed.

[Rutgers University-New Brunswick Dean of Students phone (848)932-2300 or email deanofstudents@echo.rutgers.edu]

[Rutgers University-Newark Dean of Students phone (973)353-5063 or email DeanofStudents@newark.rutgers.edu]

If you have experienced any form of **gender or sex-based discrimination or harassment**, including sexual assault, sexual harassment, relationship violence, or stalking, the Office for

Violence Prevention and Victim Assistance provides help and support. More information can be found at <http://vpva.rutgers.edu/>.

[Rutgers University-New Brunswick incident report link:

<http://studentconduct.rutgers.edu/concern/>. You may contact the Office for Violence Prevention and Victim Assistance at (848)932-1181]

[Rutgers University-Newark incident report link:

https://cm.maxient.com/reportingform.php?RutgersUniv&layout_id=7 . You may also contact the Office of Title IX and ADA Compliance at (973)353-1906 or email at TitleIX@newark.rutgers.edu. If you wish to speak with a staff member who is confidential and does **not** have a reporting responsibility, you may contact the Office for Violence Prevention and Victim Assistance at (973)353-1918 or email run.vpva@rutgers.edu]

Bias incidents: an act – either verbal, written, physical, or psychological that threatens or harms a person or group on the basis of actual or perceived race, religion, color, sex, age, sexual orientation, gender identity or expression, national origin, ancestry, disability, marital status, civil union status, domestic partnership status, atypical heredity or cellular blood trait, military service or veteran status.

Bias incidents can be reported online at:

[New Brunswick Bias Incident Report Form](#)

[Newark Bias Incident Report Form](#)

If students who have experienced a temporary condition or injury that is adversely affecting their ability to fully participate, you should submit a request via

<https://temporaryconditions.rutgers.edu> .

If you are a military **veteran** or are on active military duty, you can obtain support through the Office of Veteran and Military Programs and Services. <http://veterans.rutgers.edu/>

If you are in need of **mental health** services, please use our readily available services.

[Rutgers University-Newark Counseling Center: <http://counseling.newark.rutgers.edu/>]

[Rutgers Counseling and Psychological Services–New Brunswick: <http://rhscaps.rutgers.edu/>]

If you are in need of **physical health** services, please use our readily available services.

[Rutgers Health Services – Newark: <http://health.newark.rutgers.edu/>]

[Rutgers Health Services – New Brunswick: <http://health.rutgers.edu/>]

If you are in need of **legal** services, please use our readily available services:

<http://rusls.rutgers.edu/>

Students experiencing difficulty in courses due to **English as a second language (ESL)** should contact the Program in American Language Studies for supports.

[Rutgers–Newark: PALS@newark.rutgers.edu]

[Rutgers–New Brunswick: eslpals@english.rutgers.edu]

If you are in need of additional **academic assistance**, please use our readily available services.

[Rutgers University-Newark Learning Center: <http://www.ncas.rutgers.edu/rlc>]

[Rutgers University-Newark Writing Center: <http://www.ncas.rutgers.edu/writingcenter>]
[Rutgers University-New Brunswick Learning Center: <https://rlc.rutgers.edu/>]

[Optional items that many faculty include:

- Students must sign, date, and return a statement declaring that they understand the RU Academic Integrity Policy.
 - Students must sign, date, and return a statement declaring that they understand this syllabus.]
-

CODE OF PROFESSIONAL CONDUCT

[If you prefer to direct students to the conduct policy online instead, please use the following link and place it beneath the header above:

<https://myrbs.business.rutgers.edu/students/code-professional-conduct>]

Rutgers Business School is recognized for its high-quality education. To that end, maintaining the caliber of classroom excellence, whether in person or online, requires students to adhere to the same behaviors expected in professional career environments. These include the following principles:

Discussion and Correspondence

- Each student is encouraged to participate actively in class discussions and exercises. Substantive dialogue requires a degree of mutual respect, willingness to listen, and tolerance of opposing points of view. Disagreement and the challenging of ideas must happen in a supportive and sensitive manner. Hostility and disrespectful behavior will not be tolerated.
- In correspondence and in the classroom, students should demonstrate respect in how they address instructors. Students should use proper titles unless there is an explicit understanding that the instructor accepts less formal alternatives. Similarly, appropriate formatting in electronic communication and timely responsiveness are all expectations in every professional interaction, including with instructors. Everything said and written should demonstrate respect and goodwill.

Punctuality and Disruption

- Class starts and ends promptly at the assigned periods. Students are expected to be in their seats or present online and ready to begin class on time.
 - Take your responsibility to attend class seriously. Your attendance is a critical element of the learning experience for in-person classes. Failure to show up disrupts your learning and signals disrespect to your peers and instructors. (Of course, illness is a legitimate exception requiring advanced reporting to the [University](#) and your instructors.)

- Barring emergencies and within reason, students are expected to remain in their seats for the class duration. In person, packing belongings before the end of class disturbs both other students and the instructor. Online, attending to other tasks is distracting. In addition, even if webcams are not required in your course, your attention is fundamentally lacking if you are engaged in multiple tasks simultaneously.

Technology

- The use of technology is sanctioned only as permitted by the course instructor. As research on learning shows, peripheral use of technology in classes negatively impacts the learning environment in three ways:
 1. Individual learning and performance directly suffer, resulting in the systemic lowering of grades earned.
 2. In the classroom, one student's use of technology automatically diverts and captures other people's attention, thus impeding their learning and performance. Moreover, even minor infractions have a spillover effect and result in others doing the same.
 3. Subverting this policy (e.g., using a phone during class, even if hidden below the table or out of sight from your webcam; tapping on a smartwatch; using a laptop for non-course related matters) is evident to the course instructor and offensive to the principles of decorum in a learning environment.
- Networking, computing, and associated resources in the trading rooms, advanced technology rooms, and general classrooms are to be used in the manner intended.
- Sharing links to private online classes, attempting to join an online class you are not enrolled in, or posting disruptive content during these sessions are strictly prohibited and may lead to disciplinary action.
- For more instructions on information technology resources at Rutgers University, please refer to the [Acceptable Use Policy for Information Technology Resources](#).

Misappropriating Intellectual Property

- Almost all original work is the intellectual property of its authors. These works may include syllabi, lecture slides, recorded lectures, homework problems, exams, and other materials, in either printed or electronic form. The authors may hold copyrights in these works, which U.S. statutes protect. Copying this work or posting it online (on sites such as Chegg or Course Hero) without the author's permission may violate the author's rights. More importantly, these works are the product of the author's efforts; respect for these efforts and the author's intellectual property rights are important values that members of the university community take seriously.

- For more instructions on copyright protections at Rutgers University, please refer to the [Rutgers Libraries](#).

Rutgers Business School is committed to the highest standards of integrity. We value mutual respect and responsibility, as these are fundamental to our educational excellence inside and outside the classroom.