PHDBA 297T: Research in Micro-Organizational Behavior
Fall 2015

Time: Mondays 2-5 PM
Location: CHEIT C0132

Professors

Dana Carney
dcarney@berkeley.edu
Office: F573

Laura Kray
kray@haas.berkeley.edu
Office: F591

Juliana Schroeder
jschroeder@haas.berkeley.edu
Office: F526

All office hours by appointment. Please email us to schedule office hours.

Course Overview/Description

This course examines theory and empirical research in major topic areas of micro organizational behavior. The topics and reading list represent our attempt to balance a number of factors and to expose you to a variety of theoretical perspectives. Thus, we read broad overview articles, as well as position, theory, and empirical papers. There is a blend of classic articles, more recent cutting edge research, and articles drawn from social psychology. A number of methodological approaches are represented as well.

To enroll in this course, you should either be a Ph.D. student in Management of Organizations (MORS) at Haas or have taken an advanced seminar in social psychology or sociology and be familiar with theory and research. This is NOT an applied course and is not recommended for students interested in applied issues.

Preparation for Class Sessions

Each student is expected to come to class prepared to discuss *all* the required readings for each class session. The essence of this seminar is contained in the quality of the classroom discussion. As you review each reading you might want to consider the following issues:

- What is the basic formulation of the theory (constructs and relationships among them), and what drives the theory?
- What are the underlying assumptions?

- What is the main contribution of this paper? What are the interesting ideas?
- What did the author(s) do well and do poorly?
- Do you believe his or her arguments? What would it take to convince you?
- What are the boundary conditions of the argument, in other words, under what circumstances does the argument apply and not apply?
- What are the critical differences between this author's argument and others you have read? Can these differences be resolved through an empirical test?

COURSE REQUIREMENTS AND GRADING

A. Class Participation:	25%
B. Opinion Papers (3):	25%
C. Final Paper/Research Proposal	25%
D. Final Presentation	25%

A. Class participation is worth 25% of your grade, based on: (1) active engagement in classroom discussions and (2) acting as a session leader.

Your primary assignment in this course is to be **actively** engaged in class discussions and to immerse yourself into the field of organizational behavior. Thus, vigorous seminar participation, including developing and articulating informed views on topics and constructively contributing to others' thinking and work in the seminar, are central requirements of the course. More specifically:

1. **Active engagement in classroom discussion**. Each of you should complete and be prepared to discuss *all* the required readings for each class session. The essence of this seminar is contained in the quality of the classroom discussion. As you read each paper you might want to consider the following issues:

   - What is the basic formulation of the theory (constructs and relationships among them), and what drives the theory?
   - What are the underlying assumptions?
   - What is the main contribution of this paper? What are the interesting ideas?
   - What did the author(s) do well and do poorly?
   - Do you believe his or her arguments? What would it take to convince you?
   - What are the boundary conditions of the argument, in other words, under what circumstances does the argument apply and not apply?
   - What are the critical differences between this author's argument and others you have read? Can these differences be resolved through an empirical test? What would that study look like?

   And, for empirical papers, you might also consider:

   - Does the research design make sense given the research question?
   - Does the research design allow you to rule out alternative hypotheses?
   - How are the variables operationalized, and is this consistent with the theory?

- Are the data analyzed and interpreted effectively?

Finally, we have provided a set of preparation questions for each class. You should give serious thought to these questions prior to each class as well as any ideas for making theoretical and empirical contributions in the particular area.

2. **<u>Session leader</u>**. Students will act as class session leaders for each assigned paper (to be determined in the first week of the class). The role of the session leader is to lead the class through questions and discussions. The role is *not* merely to summarize readings, but rather, you should come to class prepared with discussion questions and observations that highlight the main issues, strengths, weaknesses, controversies, and gaps in your reading for that week.

B. *Three opinion papers are worth 25% of your grade.*

Please prepare three critical analyses about the readings. One analysis will be for Dr. Carney's readings (Weeks 3 & 8), one for Dr. Kray's readings (Weeks 4 & 6), and one for Dr. Schroeder's readings (Weeks 5 & 7). You can choose which week you submit your paper.

Each paper should be 1-2 pages long (double-spaced). In these papers, you can address one or more of the following topics: 1) critique one or more of the weekly readings, 2) develop an important theme by integrating across readings, and/or 3) propose a novel hypothesis that could be empirically tested (something not already known or immediately obvious to researchers in OB or psychology). These papers are due on Monday by noon before Monday's class. They may serve as foundations for your larger research paper but do not necessarily need to do so.

C. *Final paper is worth 25% of your grade.*

For this paper, you have two options: First, you could prepare a 5-10 page paper integrating a field of research and highlighting a new research question (e.g., adding new knowledge or bringing a new perspective to old findings within the field). You should include a set of formal propositions/hypotheses that lay out your theoretical predictions. Take the paper as far as possible in terms of developing a research design and possible empirical test of the ideas. If you choose this option, **your paper is due on November 6th**. You will be expected to incorporate the comments from your presentation (Oct. 26th).

Alternatively, you could consider writing a proposal for an NSF Graduate Research Fellowship. The award application is due Oct. 29th. (Note: given the due date, this alternative requires getting started immediately!) These proposals involve two components: Personal, Relevant Background and Future Goals Statement (3 pages, single-spaced) and Graduate Research Plan Statement (2 pages, single-spaced). For more details about the instructions for each statement, please see: https://www.nsfgrfp.org/. We will review your materials. If you choose this option, we strongly encourage you to submit your application for an award. If you choose

this option, **your application is due to us on October 26th** so that we can provide comments prior to the due date.

hPlease submit a detailed proposed outline of this paper on October 12th so that we can provide feedback.

D. *Final presentation is worth 25% of your grade.*

Please make a 10-15 minute final presentation that explains your proposal. You should prepare this talk as if you were giving it at a research conference such as the Academy of Management. Be prepared to answer questions after your talk.

COURSE OUTLINE

Week	Date	Topic
1	August 31	Course Overview and Organization Session
2	September 7	No Class
3	September 14	Power (Dana Carney)
4	September 21	Gender (Laura Kray)
5	September 28	Motivation (Juliana Schroeder)
6	October 5	Ethics/morality (Laura Kray)
7	October 12	Person perception (Juliana Schroeder) * Paper proposals due
8	October 19	Emotion/Affect (Dana Carney)
9	October 26	Final Presentations * NSF GRF applications must be submitted to instructors
	October 29	NSF GRF applications due
	November 6	Final papers must be submitted to instructors

WEEK 1: COURSE OVERVIEW AND ORGANIZATION SESSION

No assigned readings.

WEEK 2: LABOR DAY—NO CLASS!

WEEK 3: POWER (LED BY DANA CARNEY)

Required Reading: (please read in order listed)
French, J. R. P., & Raven, B. The bases of social power. In D. Cartwright and A. Zander. *Group dynamics.* New York: Harper & Row, 1959.

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

Magee, J. C., & Galinsky, A. G. (2008). The self-reinforcing nature of power and status. *Academy of Management Annals*, vol. 2.

Salancik, G. R., & Pfeffer, J. (1974). The bases and use of power in organizational decision making: The case of a university. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 19*, 453-473.

Pfeffer, J. (2013). You're still the same: Why theories of power hold over time and across contexts. The *Academy of Management Perspectives, 27*, 269–280.

Hall, J. A., Coats,E., & LeBeau, L. S. (2005). Nonverbal behavior and the vertical dimension of social relations: a meta-analysis. *Psychological bulletin.*

Questions to Consider:
1. Do you see a difference between power, status, dominance, SES?
2. Are there any parallels between verticality and social categories such as race and gender?
3. Is power in organizational contexts different than power in one's social life (or in politics)?
4. What do you *think* about power- does it make you feel yucky? Do you like it? Do you want it? Why? Do you prefer espect over power? Or do you want it all?

Recommended Reading:

Books:
1. Leadership BS (Jeff Pfeffer's new book coming soon- pre-order available on Amazon)
2. Power (Jeff Pfeffer's canonical book- available everywhere)
3. Will to Power (Nietzsche's core philosophy- available everywhere)

Key researchers in the area (insufficiently represented on the required list):
1. Cameron Anderson's work
2. Pam Smith's work
3. Adam Galinsky's work
4. Judy Hall's work
5. Serena Chen's work
6. Dacher Keltner's work
7. Frank Flynn's work
8. Deborah Gruenfeld's work

Good papers to broaden thinking:

Krieger, N., Rowley, D. L., Herman, A. A., Avery, B., & Phillips, M. T. (1993). Racism, sexism, and social class: implications for studies of health, disease, and well-being. *American Journal of Preventative Medicine, 9*, 82-122.

Magee, J. C., & Smith, P. K. (2013). The social distance theory of power. *Personality and Social Psychology Review, 17*, 158-186.

Bonacich, Phillip. 1987. "Power and Centrality: A Family of Measures." American *Journal of Sociology 92*:1170-1182.

Brass, Daniel J. 1984. "Being in the Right place: A Structural Analysis of Individual Influence in Organizations." *Administrative Science Quarterly 29*:518-539.

Molm, Linda. 1997. "Risk and Power Use: Constraints on the Use of Coercion in Social Exchange." *American Sociological Review 62*.

Casciaro, Tiziana and Mikolaj Jan Piskorski. 2005. "Power Imbalance, Mutual Dependence, and Constraint Absorption: A Closer Look at Resource Dependence Theory." *Administrative Science Quarterly 50*:167-199.

Marianne Schmid Mast, Jonas, K., & Hall, J. A. (2009). Give a person power and he or she will show interpersonal sensitivity: The phenomenon and its why and when. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 97*, 835–850.

WEEK 4: GENDER (LED BY LAURA KRAY)

Required Reading:

Brescoll, V. (2012). Who takes the floor and why: Gender, power, and volubility in organizations. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 1-20.

Desai, S. D., Chugh, D., & Brief, A. P. The implications of marriage structure for men's workplace attitudes, beliefs, and behaviors toward women. *Administrative Science Quarterly,* 59, 330-365.

Eagly, A. & Wood, W. (1999). The origins of sex differences in human behavior. *American Psychologist, 54*, 408-423.

Ely, R., & Myerson, D. (2010). An organizational approach to undoing gender: The unlikely case of offshore oil platforms. *Administrative Science Quarterly,* 30, 3-34.

Joshi, A. (2014). By whom and when is women's expertise recognized? The interactive effects of gender and education in science and engineering teams. *Administrative Science Quarterly,* 59, 202-239.

Kennedy, J. & Kray, L. J. (in press). A pawn in someone else's game?: The cognitive, motivated, and paradigmatic barriers to women's excelling in negotiation. *Research in Organizational Behavior.*

Major, B., McFarlin, D. B., & Gagnon, D. (1984). Overworked and underpaid: On the nature of gender differences in personal entitlement. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 47,* 1399-1412.

Niederle, M., & Vesterlund, L. (2006). Do women shy away from competition? Do men compete too much? *Quarterly Journal of Economics,*.

Rudman, L. & Phelan, J.E. (2008). Backlash effects for disconfirming gender stereotypes in organizations. *Research in Organizational Behavior, 28,* 61-79.

Vandello, J. A., Cohen, D., Burnaford, R. M., & Weaver, J. R. (2008). Precarious manhood. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 95*, 1325–1339.

Questions to Consider:

1. What are the primary barriers to gender equality in the workplace?
2. What are the inherent challenges to studying gender and/or sex?
3. What does this literature have to say about the nature versus nurture debate?
4. Which is greater, differences in how women and men behave (actor effects) or how they are treated (target effects)? How can these different sources of difference be teased apart?

Recommended Reading:

Buss, D. M., & Schmitt, D. P. (2011). Evolutionary psychology and feminism. *Sex Roles, 64*, 768-787.

Ibarra, H. (1997) "Paving an Alternate Route: Gender Differences in Network Strategies for Career Development." *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 60 (1): 91-102.

Kennedy, J., & Kray, L. J. (2013). Who is willing to sacrifice sacred values for money and social status? Gender differences in reactions to ethical compromises. *Social Psychological and Personality Science.*

Leslie, S., Cimpian, A., Meyer, M., & Freeland, E. (2015). Expectations of brilliance underlie gender distributions across academic disciplines. *Science, 347*, 262-265.

Rothbard, Nancy P. 2001. Enriching or depleting? The dynamics of engagement in work and family roles. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 46: 655-684.

Shih, M., Pittinsky, T. L., & Ambady, N. 1999. Stereotype susceptibility: Identity salience and shifts in quantitative performance. *Psychological Science, 10*: 80-83.

WEEK 5: MOTIVATION (LED BY JULIANA SCHROEDER)

Required Reading:

Deci, E. (1971). The effects of externally medicated rewards on intrinsic motivation. *Journal of Personality & Social Psychology, 18*, 105-115.

Dweck, C. S., & Leggett, E. L. (1988). A social-cognitive approach to motivation and personality. *Psychological Review, 95*, 256–273.

Grant, A. M. (2007). Relational job design and the motivation to make a prosocial difference. *Academy of Management Review, 32*, 393–417.

Heath, C. (1999). On the social psychology of agency relationships: Lay theories of motivation overemphasize extrinsic incentives. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 78*, 25–62.

Hull, C. L. (1932). The goal–gradient hypothesis and maze learning. *Psychological Review, 39*, 25–43.

Koo, M., & Fishbach, A. (2008). Dynamics of self-regulation: How (un)accomplished goal actions affect motivation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 94*,183-195.

Locke, E. A., & Latham, G. P. (1990). Work motivation and satisfaction: Light at the end of the tunnel. *Psychological Science, 1*, 240-246.

Locke, E. A., & Latham, G. P. (2002). Building a practically useful theory of goal setting and task motivation: A 35-year odyssey. *American Psychologist, 57*, 705–717.

Ordonez, L., Schweitzer, M. E., Galinsky, A. D., & Bazerman, M. H. (2009). Goals gone wild: The systematic side effects of overprescribing goal setting. *Academy of Management, 23*, 6–16.

Questions to Consider:

1. Think about the different strategies to motivate someone. How would you pick a particular strategy? What factors would you need to take into account to choose an effective strategy?
2. When do motivational tools backfire? How can we avoid this?
3. How does one's social environment affect motivation? How do relationships with coworkers, friends, and family influence one's motivational trajectory?
4. What's the time course of motivation? How can being at the beginning, middle, or end of goal pursuit affect motivation?

Recommended Reading:

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

Deci, E. L., Koestner, R., & Ryan, R. M. (1999). A meta–analytic review of experiments examining the effects of extrinsic rewards on intrinsic motivation. *Psychological Bulletin, 125*, 627–668.

Fitzsimons, G. M., & Finkel, E. J. (2010). Interpersonal influences on self-regulation. *Current Directions in Psychological Science, 19*, 101-105.

Heath, C., Larrick, R. P., & Wu, G. (1999). Goals as reference points. *Cognitive Psychology, 38(1)*, 79–109.

Higgins, E. T. (1987). Self-Discrepancy: A theory relating self and affect. *Psychological Review, 94*, 319–340.

Kruger, J. & Dunning, D. (1999). Unskilled and unaware of it: How difficulties in recognizing one's own incompetence lead to inflated self-assessments. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 77*, 1121-1134.

Kruglanski, A.W., Shah, J.Y., Fishbach, A., Friedman, R. S., Chun, W. Y., & Sleeth–Keppler, D. (2002). A theory of goal systems: Implications for social cognition, affect, and action. In M. P. Zanna (Ed.). *Advances in experimental social psychology*, 34, 331–376, New York: Academic Press.

Locke, E. & Latham, G. (2004). What should we do about motivation theory: Six recommendations for the twenty-first century. *Academy of Management Review, 29*, 388-403.

Miller, D.T. & Ratner, R.K. (1998). The disparity between the actual and assumed power of self-interest. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 74*, 53-62.

Oettingen, G., & Gollwitzer, P. M. (2010). Strategies of setting and implementing goals: Mental contrasting and implementation intentions. In Maddux, J. E. & Tagney, J. P. (Eds.) *Social psychological foundations of clinical psychology*. (pp. 114–135). New York, NY, US: Guilford Press.

Schroeder, J., & Fishbach, A. (2015). How to motivate yourself and others? Intended and unintended consequences. *Research in Organizational Behavior*.

Trope, Y. & Liberman, N. (2003). Temporal construal. *Psychological Review, 110*, 403–421.

WEEK 6: JUSTICE, ETHICS & MORALITY (LED BY LAURA KRAY)

Required Reading:

Aquino, K., Freeman, D., Reed, A. II, Lim, V. K. G., & Felps, W. (2009). Testing a social-cognitive model of moral behavior: The interactive influence of situations

and moral identity centrality. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 97,* 123-141.

Blader, S. L., Tyler, T R. (2009). Testing and extending the group engagement model: Linkages between social identity, procedural justice, economic outcomes, and extrarole behavior. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 94*, 445-464.

Cohen, T., & Morse, L. (2014). Moral character: What it is and what it does. *Research in Organizational Behavior, 34*, 43-61.

Gino, F., Kouchaki, M., & Galinsky, A. D. (2015). The moral virtue of authenticity: How inauthenticity produces feelings of immorality and impurity. *Psychological Science, 26,* 983-996.

Haidt, J. (2001). The emotional dog and its rational tail: A social intuitionist approach to moral judgment. *Psychological Review, 108,* 814-834.

Kray, L. J., Kennedy, J., & Van Zant, A. (2014). Not competent enough to know the difference? Gender stereotypes about women's ease of being misled predict negotiator deception. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 125,* 61-72.

Lammers, J., Stapel, D. A., & Galinsky, A. D. (2010). Power increases hypocrisy: Moralizing in reasoning, immorality in behavior. *Psychological Science, 21,* 737-744.

Questions to Consider:

1. What are the differing perspectives on studying morality? What do we know about people who are immoral versus situations that elicit immorality? What about the interaction between the person and the situation?
2. What are the different ways that morality is measured? Do we understand certain aspects of morality (i.e. attitudes, identity) more than ethical behavior? How closely linked are they?
3. Returning to the distinction between actor-driven and target-driven effects, do we know more about morality and ethics from one perspective than the other?
4. How is the study of justice distinct from the study of moral psychology?

Recommended Reading:

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

Bandura, A., Barbaranelli, C., Caprara, G. V., & Pastorelli, C. (1996). Mechanisms of moral disengagement in the exercise of moral agency. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 71,* 364-374.

Brocker, J., & Wiesenfeld, B. M. (1996). An integrative framework for explaining reactions to decisions: Interactive effects of outcomes and procedures. *Psychological Bulletin, 120,* 189-208.

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

Kramer, R. M. (1999). Trust and distrust in organizations. *Annual Review of Psychology, 50,* 569-598.

Robinson, S. L. (1996). Trust and breach of the psychological contract. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 41,* 574-599.

Rai, T. S. & Fiske, A. P. (2011). Moral psychology is relationship regulation: Moral motives for unity, hierarchy, equality, and proportionality. *Psychological Review, 118*, 57-75.

Skitka, L. J., Bauman, C. W., & Sargis, E. G. (2005). Moral conviction: Another contributor to attitude strength or something more? *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 88*, 895-917.

Tyler, T. R., Lind, E. A. (1992). A relational model of authority in groups. In *Advances in experimental social psychology, Vol. 25*, edited by Zanna, Mark P.115-191. San Diego, CA, US: Academic Press.

WEEK 7: PERSON PERCEPTION
(LED BY JULIANA SCHROEDER)

Required Reading:

Apperly, I. A., Riggs, K. J., Simpson, A., Chiavarino, C., & Samson, D. (2006). Is belief reasoning automatic? *Psychological Science, 17*, 841–844.

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

Fiske, S. T., Cuddy, A. J., Glick, P., & Xu, J. (2002) A model of (often mixed) stereotype content: Competence and warmth respectively follow from perceived status and competition. *Journal of Personality & Social Psychology, 82*, 878–902.

Gilbert, D. T., & Malone, P. S. (1995). The correspondence bias. *Psychological Bulletin, 117*, 21- 38.

Haslam, N., & Loughnan, S. (2014). Dehumanization and infrahumanization. *Annual Review of Psychology, 65*, 399-423.

Kozak, M. J., Marsh, A. A., & Wegner, D. M. (2006). What do I think you're doing? Action identification and mind attribution. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 90*, 543–555.

Pronin, E. (2008). How we see ourselves and how we see others. *Science, 320*, 1177–1180.

Waytz, A., Schroeder, J., & Epley, N. (2014). The lesser minds problem. In Bain, P., Vaes, J., & Leyens, J.P. (Eds.), *Humanness and dehumanization* (pp. 49-67). New York, NY: Psychology Press.

Questions to Consider:

1. When do people care about others' perspectives and when do they overlook others' perspectives? When does perspective-taking decrease accuracy?
2. How are people "triggered" to think about others' minds? What happens when these triggers are absent?
3. What are the different methods people can use to try to understand the thoughts and feelings of those around them? How successful, generally, are these methods?
4. How does language affect the way we perceive others?

Recommended Reading:

Bandura, A. (1999). Moral disengagement in the perpetration of inhumanities. *Personality and Social Psychology Review, 3*, 193–209.

Dunbar, R. (1998). The social brain hypothesis. *Evolutionary Anthropology, 6*, 178–190.

Gilbert, D. T., Pelham, B. W., & Krull, D. S. (1988). On cognitive busyness: When person perceivers meet persons perceived. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 54*, 733-740.

Epley, N., & Waytz, A. (2010). Mind perception. In S. T. Fiske, D. T. Gilbert, & G. Lindsay (Eds.), *The Handbook of Social Psychology* (5th ed., pp. 498–541). New York: Wiley.

Hall, J. A., & Schmid-Mast, M. (2008). Are women always more interpersonally sensitive than men? Impact of goals and content domain. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 34*, 144–155.

Heider, F., & Simmel, M. (1944). An experimental study of apparent behavior. *American Journal of Psychology, 57*, 243–249.

Ickes, W. (2003). *Everyday mind reading: Understanding what other people think and feel*. Amherst: Prometheus Books.

Ross, L., & Ward, A. (1996). Naïve realism: Implications for social conflict and misunderstanding. In T. Brown, E. Reed, & E. Turiel (Eds.), *Values and knowledge* (pp. 103–135). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Saxe, R. (2006). Uniquely human social cognition. *Current Opinion in Neurobiology, 16*, 235–239.

Schroeder, J., & Epley, N. (2015). The sound of intellect: Speech reveals a thoughtful mind, increasing a job candidate's appeal. *Psychological Science, 26*, 877-891.

WEEK 8: EMOTION & AFFECT (LED BY DANA CARNEY)

Required Reading: (read in order listed, please)

James, W. (1884). What is an emotion? *Mind, 9*, 188-205. [found here: http://psychclassics.yorku.ca/James/emotion.htm]

Keltner, D., & Lerner, J. S. (2010). Emotion. In D. T. Gilbert, S. T. Fiske, & G. Lindsay (Eds.), *The handbook of social psychology* (5th ed.; pp. 312-347). New York: McGraw Hill.

Clore, G. L., Gasper, K., Garvin, E., & Forgas, J. (2001). Affect as information. Handbook of affect and social cognition. , (pp. 121-144). Mahwah, NJ, US: Erlbaum.

Russell, J. A. (1980). A circumplex model of affect. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 39, 1161-1178.

Ekman, P. (1993). Facial expression and emotion. *American Psychologist*, *48,* 384-392.

Russell, J. A. (1994). Is there universal recognition of emotion from facial expression? A review of the cross-cultural studies. *Psychological Bulletin, 115,* 102-141.

LeDoux, J. E. (2000). Emotion circuits in the brain. Annual Review of Neuroscience, 23, 155–184.

Barsade, S. G. (2002). The ripple effect: Emotional contagion and its influence on group behavior. *Administrative Science Quarterly.*

Amabile, T. M., Barsade, S. G., & Mueller, J. S. (2005). Affect and creativity at work. *Administrative Science Quarterly.*

Questions to Consider:

1. How have definitions and measurement of emotion evolved over time, from James to Keltner?
2. What are the tricky empirical issues inherent in studying emotions?

3. How can I create a mental map of the many dimensions and theories of emotion?
4. What do we still not know about human emotion - what interesting research questions persist?
5. What are relevant organizational implications and questions that you can think of related to emotion and why are there so few OB papers on this required list?

Recommended Reading:

Books:
The Feeling of What Happens (Demasio- available anywhere)
Descartes' Error (Demasio- available anywhere)
What is an Emotion? (Ekman- edited book available anywhere)
The Expression of the Emotions in Man and Animals (Darwin- available everywhere)

Key researchers in the area (insufficiently represented on the required list):
Ekman's (and colleagues: Wally Friesen, Jerry Boucher, Maureen O'Sullivan) work
Keltner's work
Haidt's work
Izard's work
Fredrickson's work
Oschner's and Gross' work

Good papers to broaden thinking:
Payne, K. B., Cheng, C. M., Govorun, O., & Stewart, D. (2005). An inkblot for attitudes: Affect misattribution as implicit measurement. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*.
Plutchik, R. (2001). The Nature of Emotions Human emotions have deep evolutionary roots, a fact that may explain their complexity and provide tools for clinical practice. *American Scientist.*
Russell, J. A., & Feldman Barrett, L. (1999). Core affect, prototypical emotional episodes, and other things called emotion: Dissecting the elephant. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 76, 805–819*.

WEEK 9: FINAL PRESENTATIONS