MOR 601: Seminar in Organizational Behavior, Fall 2015

Instructor: Prof. Nathanael Fast
Office: Hoffman Hall 404
Phone: 213-740-1047
E-mail: nathanaf@usc.edu

Instructor: Prof. Scott Wiltermuth
Office: Hoffman Hall 405
Phone: 213-740-1128
E-mail: wiltermu@usc.edu

Class Time and Location

The course will meet from 1:00-4:00 p.m. on Wednesdays in HOH 506

Introduction and Course Objective

This seminar will provide doctoral students an overview of the major topics in organizational behavior. The course is designed to provide a broad exposure to the field, an understanding of its central concepts, and the opportunity to develop ideas for how you might contribute to this literature. We will pursue these goals by examining a mix of theoretical and empirical research, thinking critically about the strengths and limitations, and creating a forum for you to test your own conceptual and empirical ideas. Our goals are to help you to gain broad familiarity with theory and research concerned with micro-organizational processes, and to help you develop the analytical skills necessary to critically evaluate and integrate work in this area. We will also encourage you to use the course to hone your own research agenda. Our ultimate objective is to prepare you to contribute to the current dialogue in the field.

Achieving these goals will require a great deal of reading on your part. It is critical that you read the material before class, as well as spend time thinking about the implications of the readings. We have provided a list of questions for each week's readings and ask that you come to class prepared to discuss them.

Here is a list of some of the key journals in the field along with their acronyms:

AMJ: Academy of Management Journal
AMR: Academy of Management Review
ASQ: Administrative Science Quarterly
JAP: Journal of Applied Psychology
JESP: Journal of Experimental Social Psychology
JPSP: Journal of Personality and Social Psychology
OBHDP: Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes
OS: Organization Science
PSPB: Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin
Psych Bull: Psychological Bulletin
Psych Science: Psychological Science
ROB: Research in Organizational Behavior

Course Expectations and Requirements

Over the years, students have repeatedly expressed a desire to have high standards for their own and their classmates' conduct. To foster the best possible learning environment, please abide by these expectations, and be aware that we will actively enforce them. Failing to meet theses standards for classroom behavior will result in lower participation grades.

Be here (on time): This course relies on extensive discussion and interactive activities. If you are not here, you deprive yourself and your fellow students of the optimal learning environment. You are expected to attend every class, on time, and to stay for the entire class session. Plan ahead and take care of your personal needs so that you can stay throughout. **If, for any reason, you need to miss class, it is your responsibility to notify us at least 24 hours in advance so we can make arrangements for any in-class exercises and ensure that you get all of the materials distributed in class.**

Be prepared: Do all the assigned reading before class, and be ready for a substantive discussion of each article that has been assigned. Our job is to help you push beyond, to a deeper level of comprehension. To do so, you must come to class having done all of the assigned readings.

Put away your gadgets: We have a "**no gadgets**" (phones, pdas, etc.) policy in class. If you *need* an exception (whether one-time or ongoing), please talk to us individually beforehand.

Observe the honor code: The honor code was written by Marshall students and is upheld by Marshall students. We have agreed to support the Marshall Honor Committee in its efforts to make the code relevant and meaningful by providing this reminder and endorsement of the code.

Various legalistic administrative notes in fine print
- *Returned paperwork, unclaimed by a student, will be discarded after 4 weeks and thus will not be available should a grade appeal be pursued by a student following receipt of his/her course grade.*

Academic Conduct
- *Plagiarism – presenting someone else's ideas as your own, either verbatim or recast in your own words – is a serious academic offense with serious consequences. Please familiarize yourself with the discussion of plagiarism in SCampus in Section 11, Behavior Violating University Standardshttps://scampus.usc.edu/1100-behavior-violating-university-standards-and-appropriate-sanctions/. Other forms of academic dishonesty are equally unacceptable. See additional information in SCampus and university policies on scientific misconduct, http://policy.usc.edu/scientific-misconduct/.*
- *Discrimination, sexual assault, and harassment are not tolerated by the university. You are encouraged to report any incidents to the Office of Equity and Diversity http://equity.usc.edu/ or to the Department of Public Safety http://capsnet.usc.edu/department/department-public-safety/online-forms/contact-us. This is important for the safety whole USC community. Another member of the university community – such as a friend, classmate, advisor, or faculty member – can help initiate the report, or can initiate the report on behalf of another person. The Center for Women and Men http://www.usc.edu/student-affairs/cwm/ provides 24/7 confidential support, and the sexual assault resource center webpage sarc@usc.edu describes reporting options and other resources.*

- *Support System: A number of USC's schools provide support for students who need help with scholarly writing. Check with your advisor or program staff to find out more. Students whose primary language is not English should check with the American Language Institute http://dornsife.usc.edu/ali, which sponsors courses and workshops specifically for international graduate students. The Office of Disability Services and Programs http://sait.usc.edu/academicsupport/centerprograms/dsp/home_index.html provides certification for students with disabilities and helps arrange the relevant accommodations. If an officially declared emergency makes travel to campus infeasible, USC Emergency Information http://emergency.usc.edu/will provide safety and other updates, including ways in which instruction will be continued by means of blackboard, teleconferencing, and other technology.*
- *Any student requesting academic accommodation based on a disability must register with Disability Services and Programs (DSP) each semester. A letter of verification for approved accommodation can be obtained from DSP. Please deliver it to me as early in the semester as possible. DSP's phone number is 213.740.0776.*
- *The use of unauthorized material, communication with fellow students during an examination, attempting to benefit from the work of another student, verbatim text from other sources submitted as the student's work, and similar behavior that defeats the intent of an examination or other class work is unacceptable to the University. Where a clear violation has occurred, the instructor may disqualify the student's work as unacceptable and assign a failing mark on the paper. Students are responsible for knowing and following standards of academic honesty. Please become familiar with University policy at http://web-app.usc.edu/scampus/1100-behavior-violating-university-standards-and-appropriate-sanctions/.*

Assignments and Grading

1. Class participation (25%)
Class participation grades will be divided into four components:
- *Comments and questions (5%)*. Each week, you will be required to email three comments/questions about the material to the prof associated with that discussion before midnight on the day before the seminar.
- *Discussion facilitator (10%)*. With a partner, you will take your turn as the seminar's discussion facilitator for one or more of the class sessions. The discussion facilitators will be responsible for synthesizing across the week's readings and identifying commonalities and controversies. You can also take on the role of provocateur, challenging the class to think deeper, harder, or differently about a topic.
- *Comments in class (10%)*. You will also be graded on the quality of your contributions to the class discussion. To prepare to contribute, read each article carefully and assess:
   - What is missing? What questions aren't being answered in this article?
   - What are the theoretical implications of the perspective being developed (or tested if it is an empirical article)?
   - What assumptions does this perspective make about people and organizations? How tenable are they?
   - What studies need to be done to develop knowledge in the area under discussion?
   - How can you apply the theory, empirical approach, or methodology in the assigned articles to your own research question or agenda?

2. Two innovation papers (20%)

This assignment asks you to prepare **two** 2-3 page "innovation" papers. These papers will be very brief presentations of novel hypotheses—i.e., something not already known or immediately obvious to researchers in OB. In these papers, please state a hypothesis and then explain why it is likely to be true and interesting. Many of these ideas can become topics for discussion within the seminar itself. You can also use these short papers as a means to developing a more comprehensive final term paper idea. These papers can be turned in at any point during the semester (your choice when) but must be submitted prior to the last day of class.

3. Final paper (35%)

This assignment asks you to prepare a paper that adds new knowledge or brings a new perspective to old findings in micro OB. It is perfectly acceptable to incorporate your innovation papers into this longer paper, but this is not necessary. While you must incorporate what you have learned from this course in this paper, we are flexible on the topic that you pursue. It is our hope that this paper will eventually develop into the front end of a published journal article, or at least seed your future projects. The paper should be 20-25 double-spaced pages, not including charts, graphs, and references, and following the style guide for the Academy journals. The paper may be either:

- A conceptual paper targeted toward publication in the *Academy of Management Review*.
- A research proposal suitable for a paper that would appear in the *Academy of Management Journal*. No data or analysis is necessary; however, your research design, data sources, and proposed analyses should be presented showing how you would empirically test your hypotheses. Although no data collection is expected for this assignment, you should develop a proposal with the expectation that you will pursue this project in the near future.

A complete draft of your paper will be due at the start of class on Wednesday, **November 11**. Your paper will be assigned to one of your classmates for peer review and will be returned to you at the start of class on Wednesday, **November 18**. You will then have two weeks to respond to your reviewer's issues and make final revisions before turning in your final draft on Wednesday, **December 2**. Along with the final draft, you will need to include specific responses to your reviewer's comments.

4. Feedback and presentation (20%)

10% for the quality of the presentation, 10% for the quality of the feedback given

<u>**Reading List**</u>

Please complete all the assigned readings before class, and come to class prepared for a substantive discussion of each article.

Week 1: Introduction 8/26
- Heath, C., & Sitkin, S. 2001. Big-B versus Big-O: What is organizational about organizational behavior? *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 22:* 43-58.
- Chatman, J. A., & Flynn, F. 2005. Full-cycle micro-organizational behavior research. *Organization Science, 16:* 434-447.
- Davis, M.S. (1971). That's interesting! Philosophy of Social Science, 1, 309-344.
- Sutton, R.I. & Staw, B.M. (1995). What theory is not. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 40*(3), 371-384.
- Mowday, R.T., and Sutton, R.I. 1993. Organizational behavior: Linking individuals and groups to organizational contexts. *Annual Review of Psychology, 44*: 195-229.

Week 2: Person vs. Situation 9/2
- Barrick M. R. and Mount, M. K. 1991. The Big Five personality dimensions and job performance: A meta-analysis. *Personnel Psychology, 44*: 1-26.
- Davis-Blake, A., & Pfeffer, J. 1989. Just a mirage: The search for dispositional effects in organizational research. *Academy of Management Review, 14*, 385-400.
- House, R. J., Shane, S. A., & Herold, D. M. 1996. Rumors of the death of dispositional research are vastly exaggerated. *Academy of Management Review, 21*: 203-224.
- Kenrick, D. T., & Funder, D. C. 1988. Profiting from controversy: Lessons from the person-situation debate. *American Psychologist, 43*: 23-34.
- Chatterjee, A. & Hambrick, D. (2007). It's all about me: Narcissistic chief executive officers and their effects on company strategy and performance. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 52*, 351-386.
- Mehra, A., Kilduff, M., & Brass, D. J. (2001). The social networks of high and low self-monitors: Implications for workplace performance. *Administrative science quarterly*, *46*(1), 121-146.

Preparation Questions
1. What are personality traits? How can you distinguish them from values and abilities?
2. As a researcher, do you find situational or dispositional perspectives more interesting? Why?
3. How might you rethink the famous Milgram experiments on obedience to authority in light of the papers you read for this week?
4. Should managers (and organizational scholars) care about personality traits? Why or why not?
5. How would you describe yourself using the Big Five? What aspects of your personality are not captured by the Big Five?

Week 3: Self and Identity 9/9
- Greenwald, A. G. (1980). The totalitarian ego: Fabrication and revision of personal history. *American psychologist*, *35*(7), 603.
- Hogg, M., & Terry, J. 2000. Social identity and self categorization processes in organizational contexts. *Academy of Management Review*, *25*: 121-140.

- Brewer, M. B. (1991). The social self: On being the same and different at the same time. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 17:* 475-482.
- Bushman, B. J., & Baumeister, R. F. (1998). Threatened egotism, narcissism, self-esteem, and direct and displaced aggression: Does self-love or self-hate lead to violence?. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *75*(1), 219.
- Ibarra, H. 1999. Provisional selves: Experimenting with image and identity in professional adaptation. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, *44*: 764-791.
- Leary, M. R., & Baumeister, R. F. (2000). The nature and function of self-esteem: Sociometer theory. Burlington: Elsevier.

Preparation Questions
1. What is the self? Where does it come from? What does it want?
2. What would you like to know about the self that hasn't yet been answered?
3. List your various identities. Which ones are most important? What role do your identities play in your decisions, actions, and interactions with others?
4. Pick one of the topics from this class (or another field of study) in which you are interested; how could you use the self to increase understanding of this topic?

Week 4: Motivation 9/16

- Gagné, M., & Deci, E. L. 2005. Self-determination theory and work motivation. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 26*: 331-362.
- Grant, A. M., Campbell, E. M., Chen, G., Cottone, K., Lapedis, D., & Lee, K. 2007. Impact and the art of motivation maintenance: The effects of contact with beneficiaries on persistence behavior. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 103*: 53-67.
- 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.
- Iyengar, S. S., Wells, R. E., & Schwartz, B. 2006. Doing better but feeling worse: Looking for the 'best' job undermines satisfaction. *Psychological Science, 17:* 143-150.
- Elliott, E. S., & Dweck, C. S. (1988). Goals: An approach to motivation and achievement. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *54*(1), 5.

Preparation Questions
1. Which motivation theories did you find most and least appealing? Why?
2. What are the major limitations of each theory?
3. How important are extrinsic rewards in motivation?
4. Are lay theories about what motivates people similar to or different from scholarly theories?
5. What have been the most important drivers of your motivation across different work experiences?

Week 5: Job Design and Work Structures 9/23
- Morgeson, F. P., & Humphrey, S. E. 2006. The work design questionnaire (WDQ): Developing and validating a comprehensive measure for assessing job design and the nature of work. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *91*: 1321-1339.

- Wrzesniewski, A., & Dutton, J. E. 2001. Crafting a job: Revisioning employees as active crafters of their work. *Academy of Management Review, 26:* 179-200.
- Salancik, G. R., & Pfeffer, J. 1978. A social information processing approach to job attitudes and task design. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, *23*: 224-253.
- Bunderson, J.S., & Thompson, J.A. (2009). The call of the wild: Zookeepers, callings, and the double-edged sword of deeply meaningful work. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 54*, 32-57.
- Oldham, G. R., & Hackman, J. R. (2010). Not what it was and not what it will be: The future of job design research. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, *31*(2-3), 463-479.

Preparation Questions
1. How are jobs, roles, and tasks similar and different? How might we go about integrating our understanding of these work structures?
2. What job characteristics have been overlooked in existing theory, and how can we incorporate them?
3. Given the rise of project work, is the job still a relevant concept for understanding work structures? Should we shift to studying projects instead?
4. Contrast the best and worst jobs, roles, and tasks you've ever had. What were the key differences between them?
5. How are the jobs, roles, and tasks of doctoral students structured? How can they be enriched?

Week 6: Power 9/30
- Emerson, R. M. 1962. Power-dependence relations. *American Sociological Review, 27:* 31-41.
- Keltner, D., Gruenfeld, D. H., & Anderson, C. (2003). Power, approach, and inhibition. *Psychological review*, *110*(2), 265.
- Galinsky, A. D., Gruenfeld, D. H., & Magee, J. C. (2003). From power to action. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 85*: 453-466
- Ibarra, H. (1993). Network centrality, power and innovation involvement: Determinants of technical and administrative roles. *Academy of Management Journal, 36*: 471-501.
- Fast, N.J., Halevy, N., Galinsky, A.D. (2012). The destructive nature of power without status. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 48*, 391-394.

Preparation Questions
1. What is power? How have researchers gone about studying the determinants and consequences of power? What are the strengths and limitations of these approaches?
2. What is the difference between power and influence?
3. Reflect on times when you've felt powerful and powerless in your life. Is the approach/inhibition theory of power proposed by Keltner et al. (2003) consistent with how you felt and responded in these situations?
4. How does power make it easier to lead? How does power make it more difficult to lead?

Week 7: Leadership 10/7

- Meindl, J., Ehrlich, S., & Dukerich, J. 1985. The romance of leadership. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, *30*: 78-102.
- Eagly, A. H., Johannesen-Schmidt, M. C., and van Engen, M. (2003). "Transformational, Transactional, and Laissez-Faire Leadership Styles: A Meta-Analysis Comparing Women and Men." *Psychological Bulletin, 95*, 569-591.
- Fiedler, F. 1970. The contingency model: A theory of leadership effectiveness. *Classic Readings in Organizational Behavior*, pp. 198-210.
- Scott, K. A., & Brown, D. J. 2006. Female first, leader second? Gender bias in the encoding of leadership behavior. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 101*: 230-242.
- Fast, N. J., Burris, E. R., & Bartel, C. A. (2014). Managing to stay in the dark: managerial self-efficacy, ego defensiveness, and the aversion to employee voice. *Academy of Management Journal*, *57*(4), 1013-1034.

Preparation Questions
1. What is leadership? How are leadership and power similar and different?
2. What is the difference between a leader and a manager?
3. Is leadership real? Is it more than a perceptual phenomenon? Can it be taught/learned?
4. What are the most important roles of a leader?
5. Pick one of the topics previously covered in class—how could it be applied to the topic of leadership to create an interesting research question?

Week 8: Cognition and Decision Making 10/14

- Tversky, A. & Kahneman, D. 1974. Judgment under uncertainty: Heuristics and biases. *Science, 185*: 1124-31.
- Gigerenzer, G. 1996. On narrow norms and vague heuristics: A reply to Kahneman and Tversky. *Psychological Review, 103:* 592-596.
- Staw, B.M. (1976). Knee deep in the big muddy: A study of escalating commitment to a chosen course of action. Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Performance, 16, 27-44.
- Heath, C., Larrick, R.P., & Klayman, J. 1998. Cognitive repairs: How organizations compensate for the shortcoming of individual learners. *Research in Organizational Behavior, 20:* 1-37.
- Staw, B.M., Sandelands, L.E., & Dutton, J.E. (1981). Threat rigidity effects in organizational behavior: A multilevel analysis. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 26*(4), 501-524.
- Bargh, J. A., & Chartrand, T. L. 1999. The unbearable automaticity of being. *American Psychologist, 54:* 462-479.

Preparation Questions
1. Do you side more strongly with Gigerenzer or Kahneman & Tversky? Why?
2. How might we gain a more balanced understanding of the conditions under which biases and irrational behaviors do and do not occur?
3. What biases have you observed in human behavior that aren't discussed here?
4. If things are this bad, why do organizations work (relatively) well?

5. Did the readings shed new light on any judgment or decision-making mistakes that you've experienced or observed in the past?

Week 9: Affect 10/21
- Haidt, J. 2001. The emotional dog and its rational tail: A social intuitionist approach to moral judgment. *Psychological Review, 108*, 814-834.
- Staw, B. M., & Barsade, S. G. 1993. Affect and managerial performance: A test of the sadder-but-wiser vs. happier-and-smarter hypotheses. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, *38*: 304-331.
- Côté, S. 2005. A social interaction model of the effects of emotion regulation on work strain. *Academy of Management Review*, *30*: 509-530.
- Forgas, J. P., & George, J. M. (2001). Affective influences on judgments and behavior in organizations: An information processing perspective. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 86*, 3-34.
- Barsade, S.G. (2002). The ripple effect: Emotional contagion and its influence on group behavior. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 47*, 644-676.
- Keltner, D., & Haidt, J. (1999). Social functions of emotion at four levels of analysis. Cognition & Emotion, 13, 505-521.

Preparation Questions
1. In your mind, what are the tricky issues associated with studying affect?
2. What is missing in the field's treatment of affect to date?
3. How can we develop more imaginative, counterintuitive theory about affect?
4. When has affect played an important role in your work behaviors and experiences?

Week 10: Conflict and Negotiations 10/28
- Kramer, R. 1999. Trust and distrust in organizations: Emerging perspectives, enduring questions. *Annual Review of Psychology, 50:* 569-598.
- Bazerman, M. H., Curhan, J. R., Moore, D. A., & Valley, K. L. 2000. Negotiation. *Annual Review of Psychology, 51:* 279-314.
- Neale, M.A. & Bazerman, M.H. (1985). The effects of framing and negotiator overconfidence on bargaining behaviors and outcomes. *Academy of Management Journal, 28*(1), 34-49.
- Thompson, L. & Hastie, R. (1990). Social perception in negotiation. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 47*, 98-123.
- Jehn, K.A. (1995). A multi-method examination of the benefits and detriments of intragroup conflict. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 40*(2), 256-282.

Preparation Questions
1. Why is trust more difficult to build and repair than to undermine and erode?
2. Think about the people you trust most and least. What explains the difference?
3. What aspects of negotiations do we miss out on by studying them in the laboratory?
4. How do your social relationships affect whether/when you negotiate?

Week 11: Groups, Teams, & Creativity 11/4

- Goncalo, J. A., Chatman, J., Duguid, M., & Kennedy, J. A. (2014). Creativity from Constraint? How Political Correctness Influences Creativity in Mixed-Sex Work Groups. *Administrative Science Quarterly, Forthcoming.*
- Nemeth, C.J. (1986). Differential contributions of majority and minority influence. *Psychological Review, 93*(1), 23-32.
- 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*(4), 741-763.
- Heath, C. and Staudenmayer, N. (2000): 'Coordination neglect: How lay theories of organizing complicate coordination in organizations, in Barry M. Staw and Robert I. Sutton (eds.): Research in Organizational Behavior, Elsevier, Oxford: pp. 153-191.
- Sutton, Robert I. & Andrew Hargadon (1996). Brainstorming groups in context: effectiveness in a product design firm. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 41*, 685-718.

Preparation Questions
1. Are you more creative in groups, pairs, or when alone? What accounts for the difference?
2. How would you improve the collective study of creativity? What outcome variables would you use?
3. Can creativity be learned? If so, does creativity learned in one domain carry over to creativity in another domain?

Week 12: Ethics and Morality 11/11

- Tyler, T. (1994). Psychological models of the justice motive. Antecedents of distributive and procedural justice. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 67*, 850-863.
- Colquitt, J.A., Conlon, D.E., Wesson, M.J., Porter, C.O.L.H., & Ng, K.Y. (2001). Justice at the millennium: A meta-analytic review of 25 years of organizational justice research. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 86*(3), 425-445.
- Haidt, J. (2001). The emotional dog and its rational tail: A social intuitionist approach to moral judgment. *Psychological Review, 108*(4), 814-834.
- Monin, B. & Miller, D.T. (2001). Moral credentials and the expression of prejudice. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 81*(1), 33-43.
- Moore, C., & Gino, F. (2013). Ethically adrift: How others pull our moral compass from true north, and how we can fix it. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 33, 53-77.
- Bazerman, M. H., & Gino, F. (2012). Behavioral ethics: Toward a deeper understanding of moral judgment and dishonesty. *Annual Review of Law and Social Science*, 8, 85-104.

Preparation Questions
1. Is moral judgment driven more heavily by cognition or affect?
2. Under what circumstances is previous ethical behavior likely to license people to behave unethically in the future and under what circumstances is it likely to lead people to behave consistently (i.e., ethically)?

3. Do you expect growing convergence in what people consider to be unethical/ethical? Why or why not?

Week 13: Culture and Diversity 11/18
- Denison, D. R. 1996. What IS the difference between organizational culture and organizational climate? A native's point of view on a decade of paradigm wars. *Academy of Management Review, 21:* 619-654.
- Miller, D. T. 1999. The norm of self-interest. *American Psychologist, 54:* 1-8.
- Cohen, D., Nisbett, R. E., Bowdle, B. F., & Schwarz, N. 1996. Insult, aggression, and the southern culture of honor: An experimental ethnography. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *70*: 945-960.
- Markus, H.R., Kitayama, S., & Heiman, R.J. (1996). Culture and basic psychological principles. In Higgins, E.T. & Kruglanski, A.W. (Eds.), *Social Psychology: Handbook of Basic Principles, 4*: 857-913. New York, NY: Guilford.
- O'Reilly, C. and J.A. Chatman (1996). Culture as social control: Corporations, cults, and commitment. In B. M. Staw and L. L. Cummings (eds), Research in Organizational Behavior, 18: 157-200. Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
- DiMaggio, Paul (1997). Culture and Cognition. *Annual Review of Sociology, 23*, 263-87.

Preparation Questions
1. What are the conceptual differences/similarities between culture in groups, organizations, and nations?
2. Given that culture exists at so many different levels (group, department, work organization, extracurricular organization, neighborhood, community, society), where should we study it?
3. What is the culture of the PhD program at Marshall and how is it influencing your life?

Week 14: Presentations 12/2