

## **Organizational Behavior**

Department of Management and Technology  
Bocconi University

Gerardo Okhuysen

e-mail: [gokhuysel@uci.edu](mailto:gokhuysel@uci.edu)

### **Seminar Goals**

- Review major questions in organizations and the concepts and research used to explore them.
- Stimulate analytical discussions of alternative approaches to explore empirical questions, understanding how choices impose strengths and weaknesses.
- Identify new research questions and generate ways to address them.
- Develop practical skills (e.g. presentation, debate, writing) that are essential to academic careers.

This course is set up to help you learn how to conduct research by exposing you to a broad range of topics and approaches in Organizational Behavior. The way we will lead the course is a bit different:

- 1) Given the interests that you have expressed, the course is outlined around the “organizational” part of “organizational behavior”, meaning we will always begin from empirical concerns in organizations to explore the literature.
- 2) The flavor of the course is “meso” in tone, which means that we will spend time considering individual, group, and interactional approaches to questions in the literature. Our goal will be to cover traditional topics in Organizational Behavior within this framework.
- 3) The course offers a mix of qualitative, quantitative, and conceptual readings. You will also find some classic and some contemporary readings in the session descriptions. We will use the session readings to plot out a broad view of the progress of the field as well as to understand how these ideas fit into the kinds of contributions you are trying to make through your own research.
- 4) Each class session is split into two. The first part of the session is always focused on a broad issue within organizational behavior and is either conceptual (i.e., bureaucracy, the need to belong) or practical (i.e., how to publish in organization journals). I will lead that discussion for the first part of each session. The second part of each session will be the longer one, and it will focus on a substantive area of the literature. The second part of the session will be led by one of you (see below).

### **A note on reading**

When you look at the list of readings for the course, it will seem daunting. **Don't worry.** A big part of our work as academics is to read a lot, and there are tricks and strategies to get you through the reading you need to do. Moreover, I am well aware that this is not the only course or commitment you have, and I want to be respectful of your time.

At the end of each of our sessions I will take a few minutes to indicate how you should read each of the papers in the next session(s). At that time I will note whether you should skim them or what you should be looking for as you read. I will **not** expect you to memorize each reading, but I will expect you to be able to answer the questions I pose for each reading ahead of time. I want you to be able to develop a gestalt appreciation for ideas, approaches, and some of the challenges in studying the different topics we are discussing. (See my suggestions for the readings in session 1 as an example of how we will do this.)

### **Evaluation**

Because this is a doctoral level course, I anticipate that you will be interested in doing well. In addition, I consider it part of my mentorship to focus on your development. This means that if I see situations where I feel you need to improve your performance, I will let you know and help you raise it.

#### **Discussion Leadership (20% of final grade)**

Each student will lead the discussion of the assigned readings for one session. I will provide some help on framing the discussions, but the student leaders will bear the burden of structuring our conversation by outlining key questions, focusing on interesting aspects of methods, and evaluating the approaches presented in the literature.

For discussion leaders the readings assigned for the session are a starting point. I expect you will need to read more broadly to be able to successfully lead the discussion. You will be expected to present a short (20-25 minute) overview/summary of the topic(s) for the session. This presentation should focus on three questions:

- 1) What has been and is the trajectory of this topic?
- 2) How is this work done in the laboratory?
- 3) How is this work done in the field?

To lead the rest of the session you should develop a plan, including questions for your peers, interesting avenues to explore, creating new questions for research proposals, and so on. My recommendation to prepare your sessions will be to quickly skim the assigned readings and then select the way you want to deepen the topic in a way that matches your own interests.

To assist your preparation I have compiled a list of readings from current Ph.D. Seminars in a selected set of leading doctoral programs around the world. This is an extensive list and I will email it to all of you. In addition to this, another resource to keep in mind is the list of readings you are expected to complete for your second year evaluation. Finally, I am happy to discuss any part

of the topics for the week with you as you prepare. We want to make sure we focus on your interest as well as what will be useful to your peers.

Discussion leaders should summarize their plan for the session in a 2-4 page, double-spaced document and send the document to me by 8pm the night before class. This document should describe, in some detail, how you are planning to lead the discussion. (Please note, the intent of this document is so get me ready to help you!)

I will ask you which sessions you want to lead during our first meeting (or let me know ahead of time if you have a preference).

**Participation** (15% for each of 2 components = 30% of final grade)

Being part of the conversation, both verbally and in writing, is an essential part of being a successful academic. Therefore, you should be prepared to ask and answer questions, offer critiques and extensions of what you have read, and actively and articulately participate in the discussion. Your in-class participation will be evaluated on both the depth of your analysis and how well you communicate your ideas to others (15%).

Additionally, students who are not discussion leaders for a given week must prepare to engage in the discussion of the assigned readings by submitting their own reflections on the readings to me by 8pm on the night before the class session (15%). The reflections should respond to each of the following:

- What do you think of the topic or organizational situation that the session is organized around?
- How do the different approaches respond to the need to understand the question?
- Are there better or worse answers provided by the different papers?
- What is an important piece that is missing for us to fully understand the phenomenon?

Please note that it is useful to make these reflections “about you” and your ideas. I want to encourage you to engage the topics from your point of view – only this will make them relevant.

**Peer Review** (10% of final grade)

Providing insightful and constructive comments on others’ work is important to being a part of an academic community. All students will submit drafts of their final paper at the beginning of Session 5, and two students will review each draft. Each peer review should be a minimum of 1 page and maximum 2 pages single-spaced. It will be due on Session 6.

**Course paper** (40% of the final grade)

Students will submit a paper that presents a single important idea that makes an original contribution to one of the topics discussed in the class or one of your own. The papers should build on an issue in organizations and present a novel and provocative approach to study. Late papers will not be accepted.

## Topic Session

**November 6 (14:30-17:45)**

### **Reading Instructions for Session 1.**

For the first part of the session:

- a) skim Weber as background, focus on what he proposes as an “ideal” bureaucracy;
- b) read Kornberger et al. and observe how the Vienna City Administration, as a bureaucracy, has difficulty interacting with organic citizen initiatives;
- c) read Pearce et al to understand how bureaucracy and trust are related;
- d) skim Gergen and Staw to get a sense for how organizational behavior is about social psychology.

For the second part of the session:

- a) read Baumeister et al to learn what “cognitive processes” are and pay attention to the method;
- b) read De Dreu et al to learn what “motivated reasoning” is;
- c) read Hennes and understand the application of motivated reasoning to discussions of climate change;
- d) read Welsh to learn what “subconscious priming” is;
- e) read Carreher to learn what “cognitive complexity” is, learn what “pay satisfaction” is, and pay attention to the method; and
- f) Luan to learn what “heuristics” are.

### **1a. What is organizational behavior?**

1. Weber, M. (1996) Bureaucracy. In J. M. Shafritz & J. Ott (Eds.), *Classics of Organization Theory*, 4<sup>th</sup> Edition (pp. 78–83).
2. Kornberger, M., Meyer, R. E., Brandtner, C., & Höllerer, M. A. (2017). When Bureaucracy Meets the Crowd: Studying “Open Government” in the Vienna City Administration. *Organization Studies*, 38(2), 179–200. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0170840616655496>
3. Pearce, J. L., Branyiczki, I., & Bigley, G. A. (2000). Insufficient Bureaucracy: Trust and Commitment in Particularistic Organizations. *Organization Science*, 11(2), 148–162. <https://doi.org/10.1287/orsc.11.2.148.12508>
4. Gergen, K. J. (1973). Social psychology as history. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 26(2), 309–320. <https://doi.org/10.1037/h0034436>
5. Staw, B.M. (2016). Stumbling toward a social psychology of organizations: An autobiographical look at the direction of organizational research. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior*, 3, 1-19.

### **1b. Cognition**

- 1) Baumeister, R. F., Twenge, J. M., & Nuss, C. K. (2002). Effects of social exclusion on cognitive processes: Anticipated aloneness reduces intelligent thought. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *83*, 817-827.
- 2) De Dreu, C. K. W., Nijstad, B. A., & van Knippenberg, D. (2008). Motivated information processing in group judgment and decision making. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, *12*, 22-49.
- 3) Hennes, Erin P., et al. "Motivated recall in the service of the economic system: The case of anthropogenic climate change." *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General* *145.6* (2016): 755.
- 4) Welsh, D. T., & Ordóñez, L. D. (2014). Conscience without cognition: The effects of subconscious priming on ethical behavior. *Academy of Management Journal*, *57*, 723-742.
- 5) Carragher, S. M., & Buckley, M. R. (1996). Cognitive complexity and the perceived dimensionality of pay satisfaction. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *81*(1), 102-109. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.81.1.102>
- 6) Luan, Shenghua, Jochen Reb, and Gerd Gigerenzer. "Ecological rationality: Fast-and-frugal heuristics for managerial decision making under uncertainty." *Academy of Management Journal* (2019).

Additional readings:

- 1) Rousseau, D. M., & Tijoriwala, S. A. (1999). What's a good reason to change? Motivated reasoning and social accounts in promoting organizational change. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *84*, 514-528.
- 2) 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 Processes*, *16*, 27-44.
- 3) Lewis, K., Belliveau, M., Herndon, B., & Keller, J. (2007). Group cognition, membership change, and performance: Investigating the benefits and detriments of collective knowledge. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, *103*, 159-178.
- 4) Anna Kim, Pratima Bansal, and Helen Haugh. [No Time Like the Present: How a Present Time Perspective Can Foster Sustainable Development](#). *Academy of Management Journal* 2019 *62*:2, 607-634.

**November 11 (8:45-Noon)**

**2a. Crossing levels of analysis**

1. Salancik, G., & Pfeffer, J. 1978. A social information processing approach to job attitudes and task design. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, *23*: 224-253.
2. Ashforth, B. E., Rogers, K. M., Pratt, M. G., & Pradies, C. (2014). Ambivalence in organizations: A multilevel approach. *Organization Science*, *25*, 1453-1478.
3. Hackman, J. R. (2003). Learning more by crossing levels: Evidence from airplanes, hospitals, and orchestras. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, *24*, 905-922.

4. Staw, B. M., Sandelands, L. E., & Dutton, J. E. (1981). Threat rigidity effects in organizational behavior: A multilevel analysis. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 26, 501-524.
5. Woolley, A.W., Chabris, C.F., Pentland, A., Hashmi, N., Malone, T.W. (2010). Evidence for a collective intelligence factor in the performance of human groups. *Science*, 330, 686-688.

## **2b. Affect**

1. Barsade, S. G., & Gibson, D. E. (2007). Why does affect matter in organizations? *Academy of Management Perspectives*, 21, 36-59.
2. Casciaro, T., & Lobo, M. S. (2008). When competence is irrelevant: The role of interpersonal affect in task-related ties. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 53, 655-684.
3. Andrade, E. B., & Ariely, D. (2009). The enduring impact of transient emotions on decision making. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 109, 1-8.
4. Sutton, R. I., & Rafaeli, A. (1988). Untangling the relationship between displayed emotions and organizational sales: The case of convenience stores. *Academy of Management Journal*, 31, 461-487.
5. Baumeister, R. F., Vohs, K. D., DeWall, N., & Zhang, L. (2007). How emotion shapes behavior: Feedback, anticipation, and reflection, rather than direct causation. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 11, 167-203.

### *Additional readings:*

6. Grandey, A. A. (2003). When “the show must go on”: Surface acting and deep acting as determinants of emotional exhaustion and peer-rated service delivery. *Academy of Management Journal*, 46, 86-96.
7. O’Neill, O. A., & Rothbard, N. P. (2017). Is love all you need? The effects of emotional culture, suppression, and work–family conflict on firefighter risk-taking and health. *Academy of Management Journal*, 60, 78-108.
8. Rafaeli, A., & Sutton, R. I. (1991). Emotional contrast strategies as means of social influence: Lessons from criminal interrogators and bill collectors. *Academy of Management Journal*, 34, 749-775.
9. Staw, B. M., Sutton, R. I., & Pelled, L. H. (1994). Employee positive emotion and favorable outcomes at the workplace. *Organization Science*, 5, 51-71.

## **November 14 (8:45-Noon)**

### **3a. Wanting to belong**

1. Baumeister, R. F., & Leary, M. R. 1995. The need to belong: Desire for interpersonal attachments as a fundamental human motivation. *Psychological Bulletin*, 117 (3): 497-529.
2. Dachler, H. P., & Hosking, D. 1995. The primacy of relations in socially constructing organizational realities. Pp. 1-28 in D. Hosking, H. P. Dachler & K. J. Gergen (Eds.), *Management and Organizations: Relationship Alternatives to Individualism*. Aldershot, England: Avebury.

3. Kellogg, Katherine C. 2009. Operating room: Relational spaces and microinstitutional change in Surgery. *American Journal of Sociology*, 115(3): 657-711.
4. Mazmanian, M., & Beckman, C. M. (2018). "Making" Your Numbers: Engendering Organizational Control Through a Ritual of Quantification. *Organization Science*, 29(3), 357–379. <https://doi.org/10.1287/orsc.2017.1185>
5. Phillips, K. W., & Loyd, D. L. (2006). When surface and deep-level diversity collide: The effects on dissenting group members. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 99, 143-160.

*Further reading:*

6. Kiao, H., Chuang, A., Joshi, A., 2008. Perceived deep-level dissimilarity: Personality antecedents and impact on overall job attitude, helping, work withdrawal, and turnover. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 106, 106-125.
7. Anteby, M. 2008. Identity incentives as an engaging form of control: Revisiting leniencies in an aeronautic plant. *Organization Science*, 19 (2): 202-220.

**3b. Identity**

1. Ashforth, B. E., Harrison, S. H., & Corley, K. G. (2008). Identification in organizations: An examination of four fundamental questions. *Journal of Management*, 34, 325-374.
2. Elsbach, K. D., & Bhattacharya, C. B. (2001). Defining who you are by what you're not: Organizational disidentification and the National Rifle Association. *Organization Science*, 12, 393-413.
3. Creed, W. E. D., DeJordy, R., & Lok, J. (2010). Being the change: Resolving institutional contradictions through identity work. *Academy of Management Journal*, 53(6), 1336–1364. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amj.2010.57318357>
4. Ramarajan, L., Berger, I. E., & Greenspan, I. (2017). Multiple identity configurations: The benefits of focused enhancement for prosocial behavior. *Organization Science*, 28, 495-513.
5. Johnson, M.D., Morgeson, F.P., Ilgen, D.R., Meyer, C.J., & Lloyd, J.W. (2006). Multiple professional identities: Examining differences in identification across work-related targets. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 91, 498-506.

*Further reading:*

6. Ashforth, B. E., & Kreiner, G. E. (1999). "How can you do it?" Dirty work and the challenge of constructing a positive identity. *Academy of Management Review*, 24, 413-434.
7. Ashforth, B. E., & Mael, F. (1989). Social identity theory and the organization. *Academy of Management Review*, 14: 20-39.
8. 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.
9. Brewer, M. (1991). The social self: On being the same and different at the same time. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 17: 475 - 482.

10. Grant, A., Berg, J., & Cable, D. (2014). Job titles as identity badges: How self-reflective titles can reduce emotional exhaustion. *Academy of Management Journal*, 57, 1201–1225.

## December 2 (8:45-Noon)

### 4a. Leading

1. Meindl, J. R., Ehrlich, S. B., & Dukerich, J. M. (1985). The romance of leadership. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 30, 78-102.
2. Ames, D. R., & Flynn, F. J. (2007). What breaks a leader: The curvilinear relation between assertiveness and leadership. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 92, 307-324.
3. Klein, K. J., Ziegert, J. C., Knight, A. P., & Xiao, Y. (2006). Dynamic delegation: Shared, hierarchical, and deindividualized leadership in extreme action teams. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 51, 590-621.
4. Kanfer, R., & Chen, G. (2016). Motivation in organizational behavior: History, advances, and prospects. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 136, 6-19.
5. Barker, James R. 1993. Tightening the Iron Cage: Concertive Control in Self-Managing Teams, *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 38(3), pp. 408-437.

#### Additional readings:

6. Derue, D. S., Nahrgang, J. D., Wellman, N. E. D., & Humphrey, S. E. (2011). Trait and behavioral theories of leadership: An integration and meta-analytic test of their relative validity. *Personnel Psychology*, 64, 7-52.
7. Hekman, D. R., Johnson, S. K., Foo, M.-D., & Yang, W. (2017). Does diversity-valuing behavior result in diminished performance ratings for non-white and female leaders? *Academy of Management Journal*, 60, 771-797.

### 4b. Trust

1. Krosgaard, M. A., Brodt, S. E., & Whitener, E. M. (2002). Trust in the face of conflict: The role of managerial trustworthy behavior and organizational context. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87(2), 312-319. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.87.2.312>
2. Lau, D. C., & Liden, R. C. (2008). Antecedents of coworker trust: Leaders' blessings. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 93(5), 1130-1138. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.93.5.1130>
3. Edmondson, A. 1999. Psychological safety and learning behavior in work teams. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 442, 350-383.
4. Simons, Tony L., Peterson, Randall S. *Task conflict and relationship conflict in top management teams: The pivotal role of intragroup trust*. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol 85(1), Feb 2000, 102-111.

#### Additional readings:

5. F. David Schoorman, Roger C. Mayer, and James H. Davis. [An Integrative Model of Organizational Trust: Past, Present, and Future](#). *Academy of Management Review* 2007 32:2, 344-354.
6. Colquitt, J. A., Scott, B. A., & LePine, J. A. (2007). Trust, trustworthiness, and trust propensity: A meta-analytic test of their unique relationships with risk taking and job performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 92(4), 909-927.  
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.92.4.909>
7. Michele Williams. [In Whom we Trust: Group Membership as an Affective Context for Trust Development](#). *Academy of Management Review* 2001 26:3, 377-396.
8. Jason A. Colquitt, Jeffery A. LePine, Cindy P. Zapata, and R. Eric Wild. [Trust in Typical and High-Reliability Contexts: Building and Reacting to Trust among Firefighters](#). *Academy of Management Journal* 2011 54:5, 999-1015.

## December 9 (8:45-Noon)

### 5a. Doing work

1. Roy, D.F. 1959. Banana time: Job satisfaction and informal interaction. *Human Organization*, 18: 158-168.
2. Bechky, B. A. 2006. Gaffers, gofers, and grips: Role-based coordination in temporary organizations. *Organization Science*, 17: 3–21.
3. Cohen, Lisa E. 2013. "Assembling jobs: A model of how tasks are bundled into and across jobs." *Organization Science*, 24: 432-454.
4. Wageman, R., Gardner, H. & Mortensen, M. (2012). The changing ecology of teams. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 33, 301-315.
5. Mortensen, M. and M. R. Haas. 2018. Perspective—Rethinking teams: From bounded membership to dynamic participation. *Organization Science*, 29(2): 341–355.

### 5b. Teams

1. Balkundi, P., & Harrison, D. A. (2006). Ties, leaders, and time in teams: Strong inference about network structure's effects on team viability and performance. *Academy of Management Journal*, 49, 49-68.
2. Eisenhardt, Kathleen M. "Making fast strategic decisions in high-velocity environments." *Academy of Management journal* 32.3 (1989): 543-576.
3. Baumann, Michael R., and Bryan L. Bonner. "Member awareness of expertise, information sharing, information weighting, and group decision making." *Small Group Research* 44.5 (2013): 532-562.
4. Gardner, H. K. (2012). Performance pressure as a double-edged sword: Enhancing team motivation but undermining the use of team knowledge. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 57, 1-46.

*Additional readings:*

1. Wageman, R. 1995. Interdependence and group effectiveness. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 40: 145-180.
2. Jehn, K.A., & Mannix, E.A. (2001). The dynamic nature of conflict: A longitudinal study of intragroup conflict and group performance. *Academy of Management Journal*, 44: 238-251.
3. McAllister, D.J. (1995). Affect and cognition-based trust as foundations for interpersonal cooperation in organizations. *Academy of Management Journal*, 38: 24-59.
4. LePine, J. A., Piccolo, R. F., Jackson, C. L., Mathieu, J. E., & Saul, J. R. (2008). A meta-analysis of teamwork processes: Tests of a multidimensional model and relationships with team effectiveness criteria. *Personnel Psychology*, 61, 273-307.
5. Valentine, M. A., & Edmondson, A. C. (2015). Team scaffolds: How meso-level structures enable role-based coordination in temporary groups. *Organization Science*, 26, 405-422.

## December 12 (8:45-Noon)

### How to read and write OB

1. Ashford, S. J. (2013). Having scholarly impact: The art of hitting academic home runs. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 12, 623-633.
2. Davis, Murray S. "That's interesting! Towards a phenomenology of sociology and a sociology of phenomenology." *Philosophy of the social sciences* 1.2 (1971): 309-344.
3. Sutton, R. I., and Staw, B. M. (1995). What theory is not. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 40: 371-384.
4. Weick, K. E. (1995). What theory is not, theorizing is. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 40: 385-390.
5. Grant, A. M., & Pollock, T. G. (2011). Publishing in AMJ—Part 3: Setting the hook. *Academy of Management Journal*, 54, 873-879.
6. Sparrowe, R. T., & Mayer, K. J. (2011). Publishing in AMJ—Part 4: Grounding Hypotheses. *Academy of Management Journal*, 54, 1098-1102.

### 6b. Prosocial and antisocial behavior

1. Smith, C. A., Organ, D. W., & Near, J. P. 1983. Organizational citizenship behavior: Its nature and antecedents. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 68: 653-663.
2. Ashford, S. J., Rothbard, N. P., Piderit, S. K., & Dutton, J. E. (1998). Out on a limb: The role of context and impression management in selling gender-equity issues. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 43, 23-57.
3. Ragsin B. R., & Cornwell, J. M. (2001). Pink triangles: Antecedents and consequences of perceived workplace discrimination against gay and lesbian employees. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86, 1244-1261.
4. Duffy, M. K., Scott, K. L., Shaw, J. D., Tepper, B. J., & Aquino, K. (2012). A social context model of envy and social undermining. *Academy of Management Journal*, 55, 643-666.
5. Greenberg, J. (1990). Employee theft as a reaction to underpayment inequity: The hidden cost of pay cuts. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 75, 561-568.

*Additional readings:*

1. Baker, W. E., & Bulkley, N. (2014). Paying it forward vs. Rewarding reputation: Mechanisms of generalized reciprocity. *Organization Science*, 25, 1493-1510.
2. Hussain, I., Shu, R., Tangirala, S., & Ekkirala, S. (in press). The voice bystander effect: How information redundancy inhibits employee voice. *Academy of Management Journal*.
3. Kish-Gephart, J. J., Detert, J. R., Treviño, L. K., & Edmondson, A. C. (2009). Silenced by fear: The nature, sources, and consequences of fear at work. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 29, 163-193.
4. 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.
5. Morrison, E. W. (2014). Employee voice and silence. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior*, 1, 173-197.