

RSM 3065H.1 Fall 2020
Meso Organizational Behavior

Instructor: Professor Marlys Christianson
E-mail: marlys.christianson@rotman.utoronto.ca
Classroom: Zoom online seminar
Schedule: Tuesdays, 1-4pm

Course overview

The term *organizational behavior* is meant to reflect both a macro emphasis on organizations and a micro emphasis on individual behavior. Yet, OB research has fulfilled the promise of a multilevel approach to organization studies unevenly. As Lyman Porter (1996) noted in the fortieth-anniversary issue of *Administrative Science Quarterly*, “A continuing and frequently stated challenge that we ought to keep trying to meet is to forge a stronger link between the macro and micro parts of the field. This argues for giving more attention to what have been labeled meso phenomena and also to research attempts to show how individual and group actions can affect organizational actions, as well as vice versa. A focus on only the macro side or only the micro side of the organizational studies coin, as it were, will keep giving us an incomplete and ultimately unsatisfying picture.” Encouragingly, since 1996, the number of multilevel studies in organizational journals has sensibly increased, providing organizational scholars with a more solid theoretical and empirical foundation to conduct multilevel OB research.

Leveraging this foundation, this course introduces you to the study of meso OB, defined as the simultaneous study of multiple levels of organizational behavior. The intent of this class is to build your scholarly “toolkit” by exposing you to a wide range of topics related to meso research. Regardless of your field of study or focus of research, your ability to understand, develop, and extend theory will be enhanced by an enriched understanding of the mechanisms that connect variables, particularly mechanisms that bridge levels of analysis. By design, this class surveys many different types of mechanisms, collective constructs, and areas of cross-level research. The class topics have been selected to first introduce you to mechanisms and meso-level theorizing and then begin to explore these in the context of basic mechanisms related to meaning making, emotion, and action. Sociomateriality and temporality are topics that are receiving increasing attention as key mechanisms. We end the class by exploring a set of meso or multi-level topics, including teams, identity, culture and climate, and learning in organizations. This is a theoretical class, so our focus will be primarily on theoretical issues; however, I encourage you to pay

attention to the range of methods that scholars use to study meso-level topics. As the course progresses, you will develop your own meso research proposal and present it to the class at the end of the semester.

This course aims to help you:

- To gain an understanding of some of the central concepts and tools in meso organizational behavior research.
- To gain exposure to a number of areas of meso OB research and begin a process of becoming familiar with multilevel theory and empirical strategies.
- To begin to identify areas of particular interest to you and to start thinking about how a meso OB perspective might be suitable to your research questions.
- To begin to develop your own point of view on the field of OB through a meso lens.

The readings have been selected to give you an introduction to each of the topics we cover, with additional supplementary readings, should you wish to explore a specific topic in more depth. There is a set of assigned readings for each class – marked with an asterisk (*) in your syllabus – that you are responsible for reading and summarizing prior to class. We will discuss these readings in detail during our seminar. You are expected to be familiar with the assigned readings and actively participate in the class discussion. All the readings are available online through the university library system (use EBSCO Business Source Premier database).

Course requirements and evaluation

There will be three components of your final grade:

1. Class participation: 20% of grade
2. Weekly reaction memos (1-2) pages: 40% of grade.
3. Term paper: 40% of grade.

Class participation (20% of grade): This is a seminar class and, therefore, your active and engaged participation is essential to the success of the class. Prior to each class, you must have thoroughly studied and be prepared to critically evaluate the assigned readings. My expectation of thorough preparation is high. The weekly written memos (see below) will help you to prepare for class and I also encourage you to discuss the readings with classmates prior to class. For each article, I will ask a student (randomly selected) to introduce the article and provide a brief summary.

We will strive to identify common themes and concepts in each week's readings. As we discuss the readings, you should also consider how the ideas in the readings apply to your own area of research. Because this class is explicitly focused on mechanisms and multi-level research, you should come to class ready to discuss the following questions for each paper: (a) what is the core argument the authors are putting forth? (b) what variables are they considering (at which levels of analysis)? (c) what mechanisms connect these variables? (d) if reading an empirical article,

are there alternate mechanisms that should be considered to explain the relationship between variables (and, if so, what data would you collect to rule these mechanisms in or out)? (e) what are the boundary conditions of the theory? and (f) what are the similarities and differences between this article and other articles from the same class? from the previous classes?

Weekly reaction memos (40% of grade): One way to engage with the readings prior to class is to write a memo about the key themes, particularly themes that resonate across readings. The memos will be due at 5pm on Monday prior to class (with the exception of the first class; no memo is due for the first class, the memo for the second class will summarize the first and second week’s readings). Your memo should be no longer than 2 pages (double-spaced, Times New Roman, 12 pt font, 1” margins). The memo is a chance for you to synthesize and integrate your thinking about and reaction to the readings. Although the memos can take various forms, it may be helpful to include a concise summary of the articles, what you agreed with or disagreed with (and why), how these articles are related to each other (key similarities and differences), and possible connections to your own research or previous week’s readings.

Research proposal (40% of grade): Each student is responsible for writing a research proposal. A two-page synopsis is due on Session 7, and full draft is due on the day you give your class presentation (Session 12), and the final version is due one week after the last session. The proposal should be based on one of the topics covered in the course and present a framework for executing an original study. Think of a proposal as a shortened version of one of the empirical papers we read, without the results section.

To develop your research proposal throughout the term, you should identify a content domain that is of interest to you. You will then develop a meso model for your content area. Each week you will add complexity to your model as we discuss additional concepts. The proposal should therefore draw on some of the readings from the class, but also incorporate additional work from the relevant literatures. Feel free to talk to me at any time about potential paper ideas, and additional literature.

6

Schedule

Session #	Date	Topic	Deliverable due
Session 1	Sept 8	Mechanisms and theory building	
Session 2	Sept 15	Meso paradigm and multi-level research	
Session 3	Sept 22	Collective meaning making	
Session 4	Sept 29	Collective emotions	
Session 5	Oct 6	Collective action	
Session 6	Oct 13	Sociomateriality and practice theory	
Note: there is no class on Oct 20			
Session 7	Oct 27	Temporality and process theory	2 pg synopsis due

Session 8	Nov 4	Teams in organizations	
Session 9	Nov 10	Identity in organizations	
Session 10	Nov 17	Culture and climate in organizations	
Session 11	Nov 24	Learning in organizations	
Session 12	Dec 1	Student presentations	Full draft of research proposal due
	Dec 8		Final research proposal due

ASSIGNED READINGS

Session 1: Mechanisms and theory building
--

No writing assignment due before class this week, but you are expected to do the readings.

- *Hedstrom, P., & Swedberg, R. 1998. Social mechanisms: An introductory essay, *Social Mechanisms: An Analytical Approach to Social Theory*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- * Davis, G. F., & Marquis, C. 2005. Prospects for organization theory in the early 21st century: Institutional fields and mechanisms. *Organization Science*, 16(4): 332-343.
- * Weick, K. E. 1989. Theory construction as disciplined imagination. *Academy of Management Review*, 14(4): 516-531.
- * Davis, M. S. 1971. That's interesting: Towards a phenomenology of sociology and a sociology of phenomenology. *Philosophy of Social Science* (1): 309-344.

Supplementary readings

Merton, R. K. 1949. On sociological theories of the middle range, *Social Theory and Social Structure*: 39-53. NY: Simon & Schuster, The Free Press.

Elster, J. 1998. A plea for mechanisms. In P. Hedstrom, & R. Swedberg (Eds.), *Social Mechanisms: An Analytical Approach to Social Theory*: 45-73. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Elster, J. 2007. *Explaining Social Behavior: More Nuts and Bolts for the Social Sciences*: Cambridge University Press.

Anderson, P. J. J., Blatt, R., Christianson, M. K., Grant, A. M., Marquis, C., Neuman, E. J., Sonenshein, S., & Sutcliffe, K. M. 2006. Understanding mechanisms in organizational research: Reflections from a collective journey. *Journal of Management Inquiry*, 15(2): 102.

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

Special issues on theory building:

- 1989 AMR special issue on theory building (14:4)
- 1995 ASQ forum (40:3)

AMJ editor series on various aspects of publishing

Session 2: Meso paradigm and multi-level research

Note: writing assignment this week to encompass both Session 1 and Session 2 readings

*House, R., D. M. Rousseau, et al. (1995). The meso paradigm: A framework for the integration of micro and macro organizational behavior. *Research in Organizational Behavior*. C. L. L. and B. M. Staw. Greenwich: CT, JAI Press. 17: 71-114

(Article posted on Quercus)

*[Klein, K. J., & Kozlowski, S. W. 2000. From micro to meso: Critical steps in conceptualizing and conducting multilevel research. *Organizational Research Methods*, 3\(3\): 211-236.](#)

*[Morgeson, F. P., & Hofmann, D. A. 1999. The structure and function of collective constructs: Implications for multilevel research and theory development. *Academy of Management Review*, 24\(2\): 249-265.](#)

*[Hackman, J. R. 2003. Learning more by crossing levels: Evidence from airplanes, hospitals, and orchestras. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 24\(8\): 905-922.](#)

Supplementary readings

Johns, G. 2006. The essential impact of context on organizational behavior. *Academy of Management Review*, 31(2): 386-408.

Rousseau, D. M. 2011. Reinforcing the micro/macro bridge: Organizational thinking and pluralistic vehicles. *Journal of Management*, 37(2): 429-442. (part of JoM special issue)

Edmondson, A. C., & McManus, S. E. 2007. Methodological fit in management field research. *Academy of Management Review*, 32(4): 1155-1179.

Eisenhardt, K. M. 1989. Building theories from case study research. *Academy of Management Review*, 14(4): 532-550.

Grant, A. M., & Wall, T. D. 2009. The neglected science and art of quasi-experimentation. *Organizational Research Methods*, 12(4): 653-686.

Chatman, J. A., & Flynn, F. J. 2005. Full-cycle micro-organizational behavior research. *Organization Science*, 16(4): 434-447.

Session 3: Collective meaning making

*[Levine, J. M., Resnick, L. B., & Higgins, E. T. 1993. Social foundations of cognition. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 44: 585-612.](#)

*[Kozlowski, S., & Chao, G. 2012. The dynamics of emergence: Cognition and cohesion in work teams. *Managerial and Decision Economics*, 33\(5/6\), 335-354.](#)

*[Weick, K. E., Sutcliffe, K. M., & Obstfeld, D. 2005. Organizing and the process of sensemaking. *Organization Science*, 16\(4\): 409-421.](#)

*Christianson, M.K. 2019. [More and less effective updating: The role of trajectory management in making sense again. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 64\(1\):45-86.](#)

Supplementary readings

Sandberg, J., Tsoukas, H. 2014. Making sense of the sensemaking perspective: Its constituents, limitations, and opportunities for further development. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 36(S1): S6-S32.

Maitlis, S., M.K. Christianson. 2014. Sensemaking in organizations: Taking stock and moving forward. *Academy of Management Annals* 8(1) 57-125. (NOTE: focus on pages 57-69 and pages 94-108)

Maitlis, S. 2005. The social processes of organizational sensemaking. *Academy of Management Journal*, 48: 21-49.

Daft, R. L., & Weick, K. E. 1984. Toward a model of organizations as interpretation systems. *Academy of Management Review*, 9(2): 284-295.

Weick, K. E., & Roberts, K. H. 1993. Collective mind in organizations: Heedful interrelating on flight decks. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 38(3): 357-381.

Cannon-Bowers, J. A., & Salas, E. 2001. Reflections on shared cognition. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 22(2): 195-202.

Mohammed, S., L. Ferzandi, K. Hamilton. 2010. Metaphor no more: A 15-year review of the team mental model construct. *Journal of Management* 36(4) 876-910.

Zhong, C.-B., & House, J. 2012. Hawthorne revisited: Organizational implications of physical work environment. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 32: 3-22.

Heath, C., Larrick, R. P., & Klayman, J. 1998. Cognitive repairs: How organizational practices can compensate for individual shortcomings. In L. L. Cummings, & B. R. Staw (Eds.), *Research in Organizational Behavior*, Vol. 20: 1-37. Greenwich, CT: JAI Press Inc.

Session 4: Collective emotion

*[Huy, Q. N. 1999. Emotional capability, emotional intelligence, and radical change. *Academy of Management Review*, 24\(2\): 325-345.](#)

*[Sy, T., Côté, S., & Saavedra, R. 2005. The contagious leader: Impact of the leader's mood on the mood of group members, group affective tone, and group processes. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 90\(2\): 295-305.](#)

*[Sanchez-Burks, J., & Huy, Q. N. 2009. Emotional aperture and strategic change: The accurate recognition of collective emotions. *Organization Science*, 20\(1\): 22-34.](#)

*[van Kleef, G.A., & Fischer, A.H. 2016. Emotional collectives. How groups shape emotions and emotions shape groups. *Cognition and Emotion*. 30\(1\): 3-19.](#)

Supplementary readings

Barsade, S. G. 2002. The ripple effect: Emotional contagion and its influence on group behavior. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 47(4): 644-675.

Bartel, C. A., & Saavedra, R. 2000. The collective construction of work group moods. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 45(2): 197-231.

Barsade, S. G., & Gibson, D. E. 2007. Why does affect matter in organizations? *Academy of Management Perspectives*, 21(1): 36-59.

Elfenbein, H. A. 2007. Emotion in organizations: A review and theoretical integration. *Academy of Management Annals*, 1(1): 315-386.

Turner, J. H., & Stets, J. E. 2006. Sociological theories of human emotions. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 32(1): 25-52.

Session 5: Collective action

- * LeBaron, C., Christianson, M. K., Garrett, L., & Ilan, R. (2016). [Coordinating flexible performance during everyday work: An ethnomethodological study of handoff routines](#). *Organization Science*, 27(3), 514-534.
- *Howard-Grenville, J. A. 2005. The persistence of flexible organizational routines: The role of agency and organizational context. *Organization Science*, 16(6): 618-636.
- *Salvato, C., & Rerup, C. 2011. Beyond collective entities: Multilevel research on organizational routines and capabilities. *Journal of Management*, 37(2): 468-490.
- *Okhuysen, G. A., & Bechky, B. A. 2009. Coordination in organizations: An integrative perspective. *The Academy of Management Annals*, 3(1): 463-502.

Supplementary readings:

- Dionysiou, D.D., H. Tsoukas. 2013. Understanding the (re)creation of routines from within: A symbolic interactions perspective. *Academy of Management Review* 38(2) 181-205.
- Feldman, M.S., B.T. Pentland. 2003. Reconceptualizing organizational routines as a source of flexibility and change. *Administrative Science Quarterly* 48(1) 94-118.
- May/June 2016 *Organization Science*, 27(3) special issue on routine dynamics
- Cohen, M. D. 2007. Reading Dewey: Reflections on the study of routine. *Organization Studies*, 28(5): 773-786.
- Rico, R., Sanchez-Manzanares, M., Gil, F., & Gibson, C. 2008. Team implicit coordination processes: A team knowledge-based approach. *Academy of Management Review*, 33(1): 163-184.
- Faraj, S., & Xiao, Y. 2006. Coordination in fast-response organizations. *Management Science*, 52(8): 1155-1169.
- Bakeman, R., & Gottman, J. M. 1997. *Observing Interaction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Streeck, J., Goodwin, C., & LeBaron, C. D. (Eds.). 2011. *Embodied Interaction: Language and Body in the Material World*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Session 6: Sociomateriality and practice theory

*Orlikowski, W., & Scott, S. V. 2008. Sociomateriality: Challenging the separation of technology, work and organization. *The Academy of Management Annals*, 2(1): 433-474.

*Feldman, M. S., & Orlikowski, W. J. 2011. Theorizing practice and practicing theory. *Organization Science*, 22(5): 1240-1253.

*Bechky, B. A. 2011. Making organizational theory work: Institutions, occupations, and negotiated orders. *Organization Science*, 22(5): 1157-1167.

*Nicolini, D. 2009. Zooming in and out: Studying practices by switching theoretical lenses and trailing connections. *Organization Studies*, 30(12) 1391-1418.

Supplementary readings:

Leonardi, P. M., & Barley, S. R. 2010. What's under construction here? Social action, materiality, and power in constructivist studies of technology and organizing. *The Academy of Management Annals*, 4(1): 1-51.

Barley, S. R., & Kunda, G. 2001. Bringing work back in. *Organization Science*, 12(1): 76-95.

Star, S. L., & Griesemer, J. R. 1989. Institutional ecology, "translations", and boundary objects: Amateurs and professionals in Berkeley's Museum of Vertebrate Zoology, 1907-1939. *Social Studies of Science*, 19: 387-420.

Carlile, P. R. 2002. A pragmatic view of knowledge and boundaries: Boundary objects in new product development. *Organization Science*, 13(4): 442-455.

Bechky, B. A. 2003. Sharing meaning across occupational communities: The transformation of understanding on a production floor. *Organization Science*, 14(3): 312-330.

Heath, C., Luff, P., & Knoblauch, H. 2004. Tools, technology, and organizational interaction: The emergence of 'workplace studies'. In D. Grant, C. Hardy, C. Osrick, & L. Putnam (Eds.), *The Sage Handbook of Organizational Discourse*: 337-358. London: Sage Publications.

Barad, K. 2007. *Meeting the Universe Halfway: Quantum Physics and the Entanglement of Matter and Meaning*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Session 7: Temporality and process theory

*[Langley, A. 1999. Strategies for theorizing from process data. *Academy of Management Review*, 24\(4\): 691-710.](#)

*[Orlikowski, W.J., J. Yates. 2002. It's about time: Temporal structuring in organizations. *Organization Science* 13\(6\) 684-700.](#)

*[Kaplan, S., & Orlikowski, W. J. 2013. Temporal work in strategy making. *Organization Science*, 24\(4\): 965-995.](#)

* Geiger, D., Danner-Schröder, A., & Kremser, W. In press. [Getting ahead of time - Performing temporal boundaries to coordinate routines under temporal uncertainty. *Administrative Science Quarterly*.](#)

Supplementary readings

Ancona, D. G., Okhuysen, G. A., & Perlow, L. A. 2001. Taking time to integrate temporal research. *Academy of Management Review*, 26(4): 512-529.

Hofmann, D. A., Jacobs, R., & Gerras, S. J. 1992. Mapping individual performance over time. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 77(2): 185-195.

Beal, D. J., & Weiss, H. M. 2003. Methods of ecological momentary assessment in organizational research. *Organizational Research Methods*, 6(4): 440.

Marks, M. A., Mathieu, J. E., & Zaccaro, S. J. 2001. A temporally based framework and taxonomy of team process. *Academy of Management Review*, 26(3): 356-376.

Mosakowski, E. 2000. A selective review of time assumptions in strategy research. *Academy of Management Review*, 25(4): 796-812.

Ballard, D. I., Tschan, F., & Waller, M. J. 2008. All in the timing: Considering time at multiple stages of group research. *Small Group Research*, 39(3): 328-351.

Perlow, L. A., Okhuysen, G. A., & Reppenning, N. P. 2002. The speed trap: Exploring the relationship between decision making and temporal context. *Academy of Management Journal*, 45(5): 931-955.

Gersick, C. J. G. 1988. Time and transition in work teams: Toward a new model of group development. *Academy of Management Journal*, 31(1): 9-41.

Session 8: Teams in organizations

*[Ilgen, D. R., Hollenbeck, J. R., Johnson, M., & Jundt, D. 2005. Teams in organizations: From Input-Process-Output models to IMO models. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 56\(1\): 517-543.](#)

*Reagans, R., Zuckerman, E., & McEvily, B. 2004. How to make the team: Social networks vs. demography as criteria for designing effective teams. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 49(1): 101-133.

*Klein, K. J., Ziegert, J. C., Knight, A. P., & Yan, X. 2006. Dynamic delegation: Shared, hierarchical, and deindividualized leadership in extreme action teams. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 51(4): 590-621.

*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): 1-46.

Supplementary reading:

Gibson, C. B., & Zellmer-Bruhn, M. E. 2001. Metaphors and meaning: An intercultural analysis of the concept of teamwork. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 46(2): 274-303.

Burke, C. S., Stagl, K. C., Salas, E., Pierce, L., & Kendall, D. 2006. Understanding team adaptation: A conceptual analysis and model. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 91(6): 1189-1207.

Klein, C., DiazGranados, D., Salas, E., Huy, L., Burke, C. S., Lyons, R., & Goodwin, G. F. 2009. Does team building work? *Small Group Research*, 40(2): 181-222.

Haas, M. R. 2006. Acquiring and applying knowledge in transnational teams: The roles of cosmopolitans and locals. *Organization Science*, 17(3): 367-384.

Edmondson, A. 2012. *Teaming: How Organizations Learn, Innovate, and Compete in the Knowledge Economy*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Session 9: Identity in organizations

*Ashforth, B. E., Rogers, K. M., & Corley, K. G. 2011. Identity in organizations: Exploring cross-level dynamics. *Organization Science*, 22(5): 1144-1156.

*Ellemers, N., Spears, R., & Doosje, B. 2002. Self and social identity. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 53(1): 161.

*Gioia, D. A., Patvardhan, S. D., Hamilton, A. L., & Corley, K. G. 2013. Organizational identity formation and change. *Academy of Management Annals*, 7(1): 123-193.

*Gioia, D. A., Schultz, M., & Corley, K. G. 2002. On celebrating the organizational identity metaphor: A rejoinder to Cornelissen. *British Journal of Management*, 13(3): 269-275. (in response to Cornelissen, J. P. 2006. Metaphor and the dynamics of knowledge in organization theory: A case study of the organizational identity metaphor. *Journal of Management Studies*, 43(4): 683-709.)

Supplementary reading:

Ashforth, B. E., & Mael, F. 1989. Social identity theory and the organization. *Academy of Management Review*, 14(1): 20-39.

Hogg, M. A., & Terry, D. J. 2000. Social identity and self-categorization processes in organizational contexts. *Academy of Management Review*, 25(1): 121-140.

Pratt, M. G., Rockmann, K. W., & Kaufmann, J. B. 2006. Constructing professional identity: The role of work and identity learning cycles in the customization of identity among medical residents. *Academy of Management Journal*, 49(2): 235-262.

Albert, S., & Whetten, D. A. 1985. Organizational identity. In L. L. Cummings, & B. M. Staw (Eds.), *Research in Organizational Behavior*, Vol. 7: 263-296. Greenwich, CT: JAI Press Inc.

Dutton, J. E., & Dukerich, J. M. 1991. Keeping an eye on the mirror: Image and identity in organizational adaptation. *Academy of Management Journal*, 34(3): 517-554.

Hsu, G., & Elsbach, K. D. 2013. Explaining variation in organizational identity categorization. *Organization Science*, 24(4): 996-1013.

Special issue on organization identity and identification (AMR, 2000): Albert, S., Ashforth, B. E., & Dutton, J. E. 2000. Organizational identity and identification: Charting new waters and building new bridges. *Academy of Management Review*, 25(1): 13-17.

Session 10: Climate and culture in organizations

*O'Reilly, C. A., & Chatman, J. A. 1996. Culture as social control: Corporations, cults, and commitment, *Research in Organizational Behavior*, Vol. 18: 157-200. Greenwich, CT: JAI Press. (**Article posted on Quercus**)

*[Glick, W. H. 1985. Conceptualizing and measuring organizational and psychological climate: Pitfalls in multilevel research. *Academy of Management Review*, 10\(3\): 601-616.](#)

a. [James, L. R., Joyce, W. F., & Slocum Jr, J. W. 1988. Comment: Organizations do not cognize. *Academy of Management Review*, 13\(1\): 129-132.](#)

b. [Glick, W. H. 1988. Response: Organizations are not central tendencies: Shadowboxing in the dark, round 2. *Academy of Management Review*, 13\(1\): 133-137.](#)

*[Zohar, D., & Luria, G. 2005. A multilevel model of safety climate: Cross-level relationships between organization and group-level climates. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 90\(4\): 616-628.](#)

*Vogus, T. J., Sutcliffe, K. M., & Weick, K. E. 2010. Doing no harm: Enabling, enacting, and elaborating a culture of safety in health care. *Academy of Management Perspectives*, 24(4): 60-77.

Supplementary readings

Schein, E. H. 1996. Culture: The missing concept in organization studies. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 41(2): 229-240.

Chatman, J. A., Polzer, J. T., Barsade, S. G., & Neale, M. A. 1998. Being different yet feeling similar: The influence of demographic composition and organizational culture on work processes and outcomes. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 43(4): 749-780.

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(3): 619-654.

Ravasi, D., & Schultz, M. 2006. Responding to organizational identity threats: Exploring the role of organizational culture. *Academy of Management Journal*, 49(3): 433-458.

Session 11: Learning in organizations
--

*Edmondson, A. 1999. Psychological safety and learning behavior in work teams. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 44(2): 350-383.

*Bresman, H., & Zellmer-Bruhn, M. 2013. The structural context of team learning: Effects of organizational and team structure on internal and external learning. *Organization Science*, 24(4): 1120-1139.

*Crossan, M. M., Lane, H. W., & White, R. E. 1999. An organizational learning framework: From intuition to institution. *Academy of Management Review*, 24(3): 522-537.

*Crossan, M. M., Maurer, C. C., & White, R. E. 2011. Reflections on the 2009 AMR Decade Award: Do we have a theory of organizational learning? *Academy of Management Review*, 36(3): 446-460.

Supplementary readings

Organizational Science 1991 special issue on organizational learning

- Cohen, M. D. 1991. Individual learning and organizational routine: Emerging connections. *Organization Science*, 2(1): 135-139.

- March, J. G., Sproull, L. S., & Tamuz, M. 1991. Learning from samples of one or fewer. *Organization Science*, 2(1): 1-13.

- Weick, K. E. 1991. The non-traditional quality of organizational learning. *Organization Science*, 2: 116-124.

Levinthal, D., & Rerup, C. 2006. Crossing an apparent chasm: Bridging mindful and less-mindful perspectives on organizational learning. *Organization Science*, 17(4): 502-513. (with rejoinder by Weick, K. E., & Sutcliffe, K. M. 2006. Mindfulness and the quality of organizational attention. *Organization Science*, 17(4): 514-524).

Christianson, M. K., Farkas, M. T., Sutcliffe, K. M., & Weick, K. E. 2009. Learning through rare events: Significant interruptions at the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Museum. *Organization Science*, 20(5): 846-860.

Session 12. Student Presentations
--