

**Agenda**  
**OB Division Executive Committee**  
**Midyear Meeting**  
**Pittsburgh, January 21-23, 2011**

**1. Welcome and Brief Updates (Carrie)**

Carrie began with a welcome and a brief overview of the agenda.

**a. Brief review of Finances**

Overall, our finances are good. A full review of financial reports will come at the end (Sunday morning) when Brian can be on the phone to review them with us.

**2. Division Issues (Carrie)**

**a. Award and Event Sponsorships**

An overview of our sponsorships from last year is in the financial reports. Still one check outstanding (\$3750 from Wiley for HR/OB Welcome Reception).

**i. Emerald proposal (see pg 13)**

We received a request from Nancy Rolph at Emerald regarding a quote (from a thank-you email from Sandra) that they would like to put on the JMP web page. We discussed whether we are okay with the idea and whether we are okay with the specific wording. Concerns were expressed about saying that the award is our “big one” since we have several big awards. Decision was made that we are fine with them using the quote, but that they would need to change “this really is our ‘big one’ to “this is one of our most prestigious awards”.

**ACTION:**

Carrie will convey this to Nancy Rolph at Emerald

**ii. McKinsey sponsorship issue (see p. 15)**

McKinsey has in the past sponsored both the Award for the Best Conference Paper with Practical Implications and the Lifetime Achievement Award. David Turnipseed has been our liaison to McKinsey. Over the past several years, there has been a great deal of correspondence between David and the OB Division Chair, regarding McKinsey’s desire to have a representative on the awards committees and David’s role in facilitating this. Our understanding has been that David serves as McKinsey’s representative on the two awards committees. But last year, there was an apparent misunderstanding (from what we understand, McKinsey wanted an actual McKinsey person to be on the committees). As a result of this misunderstanding, McKinsey pulled their sponsorship from the Lifetime Achievement Award this past year. We were disappointed to lose the

sponsorship, but at the same time, had concerns about having a non-academic on the committee to select the Lifetime Achievement Award winner, and not being able to deal directly with McKinsey. Carrie and Elizabeth met with David at AOM in August to try to resolve this issue, but did not reach a clear resolution. This issue was discussed at length at our meeting, and the following was decided:

- (a) David will continue to be on the Best Paper award committee as a representative for McKinsey, although we need to confirm that this corresponds with McKinsey's understanding/preferences
- (b) For the Lifetime Achievement Award, we need to be able to deal directly with an individual at McKinsey. If we are unable to get the name of a contact at McKinsey, we will seek other sponsorship for the award.

**ACTION:**

Amy will send email to David confirming that he is representing McKinsey on the paper award committee.

Carrie will email Susan Jackson and will ask whether McKinsey sponsors other awards, and if so, whether there is a McKinsey rep that we can contact.

Carrie will also email David telling him that we need a contact name at McKinsey so that we can discuss the Lifetime Achievement Award, and that if we do not have a name by Feb 15th, we will seek other sponsorship.

**iii. JOB sponsorship update**

JOB used to sponsor the Doctoral Consortium (DC) for \$10,000. Last year they indicated that they could not contribute this much. They were under pressure to reduce and rationalize expenditures and were especially concerned about ensuring that they were getting a clear "return" from the sponsorship. We offered them several options, and the one that they selected was to sponsor just the lunch at the DC (\$5000). They requested to have the editor talk about JOB at the lunch, but this would violate AOM policy. Instead, the editor talked about publishing in general (and avoided promoting JOB in any explicit way). The organizers felt that the talk was quite effective. It was valuable to students, and JOB got "advertising" since there were signs on tables saying that lunch was sponsored by JOB, and the students got thumbdrives loaded with best papers from JOB. Carrie wrote to the JOB editor asking about the status of their sponsorship going further. Response was that JOB will continue to play a sponsorship role of the DC, with Hester Tillbury as the contact person.

Our strong desire is to get a greater level of sponsorship from JOB (back up to \$10,000), but we are sensitive to their desire to get maximum visibility from it. Proposal: See if we can get them to sponsor (in addition to the lunch at the DC) the Lifetime Achievement Award and the coffee that follows it, for total of \$5000.

**ACTION:**

Carrie will speak to Hester and see if whether, in addition to DC, they would be willing to sponsor LAA. In that conversation, Carrie will emphasize their desire for visibility and bang-for-the-buck, and will also convey just how great the

feedback was from the DC (and our sense that it was very effective for giving visibility to JOB). Carrie will emphasize the high level of attendance at the LAA talk, and at the business meeting where we announce the award and its sponsor. She will convey our hope that they will be able to return to their historic level of sponsorship.

**iv. Ideas on sponsors**

We brainstormed ideas for other sources of sponsorship dollars. Suggestions included Rutledge (trying to establish itself in the scholarly realm), Oxford, and PhD Project.

**ACTION:**

Michelle will contact Peter Lee at Rutledge.

Carrie will contact the head(s) of the PhD Project. She will ask whether there is anything we can do to establish better connections, and will suggest (as one idea) having someone from OB come to their reception. Hold off on sponsorship for now – it is premature.

**b. Division Sponsorships**

**i. Request from Peter Bamberger on conference sponsorship (see pg. 16)**

We discussed this proposal and the consensus was supportive. It would not cost us anything, it gives the division visibility, and it is consistent with our desire (stemming from the 5 yr review) to ensure we are meeting the needs of non-North American members. Our main concern was precedent. This could lead to lots of such requests, and if so, we need a policy to guide us.

We agreed upon the following criteria for the division to sponsor a conference: it must appeal to a broad segment of our membership, it must be open to anyone who wants to submit and attend, it must fill a unique niche (e.g. international). We also agreed upon the following policy: We can advertise the conference to our membership at our discretion, we do not provide funding, it must be clear that it is sponsored by the OB division and not AOM at large, it must not conflict with other academy events, and we have discretion to sponsor or not depending on whether we feel it meets our criteria.

**ACTION:**

The policy will be posted on the OB website.

Carrie will let Peter know that we are happy to support the conference.

**ii. Policy on Division sponsorships (see pg. 21)**

**c. OB Web Update (Richard) (see pg. 24)**

About 9 months ago we transitioned to a new system for OB web (current AOM standard). New system is simpler (old system had large number of features, many not being used). It contains general information on division, major announcements, calls for papers, podcasts.

See report for information on usage, traffic, and conclusions

Are there things we should add to the webpage? If so, what? What is the best approach to finding out?

We discussed several ideas (e.g. posting course materials from award winning teachers), visiting other division websites to see what they do, etc.

**ACTION:**

Richard will put together a small task force to brainstorm ideas for additional content. The task force will have a clear charge and a deadline.

Each member of the executive committee will identify 1-3 potential names for the task force and will email those names to Richard by the end of January (with a brief justification for why they are being recommended) Categories: teacher, practitioner, student, researcher, international.

Tasks for the group:

- Examine the websites of other divisions and comment on specific features and their value
- Discuss features needed for OB website via e-mail
- Locate external web-based resources that we should link to
- Write web content specific to one or more audiences listed above

Goal is for committee to be set up by March 1

**OTHER ACTIONS:**

Carrie will send a cc whenever a new podcast is posted.

Carrie will also consider sending a cc that highlights the popularity of some of the podcasts.

**d. Division Structure**

**i. Division Chair Elect role (discussion continued on Sunday morning)**

Last year, we created a new position for catering, which freed up one of the 3<sup>rd</sup> yr. reps-at-large. The rep's responsibilities shifted to handling all of the awards. However, we discovered that this (a) left the Division Chair-Elect with relatively few responsibilities, and (b) did nothing to address one of the biggest issues we face, which is the extremely high workload for the Program Chair. So we decided we needed to revisit this issue, to see if we could use the "freed up rep-at-large" in a way that would better help to off-load some of the workload from the Program Chair.

Proposal: Have the 3<sup>rd</sup> year rep. handle the paper checking in process (everything up to the point where we have 3 reviews for each submission). The Program Chair will take over from there: making acceptance decisions, grouping papers, scheduling, finding chairs, etc. Awards would go back to Division Chair Elect and Division Chair.

We had a lengthy discussion of the pros and cons of this proposal, and discussed other ways to divide the work between rep-at-large, program chair, and program chair-elect.

Final decision was that 3<sup>rd</sup> yr rep will become “Program Assistant” and that specific details will be figured out before the August meeting.

**ACTION:**

Cheri and Paul will come up with a specific proposal by June and then we will try it for a few years.

**ii. What to do with IM subcommittee currently on hiatus for past two years**

Resolution: dissolve committee, put Robert Wright (the chair) on the obweb task force to help ensure that our web page meets the needs of our international members (and ask him to use his committee members to get input).

**ACTION:**

Carrie will email Robert, and make sure that Richard knows that Robert should be on the committee.

**iii. Size issue – do we want to consider subdividing in some way?**

**3. Activity Reports/Updates**

a. PDWs (**Suzanne**) (see pg. 26)

i. PDW Deadline

same as all other deadlines this year.

ii. Room for a few more PDW submissions if allocation stays this high

24 submissions (up from last year) but we have used only 82 of the 91 hours allocated

We can co sponsor up to 54 – have been requested to co sponsor 52

iii. SAC and MCC continue to submit superb PDWs.

iv. Coordinating food and/or special requests (flipcharts; internet access) for PDWs

v. Will we cover any expenses associated with such requests?

We decided on the following policy for providing food/beverages:

- PDWs that are not division sponsored: Organizers will be told that they can pay themselves for food/beverages. We will make arrangements with hotel, and organizers will then reimburse us.

- For division sponsored PDWs, we will provide lunch if the session is 6+ hours, coffee and cookies/pastries if it is 4 hours, and nothing if it is less than 4 hours.

It was noted that the lunches for the “Halfway There” PDW last year were expensive (\$4400 for box lunches for 150 people) and that lunch is probably not necessary for a 4 hour PDW.

Decided to move it so that it does not span the lunch hour. We will provide coffee & cookies/pastries (consistent with above policy).

The OB Teaching Incubator and New Member Networking/Research Forum will be back-to-back, in the same room, and treated as one 4 hr. session. We will provide coffee and cookies/pastries at some point during the 4 hrs (consistent with above policy).

Help I’m Stuck -- no food (less than 4 hrs)

The Productivity Process -- treat it like a division sponsored PDW (since it will be after this coming year) -- so we will provide coffee & cookies

Decided to give a \$1000 discretionary budget to PDW chair for food, AV requests, flipcharts, etc.

**ACTION:**

Laura will update her catering chart to reflect the above changes.

vi. Coordination issues because of high number of individuals appearing in multiple PDWs

Suzanne suggested that we should try to diversify the people on the division sponsored PDWs, perhaps by telling people that they can only do one. This will help with the coordination issue.

b. Awards (**Amy**) (see pg. 29)

All 10 committees have been set up and are reporting to Amy

She has not assigned chairs to the committees, but this is something we should re-consider next year

Will use a 5 point rating scale (and ordinal ranking) for all awards (not the 100 point allocation system)

- i. Published Paper Awards
- ii. Lifetime Achievement and Cummings Awards
- iii. Conference Awards
- iv. Service Awards: how and should we give routinely awards to the heads of our committees?

It was decided that we should give awards to committee chairs  
after 3 years of service

- v. Committee member repository
- vi. Chair/ full member pros and cons

**ACTION:**

Cheri will make sure that all submitters to the conference are sent an email reminding them of the importance of rating their reviewers since we use this to give Best Reviewer Awards.

c. Program (**Cheri & Paul**) (see pg. 31)

- i. Program highlights
- ii. Dealing with the workload (discussed under division structure)
- iii. Trends in submission rates  
About the same number of submissions as last year (after steep increases for several years)
- iv. Increasing the number of reviewers, esp experienced/senior reviewers.  
Given the need to run the matching algorithm in two parts (due to large number of papers), it is extremely important that we have a sufficiently large number of reviewers  
It is imperative that we send out a final email to get people to sign up (which we did this year and were able to boost the numbers by several hundred)
- v. Changes in AoM process  
AOM office was responsive to our concerns about standardizing the format for symposium submissions, so the check in process was easier
- vi. Questions were asked about the feedback on the new session formats  
Anecdotal evidence suggests that they may not have been well attended or well received

**ACTION:**

Elizabeth will email Jimmy to see if we can get insight from the survey results  
Paul will raise this question with the new program chairs

d. Doctoral Consortium (**Sharon & Joyce**) (see pg. 33)

- i. Ethics training: Okay to have the AOM committee do it again
- ii. Nomination process

A concern was expressed that the questions that we ask about date of defense preclude strong candidates from top schools (who will be on the market but who may not be defending until summer).

**ACTION:**

Sharon and Joyce will change question to “anticipated proposal defense date” and also ask for anticipated dates of data collection and whether they plan to be on the market.

e. Junior Faculty Workshop (**Adam by phone & Michele**) (see pg. 40)

Went great last year – nothing needing change except a few very minor tweaks (e.g., eliminated presentations from faculty fellows and are just having panels; increased number of journal table rotations from 2 to 3).

e. Scientific Affairs Committee & Making Connections Committee (**Elizabeth**)

See report (pg. 43) for details

**ACTION:**

Elizabeth will ask Scott and David if they still think their committees should merge. If so, they should co-chair it and work on coming up with a new name for a combined committee and a mission (and make sure that mission does not lose the focus of MCC which was to meet the needs of new members).

g. Catering (**Laura**) (see pg. 44)

i. Budget

ii. Catering at PDWs that make requests (see notes under PDW section)

iii. Chocolates, napkins, and banner

Decided that Laura has discretion to order less chocolate (we had too much last year) Decided to do away with napkins and banner.

iv. Drink tickets

Problems with drink tickets: determining who gets them and who doesn't, keeping track of them, determining when to distribute them, making sure we only pay for what we use

Decided that despite the hassle, we should go back to drink tickets since it is good to be able to “buy a drink” for committee members, award winners, etc.

These will be given to award committee members (instead of inviting them to the Thank You coffee), to the DC attendees and to our award winners. (but we will continue to give Starbucks cards to the faculty who participate in the doctoral and junior faculty consortium).

Discussed the idea of, instead of tickets, using a card that says thank you and has our logo which can be traded in for a drink

v. Other

If we need any av for business meetings or other events (e.g. wireless mike for business meeting), make sure to let Laura know and she will take care of it



Laura noted that, going forward, we need to get AOM to negotiate with hotels for internet access, since it is very costly and increasingly common  
Decision: We will no longer have the Thank You coffee. Attendance has been very low.

**ACTION:**

When Amy sends her thank you emails to the award committee members, she will inform them about the drink ticket (details for distribution to be determined).

Cheri: Make sure to not schedule the Thank You coffee (which may appear on the template).

Laura will explore different options for tickets (or cards that can be redeemed) and talk with hotel to make sure that we only pay for what is consumed.

**h. Celebration event (Carrie)**

**i. Logistics**

Business meeting works well -- no need to change anything.

System for submitting pictures for slide show worked well. Do it again.

Go back to two adjacent rooms for business meeting and social hour. It was too noisy with the back of the room set up for the social hour.

**ii. Plaques & Shirts**

Brian handles the plaques, which will be sent to the hotel. Both he and Amy will need to carefully check them for errors.

Will keep shirts, but with new logo (see below). We had a discussion about a different style of shirt, but with no clear resolution.

**iii. Making Connections Slogan/Logo**

Decided it was time to retire this catch-phrase, and design a new logo for the division. Will use Hatchwise to help with this (we pay Hatchwise, they solicit logos from graphic designers, and you we pick one).

Committee to work on this: Amy, Sandra, Laura, Michele, Richard (chair).

We will have the committee narrow down the proposals to 5, and then we will post these on obweb for membership to vote.

**ACTION:**

Richard will negotiate with Hatchwork about a slightly longer timeframe for voting on the winner (1 week for the committee to select the top 5, and 1 week for membership to vote). Richard will also take care of posting information on the web about the contest.

Carrie will send a cc about the contest.

**4. Slate for Division Officers (Carrie and group)**

**a. 2 Representatives at Large**

There was one nomination from the membership. We identified 22 additional names. Based on an iterative voting process, we narrowed down the list to 10 names, in order of preference.

**ACTION:**

Carrie will call the nominees, starting at the top of the list (individuals who received the most votes), and will continue until we have 6 people willing to be on the slate.

b. Division Chair

We identified 16 names. Based on an iterative voting process, we narrowed down the list to 8 names, in order of preference.

**ACTION:**

Carrie will call the nominees, starting at the top of the list (individuals who received the most votes), and will continue until we have 3 people willing to be on the slate.

5. **Financial Report (Brian by phone)** (see financial reports)

Catering costs are explanatory (see table).

Big expenses overall are academy social events and consortium.

Last 3 yrs, pretty even in term of what we start with in terms of revenue (balance forward plus allocation from AOM).

AOM could reduce our allocation if we carry forward too much from prior yr but that is very unlikely to happen since we spend our allocation each year.

Brian does not see the need for a division credit card.

He also did not think it would be a big hassle to have PDW organizers reimburse us for food and/or AV expenses (he felt this was better than having them pre-pay since it is hard to estimate costs). But need to make sure we list this as a one-time contribution, not as a sponsorship that we would expect each yr.

It is hard each yr to get money from Wiley for the welcome reception since they want to see the receipt first, and because it is getting split across 2 divisions. But we should have the check soon.

Leadership institute uses us as their pass-through for paying for their reception. Still owe us \$1310.

**ACTION:**

Carrie will contact all of our sponsors right after the mid yr meeting

Brian will check where the McKinsey check came from to see if we can get a name

**2ai. Emerald Proposal**

**From:** Nancy Rolph [NRolph@emeraldinsight.com]  
**Sent:** Friday, December 17, 2010 3:14 AM  
**To:** Robinson, Sandra  
**Subject:** Emerald and OB Division

Dear Sandra

I hope this email finds you well? You might remember that we were in touch in spring and summer of this year regarding *Journal of Managerial Psychology's* sponsorship of the Outstanding Publication in Organizational Behavior Award at this year's US Academy.

My reason for getting in touch, very briefly, is we're reviewing our conference support in 2010 and where possible we're publicizing this on the relevant journal homepages and in our circulars. I wondered if you might agree to me adding the following wording (from your email to me of March 2010) to the JMP website? You'll aware I'm sure that JMP's sponsorship has been in place for some years and I think your words below perfectly capture our own thoughts on the longevity of our GDO Division relationship. The words I would like your permission to use are:

"We have been very fortunate and extremely thankful to have the ongoing support of Emerald Group's Publishing (on behalf of the Journal of Managerial Psychology). In particular, Emerald Group's sponsorship of our *Outstanding Publication in Organizational Behavior Award* has been greatly appreciated. Although we offer a number of awards, this really is our "big one" and it works so well for us to have a highly recognized name behind this important award."

Please could you let me know if this is acceptable to you Sandra? Also as I wasn't present in Montreal please could you let me have the contact details of next year's Division Chair? I finish for the Christmas break this week but if you're able to reply to this email in the new year that would be great.

Many thanks in anticipation and wishing you greetings of the season,

Kind regards  
Nancy

Nancy Rolph  
Publisher, Emerald Group Publishing Limited  
Tel: +44(0) 1274 785164  
<http://www.emeraldinsight.com>

---

Dear Nancy:

I hope this finds you well. I am attempting to follow in the big shoes of Blake Ashforth, as I am this year's chair of the OB Division of the Academy of Management. I hope you are able to keep track of us!

We have been very fortunate and extremely thankful to have the ongoing support of Emerald Group's Publishing (on behalf of the Journal of Managerial Psychology). In particular, Emerald Group's sponsorship of our *Outstanding Publication in Organizational Behavior Award* has been greatly appreciated. Although we offer a

*OB Division Mid-Year Meeting  
January 21-23 2011*

number of awards, this really is our "big one" and it works so well for us to have a highly recognized name behind this important award.

We are hoping this relationship can continue and I wanted to touch base with you and ask if we can count on your support of this award for the upcoming year. I am about to email our 6000 members to request nominations for this coveted award, and it is important we highlight who generously sponsors it! Also if you have a logo I can use, I will try to figure out a way to insert it into our email.

Thanks Nancy, I look forward to hearing from you!

Sandra

**2a. McKinsey Issue**

**From:** David Turnipseed [mailto:Turnipseed@usouthal.edu]  
**Sent:** Friday, January 14, 2011 1:42 PM  
**To:** Leana, Carrie R  
**Subject:** Re: Follow-up on our meeting last August at AoM

Hi Carrie,

Good to hear from you! McKinsey wants a McKinsey person on the selection committee. They are happy for me to do the coordinating work, but they want (to be asked to have) their person on the committee. Now in the past, when they have been asked, it fell to me, but at least they were asked. I will talk with them and get back to you ASAP.

Best regards,  
David

>>> "Leana, Carrie R" <LEANA@katz.pitt.edu> 1/10/2011 1:21 PM >>>

Hello David,

I hope this finds you well. Belated best wishes for a prosperous and happy new year!

The reason I am writing is that we will be having our mid-term meeting of the OB Division's Executive Committee late next week. I wanted to follow up with you regarding sponsorship by McKinsey of our division awards.

As you recall, Elizabeth Morrison and I met with you last August. There you confirmed that McKinsey was happy with you serving as their representative on the award committee that selects the Best Conference Paper with Practical Implications, and that they would continue to support this award. At the same time, you shared concern about McKinsey's representation on the Lifetime Achievement Award committee and you were unsure about future sponsorship.

Could you confirm that my understanding regarding both of these awards is correct? Also, I would very much like to talk to someone at McKinsey, particularly about the Lifetime Achievement Award sponsorship. Could you provide me with the contact information of someone I might contact either directly or in a conference call with you?

Thanks very much, David, for all your past support of the OB Division. I look forward to continuing to work with you and McKinsey.

All best,

Carrie

**2bi. Proposal from Peter Bamberger on Conference Sponsorship**

**From:** Peter Bamberger [mailto:peterb@post.tau.ac.il]  
**Sent:** Saturday, January 08, 2011 4:32 PM  
**To:** Leana, Carrie R  
**Cc:** 'Hilla Dotan'  
**Subject:** RE: OB Conference in Israel

Dear Carrie:

Thanks very much for the opportunity to have our conference considered by the Division's Executive Committee(EC) later this month.

I have attached a copy of the proposed call for paper. As you will see, we have included the AOM logo so that you and the EC's members can see how we intend to promote the division's sponsorship if it is granted (and obviously, we will remove this logo if the EC decides not to back the conference). While I believe that the call for papers says it all, let me briefly summarize what the conference is about and what we are asking from the Division:

The conference is aimed at providing an intimate environment for exploring what we view as a central theme in OB research, namely relational issues. Accordingly, we see the conference as drawing researchers studying such topics as helping, OCB, friendship networks, team/group processes and inter-group relations in organizations. While we hope to attract colleagues from the USA, we view a conference in Israel (particularly around the holiday season) as being highly attractive to OB researchers in Europe and the Mediterranean basin. We view our two-day program as being structured primarily around paper and symposium presentations. However, we are also planning on several keynote addresses. Two keynote speakers – Adam Grant and Linn Van Dyne have already agreed to participate. We also expect to Shelly Zedek give a keynote in the context of his receiving a special award for lifetime achievement.

Our request from the OB Division is quite simple. We are not asking for any financial backing (although we obviously wouldn't object if such funding might be made available to us). Rather, we are asking to be able to refer to our conference as a Division-sponsored event and to use its logo on our call for papers and promotion materials.

Please let me know if you need any further information before your meeting.

Looking forward to hearing from you.

Peter

# The First Israel Organizational Behavior Conference (IOBC)

December 21-22, 2011

Conference Topic:

## "Relational Issues in Management"

In an effort to develop a more global community of organizational behavior scholars and promote emerging issues in our field, we are proud to announce that the 1<sup>st</sup> Israel Organizational Behavior Conference (IOBC), sponsored by the Academy of Management (AOM), will be held at the Leon Recanati Graduate School of Business Administration, Tel-Aviv, Israel, on December 21- 22, 2011.

The tentative program features several prominent keynote speakers including Professor Adam Grant (University of Pennsylvania), and Professor Linn van Dyne (Michigan State University). The IOBC will offer a unique opportunity to present innovative ideas and explore recent developments on "relational" issues in management. The conference will also be an opportunity to share work-in-progress, receive feedback and interact with leading scholars in the field with the hope of forging fruitful collaborations.

## **Call for Papers and Symposia**

Although relational concerns have been at the heart of management research for decades, the recent global crisis has made the power of relationships even more salient both for individuals and organizations. Individuals who lost their jobs resorted to close relationships and trusted others with the hope of assisting them in finding new jobs. Organizations on the verge of Chapter 11 leveraged relationships with their employees, key institutional stake-holders and even competitors with the hope of gaining their assistance and support. Indeed, the recent crisis demonstrates the need for research to go beyond basic models of social exchange and extra-role behaviors to understand the mechanisms underlying the formation and nature of interpersonal relations in organizations, and the power they can unleash.

Accordingly, we invite individuals to submit proposals for presentations addressing, but not limited to, such issues as:

- A. What is an "effective" or a "valuable" relationship at work, what underlies relational efficacy and upon what contextual factors does it depend?
- B. How do organization members build effective relationships at work?

- C. How does the process of relationship emergence differ when the targets are internal (versus external) to the organization? What is the nature of this process in virtual relationships?
- D. How might peer relations in organizations serve as mechanisms of control and what are the means that managers use to gain control over such relations?
- E. What is the role of social categorization and other interpersonal processes, such as perspective-taking, on the emergence of relationships within and across teams and organizations?
- F. How do employees use their relationships with others in the workplace to influence their self-identity and the meaning of their jobs?
- G. How do relational networks within and between organizations change over time, and what are the key drivers of such change?

We also invite individuals to submit research symposia (comprising no more than 4 papers) relating to these and other relationship matters. Preference will be given to those symposia involving international collaboration and comprising presenters from different countries.

### **Submission Guidelines**

IOBC will consider unpublished original paper and symposia relating to any matter associated with relational issues in management. Proposals (a 2 - 3 page abstract for a paper, 9-10 page proposal for a symposium) can be conceptual or empirical, quantitative or qualitative. International and global perspectives are encouraged. Published papers or papers accepted for publication prior to the submission deadline will NOT be considered. Submissions will go through a double blind review process and will be evaluated on the basis of academic rigor, relevance, and contribution to the field of organizational behavior. To submit the paper abstract or symposia proposal, upload your document in Word or PDF format to the Submissions Section of the IOBC website at: <http://www.recanati.tau.ac.il/ENG/conferences/IOBC> where additional guidelines are available.

The Submission Section of the IOBC website will open in March, 2011 and will be available until May 5, 2011. The deadline for online submissions of abstracts and symposium proposals is **May 5, 2011**. Acceptance notices to authors will be sent in June, 2011, indicating whether the proposed paper or symposium has been selected, and whether the paper was accepted to a paper session or to an interactive session. Authors of accepted papers (whether part of a symposium or individually submitted) will be required to submit a full-length paper by October 1, 2011, and to register for the conference by November 1, 2011.

### **Conference Format**

The conference will begin with a welcome reception on the evening of December 20th. Papers will be assigned to various session formats based on common themes, scheduled on December 21-22, 2011. Each author in paper sessions will be given 15 minutes to present the paper. Then discussants will review the papers presented and offer integrative critique and suggestions, followed by questions from the audience and a general discussion. The conference will also



feature themed interactive sessions which will offer authors the opportunity to present their papers interactively and discuss them with the audience. Keynote addresses and special sessions will be noted in the conference program.

### **IOBC Best Paper Award**

Select papers will be nominated as finalists for the IOBC Best Paper Award. The finalists will be asked to submit a full paper for an additional blind-review process by a distinguished panel. The selected winner(s) of the IOBC Best Paper Award will receive a \$500 cash prize. The winning paper will be announced in the concluding session of IOBC.

### **Conference Location and Accommodation**

IOBC 2011 will be held at the Leon Recanati Graduate School of Business Administration at Tel-Aviv University, in Tel-Aviv, Israel. Conference hotels (TBD) will offer special rates to attendees.

Details regarding accommodations will be posted on the conference website soon.

### **A Holiday & Family Friendly Conference!**

The timing between the Christmas holiday and New Year, combined with Israel's mild weather and fabulous tourist attractions, is perfect for bringing your family to Israel. To make the conference more enjoyable to all involved, IOBC will offer excursions to family members during the conference. These excursions will be offered at net cost and require advance registration.

### **Conference Registration & Fees**

Registration will open in July, 2011. Early registration is advised! Early registration fee will be available till November 1, 2011. Late registration fee will apply after November 1, 2011 and on-site. Attendees are nevertheless advised to register online by November 1. Students must present valid student ID upon admission to the conference. Additional fees apply for those registering to the social events and family trips. Please visit the IOBC website to register: <http://www.recanati.tau.ac.il/ENG/conferences/IOBC>. Payment instructions will be posted on this website.

The conference registration fees:

Early registration fee: \$150

Early registration fee for students: \$100

Late registration fee: \$200

Late registration fee for students: \$150

### **Conference co-organizers**

Peter Bamberger, Tel Aviv University

Hilla Dotan, Tel Aviv University

Dov Eden, Tel Aviv University

Miriam Erez, Technion-Israel Institute of Technology

Avraham Kluger, Hebrew University  
Mina Westman, Tel Aviv University

### **Advisory committee**

Bruce Avolio, University of Washington  
Samuel Bacharach, Cornell University  
Julian Barling, Queen's University  
Sigal Barsade, University of Pennsylvania  
Gilad Chen, University of Maryland  
Cary Cooper, Lancaster University  
Michael Frese, *National University of Singapore*  
Yitzhak Fried, Syracuse University  
John Hollenbeck, Michigan State University  
Kenneth Law, Chinese University of Hong Kong  
David Lewin, UCLA  
Elizabeth Morrison, New York University  
Daan van Knippenberg, Erasmus University

For additional information and to register to the conference, visit the IOBC website at:  
<http://www.recanati.tau.ac.il/ENG/conferences/IOBC>

**We look forward to seeing you in Tel-Aviv, Israel in December 2011!**

**Thank you to Our Sponsors:**



**אוניברסיטת תל אביב**  
**TAU Recanati**

הפקולטה לניהול בית הספר למוסמכים במנהל עסקים ע"ש ליאון רקנאטי



## 2bii. Policy on Division Sponsorships

### External Relations Policies for Divisions

*Policies pertaining to agreements between the Academy of Management and other organizations, excerpted from the AOM External Relations Policy*

Officers of the professional divisions of the Academy of Management often initiate or receive proposals to form relationships with other organizations, including vendors, publishers, and other associations. Such proposals have included endowments for awards, sponsorships for professional development activities, discounts for journal subscriptions, access to membership data, publishing partnerships, and web site links. Most of these proposals involve the use of the Academy's name and reputation, and many have significant legal and financial implications.

While these agreements grew out of entrepreneurial initiatives intended to benefit members of the division, they would or could have had unintended consequences.

Consequently, the Board developed an External Relations policy codifying the allowable content of agreements with other organizations, and setting up a process for approving these agreements. The policy draws a distinction between agreements that the officers of Divisions may enter into unilaterally, and other agreements that must be reviewed and approved by the Board of Governors.

**The policy for Divisions falls into three categories: agreements that do not require approval from the Board; agreements that do require approval from the Board; and agreements that are not allowed. This policy is excerpted from the AOM External Relations Policy dated August 3, 2007.**

#### **1. Agreements that DO NOT require approval from the Board of Governors**

Divisions or Interest Groups, may: <sup>1</sup>

- Make known to AOM members special discounts for subscriptions to non-Academy journals, or discounted memberships in other professional associations. However, these agreements must not include reciprocal discounts for AOM subscriptions or membership.
- Solicit or accept money or other goods and services in support of activities sponsored by the Academy or its divisions or interest groups. <sup>2</sup>
- Undertake one-time co-sponsorship of a professional development activity.
- Include informational links to outside groups via AOM or division or interest group web sites or newsletters. However, these informational links must not imply endorsement of any external group, including political causes or social initiatives. In establishing these linkages, consideration should be given to the informational needs of our members.

#### **2. Agreements that DO require approval from the Board of Governors**

Divisions and interest groups must receive Board approval for:

- Any written contractual agreement
- Any relationship with a journal that is not expressly precluded in section #3
- Regularly scheduled professional development activities that occur more than one time
- Sale, release, or use of AOM members' names, addresses, or email addresses
- Written use of the name "Academy of Management," or reproduction of the AOM logo, except for one-time usage associated with activities identified in Section 1
- Exclusive relationships

- Reprint, distribution, or production rights for any copyrighted material, or other byproducts of Academy events or publications

### 3. **Agreements that are NOT allowed**

Divisions and interest groups MAY NOT enter into agreements that:

- Involve governmental lobbying
- Assume legal, administrative or financial responsibility for other groups
- Seek to establish AOM Interest Groups based on constituencies of people (e.g. practitioners ) and in conjunction with outside groups. Interest groups are reserved for emerging bodies of scholarship initiated solely by AOM members
- **Sponsor or endorse third party journals.**<sup>3</sup> Divisions and interest groups, committees, and activity areas, as legal and financial entities of the Academy of Management, **may not** sponsor or endorse third party journals. This precludes but is not limited to:
  - use by the journal of the division's or the Academy's name/logo
  - promoting false or implied partnership or ownership interest in the journal
  - providing privileged access to papers presented at Academy meetings or other Academy-owned material/products
  - the assumption of legal, financial, or other liabilities for the Academy
  - assuming administrative work on behalf of the publisher, such as collecting the publisher's subscription fees
  - merging functions between the publisher and the Academy, such as including the cost of the third-party journal in Academy dues
  - mandating by vote, poll, or decree that all division members, or other Academy membership groups, automatically receive the journal or permit the publisher to automatically bill members
  - sale, release, or use of AOM members' names, addresses, or email addresses.

This policy with regard to journals does not apply to traditional award or event sponsorships by publishers.

### 4. **Guidelines to be used by the Board of Governors in evaluating all requests for agreements with external organizations.**

*Purpose and Motivation:*

- What is the purpose of the proposed relationship? Why and for whom is this important?
- Does this relationship further the Academy's mission, or advance its core values in a meaningful way?
- Is this relationship consistent with our current strategic priorities and activities, especially those pertaining to our professional journals and annual conference?
- Are we improving the Academy as an organization by entering into this relationship?
- Is this something that the "Academy" (e.g., Executive Committee members, Division or Interest Group Executive Committee members, Board of Governors Committee members) is committed to sustaining?
- Are there measures for determining that the purpose of the agreement is achieved?
- Does the relationship provide the opportunity for the partners to realize equal value or benefit?

*The External Organization ("Partner"):*

- What is the quality of the partner's reputation?
- Is this the best option for this activity within the set of alternative partners?
- Does the partner have a core competency that we cannot or wish not to develop?

- Are the image, activities, and values of the partner consistent with those of the Academy?

*The Agreement:*

- If this relationship is intended to generate revenue, are the parameters, responsibilities, and expectations clearly specified?
- What are the implications for the value of our name?<sup>4</sup>
- Have any risks (financial or legal) been clearly specified and accurately assessed?
- What benefits or considerations will the partners provide each other?
- Have all potential conflicts of interest involving representatives of all parties to the agreement been disclosed?
- Is the benefit to the Academy as a whole spelled out?
- Is the duration of the agreement, as well as the conditions for terminating the agreement clearly specified?<sup>5</sup>
- It does not give exclusive or special rights to publish or distribute Academy “intellectual property,” such as papers and presentations listed in our annual conference program.
- Does this activity conflict with our status as a 501C3 corporation, which prohibits us from active involvement in unrelated business activities?<sup>6</sup>
- Does the activity involve divisions placing paid advertisements from outside groups in their newsletter, on their web page, etc. (We are seeking legal counsel on this matter, but at this time we cannot authorize this practice because unregulated advertisement could jeopardize our 501C3 status.)

End notes

<sup>1</sup> Although the Board does not believe it is our prerogative or responsibility to delineate the necessary division-level processes for regulating these external relationships, we recommend that at a minimum division or interest group executive committees retain approval authority for entering into agreements outlined in Section 1. (The magnitude or scope of some agreements may warrant a vote of the division members at a business meeting.) We further recommend that divisions and interest groups use the guidelines in Section 4 for evaluating all proposals.

<sup>2</sup> For information regarding the purposes and activities that can be supported by outside contributions, see the “Frequently Asked Questions About Division Finances” document, available from the Academy business office.

<sup>3</sup> In the interest of clarity, Divisions are precluded from creating or publishing anything that looks like a Journal. This policy is stated in the 1992 AOM Handbook, and remains in effect today. This prohibition covers journals done independently by the division or with a third party in any form.

<sup>4</sup> This is a particularly important consideration. The Academy of Management name is our most important asset. As such, it must remain intrinsically valuable and unique. Therefore, the use of the Academy's name by others must enhance our reputation, and provide valuable benefit to our members.

<sup>5</sup> There can be no perpetual agreements. Beginning and ending dates must be defined. Terms of renewal should be specified. Also, all agreements must allow for the Academy of Management to terminate the agreement with no more than 90 days notice.

<sup>6</sup> For example, a division can legitimately acknowledge an outside group's contribution to, or sponsorship of, a division activity or award. However, if an outside journal offered to give a division a payment for every member that subscribes to the journal, then it might appear to an auditor that we are actively generating income from an activity unrelated to our charter. Similarly, the IRS Code prohibits lobbying by 501C3 organizations.

**2c. OB Web Update**  
**Richard Landers**

Total usage:

- 9000 total visitors in the previous six months – about 7500 of these are unique, though tracking this is not perfect – all statistics presented below are based on this six-month metric
- On average, visitors view 2.13 pages per visit
- 65% bounce rate (percentage users that view a single page only)
- Typically about 30 people per day with spikes to specific articles
- Average tech-savvy audience, maybe slightly below average – 47% IE, 31% Firefox, 12% Chrome, 8% Safari, 1% Opera (world averages: 44% IE, 30% FF, 12% Chrome, 6% Safari, 2% Opera)
- Top Country: United States (46% - 4200) so 54% come internationally
  - India 900
  - Canada 430
  - UK 311
  - Australia 243
  - Germany 221
  - Pakistan 170
  - 137 countries are represented

Traffic:

- Searches
  - Google searches (45%)
  - Direct (22% - mostly e-mail links)
  - Univ of Washington Business School Blackboard site (4% - 383)
  - AOMOnline (9%)
  - Merlot.org (3%) – Multimedia Educational Resource for Learning and Online Teaching
  - variety of search engines after that
- Biggest Days
  - Dec 2 (450), 2011 call for reviewers
  - Sep 24 (323), AOM 2010 followup (Terry Mitchell Lifetime Achievement, Awards presentation, and photos)
  - Oct 12/13 (500, about 250 per day) New awards announcements

Most popular webpages:

- Root page (<http://obweb.org>) is by far most popular (6000 visitors)
- Podcast list (1700)
  - Employee Silence on Critical Work Issues: Interview with Subra Tangirala (2000)
  - Early Warning Signs of Burnout: Interview with Christina Maslach (1900)

- Task Significance: Interview with Adam Grant (600)
- About the OB Division – this page contains mission statement, domain statement, directory of academic journals in OB (1000)
- How to subscribe to the listserv (650)
- 2011 call for reviewers (550)

General conclusions:

- Multimedia content is very popular – both listserv and podcast make top content
- Substantial portion of userbase is visiting the website and seeks more information, but there is little for them – impossible to know what they’re looking for though
- International audience is larger than domestic – don’t know if we should target them though we could
- Several landing pages have been identified – if we want to get information across about “who we are” or “what ob is,” we have places to do that

**3a. PDW Report  
Suzanne Masterson**

**Lead Sponsorship Summary:** 24 submissions total

<b>Title</b>	<b>Organizer</b>	<b>Hours</b>	<b>Issues</b>
From Associate to Full ... And Beyond	Porter/Bolino (SAC)	2	
Halfway There, But Now What?	Zapata/Wellman (SAC)	4	FOOD!
OB Teaching Incubator	Litchfield/Johnson/ Leigh (SAC/MCC)	2	FOOD!
OB New Member Networking and Research Forum	Sluss/Nahrgang (MCC)	2	FOOD!
Understanding Scholarly Impact: What is a Scholarly Home Run and How Do I Hit One?	DeRue/Myers (SAC/MCC)	2	
Help, I'm Stuck: OB Research Incubator	Piccolo/Dragoni (SAC)	2.5	FOOD!
OB Doctoral Consortium	Parker/Bono	13	FOOD! Flipcharts
OB Junior Faculty Consortium	Grant/Williams	13	FOOD! (Need info for entry)
OB/HR Member Welcome Reception	Kraimer/Erskine	2	FOOD!
Conventional, Robotic, and e-Leadership	Sarwar	4	Food?
The Productivity Process: Research Tips and Strategies from Prolific Junior Faculty	Bergeron/Shipp (SAC starting 2012?)	4	Beverages/ flipcharts?
Creativity Research Beyond Boundaries: Multi- and Interdisciplinary Approaches	Arndt/Carl	3	Flipcharts?
Shaping Caring Cultures and Strategies in Organizations	Kawamura and others	4	Food/ Flipcharts?



Title	Organizer	Hours	Issues
Researching and Teaching a Second Life: A Tutorial on Virtual Worlds	Landers	2	Internet access?
Motivational Scholarship: Enlightening, Balanced, and Transcending Traditional Approaches	Provitera	2	
Research in the Wild: Making the Most of Academic/Practitioner Collaborations	Dekas/Kurkoski	2	
Dilemmas of Learning in Organizations: A Research Incubator to Explore Negative Effects of Learning	Katz-Navon/Naveh	3	
A Practical Guide to Causal Mapping	Billsberry/Talbot	2	
Enlightening Scholars to Advance Leadership Research: A Mentoring Session	Dasborough	2	
Action Research and Professional Development	Lodwich/Kaye	2	
Leadership Development Challenges and Best Practices: A Scientist-Practitioner Forum	Chrobot-Mason and others	2.5	
The 19 <sup>th</sup> Annual Craft of Reviewing Workshop	Gower/Watters	2	
Bridging the Divide: Doing Research that Impacts Practice and Building Effective Partnerships	Tesluk/Green	4	

\*OB Teaching Incubator and New Member PDW are designed to be integrated such that one flows into the next.

**Total Hours Submitted: 82**

**Total Hours Allocated: 91**

**Total Hours Charged: TBD**

**Co-sponsorship Summary:**

**Total Cosponsorships Allotted: 54**

**Total Cosponsorships Requested: 52**

**Total Cosponsorships Charged: TBD (I can't accept them until the primary division accepts)**

- a. Under the co-sponsorship system, each division receives a list of sessions that have listed that division as a potential cosponsor
- b. Each co-sponsorship that is accepted costs one credit; OB was allocated 54 credits.
- c. Acceptance criteria will follow last year's guidelines including where OB fell in the potential cosponsor rankings and how broad the appeal was.

**Discussion Points**

1. PDW Deadline same as all others this year. We have until 2-11 to get the program done and work out details.
2. Room for a few more PDW submissions if allocation stays this high, but pretty close.
3. SAC and MCC continue to submit superb PDWs.
4. There are a few non-OB division submitted PDWs that would like to pay for food and/or special requests (flipcharts) themselves; can we coordinate that?
5. A few others have requested internet access and flipcharts (haven't contacted them about payment); will we cover this?
6. There are likely to be coordination issues once acceptances are made, given high number of individuals appearing in multiple PDWs; sponsors should be prepared for a flurry of emails on this in late February/early March.

**3b. Award Committees**  
**Amy Wrzesniewski**

Best Paper:

Stacy Blake Beard  
Melissa Cardon  
Christian Kiewitz  
John Bingham  
Greg Northcraft  
Heidi Gardner  
Joan Brett  
Lisa Lambert

Most Innovative Student Paper (new Sage award):

Glen Kreiner  
Sigal Barsade  
Sherry Thatcher  
Dan Cable  
Dave Mayer  
Shelley Brickson

Best Paper w/International Implications:

Anneloes Raes  
Linzi Kemp  
Ravi Singh Bangari  
Joel Evans  
Paula O'Kane

Best Dissertation-Based Paper:

Jone Pearce  
Herminia Ibarra (pending confirm)  
Jennifer George  
Mark Fichman  
Adam Galinsky  
Fred Morgeson

Outstanding Practical Implications for Management:

David Turnipseed (hasn't written me back to confirm)  
Liuba Belkin  
Lakshmi Ramarajan  
Nelson Ramalho  
Gregory Park

Making Connections Award:

Amy Colbert  
Kelly See (pending confirm)

Michael Cole  
Bob Giambatista  
Yuval Kalish  
Spela Trefalt (pending confirm)

LAA:

Janet Dukerich, chair  
Jeff Polzer  
Tom Bateman  
Sue Ashford  
Jenny Chatman

Cummings:

Elizabeth George, chair  
Deb Shapiro  
Stuart Bunderson  
Fred Luthans  
Maria Kraimer (last year's winner)

OPOB:

Cristina Gibson  
Laurie Milton  
Luis Martins  
Bennett Tepper  
Erik Dane  
Ron Piccolo  
Cecily Cooper  
Babis Charalampos  
Riki Takeuchi  
Michael Gross  
Nancy Rothbard  
Brenda Ghitulescu (pending confirmation – someone else just pulled out)

OPOP:

Michael Gross  
Cam Caldwell  
Rocio Bonet  
Duane Hoover (I am awaiting confirmation on Hoover, Tierney and Baugh – people have said no to this committee to a shocking degree...)  
Pam Tierney  
Gayle Baugh

**3c. Program**  
**Cheri Ostroff and Paul Tesluk**

**I. Submissions**

- 849 papers (up 2% from last yr., compared with a 10% increase from 09 to 10)
- 136 symposia (down 10% from compared with a 41% increase from 09 to 10)
- Total submissions about same as last year

**II. Reviewers**

- 1378 total reviewers (up about 50 from last year)
- 1177 reviewers used (87%), as of 1/18
- Average number of assignments per reviewer = 2.5
- Too early to track how many declined, active, and complete
- 30% are new reviewers, similar to last year
- 38% are students, similar to last year
- 38% are non-US, similar to last year
- 70% also submitted, similar to last year

**III. Reviewer Matching Process**

- Almost all divisions used the matching algorithm this year
- After several iterations with glitches, BJ solved problem by dividing the submissions in half and running the program on each half. This worked extremely well. *Note* this requires a reviewer pool with several hundred more than we actually need.

**IV. Continued from Last Year (Cross-divisional and Discussion sessions new since 2010)**

Divisional Presentation Paper (DPP) Sessions

- Organized and scheduled by Program Chairs
- Recommended that 45% of accepted papers be assigned to these
- Divisional Roundtable Paper (DRP) Sessions
  - Organized and scheduled by Program Chairs
  - Recommended that 40% of accepted papers be assigned to these
- Cross-Divisional Roundtable Paper (CDRP) Sessions
  - Organized and scheduled by the CDRP Committee
  - Program Chairs identify up to 5% of accepted papers for these sessions
  - Program Chairs provide names of scholars who could be good facilitators
- Discussion Paper Sessions
  - Organized and scheduled by the Discussion Paper Committee
  - For papers that are weak, but promising and that might benefit from developmental feedback
  - Program chairs identify up to 10% of accepted papers for these sessions
  - Program chairs provide names of scholars who could serve as coaches

#### IV. Issues to Discuss/Note

- Dealing with the submission rate. Is our current approach to dealing with the Program Chair role sustainable? Do we want to consider using Associate Editors like some divisions? Does it make sense to divide the job between Program Chair and Program Chair Elect in the way that we do? Can we divide the Program Chair positions differently, e.g. having one person check in and accept papers, another person group into sessions and schedule?
- Submission rate -- for the past 5 years, we got an 8-10% increase in paper submissions each year and a small (2-5%) increase in symposia submissions each year. Last year, there was a similar increase for papers, but a huge increase (41%) in symposia.

This year, paper submissions increased very slightly (2%) and symposia submissions were down 10% from last year. Thus, we had almost an identical amount of total submissions from last year to this year, rather than increasing total submissions. Is this an academy-wide phenomenon due to either the venue or the fact that academy-wide acceptances were largely enforced at 50% or is this due to something about OB?

- 38% of reviewers are students. We sent multiple CC's, emails to editorial board members and past reviewers. Is there a way to increase the number of experienced/senior reviewers?
- Note: Last year, a concern was whether there was any hope of getting AOM to make the checking-in process easier on Program Chairs, (e.g. by having the format for symposia standardized). Much of this has been done.

**3d. OB Doctoral Consortium**  
**Sharon Parker & Joyce Bono**

1. We have 49 faculty lined up to participate in the OBDC this year (the proposed schedule is presented below). We continued with changes made last year that were successful (e.g., the Open Space session continues to be on day 2; the replacement of the editor panel with editors manning roundtables). Overall the feedback from last year was very positive, so much of the content is the same, with some overlapping faculty but also some new faculty. The ethics session has been confirmed.
2. We made a few adjustments, based on feedback from last year:
  - a. The panel discussion for teaching has been replaced with a round-table discussion. Thus, following the interactive exercise by Elaine (same as last year), instead of a panel discussion, faculty will host roundtables on particular teaching topics that students will be allocated to. The topics will be a combination of issues raised in the panel discussion and faculty's suggested topics. Illustrative topics include... Students will be asked to indicate their preference for topics and an attempt will be made to match them to topics. To ensure maximum sharing, we will ask each roundtable to summarise 2-3 tips to the broad group.
  - b. Based on feedback from the Open Space section, we will rotate students approximately half way into the session (last year, the students stayed with one table, but feedback indicated that they would have preferred to rotate). We have also increased the representation of international faculty for the Open Space session because last year there were many international students wanting to discuss issues such as post-doctoral options but relatively few faculty able to speak to this.
  - c. For the 'job crafting' session, and for the research session, we will have two faculty presenters instead of one. Faculty will focus on somewhat different elements and are in contact with each other to avoid overlap. We opted for two presenters instead of one to provide more than one perspective
  - d. An issue arose last year in which a couple of students made derogatory comments about students from some of the top tier institutions (from memory, along the lines that these students shouldn't take up the space in the consortium as they already have all the advantages). The students from the latter were upset and one left half way through. At the same time, an international student asked at the end of the session what "on the job market" meant. Thus it is clear that there is quite a lot of diversity in the room. We intend to raise the fact that there is diversity explicitly – like indeed the Academy more broadly - and ask students to be respectful of students coming from many different backgrounds, with different experiences etc, and to be open to learning from each other, etc.
3. An aspect of which we are uncertain is whether JOB will once again be sponsoring the OB Doctoral Consortium and therefore whether the Editor of JOB will be doing a presentation. In 2010, Neil Ashkanazy presented a talk on 'Impact' of research, which was reasonably well received. The overall format worked well. **Can the team advise who to contact regarding JOB sponsorship, or is this someone else's remit?**
4. Our next step is to put out the call for nominations. We will continue to use the application/ nomination form from last year with some minor amendments (the 2010 form is

attached). The goal of the form was to reduce gaming and increase fairness of the selection process, which appears to have been largely met.

- a. Form completed by advisor (see below): On the market, working on dissertation (proposal defended), but final dissertation not yet defended (information confirmed through series of question on nomination form). Designed to be appropriate for and clear to both US and international students.
- b. From nominee: one page bio/CV and one page dissertation summary (title and abstract is fine)
- c. Limit of 2 students per program maximum (4 per university)
- d. Goal is to have 60 or less students; prefer to keep around 50
- e. Will follow last year's call in terms of mentioning "halfway there" and "new doctoral student" consortiums as alternatives for students who are NOT at this stage in the program

**For discussion:** An outstanding issue concerns complaints from some faculty whose students missed out for the second year in a row because they haven't yet defended nor collected data because of the schools' timing on these aspects but they do nevertheless go on to complete on time.

3. AoM issues:

- a. Will need 8 flipcharts on Saturday from 2:30-4:00
- b. Will need at least 10 roundtables in the room; would be nice to have 11 or 12, so can have a dedicated table or two for materials, name tents, etc.
- c. I'll plan to bring my laptop for presentations
- d. Food needs:
  1. Heavy hors d'oeuvres and beverages for Friday evening (4-7 pm).
  2. Would like both warm appetizers and cold appetizers. Last year, was mostly warm appetizers, and they went fast. Having cold appetizers (like chips/pretzels, cheese/crackers, fruit/veggies) might stretch out the warm appetizers, perhaps be cheaper than warm, and be filling.
  3. Soda and wine/beer?
    - ii. Continental breakfast for Saturday morning (8-8:30 am)
    - iii. Coffee break for Saturday morning (10-10:15 am)
    - iv. Lunch buffet for Saturday (11:45 am-1 pm)
    - v. Soda/cookie break for Saturday afternoon (3:45-5 pm)
- e. Drink tickets
  - i. 2 each for student participants (~120 max)
  - ii. At least 1 each for faculty participants (~50) – would be nice to have 2 for each, if possible
- f. OB Chocolates for the tables

3. JOB/Wiley Sponsorship

- i. In past few years, JOB has given participants thumb drives. If this is the plan again for this year, like last year, we will get them in
- ii. advance and load participant bios and other information on them.



ORGANIZATIONAL BEHAVIOR DOCTORAL CONSORTIUM  
2011 Academy of Management Meetings in San Antonio, Texas  
August 12-13

Coordinators

Sharon K. Parker, The Business School, University of Western Australia ([sparker@biz.uwa.edu.au](mailto:sparker@biz.uwa.edu.au))  
Joyce Bono, University of Minnesota ([jbono@umn.edu](mailto:jbono@umn.edu))

Friday, August 12, 4:00 p.m.-7:00 p.m. **VENUEXXXX**

Ice breaker/Introductions (4:00-5:30 p.m.)

Interactive/Experiential Teaching Session (5:30-7:00 p.m.)

Elaine Hollensbe, U. of Cincinnati (lead speaker)  
Tim Baldwin, Indiana U.  
Deanne Den Hartog, Amsterdam Business School  
Brad Kirkman, Texas A&M U.  
Ana Leonard, U. of Cincinnati  
Mara Olekalns, Melbourne Business School  
Ron Piccolo, Rollins MBA Crummer Graduate School  
Mathew Sheep, Illinois State U.  
Michael Wesson, Texas A&M U.

Saturday, August 13, 8:00 a.m.-5:30 p.m. **Venue XXXXX**

Continental Breakfast (8:00-8:30 a.m.)

Session I: Research and Publishing (8:30-10:00 a.m.)

Talya Bauer, Portland State U., *Journal of Management* (lead speaker)  
Jason Colquitt, U. of Florida, *Academy of Management Journal* (lead speaker)  
Paul Adler, U of Southern California, *Organization Science*  
Samuel Aryee, Aston Business School, *Human Relations*  
Gilad Chen, U. of Maryland, *Journal of Applied Psychology*  
Xiao-Ping Chen, U. of Washington, *Organizational Behavior & Human Decision Processes*  
Jose Cortina, George Mason U., *Organizational Research Methods*  
Mark Martinko, Florida State U., *Journal of Organizational Behavior*  
Fred Morgeson, Michigan State U., *Personnel Psychology*  
Roy Suddaby, U. of Alberta, *Academy of Management Review*

Break (10:00-10:15 a.m.)

Session 2: Crafting the Right Academic Job: from Job Search to Transition (10:15-11:45 a.m.)

Murray Barrick, Texas A&M U., (lead speaker)  
Amy Colbert, U. of Iowa (lead speaker)  
Don Ferrin, Singapore Management U.  
Cristina Gibson, U. of Western Australia  
Cynthia Lee, Northeastern U/ Hong Kong Polytechnic University  
Lynn Shore, San Diego State U.  
Susan Taylor, U. of Maryland  
Bennett Tepper, Georgia State U.

Lois Tetrick, George Mason U.  
Mary Uhl-Bien, U. of Nebraska

**Lunch and Interactive Research Discussion among Attendees (11:45 a.m.-1:00 p.m.)**

(need to clarify whether JOB is sponsoring and if so whether Editor is speaking)

**Session 3: Work-Life Balance (1:00-2:30 p.m.)**

Kenneth Brown, U. of Iowa (lead speaker)  
Amy Kristof-Brown, U. of Iowa (lead speaker)  
Scott de Rue, U. of Michigan  
Brian Dineen, U. of Kentucky  
Gail Fairhurst, U. of Cincinnati  
Lucy Gilson, U. of Connecticut  
Ellen Kossek, Michigan State U.  
Jayanth Narayanan, National U. of Singapore  
Christina Shalley, Georgia Institute of Technology  
Steffanie Wilk, Ohio State U.

**Open Space Session (2:30-3:45 p.m.)**

Tammy Allen, U. of South Florida  
Jackie Coyle-Shapiro, London School of Economics  
Michael Frese, National U. of Singapore.  
Karen Jansen, U. of Virginia  
Jim Jawahar, Illinois State U.  
Carol Kulik, U. of South Australia  
Todd Maurer, Georgia State U.  
Christopher Porter, Texas A&M U.  
Sabine Sonnetag, U. of Konstanz  
Amanuel Tekleab, Wayne State U.  
Elizabeth Umphress, Texas A&M U.

**Break (3:45-4:00 p.m.)**

**Ethics Workshop by AoM (4:00-5:00 p.m.)**

James Davis, Notre Dame U.  
Susan Madsen, Utah Valley U.

**Concluding Comments/Evaluations (5:00-5:30 p.m.)**

Carrie Leana, U. of Pittsburgh, OB Division Chair  
Elizabeth W. Morrison, New York University, OB Division Incoming Chair

Saturday, August 13, 5:30 p.m.-7:00 p.m. Joint HR/OB Welcome reception

## **AoM ORGANIZATIONAL BEHAVIOR DOCTORAL CONSORTIUM**

**AUGUST 12-13, 2011**

The 2011 OB Doctoral Consortium will be held on August 12 and 13 as part of pre-conference program at the Academy of Management meeting in San Antonio.

The consortium includes an interesting and energetic mix of presentations, discussions, and interactive sessions designed to launch doctoral students into their academic careers. The consortium will begin on Friday afternoon, and will continue throughout the day on Saturday. The program will include faculty presentations and roundtable sessions on topics such as crafting the right academic job, succeeding at research and publishing, preparing for effective teaching, and managing work-life balance, as well as an interactive session based on participants' interests.

We encourage advisors to nominate students for the consortium. To keep the faculty-participant ratio to an optimal size, the number of participants will be limited. This has been a popular program, so apply early!

**The deadline for receipt of nominations and supporting materials is May 21, 2011.**

To apply, interested students must be nominated by their schools. No university can nominate more than four students, and each doctoral program within a university is limited to two nominations (e.g., two from the business school and two from the I/O program). Universities with multiple departments seeking to send students should coordinate their nominations. Please use the provided nomination form (see following two pages).

***In making the decision to accept students, preference is given to those who have made the most progress toward completing their Ph.D. program but have not yet defended their dissertation.*** Schools are therefore encouraged to nominate students in their final year of studies who are working on their dissertation research and entering the job market (e.g., in the US, students would typically be in their fourth or fifth year having defended their dissertation proposal; International students would be writing up their findings and defending their thesis in the near future). There is an Academy-sponsored, all-day doctoral consortium for new students (the New Doctoral Student Consortium) as well as a new 4-hour "halfway there" doctoral consortium sponsored by the OB Division for students at earlier stages in their programs. Please note that the consortium is not open to those who have already completed their Ph.D. degree. New faculty will find the Junior Faculty Consortium more appropriate for their interests.

The consortium begins on Friday, August 12<sup>th</sup> at 4:00 p.m. and will continue with a full day (8:00 a.m.-5:00 p.m.) on Saturday, August 13<sup>th</sup>. Participants are expected to attend all of the consortium sessions.

The Organizational Behavior Doctoral Consortium (OBDC) is designed for students who are in the final year of their doctoral program (i.e., students who are currently on the job market and who have made significant progress on their dissertation/thesis research). We strongly encourage students who are at an earlier stage in their doctoral studies to consider the New Doctoral Student Consortium (for students just beginning or completing their first year) or the Organizational Behavior Division's "Halfway There" Doctoral Consortium (for students completing coursework and just starting their dissertation/thesis research). Priority for OBDC will be given to students who have made the most progress toward completing their Ph.D. program but have not yet defended their dissertation.

### Nominee Information

**Student Name:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Email:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Telephone:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Address:** \_\_\_\_\_

**University/Program:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Dissertation Title:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Dissertation Chair:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Nomination Procedure:** A completed nomination will include three documents:

1. The completed, two page nomination form.
2. The nominee's one page CV/bio.
3. The nominee's one page dissertation summary (title and abstract is fine).

The completed nomination should be submitted by the nominating department/school, **via email**, to:  
**Sharon K. Parker, sharon.parker@uwa.edu.au**

Application deadline: **Friday, May 21, 2011**

*This page must be completed by the student's advisor or program chair.*

**Student name:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Please report on the student's progress:**

Completed coursework?

No \_\_\_\_\_ Yes \_\_\_\_\_ NA \_\_\_\_\_ Date (if yes) \_\_\_\_\_

Passed comprehensive exam?

No \_\_\_\_\_ Yes \_\_\_\_\_ NA \_\_\_\_\_ Date (if yes) \_\_\_\_\_

Defended dissertation/thesis proposal?

No \_\_\_\_\_ Yes \_\_\_\_\_ NA \_\_\_\_\_ Date (if yes) \_\_\_\_\_

Collected dissertation/thesis data?

No \_\_\_\_\_ Yes \_\_\_\_\_ Date (if yes) \_\_\_\_\_

On the job market this year (2011-12, seeking job starting in 2012)?

No \_\_\_\_\_ Yes \_\_\_\_\_

Likely date for final dissertation defense? \_\_\_\_\_

**Please provide a short paragraph in support of this student's nomination for the OBDC:**

**Nominator Name:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Email:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Phone:** \_\_\_\_\_

**3e. Junior Faculty Workshop**  
**Adam Grant and Michele Williams**

The Junior Faculty Workshop is scheduled to take place on Friday evening August 5<sup>th</sup> (5pm to 9:30pm) and Saturday, August 6<sup>th</sup> (8am to 5pm) followed by the joint HR/OB reception from 5:30-7pm. A draft of the schedule is included below with a list of Faculty Fellows. Please understand that this schedule is a draft and the timing of the events may be modified slightly between now and the actual workshop.

The participants' time commitment for the workshop begins Friday evening around 5pm and ends Saturday around 5pm. The Faculty Fellows' time commitment for the workshop begins Friday evening around 6pm and ends around 2:10pm on Saturday (they do not need to attend the editor session or the network/feedback session on Saturday).

As you'll see, the schedule closely aligns with last year's plan because it worked so well in 2010. The most significant changes are (1) eliminating formal presentations in favor of a panel format and (2) expanding time for round table discussions with the Faculty Fellows and editors.

Participant Networking. The JFW will begin with an icebreaker on Friday evening from 5-6pm for the participants only. Additional time for networking is also scheduled at the end of the day on Saturday from 4-5pm.

Welcome Reception/Introductions. The Faculty Fellows will join the participants on Friday around 6pm for a reception and introductions. Carrie and Elizabeth will join us at this time as well, and the dinner/workshop will follow.

Faculty Panel. Last year, participants expressed an interest in more informal discussions with the Faculty Fellows, and in expanding the amount of time available for Faculty Fellows to discuss, debate, and integrate different perspectives on research, teaching and mentoring, and tenure. As such, we are eliminating the formal presentations in favor of a panel format. The three panels will cover the same topics as last year: Conducting High Impact Research, Having Impact as a Teacher and Mentor, and Surviving the Tenure Process and Work-Life Balance. We will collect questions from participants in advance, and we may also consider an "interview" format in which Faculty Fellows ask each other questions.

Editor Round Tables. We have lined up associate editors from *AMJ*, *AMR*, *ASQ*, *JAP*, *JOB*, *OBHDP*, and *Organization Science* to host round table discussions. Over a 90-minute period, participants will have the chance to meet with an editor from three different journals.

Total Number of Participants, Cost, and Selection criteria. We will seek 38 participants at \$150 each. The workshop fee was \$150 in 2010, \$75 in 2009 and \$150 in 2008. Enrollment was 38 in 2010 and 2009, and 35 in 2008. The selection criteria have been discussed over the years. The target audience is participants with at least one year of experience as assistant professors and a maximum of five years out, aiming for a mix of domestic and international scholars.

**DRAFT**  
**Junior Faculty Workshop 2011**  
**Academy of Management, San Antonio**  
**August 5-6**

**Organizers:**

Adam Grant, University of Pennsylvania, grantad@wharton.upenn.edu  
Michele Williams, Cornell University, mwilliams@cornell.edu

**Faculty Fellows:**

Deborah Ancona, Massachusetts Institute of Technology  
Sigal Barsade, University of Pennsylvania  
Kim Elsbach, University of California-Davis  
Michele Gelfand, University of Maryland  
Cristina Gibson, University of Western Australia  
Avi Kluger, Hebrew University  
Keith Murnighan, Northwestern University  
Sim Sitkin, Duke University  
Barry Staw, University of California-Berkeley  
David Thomas, Harvard Business School

**Friday, August 5, 5:00-9:30pm (Room details)**

- 5:00-6:30pm      *Welcome, Introductions, Icebreaker*
- Participants arrive at 5pm, participate in an icebreaker until 6pm, and then join the reception/introductions.
  - Faculty Fellows arrive at 6pm for a reception and introductions.
- 6:30-7:30pm      *Dinner*
- 7:30-9:30pm      *Conducting High Impact Research*
- Panel Q&A with 4 Faculty Fellows (7:30-8:45pm)
- Round Table Discussions (8:45-9:30pm)

**Saturday, August 6, 8:00am-5:00pm (Room details)**

- 8:00-8:30am      *Breakfast*
- 8:30-9:30am      *Research Group Discussion I*

*OB Division Mid-Year Meeting  
January 21-23 2011*

- 9:30-10:45am      *Having Impact as a Teacher and Mentor*
- Panel Q&A with 3 Faculty Fellows (9:30-10:15am)
- Round Table Discussions (10:15-10:45am)
- 10:45-11:00am      *Break*
- 11:00am-12pm      *Research Group Discussion II*
- 12:00-12:45pm      *Lunch*
- 12:45-2:10pm      *Surviving the Tenure Process and Work-Life Balance*
- Panel Q&A with 3 Faculty Fellows (12:45-1:30pm)
- Round Table Discussions (1:30-2:10pm)
- 2:10-2:30pm      *Break*
- 2:30-4:00pm      *Editor Roundtables*
- Rotations at 3pm and 3:30pm
- 4:00- 5:00pm      *Networking and Feedback*
- 5:30-7:00pm      *Evening Reception for OB and HR Doctoral and Junior Faculty Consortia*



<p style="text-align: center;"><b>3f. Scientific Affairs (SAC) and Making Connections (MCC) Committees</b> <b>David Mayer and Scott DeRue</b></p>
---

Following last year's combined SAC-MCC effort, we have continued to collaborate on committee planning and activities. This collaboration has worked effectively and offered committee members a more diverse set of opportunities to contribute to the OB Division and AOM. For AOM 2011, we have collaboratively organized the following five PDWs and other events (the official proposals submitted to AOM are attached):

Professional Development Workshops (PDWs)

- **Halfway There PDW:** Cindy Zapata, Ned Wellman
- **Help I'm Stuck PDW:** Lisa Dragoni, Ron Piccolo
- **Moving From Associate to Full...and Beyond PDW:** Christopher Porter, Mark Bolino, Mel Fugate
- **New Member Networking Forum:** David Sluss, Jennifer Nahrgang
- **Understanding Scholarly Impact:** Scott DeRue, Chris Myers

Related Events

- **Junior Faculty Informal Dinner:** Jennifer Nahrgang

Collectively, these PDWs and related events will help serve a diverse set of our division's membership, including new members, graduate students that "fall" between the new PhD student and doctoral student consortia, mid-career scholars that fall outside the junior faculty consortium, and both teaching-focused and research-focused members. Thus, we hope that this set of PDWs can help our members to make connections in new and exciting ways.

Beyond 2011, we have started planning for the future. Here are two specific examples:

In 2012, we will expand the junior faculty informal dinner to a "more junior" cohort. Currently, this event draws scholars who graduated between (approx) 2004-2008. We have begun recruiting for someone to plan and launch a "junior faculty" informal dinner for people who graduated more recently. We will launch this event next year. It will become the junior faculty informal dinner, and the current dinner event will become the "less junior" informal dinner. Our goal is to arrange these informal dinners in 3-4 year cohorts, and make each an annual tradition at AOM.

In addition, we have started planning the following PDW on "micro-communities in OB" for AOM 2012. We had originally planned to launch this PDW in 2011, but the key stakeholders from existing micro-communities were either not attending AOM or unavailable. We have secured their participation for 2012, and will launch this PDW then.

- **Organizing Micro-Communities in the OB Division:** Maia Young, Rosalind Chow, Dave Mayer, Scott DeRue (re-scheduled for 2012 AOM conference)

**3g. Catering Report**  
**Laura Erskine**

The catering activities for the OB Division at the 2011 AOM conference will be taking place beginning on Friday, August 12 and ending on Tuesday, August 16. Based upon the 2010 Conference, the main events that involve catering and/or audio/visual needs include:

- Junior Faculty Workshop
- Doctoral Consortium
- Networking and Research Forum
- Halfway There But Now What
- OB/HR Joint Reception
- Network of Leadership Scholars
- OB Thank You Coffee
- OB Reception
- Lifetime Achievement Award
- Making Connections Coffee
- Any new events that are added in 2011

A draft plan of the events and related catering or audio/visual needs is included below based upon the 2010 Conference. I will work with the relevant people to modify the dates/times/catering needs of the events to fit the 2011 Conference schedule and budget.

Topics to discuss at the mid-year meeting include:

- Review last year's events and discuss what to keep/change/lose in terms of catering and audio/visual needs
- Should catering be an option for any PDW willing to purchase food?
- Chocolates and napkins (2008 ordered 1500 small and 240 large chocolates; 2009 ordered 2000 small chocolates; 2010 ordered 2000 small chocolates; decide if need them/as many; decide if need new packaging; should napkins be ordered again?)
- Drink tickets (traditionally for Doctoral Consortium participants and Junior Faculty Workshop Presenters; no drink tickets given in 2010 – publishing reps wanted them)
- OB Social (banner to travel again?)
- Obtain the names of the contact persons for Halfway There & Networking/Research Forum

OB Division Mid-Year Meeting  
January 21-23 2011

<b>Date/Time 2010</b>	<b>AV 2010</b>	<b>Title 2010</b>	<b>Catering 2010</b>
Fri. Aug. 6 5-9:30pm	Standard	Junior Faculty Workshop	Dinner
Sat. Aug. 7 8 a.m.	Standard	Junior Faculty Workshop	Breakfast
Sat. Aug. 7 10:45am	Standard	Junior Faculty Workshop	Break AM (coffee, juice, soft drinks)
Sat. Aug. 7 Noon	Standard	Junior Faculty Workshop	Lunch
Sat. Aug. 7 2:10pm	Standard	Junior Faculty Workshop	Break PM (coffee, soft drinks, cookies)
Fri. Aug. 6 4-7pm	Standard	Doctoral Consortium	Hor d'oeuvres, wine
Sat. Aug. 7 8am	10 Flip charts & markers on easels	Doctoral Consortium	Breakfast
Sat. Aug. 7 10am	Standard	Doctoral Consortium	Break AM (coffee)
Sat. Aug. 7 11:45am	Standard	Doctoral Consortium	Lunch
Sat. Aug. 7 2:30pm	Standard	Doctoral Consortium	Break PM (coffee, soft drinks, cookies)
Sat. Aug. 7 3:15-4:45pm	Standard	Networking & Research Forum	Coffee, juice, soft drinks, cookies
Sat. Aug. 7 9-1pm	Standard	Half-Way There	Boxed lunch, soft drinks
Sat. Aug. 7 5:30-6:30pm	1 wired handheld microphone	OB/HRM Joint Reception	Hor d'oeuvres; cash bar; Costs split with HR
Sun. Aug. 8 5-6pm	None	Network of Leadership Scholars	Hor d'oeuvres; cash bar
Mon. Aug. 9 10-11am	None	Thank you Coffee	Coffee, cookies, pastries
Mon. Aug. 9 6:30-8:30pm	1 wired handheld microphone; 1 XGA LCD projector, 1 7-8' screen; 1 projector stand with power cord VGA switcher	OB Reception	Hor d'oeuvres; cash bar; servers
Tues. Aug. 10 9-10am	Standard	Lifetime Achievement Award	No catering
Tues. Aug. 10 10:10-11:10am	None	Making Connections Coffee	Coffee, cookies, pastries