Occupational Stress & Health Psychology
Dr. Cong Liu
Spring 2025

Classroom: Smithers Hall 200
Class time: T 3:35-6:05
Office Hour: By Appointment
Email: cong.a.liu@rutgers.edu
Zoom meeting: https://rutgers.zoom.us/my/cl1723

Overview

Occupational health psychology (OHP) is an interdisciplinary field concerned with psychological factors in employee health, safety, and well-being. This course provides an in-depth treatment of this literature, focusing mainly on occupational health and stress. Students will read and discuss chosen readings each week.

Seminar Objectives

This is a Doctoral-level course. It will be taught in a seminar format. You carry a major responsibility for the course's conduct. The class will focus on the understanding of complex materials, communication of ideas, critical review of others' work, and integration of ideas and approaches. Most of the time, you will be asked to prepare and present summaries and critical reviews of others' professional writings. You will do this orally in class, through assigned papers, and by reviewing and discussing others' oral presentations. While one individual will have responsibility for an oral presentation in class, all students (and I) must be prepared by having read the assigned readings and, thus, be prepared to comment on and discuss the materials. You must be prepared for every class.

This seminar covers current topics associated with Occupational Health Psychology. The course objectives are:

1. To acquire knowledge of the empirical literature on OHP. Give the student an introduction to, along with an in-depth understanding of, the major concepts, issues, and principles in Occupational Health Psychology. Enhance the participants' mastery of classical, contemporary, theoretical, and practical knowledge about how the science of psychology can contribute to improving occupational health and employees' well-being.

2. The emphasis of this seminar is on developing "mental frameworks" for organizing conceptual and professional issues. By developing these mental frameworks, you are better equipped to meet any professional situation, not just those encountered in the Seminar.

3. To gain an expanded appreciation of how applied research is conducted and disseminated. Delineation of researchable topics in Occupational Health Psychology through reading and class discussion. The course will be oriented toward research issues and problems as a way to facilitate the development of a Doctoral Dissertation.

Philosophy of Seminar

Quality graduate education is different than undergraduate education in many ways. One of these is the

role played by faculty and students in the learning process. The graduate seminars focus on the development of certain professionally critical skills such as organizing and analyzing information, effective oral presentation and discussion, and group understanding and decision making. To accomplish these goals, you are expected to be much more proactive and assertive, and to be actively involved in shaping and managing the learning process. I expect verbal and mental involvement from everyone during every Seminar meeting.

Seminar Format

Each meeting focuses on a topic area (see attached <u>Seminar Schedule</u>) chosen to represent important and current issues facing professional Occupational Health Psychologists. For each meeting, a set of readings will be assigned pertaining to the topic for that week. The seminar will involve a discussion of articles related to the topic. You are expected to read the material and come prepared to discuss it carefully. Participation in discussion will be reflected in the class participation grade.

1. ***Presenter:*** Presenter(s) will be assigned for each Seminar. The presenter's chief responsibility is to present the readings assigned in the particular week. These presentations should be viewed as preparatory for professional presentations that you will be required to make often in your career.

   The presenter will
   1) present a short summary of the papers
   2) discuss the strengths and weaknesses of each study
   3) lead a comprehensive discussion on the papers

   These presentations should focus on clarifying any particularly important, interesting, or "fuzzy" concept or issue relevant to that week's readings. In preparation for these presentations, the assigned presenter can consult with any people who are available as resources.

   > **Presentations of Articles**
   >
   > One/two student(s) will be responsible for presenting an overview of the week's readings/topic at the beginning of class. Consider this a mini-lecture on the week's topic based on the material we read. The idea is not to give a detailed summary of each reading but to integrate the readings into a coherent overview. Connections should be made among the articles as possible. PowerPoint slides should be used to help highlight the major points.
   >
   > **Each formal presentation should be approximately 15 minutes in duration and no longer than 20 minutes. The PowerPoint presentation should be distributed to the class.** The presenter should dress formally. To ensure a good presentation, practice before the class is very important.

   Then the presenter should lead a comprehensive discussion on the papers. **The presenter needs to prepare one (1) discussion question for each reading (I should receive the presentation outline and questions 24 hours before each seminar meeting).**

   You will be judged on your ability to carry out each phase of the presentation: Summary, critique, and discussion**.**

2. ***Participants:*** While one individual is responsible for the oral presentation, each of you is to participate in the discussion. This means you must have read the appropriate readings and be

prepared to participate in the discussion. **To aid you in being prepared, each student will develop two (2) short (1/4 to 1/2 page) discussion questions based on the materials presented during a session. You should submit the question to me and the presenter 24 hours before the seminar meeting.** These can be questions about something you do not understand or questions that you believe elaboration about would benefit the group as a whole. The presenters will use some or all of the questions to stimulate discussion. **The quality of these questions and failing to submit a question will be used to determine the grade in this area.**

The two questions should be created for at least <u>two</u> different readings.

Discussion Questions

The purpose of the discussion questions is to guide and stimulate our class discussion of the material. A good question is one that might produce a difference of opinion or has no clear-cut easy answer. It might require that we have an understanding of an issue or the research findings. Simple questions that just ask the class to recall what's in the reading should be avoided. For example, a good question might be, "Why should an organization provide family-friendly benefits to employees? What are the advantages and drawbacks? If you were CEO of a company, would you provide them? Why or why not? Argue the position that a company should (or shouldn't) give these benefits." Avoid questions such as "What are the most common family-friendly benefits listed in the reading? In the reading, what did the author say were the four effects of implementing these benefits? How much does it cost to implement these benefits? Which types of companies are most family-friendly?" These questions are just asking everyone to remember something verbatim from the reading, so there's not much room for discussion. It is fine to ask the class to recall what the reading said, and then discuss whether the class agrees/disagrees, can note advantages/weaknesses, or can link it to something else that we have read. Questions that integrate multiple readings are particularly good.

Questions can fall into (but not limited within) any of the following categories:

1. Empirical findings: A discussion of whether research supports or refutes some hypothesis or addresses an important question. This can also place the findings of a study in the context of the broader literature.
2. Methodology: A critique/discussion of the methodology used in a particular study or studies.
3. Study design: A discussion of how we might design a study to address a particular question, or improve on the design of a study we read. This question can draw on creativity.
4. Theory: A discussion of some theoretical position or positions, including a comparison of two or more theories.

Final Term Paper

Each student must select one(1) topic from OHP Topics (see Seminar Schedule). The topic may be broad or narrow so long as it relates to Occupational Health Psychology, but it MUST be approved by me by March 25th. The student will also review the literature on a topic of their choosing and write a literature review on that topic.

The paper is to be typed and written per the APA publication guidelines specified in the most current version of the APA publication manual. The paper should be 18-22 pages in length. You should also begin collecting references early if an interlibrary loan is required.

The paper will be judged in content and style (grammar, spelling, etc.).

Plagiarism & Prohibition of GenAI Use

As commonly defined, plagiarism consists of passing off one's own ideas, words, writings, etc., which belong to another. In accordance with this definition, you are committing plagiarism if you copy the work of another person and turn it in as your own, even if you should have permission from that person. Plagiarism is one of the worst academic sins, for the plagiarist destroys the trust among colleagues, without which research cannot be safely communicated. **You will receive a D for the class if your term paper commits to plagiarism.**

In this course, the focus is on the development of independent critical thinking and the mastery of subject-specific content. To ensure that all submitted work accurately reflects personal understanding and original thought, the use of Generative AI (GenAI) tools in completing assignments or assessments is strictly prohibited. This policy supports our commitment to academic integrity and the direct measurement of each student's learning against the course's Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs). Any work found to be generated by AI will be subject to academic review.

Class Attendance and Participation

Class attendance is mandatory. Students are expected to attend all classes. Missing more than the first half hour of a class will be considered an absence unless prior arrangements are made. You will be dropped a letter grade for any two (2) unexplained absences (e.g., without prior notification or a verifiable excuse).

For any missing class, you are required to make up the discussion by providing me with two-page summaries for two of the assigned readings.

If you cannot attend a class due to unusual circumstances (e.g., illness, family care) or religious observance, please inform the instructor in writing as soon as possible. Any absence must be reported through the University's Self-Reporting Absence System (https://sims.rutgers.edu/ssra/). Faculty will receive notification of anticipated absence(s) via email from the Dean of Students Office about confirmed health and emergency circumstances that may influence students' class attendance. Students with long-term illnesses that prevent regular attendance should coordinate with their academic advisors and Student Access Services (SAS) for appropriate accommodations.

It is the student's responsibility to discuss with the instructor and make up any missed assignments, quizzes, or exams and to fulfill all class participation requirements in a timely manner.

Class participation consists of coming to class prepared (i.e., having read all the assigned readings) and being willing to contribute to discussing the topics for the week. There are many ways to participate in the seminar. For example, arrange for quality guest speakers, ask questions to stimulate your coverage of the points above, assign outside preparatory projects, create schematic diagrams, do anything else you believe will enhance learning, hold team competitions, plan topical debates, write or compile existing case studies… be creative.

Determining Seminar Grade

Each participant's grade for the semester will be determined by performance in the following areas:

	Weight
1. Participation	30%
2. Presentation	30%
3. Term paper • **You will receive a D for the class if your term paper commits to plagiarism.** • **Late penalty: 10% deduction each day late.**	40%

A: 90-100   B+: 87-89   B: 80-86   C: 70-79   D: 60-69   F: 0-59

Cell Phones and Laptops

Statement of the obvious—if you bring a cell phone to class, turn it silent or off. If you bring a laptop to class, all activities should be course-related.

Instructor and Student Responsibility

Instructors reserve the right to adjust course content and/or the pace of course progress. Students are responsible for staying up to date with all adjustments.

Availability of Course Materials When Students are Unable to Attend Class

Each faculty member will determine a method(s) to accommodate students who cannot attend class(es) due to medical reasons and are enrolled in classes which include an in-person component. Some examples of course materials faculty may make available include PowerPoint presentations, class notes, or other resources deemed appropriate by the instructor. It is understood that only students enrolled in the course may view any materials posted online.

Freedom of Speech and Academic Freedom

Rutgers adopted its Policy on Academic Freedom. Please refer to the website Freedom of Speech and Academic Freedom: https://www.rutgers.edu/president/academic-freedom-free-speech

Safety Escort

If you need safety escort for the night classes, please see: https://ipo.rutgers.edu/publicsafety/rupd/escorts

Web Cameras

When a synchronous online class meeting is warranted, for pedagogical, academic integrity, and security reasons, instructors may require students to have their web cameras turned on during synchronous online class meetings, labs, and exams. If specific testing software is required for exams, the student is responsible for making sure it works properly before an exam. Instructors should clearly indicate on the syllabus any course requirements for camera use. If a student has compelling technological or environmental reasons for leaving the camera off during class, the student should communicate directly and privately with the instructor

to request an exemption and explore possible solutions.

Campus Closures/Snow Days

When the campus is closed for snow or other inclement weather, faculty are encouraged to hold classes remotely whenever pedagogically appropriate and logistically reasonable. The decision to do so is left to the discretion of each faculty member and should be communicated to students in a timely manner.

On snow days or other school closures, childcare interruptions, weather emergencies, bandwidth, technology or other home arrangements may interrupt class attendance. Students who are experiencing these issues should speak with faculty about possible ways to participate in class and/or catch up on missed work.

Seminar Schedule

<u>Required Text.</u> Quick, J. C., & Tetrick, L. E. (2011). *Handbook of Occupational Health Psychology*. Washington, DC: APA.

There are 5-6 readings each week. If two presenters are assigned in the same week, each presenter is responsible to present and generate discussion questions for 3 articles. If one presenter is assigned in a week, he/she is responsible to present 3 articles (in black), AND, generate discussion questions for all 5 articles.

WK	Date	Topic	Reading/Assignment	References	Presenter	Format
1	1/21	Introduction	Syllabus; Presentation assignment		**Liu**	Remote
2	1/28	Models and frameworks	Ch1; Ch2; Ch3; Beehr and Newman (1978), PPsyc Bliese et al. (2017), JAP Chen (2023)	Beehr, T.A., & Newman, J.E. (1978). Job stress, employee health, and organizational effectiveness: A facet analysis, model, and literature review. *Personnel Psychology, 31,* 665-699. Bliese, P. D., Edwards, J. R., & Sonnentag, S. (2017). Stress and well-being at work: A century of empirical trends reflecting theoretical and societal influences. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *102*(3), 389-402. https://doi.org/10.1037/apl0000109 Chen, P. (2023). Preventive Interventions. In Chen, P. Y. (2023). Occupational Stress, Hogrefe Publishing.	**Sanay** **Reanda**	In-person
3	2/4	Job demand: Quantitative & Qualitative Workload	**Demand and workload** Ilies et al. (2010), PPsyc Van Yperen and Janssen (2002), AMJ Belinda et al. (2024), JAP **Job Complexity** Spector and Jex (1991), JAP Xie and Johns (1995), AMJ Morgeson and Humphrey (2006), JAP	**Demand, Workload, and Bordom** Ilies, R., Dimotakis, N., & De Pater, I. E. (2010). Psychological and Physiological Reactions to High Workloads: Implications for Well-Being. *Personnel Psychology*, *63*(2), 407-436. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6570.2010.01175.x Van Yperen, N. W., & Janssen, O. (2002). Fatigued and dissatisfied or fatigued but satisfied? Goal orientations and responses to high job demands. *Academy of Management Journal*, *45*(6), 1161-1171. Belinda, C., Melwani, S., & Kapadia, C. (2024). Breaking boredom: Interrupting the residual effect of state boredom on future productivity. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 109*(6), 829–849. https://doi.org/10.1037/apl0001161 **Job Complexity: Qualitative Workload** Xie, J. L., Johns, G. (1995) Job scope and stress: Can job scope be too high? Academy *of Management Journal*, *38,* 1288-1309. Spector & Jex (1991). Relations of Job Characteristics From Multiple Data Sources with Employee Affect, Absence, Turnover Intentions, and Health. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 76,* 46-53. Morgeson, F. P., & Humphrey, S. E. (2006). The Work Design Questionnaire (WDQ): developing and validating a comprehensive measure for assessing job design and the nature of work. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *91*(6), 1321-1339. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.91.6.1321	**Tori** **Sheyla**	In-person
4	2/11	Demand, Control, and Resources	**JDC & JDC/S** Van der Doef and Maes (1999), W&S Matusik et al. (2024), JAP **JDR** Demerouti et al. (2001), JAP	**JDC & JDC/S** Van der Doef, M., & Maes, S. (1999). The Job Demand-Control (-Support) Model and psychological well-being: A review of 20 years of empirical research. *Work & Stress*, *13*(2), 87-114. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1080/026783799296084 Matusik, J. G., Poulton, E. C., Ferris, D. L., Johnson, R. E., & Rodell, J. B. (2024). The PCMT model of organizational support: Scale development and theoretical	**Alex**	Remote

#	Date	Topic	Readings	References	Presenter	Format
			Crawford et al. (2010), JAP **Matching & DISC** Daniels and de Jonge (2010), JOOP	application. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 109*(7), 1059–1076. https://doi.org/10.1037/apl0001110 **JDR** Demerouti, E., Bakker, A. B., Nachreiner, F., & Schaufeli, W. B. (2001). The job demands-resources model of burnout. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 86*(3), 499-512. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.86.3.499 Crawford, E. R., Lepine, J. A., & Rich, B. L. (2010). Linking job demands and resources to employee engagement and burnout: a theoretical extension and meta-analytic test. *J Appl Psychol, 95*(5), 834-848. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0019364 **Matching & DISC** Daniels, K., & de Jonge, J. (2010). Match making and match breaking: The nature of match within and around job design. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 83*(1), 1-16. https://doi.org/10.1348/096317909X485144		
5	2/18	IRB CITI Training				Remote
6	2/25	Challenge & Hindrance Demands	Ch4 Lepine et al. (2005), AMJ Ohly and Fritz (2009) Liu and Li (2016), JBP Podsakoff et al. (2023), AR	Lepine, J. A., Podsakoff, N. P., & Lepine, M. A. (2005). A meta-analytic test of the challenge stressor-hindrance stressor framework: An explanation for inconsistent relationships among stressors and performance. *Academy of Management Journal, 48*, 764-775. https://doi.org/doi:10.5465/AMJ.2005.18803921 Ohly, S., & Fritz, C. (2009). Work characteristics, challenge appraisal, creativity, and proactive behavior: A multi-level study. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 31*(4), 543-565. https://doi.org/10.1002/job.633 Liu, C., & Li, H. (2016). Stressors and Stressor Appraisals: the Moderating Effect of Task Efficacy. *Journal of Business and Psychology, 33*(1), 141-154. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10869-016-9483-4 Podsakoff, N. P., Freiburger, K. J., Podsakoff, P. M., & Rosen, C. C. (2023). Laying the Foundation for the Challenge–Hindrance Stressor Framework 2.0. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior, 10*(1), 165-199. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-orgpsych-080422-052147	**Carl**	Remote
7	3/4	Social stressors I	**Summary** Hershcovis (2011), JOB **Interpersonal conflict** de Wit et al. (2012), JAP Sinha et al. (2016), JAP Liu et al. (2008), W&S Quade et al. (2017), PPsy	**Summary** Hershcovis, M. S. (2011). "Incivility, social undermining, bullying…oh my!": A call to reconcile constructs within workplace aggression research. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 32*(3), 499-519. https://doi.org/10.1002/job.689 **Interpersonal conflict** de Wit, F. R., Greer, L. L., & Jehn, K. A. (2012). The paradox of intragroup conflict: a meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 97*(2), 360-390. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0024844 Sinha, R., Janardhanan, N. S., Greer, L. L., Conlon, D. E., & Edwards, J. R. (2016). Skewed task conflicts in teams: What happens when a few members see more conflict than the rest? *Journal of Applied Psychology, 101*(7), 1045-1055. https://doi.org/10.1037/apl0000059 Liu, C., Nauta, M.M., Spector, P.E., & Li, C.P. (2008). Direct and Indirect Conflict at Work in China and the United States. *Work & Stress, 22,* 295-313.	**Jenny**	In-person

				Quade, M. J., Greenbaum, R. L., & Petrenko, O. V. (2017). "I don't want to be near you, unless…": The interactive effect of unethical behavior and performance onto relationship conflict and workplace ostracism. *Personnel Psychology, 70*(3), 675-709. https://doi.org/10.1111/peps.12164		
8	3/11	Low Residency				
9	3/18	Spring Break				
10	3/25	Social Stressors II **The final paper topic is due this week**	**Incivility and Aggression** Hershcovis and Barling (2010), JAP **Workplace Ostracism** Wu et al. (2016), JAP Liu (2019), JOHP **Abusive supervision** Aryee et al. (2007), JAP Liang et al. (2018), LQ	**Incivility and aggression** Hershcovis, M. S., & Barling, J. (2010). Comparing victim attributions and outcomes for workplace aggression and sexual harassment. *J Appl Psychol, 95*(5), 874-888. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0020070 **Workplace Ostracism** Wu, C. H., Liu, J., Kwan, H. K., & Lee, C. (2016). Why and when workplace ostracism inhibits organizational citizenship behaviors: An organizational identification perspective. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 101*(3), 362-378. https://doi.org/10.1037/apl0000063 Liu, C. (2019). Ostracism, attributions, and their relationships with international students' and employees' outcomes: The moderating effect of perceived harming intent. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 24*(5), 556-571. https://doi.org/10.1037/ocp0000130 **Abusive supervision** Aryee, S., Chen, Z. X., Sun, L. Y., & Debrah, Y. A. (2007). Antecedents and outcomes of abusive supervision: test of a trickle-down model. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 92*(1), 191-201. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.92.1.191 Liang, L. H., Brown, D. J., Lian, H., Hanig, S., Ferris, D. L., & Keeping, L. M. (2018). Righting a wrong: Retaliation on a voodoo doll symbolizing an abusive supervisor restores justice. The Leadership Quarterly. https://doi-org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2018.01.004	**Jaimee**	Remote
11	4/1	Work-Family Conflict	Cp9 Carlson et al. (2000), JVB ten Brummelhuis and Bakker (2012) Wood and Michaelides (2016), HR Wan et al. (2022), IJSM	Carlson, D. S., Kacmar, K. M., & Williams, L. J. (2000). Construction and Initial Validation of a Multidimensional Measure of Work–Family Conflict. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 56*(2), 249-276. https://doi.org/10.1006/jvbe.1999.1713 ten Brummelhuis, L. L., & Bakker, A. B. (2012). A resource perspective on the work-home interface: the work-home resources model. *American Psychologist, 67*(7), 545-556. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0027974 Wood, S. J., & Michaelides, G. (2016). Challenge and hindrance stressors and wellbeing-based work–nonwork interference: A diary study of portfolio workers. *Human Relations, 69*(1), 111-138. https://doi.org/10.1177/0018726715580866 Wan, M., Shaffer, M. A., Dou, J., Zhang, M., & Zhang, Y. (2022). A dyadic approach to examining dual-earner couples' boundary segmentation preferences and work–family conflict. *International Journal of Stress Management, 29*(3), 292-305. https://doi.org/10.1037/str0000262	**Daniel**	In-person
12	4/8	Justice and stress	**Overview** CP11 Greenberg (2006), JAP	**Overview** Greenberg, J. (2006). Losing sleep over organizational injustice: attenuating insomniac reactions to underpayment inequity with supervisory training in interactional justice. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 91*(1), 58-69.	**Sara**	In-person

			Justice and Supervisor Relationship Liu et al. (2013), JOHP Goodstein and Aquino (2010), JOB Jones (2009), JOB	https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.91.1.58 **Justice and Supervisor Relationship** Liu, C., Yang, L. Q., & Nauta, M. M. (2013). Examining the mediating effect of supervisor conflict on procedural injustice-job strain relations: the function of power distance. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, *18*(1), 64-74. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0030889 Goodstein, J., & Aquino, K. (2010). And restorative justice for all: Redemption, forgiveness, and reintegration in organizations. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, *31*(4), 624-628. https://doi.org/10.1002/job.632 Jones, D. A. (2009). Getting even with one's supervisor and one's organization: relationships among types of injustice, desires for revenge, and counterproductive work behaviors. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, *30*(4), 525-542. https://doi.org/10.1002/job.563		
13	4/15	Burnout, health & well-being	**Burnout:** Ch12 Maslach and Leiter (2008), JAP **CVD:** Ch13 **Sleep:** Barnes et al. (2017), JAP **Physiological reactivity:** Kouchaki and Wareham (2015), JAP	**Burnout:** Maslach, C., & Leiter, M. P. (2008). Early predictors of job burnout and engagement. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *93*(3), 498-512. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.93.3.498 **Sleep:** Barnes, C. M., Miller, J. A., & Bostock, S. (2017). Helping employees sleep well: Effects of cognitive behavioral therapy for insomnia on work outcomes. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *102*(1), 104-113. https://doi.org/10.1037/apl0000154 **Physiological reactivity:** Kouchaki, M., & Wareham, J. (2015). Excluded and behaving unethically: social exclusion, physiological responses, and unethical behavior. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 100*(2), 547-556. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0038034	**Jacob**	Remote
14	4/22	Individual Difference	**Personality** Bolger and Zuckerman (1995), JPSP Lin et al. (2015), JOB **Self-efficacy** De Clercq et al. (2019), PR **Self-esteem** Ferris et al. (2009), JAP **CSE** Chang et al. (2012), JOM	**Personality** Bolger, N., & Zuckerman, A. (1995). A framework for studying personality in the stress process. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *69*(5), 890-902. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.69.5.890 Lin, W., Ma, J., Wang, L., & Wang, M. (2015). A double-edged sword: The moderating role of conscientiousness in the relationships between work stressors, psychological strain, and job performance. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, *36*(1), 94-111. https://doi.org/10.1002/job.1949 **Self-efficacy** De Clercq, D., Haq, I. U., & Azeem, M. U. (2019). Workplace ostracism and job performance: roles of self-efficacy and job level. *Personnel Review*, *48*(1), 184-203. https://doi.org/10.1108/pr-02-2017-0039 **Self-esteem** Ferris, D. L., Brown, D. J., Lian, H., & Keeping, L. M. (2009). When does self-esteem relate to deviant behavior? The role of contingencies of self-worth. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *94*(5), 1345-1353. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0016115 **CSE** Chang, C.-H., Ferris, D. L., Johnson, R. E., Rosen, C. C., & Tan, J. A. (2012). Core Self-Evaluations. *Journal of Management*, *38*(1), 81-128.	**Jordan**	In-person

				https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206311419661		
15	4/29	Term Paper	Term Paper			Remote
16	5/6	No class				
17	5/13	**Term Paper Due**				

References

Aryee, S., Chen, Z. X., Sun, L. Y., & Debrah, Y. A. (2007). Antecedents and outcomes of abusive supervision: test of a trickle-down model. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *92*(1), 191-201. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.92.1.191

Barnes, C. M., Miller, J. A., & Bostock, S. (2017). Helping employees sleep well: Effects of cognitive behavioral therapy for insomnia on work outcomes. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *102*(1), 104-113. https://doi.org/10.1037/apl0000154

Beehr, T. A., & Newman, J. E. (1978). Job stress, employee health, and organizational effectiveness: A facet analysis, model, and literature review 1. *Personnel Psychology*, *31*(4), 665-699.

Belinda, C., Melwani, S., & Kapadia, C. (2024). Breaking boredom: Interrupting the residual effect of state boredom on future productivity. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *109*(6), 829-849. https://doi.org/10.1037/apl0001161

Bliese, P. D., Edwards, J. R., & Sonnentag, S. (2017). Stress and well-being at work: A century of empirical trends reflecting theoretical and societal influences. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *102*(3), 389-402. https://doi.org/10.1037/apl0000109

Bolger, N., & Zuckerman, A. (1995). A framework for studying personality in the stress process. *Journal of Personality and Social psychology*, *69*(5), 890-902. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.69.5.890

Carlson, D. S., Kacmar, K. M., & Williams, L. J. (2000). Construction and Initial Validation of a Multidimensional Measure of Work-Family Conflict. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, *56*(2), 249-276. https://doi.org/10.1006/jvbe.1999.1713

Chang, C.-H., Ferris, D. L., Johnson, R. E., Rosen, C. C., & Tan, J. A. (2012). Core Self-Evaluations. *Journal of Management*, *38*(1), 81-128. https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206311419661

Chen, P. (2023). Preventive Interventions. In *Occupational Stress*. Hogrefe Publishing.

Crawford, E. R., Lepine, J. A., & Rich, B. L. (2010). Linking job demands and resources to employee engagement and burnout: a theoretical extension and meta-analytic test. *J Appl Psychol*, *95*(5), 834-848. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0019364

Daniels, K., & de Jonge, J. (2010). Match making and match breaking: The nature of match within and around job design. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, *83*(1), 1-16. https://doi.org/10.1348/096317909X485144

De Clercq, D., Haq, I. U., & Azeem, M. U. (2019). Workplace ostracism and job performance: roles of self-efficacy and job level. *Personnel review*, *48*(1), 184-203. https://doi.org/10.1108/pr-02-2017-0039

de Wit, F. R., Greer, L. L., & Jehn, K. A. (2012). The paradox of intragroup conflict: a meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *97*(2), 360-390. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0024844

Demerouti, E., Bakker, A. B., Nachreiner, F., & Schaufeli, W. B. (2001). The job demands-resources model of burnout. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *86*(3), 499-512. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.86.3.499

Ferris, D. L., Brown, D. J., Lian, H., & Keeping, L. M. (2009). When does self-esteem relate to deviant behavior? The role of contingencies of self-worth. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *94*(5), 1345-1353. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0016115

Goodstein, J., & Aquino, K. (2010). And restorative justice for all: Redemption, forgiveness, and reintegration in organizations. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, *31*(4), 624-628. https://doi.org/10.1002/job.632

Greenberg, J. (2006). Losing sleep over organizational injustice: attenuating insomniac reactions to underpayment inequity with supervisory training in interactional justice. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *91*(1), 58-69. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.91.1.58

Hershcovis, M. S. (2011). "Incivility, social undermining, bullying…oh my!": A call to reconcile constructs within workplace aggression research. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, *32*(3), 499-519. https://doi.org/10.1002/job.689

Hershcovis, M. S., & Barling, J. (2010). Comparing victim attributions and outcomes for workplace aggression and sexual harassment. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *95*(5), 874-888. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0020070

Ilies, R., Dimotakis, N., & De Pater, I. E. (2010). Psychological and Physiological Reactions to High Workloads: Implications for Well-Being. *Personnel Psychology*, *63*(2), 407-436. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6570.2010.01175.x

Jones, D. A. (2009). Getting even with one's supervisor and one's organization: relationships among types of injustice, desires for revenge, and counterproductive work behaviors. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, *30*(4), 525-542. https://doi.org/10.1002/job.563

Kouchaki, M., & Wareham, J. (2015). Excluded and behaving unethically: social exclusion, physiological responses, and unethical behavior. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *100*(2), 547-556. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0038034

Lepine, J. A., Podsakoff, N. P., & Lepine, M. A. (2005). A meta-analytic test of the challenge stressor-hindrance stressor framework: An explanation for inconsistent relationships among stressors and performance. *Academy of Management Journal*, *48*, 764-775. https://doi.org/doi:10.5465/AMJ.2005.18803921

Liang, L. H., Brown, D. J., Lian, H., Hanig, S., Ferris, D. L., & Keeping, L. M. (2018). Righting a wrong: Retaliation on a voodoo doll symbolizing an abusive supervisor restores justice. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *29*(4), 443-456. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2018.01.004

Lin, W., Ma, J., Wang, L., & Wang, M. (2015). A double-edged sword: The moderating role of conscientiousness in the relationships between work stressors, psychological strain, and job performance. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, *36*(1), 94-111. https://doi.org/10.1002/job.1949

Liu, C. (2019). Ostracism, attributions, and their relationships with international students' and employees' outcomes: The moderating effect of perceived harming intent. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, *24*(5), 556-571. https://doi.org/10.1037/ocp0000130

Liu, C., & Li, H. (2016). Stressors and Stressor Appraisals: the Moderating Effect of Task Efficacy. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, *33*(1), 141-154. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10869-016-9483-4

Liu, C., Nauta, M. M., Spector, P. E., & Li, C. P. (2008). Direct and Indirect Conflict at Work in China and the United States. *Work & Stress*, *22*, 295-313.

Liu, C., Yang, L. Q., & Nauta, M. M. (2013). Examining the mediating effect of supervisor conflict on procedural injustice-job strain relations: the function of power distance. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, *18*(1), 64-74. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0030889

Maslach, C., & Leiter, M. P. (2008). Early predictors of job burnout and engagement. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *93*(3), 498-512. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.93.3.498

Matusik, J. G., Poulton, E. C., Ferris, D. L., Johnson, R. E., & Rodell, J. B. (2024). The PCMT model of organizational support: Scale development and theoretical application. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *109*(7), 1059-1076. https://doi.org/10.1037/apl0001110

Morgeson, F. P., & Humphrey, S. E. (2006). The Work Design Questionnaire (WDQ): developing and validating a comprehensive measure for assessing job design and the nature of work. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *91*(6), 1321-1339. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.91.6.1321

Ohly, S., & Fritz, C. (2009). Work characteristics, challenge appraisal, creativity, and proactive behavior: A multi-level study. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, *31*(4), 543-565. https://doi.org/10.1002/job.633

Podsakoff, N. P., Freiburger, K. J., Podsakoff, P. M., & Rosen, C. C. (2023). Laying the Foundation for the Challenge-Hindrance Stressor Framework 2.0. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior*, *10*(1), 165-199. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-orgpsych-080422-052147

Quade, M. J., Greenbaum, R. L., & Petrenko, O. V. (2017). "I don't want to be near you, unless…": The interactive effect of unethical behavior and performance onto relationship conflict and workplace ostracism. *Personnel Psychology*, *70*(3), 675-709. https://doi.org/10.1111/peps.12164

Sinha, R., Janardhanan, N. S., Greer, L. L., Conlon, D. E., & Edwards, J. R. (2016). Skewed task conflicts in teams: What happens when a few members see more conflict than the rest? *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *101*(7), 1045-1055. https://doi.org/10.1037/apl0000059

Spector, P. E., & Jex, S. M. (1991). Relations of job characteristics from multiple data sources with employee affect, absence, turnover intentions, and health. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *76*(1), 46-53.

ten Brummelhuis, L. L., & Bakker, A. B. (2012). A resource perspective on the work-home interface: the work-home resources model. *American Psychologist*, *67*(7), 545-556. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0027974

Van der Doef, M., & Maes, S. (1999). The Job Demand-Control (-Support) Model and psychological well-being: A review of 20 years of empirical research. *Work & Stress*, *13*(2), 87-114. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1080/026783799296084

Van Yperen, N. W., & Janssen, O. (2002). Fatigued and dissatisfied or fatigued but satisfied? Goal orientations and responses to high job demands. *Academy of Management Journal*, *45*(6), 1161-1171.

Wan, M., Shaffer, M. A., Dou, J., Zhang, M., & Zhang, Y. (2022). A dyadic approach to examining dual-earner couples' boundary segmentation preferences and work-family conflict. *International Journal of Stress Management*, *29*(3), 292-305. https://doi.org/10.1037/str0000262

Wood, S. J., & Michaelides, G. (2016). Challenge and hindrance stressors and wellbeing-based work-nonwork interference: A diary study of portfolio workers. *Human relations*, *69*(1), 111-138. https://doi.org/10.1177/0018726715580866

Wu, C. H., Liu, J., Kwan, H. K., & Lee, C. (2016). Why and when workplace ostracism inhibits organizational citizenship behaviors: An organizational identification perspective. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *101*(3), 362-378. https://doi.org/10.1037/apl0000063

Xie, J. L., & Johns, G. (1995). Job scope and stress: Can job scope be too high? *Academy of Management Journal*, *38*(5), 1288-1309.