

MGT 7810: Morality

Instructor: Jesse Graham

Office: SFEBB 8207

Office Hours: After class or by appointment

Email: jesse.graham@eccles.utah.edu

Class time: 12-3:30pm

Class dates: Fridays, 2/2-4/20

Class location: SFEBB 7112

Course Objectives

This course covers empirical approaches to (mostly human) morality by researchers in organizational behavior, psychology, sociology, philosophy, economics, public policy, computer science, and other fields. Particular focus is paid to recent work, to develop an understanding of the current state of the field(s). At the end of this course, you will be able to: a) have a practical understanding of the current state of interdisciplinary research on this topic; b) better evaluate the research designs and methodological approaches used in morality research; and c) design and execute your own empirical project on some aspect of morality (ideally as linked with your primary research areas).

Course Policies

This course is organized as a seminar. The primary vehicle for learning is discussion of the assigned readings. For this reason, punctual attendance is mandatory, as is thorough reading of all assigned articles (aside from the optional ones). Also for this reason, laptops/tablets/phones are not allowed during class time (I know this is a total Luddite policy, but these magical devices are just too potent a distraction temptation for even faculty to resist, and thus they tend to be conversation-killers).

Course Requirements

Class participation (35% of grade)

You are expected to attend all class meetings and to be prepared (i.e., complete readings in advance of the class meeting) even if you are auditing the class. Being prepared will maximize your ability to contribute meaningfully to and benefit from class discussion. Each week you will submit (via Canvas) a discussion question (~300-500 words) based on the week's readings; these questions must be submitted by 5pm on the Thursday before class. In addition, each student will be discussion leader one week; in this week you will organize the class questions into an order that makes sense, compile the questions into a document, and print out 8 copies of that document to bring to class. Discussion leader will also lead off our discussion by giving a summary overview of the readings. These overviews should not take up more than a couple minutes per article, but feel free to use slides or handouts to facilitate your summary.

Research project presentation (20% of grade, due 4/20)

In our last class meeting (April 20), you will deliver a formal (and *practiced*) conference-style talk presenting your research project. *Your project should involve morality in some way (and what doesn't?), must be your own independent work that you develop this semester, and must not be something you have used for a previous class.* Each presenter will have 20 minutes total: the talks should take between 11 and 15 minutes, with the remaining time reserved for feedback and questions from the rest of the class.

Research project proposal (35% of grade, due 5/3)

At the end of the course, you will hand in a research proposal, 10-15 pages in length (12 point Times font, double-spaced, 1-inch margins), in the format of an APA-style empirical report. The report should contain title page and abstract, intro, methods, (hypothetical) results, discussion, and references (title page with abstract and references don't have to count toward the page total). Plan on turning in a summary of your idea for the final paper in class first, as soon as you are ready, roughly halfway through the course. This summary should be less than a page in length, and could be just a paragraph.

Referee reports (10% of grade, due 5/5)

After everyone hands in their papers, they will be distributed to other members of the class for review. These reviews will then be returned (anonymously, but remember how few of us are in the class) to each author. Excellent reviews will offer both praise for the paper's strengths and specific criticisms of its shortcomings along with suggestions for improvement. See Tesser and Martin (2006) for insights on reviewing.

CLASS SESSIONS OVERVIEW

Date	Topic	Readings
2/2	Overview Morality	Haidt (2007); Graham & Valdesolo (in press); <i>Atlas of Moral Psychology</i> TOC (in press)
2/9	Pluralist Morality	Graham et al. (in press); Koleva, Beall, & Graham (in press); Henik (2008); Dungan, Waytz, & Young (2014)
2/16	Tannenbaum Morality Guest Star: David Tannenbaum , Eccles	Epley & Tannenbaum (in press); Pizarro & Tannenbaum (2011); Tannenbaum, Uhlmann, & Diermeier (2011); Tannenbaum, Fox, & Rogers (2017)
2/23	Kreps Morality Guest Star: Tamar Kreps , Eccles	Kreps, Laurin, & Merritt (2017); Kreps & Monin (2011); Jago, Kreps, & Laurin (under review); Lin, Reich, & Kreps (under review)
3/2	No Class Morality	No Class (SPSP conference)
3/9	Workplace Morality	Gino, Ayal, & Ariely (2009); Leavitt & Sluss (2015); Cohen, Panter, Turan, Morse, & Kim (2014); May, Luth, & Schwoerer (2014)
3/16	Management Morality	Fehr, Yam, & Dang (2015); Shin, Sung, Choi, & Kim (2015); Kacmar, Bachrach, Harris, & Zivunuska (2011); Derfler-Rozin, Baker, & Gino (2017)
3/23	Spring Break Morality	No Class (Spring Break)
3/30	Group Morality	Cikara & Paluck (2013); Halevy, Kreps, Weisel, & Goldenburg (2015); Mooijman, Meindl, Dehghani, Oyserman, Monterosso, Doris, & Graham (in press); Thau, Derfler-Rozin, Pitesa, Mitchell, & Pillutla (2015)
4/6	Money Morality	Gino & Mogilner (2014); Schweitzer, Ordóñez, & Douma (2004); Vohs (2015); Caruso, Shapira, & Landy (2017)
4/13	Technology Morality	Hoover, Dehghani, Johnson, Iliev, & Graham (in press); Waytz & Gray (in press); Singer & Sagan (2012); Harris & Savulescu (2015)
4/20	Research Presentations	Read: Edwards (2013); Listen: Your Colleagues (2018)
	FINAL PAPER DUE 5/3; REFEREE REPORTS DUE 5/5	Read: Kerr (1998); Vazire (2014); Sternberg (1988); Oppenheimer (2006); Jordan & Zanna (1999)

DETAILED SESSION INFORMATION

Note: Adequate preparation for class includes reading all assigned readings before that session's class meeting. Readings listed as 'optional' are not required and we are unlikely to discuss them much in class; I am including them more as further references for you in case you would like to learn more. Many links below will only work on a university computer or using the [UU VPN](#).

February 2: Overview Morality

- Haidt, J. (2007). [The new synthesis in moral psychology](#). *Science*, 316, 998-1002.
- Graham, J., & Valdesolo, P. (in press). [Morality](#). In K. Deaux & M. Snyder (Eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Personality and Social Psychology*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Lots of people. (in press). [Table of contents](#). In K. Gray & J. Graham (Eds.), *The Atlas of Moral Psychology: Mapping Good and Evil in the Mind*. New York: Guilford.

Optional:

- Kahane, G., Everett, J. A. C., Earp, B. D., Caviola, L., Faber, N. S., Crockett, M. J., & Savulescu, J. (in press). [Beyond sacrificial harm: A two-dimensional model of utilitarian psychology](#). *Psychological Review*. [latest major statement on trolleyology]

February 9: Pluralist Morality

- Graham, J., Haidt, J., Motyl, M., Meindl, P., Iskiwitch, C., & Mooijman, M. (in press). [Moral Foundations Theory: On the advantages of moral pluralism over moral monism](#). In K. Gray & J. Graham (Eds.), *The Atlas of Moral Psychology*. New York: Guilford.
- Koleva, S., Beall, E., & Graham, J. (in press) [Moral Foundations Theory: Building value through moral pluralism](#). In A. J. G. Sison (Ed.), *The Handbook of Virtue Ethics in Business and Management*. Springer: New York.
- Henik, E. (2008). [Mad as hell or scared stiff? The effects of value conflict and emotions on potential whistle-blowers](#). *Journal of Business Ethics*, 80, 111-119.
- Dungan, J., Waytz, A., & Young, L. (2014). [Corruption in the context of moral trade-offs](#). *Journal of Interdisciplinary Economics*, 26, 97-118.

Quasi-Optional (skim it):

- Graham, J., Haidt, J., Koleva, S., Motyl, M., Iyer, R., Wojcik, S., & Ditto, P. H. (2013). [Moral Foundations Theory: The pragmatic validity of moral pluralism](#). *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, 47, 55-130.

Optional:

- Waytz, A., Dungan, J., & Young, L. (2013). [The whistleblower's dilemma and the fairness-loyalty tradeoff](#). *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 49, 1027-1033.
- Wynn, K. (2016). [Origins of value conflict: Babies do not agree to disagree](#). *Trends in cognitive sciences*, 20, 3-5.

February 16: Tannenbaum Morality

- Epley, N., & Tannenbaum, D. (in press). [Treating ethics as a design problem](#). *Behavioral Science and Policy*.
- Pizarro, D. A., & Tannenbaum, D. (2011). [Bringing character back: How the motivation to evaluate character influences judgments of moral blame](#). In M Mikulincer and PR Shaver (Eds), *The Social Psychology of Morality: Exploring the Causes of Good and Evil* (pp. 91–108). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Tannenbaum D, Uhlmann EL and Diermeier D (2011). [Moral signals, public outrage, and immaterial harms](#). *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 47, 1249-1254.
- Tannenbaum, D., Fox, C. R., & Rogers, T. (2017). [On the misplaced politics of behavioural policy interventions](#). *Nature Human Behaviour*, 1, 0130.

Optional (including other work on person-centered moral judgments David recommends):

- Tannenbaum, D., Valasek, C. J., Knowles, E. D., & Ditto, P. H. (2013). [Incentivizing wellness in the workplace: Sticks \(not carrots\) send stigmatizing signals](#). *Psychological Science*, 24, 1512-1522.
- Tannenbaum, D., Fox, C. R., & Ülkümen, G. (2017). [Judgment extremity and accuracy under epistemic versus aleatory uncertainty](#). *Management Science*, 63, 497-518.
- Samper, A., Yang, L., & Daniels, M. (in press). [How beauty work affects judgments of moral character and consumer preferences](#). *Journal of Consumer Research*.
- Goodwin, G.P. (2015). [Moral character in person perception](#). *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 24, 38-44.
- Goodwin, G.P., Piazza, J. & Rozin, P. (2014). [Moral character predominates in person perception and evaluation](#). *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 106, 148-168.
- Everett, J.A.C., Pizarro, D. A. & Crockett, M.J., (2016). [Inference of trustworthiness from intuitive moral judgments](#). *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General*, 145, 772-787.
- Critcher, C., Inbar, Y. & Pizarro, D.A. (2012). [How quick decisions illuminate moral character](#). *Social Psychological and Personality Science*.
- Inbar, Y., Pizarro, D.A., & Cushman, F. (2012). [Benefiting from misfortune: When harmless actions are judged to be morally blameworthy](#). *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 38, 52-62.
- Pizarro, D.A., Uhlmann, E., & Salovey, P. (2003). [Asymmetry in judgments of moral blame and praise: The role of perceived metadesires](#). *Psychological Science*, 14, 267-272.
- Woolfolk, R. L., Doris, J. M., & Darley, J. M. (2006). [Identification, situational constraint, and social cognition: Studies in the attribution of moral responsibility](#). *Cognition*, 100, 283-301.

February 23: Kreps Morality

- Kreps, T.A., Laurin, K. & Merritt, A.C. (2017). [Hypocritical flip-flop, or courageous evolution? When leaders change their moral minds.](#) *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 113, 730-752.
- Kreps, T.A., & Monin, B. (2011). [“Doing well by doing good”? Ambivalent moral framing in organizations.](#) *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 31, 99-123.
- Jago, A., Kreps, T.A., & Laurin, K. (under review). [Locating moral conviction within organizations.](#)
- Lin, S.C., Reich, T., & Kreps, T.A. (under review). [When moving on feels wrong: Avoiding hedonic consumption to maintain moral character.](#)

Optional:

- Kreps, T.A., & Monin, B. (2014). [Core values vs. common sense: consequentialist explanations appear less rooted in morality.](#) *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 40, 1529-1542.

March 9: Workplace Morality

- Gino, F., Ayal, S., & Ariely, D. (2009). [Contagion and differentiation in unethical behavior: The effect of one bad apple on the barrel.](#) *Psychological Science*, 20, 393-398.
- Leavitt, K., & Sluss, D. M. (2015). [Lying for who we are: An identity-based model of workplace dishonesty.](#) *Academy of Management Review*, 40, 587-610.
- Cohen, T. R., Panter, A. T., Turan, N., Morse, L., & Kim, Y. (2014). [Moral character in the workplace.](#) *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 107, 943-963.
- May, D. R., Luth, M. T., & Schworer, C. E. (2014). [The influence of business ethics education on moral efficacy, moral meaningfulness, and moral courage: A quasi-experimental study.](#) *Journal of Business Ethics*, 124, 67-80.

Optional:

- Kim, Y., & Cohen, T. R. (2015). [Moral character and workplace deviance: Recent research and current trends.](#) *Current Opinion in Psychology*, 6, 134-138.
- Celse, J., Chang, K., Max, S., & Quinton, S. (2016). The reduction of employee lying behaviour: Inspiration from a study of envy in part-time employees. *Journal of Strategy and Management*, 9, 118-137.

March 16: Management Morality

- Fehr, R., Yam, K. C. S., & Dang, C. (2015). [Moralized leadership: The construction and consequences of ethical leader perceptions](#). *Academy of Management Review*, 40, 182-209.
- Shin, Y., Sung, S. Y., Choi, J. N., & Kim, M. S. (2015). [Top management ethical leadership and firm performance: Mediating role of ethical and procedural justice climate](#). *Journal of Business Ethics*, 129, 43-57.
- Kacmar, K. M., Bachrach, D. G., Harris, K., & Zivnuska, S. (2011). [Fostering good citizenship through ethical leadership: Exploring the moderating role of gender and organizational politics](#). *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 96, 633-642.
- Derfler-Rozin, R., Baker, B., & Gino, F. (2017). [Compromised ethics in hiring processes? How referrers' power affects employees' reactions to referral practices](#). *Academy of Management Journal*.

Optional:

- Mooijman, M., & Graham, J. (under review). [How unjust punishments perpetuate in organizations](#). Manuscript invited for *Research in Organizational Behavior* (B. Staw & A. Brief, Eds.).

March 30: Group Morality

- Cikara, M., & Paluck, E. L. (2013). [When going along gets you nowhere and the upside of conflict behaviors](#). *Social and Personality Psychology Compass*, 7, 559-571.
- Halevy, N., Kreps, T.A., Weisel, O., & Goldenberg, A. (2015). [Morality in intergroup conflict](#). *Current Opinion in Psychology*, 6, 10-14.
- Mooijman, M., Meindl, P., Dehghani, M., Oyserman, D., Monterosso, J., Doris, J., & Graham, J. (in press). [Resisting temptation for the good of the group: Binding moral values and the moralization of self-control](#). *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*.
- Thau, S., Derfler-Rozin, R., Pitesa, M., Mitchell, M. S., & Pillutla, M. M. (2015). [Unethical for the sake of the group: Risk of social exclusion and pro-group unethical behavior](#). *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 100, 98-113.

Optional:

- Hofmann, W., Meindl, P., Mooijman, M., & Graham, J. (in press). [Morality and self-control: How they are intertwined, and where they differ](#). *Current Directions in Psychological Science*.

April 6: Money Morality

- Gino, F., & Mogilner, C. (2014). [Time, money, and morality](#). *Psychological Science*, 25(2), 414-421.
- Schweitzer, M. E., Ordóñez, L., & Douma, B. (2004). [Goal setting as a motivator of unethical behavior](#). *Academy of Management Journal*, 47, 422-432.
- Vohs, K. D. (2015). [Money priming can change people's thoughts, feelings, motivations, and behaviors: An update on 10 years of experiments](#). *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General*, 144, e86-e93.
- Caruso, E. M., Shapira, O., & Landy, J. F. (2017). [Show me the money: A systematic exploration of manipulations, moderators, and mechanisms of priming effects](#). *Psychological science*, 28, 1148-1159.

April 13: Technology Morality

- Hoover, J., Dehghani, M., Johnson, K., Iliev, R., & Graham, J. (in press). [Into the wild: Big data analytics in moral psychology](#). In K. Gray & J. Graham (Eds.), *The Atlas of Moral Psychology: Mapping Good and Evil in the Mind*. New York: Guilford.
- Waytz, A., & Gray, K. (in press). [Does online technology make us more or less sociable? A preliminary review and call for research](#). *Perspectives on Psychological Science*.
- Singer, P., & Sagan, A. (2012). [Are we ready for a 'morality pill'?](#) *The New York Times*.
- Harris, J., & Savulescu, J. (2015). [A debate about moral enhancement](#). *Cambridge Quarterly of Healthcare Ethics*, 24, 8.

April 20: Research Presentations

- Edwards, P. N. (2013). How to give an academic talk, v 5.1. Retrieved from: https://ocw.mit.edu/courses/electrical-engineering-and-computer-science/6-857-network-and-computer-security-spring-2014/projects/MIT6_857S14_proj_umic-talk.pdf

Bonus: Resources on Writing (and Publishing!) Your Paper

- Kerr, N. L. (1998). [HARKing: Hypothesizing after the results are known](#). *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 2, 196-217.
- Vazire, S. (2014, March). Life After Bem. Retrieved from: <http://sometimesimwrong.typepad.com/wrong/2014/03/life-after-bem.html>
- Sternberg, R.J. (1988). [Eight common misconceptions about psychology papers](#). In *The Psychologist's Companion* (3rd ed.). New York: Cambridge University. (Chap. 1, pp. 5-16).
- Oppenheimer, D. M. (2006). [Consequences of erudite vernacular utilized irrespective of necessity: problems with using long words needlessly](#). *Applied Cognitive Psychology*, 20, 139-156.
- Jordan, C. H., & Zanna, M. P. (1999). [How to Read a Journal Article in Social Psychology](#). In R. F. Baumeister (Ed.), *The Self in Social Psychology* (pp. 461-470). Philadelphia: Psychology Press. [given for eye toward criticism]
- Silvia, P. J. (2007). *How to write a lot: A practical guide to productive academic writing*. American Psychological Association. [ask Jesse for a copy]

David Eccles School of Business Statement of Professional and Ethical Conduct

Because of the importance of professional and ethical behavior in business, and its emphasis in our program, professional or academic misconduct is not tolerated in the David Eccles School of Business. Students are expected to adhere to the standards of behavior outlined in the University of Utah Code of Student Rights and Responsibilities (Policy 6-400). Students engaging in behavioral misconduct could be subject to suspension or dismissal from the University. Students involved in any form of academic misconduct, including but not limited to cheating on tests, plagiarism and collusion may, at the instructor's discretion, receive a failing grade in the course, examination, or academic assignment. In addition to or instead of this sanction, the instructor may refer the case to the Student Behavior Committee for hearing. If the instructor chooses not to do so, the Associate Dean for Academic Affairs, after appropriate investigation, may do so along with a recommendation to dismiss the student from the Business School. If, after hearing the evidence, the Committee determines that the student in question is guilty of the misconduct charged, the Committee may impose sanctions in addition to those taken by the professor. If the academic dishonesty is not proven, the instructor must rescind any sanctions imposed and will be required to evaluate the student's performance with the assumption that there has been no misconduct. The School will treat the student likewise. If a student suspects another student of academic misconduct, he/she should refer the incident to the instructor, the appropriate department, the Associate Dean for Academic Affairs, or the Student Behavior Committee, administered by the Associate Dean of Students, 270 Union.

Statement of Grading Policy

Grading provides feedback to students on how well they have mastered the content and learning objectives of a particular course to allow students to capitalize on strengths and work to improve weaknesses through future courses of action. The DESB grading policy is intended to ensure grades offer reliable feedback regarding student performance, and to ensure fairness and consistency across the School. The faculty member is responsible for arriving at a grade for each student that the faculty member believes appropriately reflects the student's mastery of the course material and learning objectives. The faculty member will then consider the class' overall performance in terms of School guidelines. These guidelines are provided to ensure that grading, on average for the School as a whole, is sustained at a reasonable level over time. The guidelines are as follows:

COURSE LEVEL	GUIDELINE
1000-2000	2.4-2.8
3000-3990	2.6-3.0
4000-5990	2.8-3.2
6000-6990	3.1-3.5

If students have a concern about their grade in a particular course, they should consider whether it reflects an accurate evaluation of their mastery of the course material and learning objectives, in terms of the above descriptors. If they need clarification of the instructor's evaluation, they should

meet with the instructor to obtain additional information and feedback. If after doing so, they believe their grade was arrived at in an inappropriate manner, they may pursue an appeal through the School's appeals process as described in Section 5.15 of the University of Utah Code of Student Rights and Responsibilities (Policy 6-400).

Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) Statement

The University of Utah seeks to provide equal access to its programs, services and activities for people with disabilities. If you will need accommodations in the class, reasonable prior notice needs to be given to the Center for Disability Services, 162 Olpin Union Building, 581-5020 (V/TDD). CDS will work with you and the instructor to make arrangements for accommodations. All information in this course can be made available in alternative format with prior notification to the Center for Disability Services.

Wellness Statement

Personal concerns such as stress, anxiety, relationship difficulties, depression, cross-cultural differences, etc., can interfere with a student's ability to succeed and thrive at the University of Utah. For helpful resources contact the Center for Student Wellness - www.wellness.utah.edu; 801-581-7776.

Veterans Center

If you are a **student veteran**, I want you to know that the U of Utah has a Veterans Support Center on campus. They are located in Room 161 in the Olpin Union Building. Hours: M-F 8-5pm. Please visit their website for more information about what support they offer, a list of ongoing events and links to outside resources: <http://veteranscenter.utah.edu/>. Please also let me know if you need any additional support in this class for any reason.

LGBT Resource Center

If you are a member of the **LGBTQ community**, I want you to know that my classroom is a safe zone*. Additionally, please know that the U of Utah has an LGBT Resource Center on campus. They are located in Room 409 in the Oplin Union Building. Hours: M-F 8-5pm. You can visit their website to find more information about the support they can offer, a list of events through the center and links to additional resources: <http://lgbt.utah.edu/>. Please also let me know if there is any additional support you need in this class.

Learners of English as an Additional/Second Language

If you are an English language learner, please be aware of several resources on campus that will support you with your language development and writing. These resources include: the Department of Linguistics ESL Program (<http://linguistics.utah.edu/esl-program/>); the Writing Center (<http://writingcenter.utah.edu/>); the Writing Program (<http://writing-program.utah.edu/>); the English Language Institute (<http://continue.utah.edu/eli/>). Please let me know if there is any additional support you would like to discuss for this class.

All written information in the course can be made available in alternative format with prior notification to the Center for Disability Services. <http://www.oeo.utah.edu/ada/guide/faculty>