

School/Department:	Rotterdam School of Management / Department of Business-Society Management
Project Title:	The cognitive bases of ethical behavior
Abstract:	<p>It seems obvious that the way that people understand and think about the organizational environment they are in influences the type of behavior they enact. Yet, we know very little about how cognitive representations affect ethical (e.g., being truthful, helping others) or unethical (e.g., stealing, lying) behaviors. One deep-level cognitive variable that particularly determines such understanding is construal level, that is, the level of abstraction of our mental representations (Liberman & Trope, 2008, 2014; Wiesenfeld, Reyt, Brockner, & Trope, 2017). Abstract representations (i.e. high level construals) allow you to take a mental step back and see the broad picture. In contrast, concrete representations (i.e. low level construals) are more detailed and allow you to remain in the moment.</p> <p>Unfortunately, prior work studying construal level (or proxies of it, such as psychological distance) in the context of ethical or prosocial behavior found inconsistent and apparently opposite effects. For instance high (vs. low) construal level promotes a focus on benefitting the collective (Stillman, Fujita, Sheldon, & Trope, 2018) but also decreased empathic concerns (Wolfin, Corneille, Yzerbyt, & Förster, 2011). Furthermore, some research finds that high (vs. low) construal level (or psychological distance) leads to more severe judgments of moral transgressions, while other research finds the opposite or no effect (Eyal, Liberman, & Trope, 2008; Gong & Medin, 2012; van Dijke, van Houwelingen, De Cremer, & De Schutter, 2018; Zeele & Jokic, 2014).</p> <p>The proposed PhD project is based on the premise that to understand how construal level is related to ethical or prosocial behavior, it is necessary to understand that multiple psychological processes (e.g., awareness of need, evaluation of tangible and intangible costs and benefits, evaluation of concordance with values, perceived efficacy) unfold when these types of behavior are enacted. These different processes cannot all be linked with construal level in a simple and straightforward way (e.g., in the sense that “high construal level is better”). Instead, high and low construal level serve distinct self-regulatory functions and these functions link in unique</p>

	<p>ways with the aforementioned processes. Moreover, because the various processes involved in driving ethical and prosocial behavior unfold on a moment to moment basis, the roles of high and low construal level should also be studied on a moment to moment basis.</p> <p>The research questions will, first, be tested in (laboratory and online) experiments, which emphasize in particular the induction of differences in construal level over time within the same participants. Second, the generalizability of these findings to work organizations will be studied using Experience Sampling Methodology (ESM). This method involves measuring daily experiences and behaviors of employees and managers in the work context, and testing how these experiences and behaviors unfold over time.</p> <p>References</p> <p>Eyal, T., Liberman, N., & Trope, Y. (2008). Judging near and distant virtue and vice. <i>Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 44</i>, 1204–1209.</p> <p>Gong, H., & Medin, D. L. (2012). Construal levels and moral judgment: Some complications. <i>Judgment and Decision Making, 7</i>, 628–638.</p> <p>Gong, H., Medin, D. L., Eyal, T., Liberman, N., Trope, Y., Žeželj, I. L., & Jokić, B. R. (2014). Commentaries and rejoinder on Žeželj and Jokić (2014). <i>Social Psychology, 45</i>, 327–334.</p> <p>Liberman, N., & Trope, Y. (2008). The psychology of transcending the here and now. <i>Science, 322</i>(5905), 1201–1205.</p> <p>Liberman, N., & Trope, Y. (2014). Traversing psychological distance. <i>Trends in Cognitive Sciences, 18</i>(7), 364–369.</p> <p>Stillman, P. E., Fujita, K., Sheldon, O., & Trope, Y. (2018). From “me” to “we”: The role of construal level in promoting maximized joint outcomes. <i>Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 147</i>, 16–25.</p> <p>van Dijke, M. H., Van Houwelingen, G., De Cremer, D., & De Schutter, L. (2018). So gross and yet so far away: Psychological distance moderates the effect of disgust on moral judgment. <i>Social Psychological and Personality Science, 9</i>, 689–701.</p> <p>Wiesenfeld, B. M., Reyt, J.-N., Brockner, J., & Trope, Y. (2017). Construal Level Theory in Organizational Research. <i>Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior, 4</i>(1), 367–400.</p> <p>Wolfin, K. A., Corneille, O., Yzerbyt, V. Y., & Förster, J. (2011). Narrowing down to open up for other people's concerns: Empathic concern can be enhanced by inducing detailed processing. <i>Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 47</i>(2), 418–424.</p> <p>Zeželj, I. L., & Jokic, B. R. (2014). Replication of experiments evaluating impact of psychological distance on moral judgment:</p>
--	--

	(Eyal, Liberman, & Trope, 2008; Gong & Medin, 2012). <i>Social Psychology</i> , 45, 223–231.
Requirements of candidate:	<p>Background: Management / Business with a focus on Organizational Behavior; social or organizational psychology; behavioral economics. Regardless of specific background, research experience (e.g. laboratory experiments, surveys, ESM studies) and the statistics required to analyze the resulting data (i.e., ANOVA, OLS regression, Hierarchical Linear Modeling) is required. Excellent communication skills for both writing and speaking in English are expected. Candidates are expected to be in the top segment of their class with respect to their grades and must show interest in an academic career.</p> <p>Master's degree: Yes</p> <p>EUR requirement: IELTS: 7.5 (min. 6.0 for all subs.) or TOEFL: 100 (internet) or 600 (paper) and GMAT-test or GRE-test: 85%.</p>
Supervisor information:	<p>Prof. Dr. Marius van Dijke mvandijke@rsm.nl https://www.irim.eur.nl/people/marius-van-dijke/</p> <p>Publications of last five years:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Sheppard, L., O'Reilly, J., van Dijke, M. H., Restubog, S. L. D. & Aquino, K. (in press). The Stress-Relieving Benefits of Positively-Experienced Social Sexual Behavior in the Workplace. <i>Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes</i>. 2. Van Dijke, M. H. (in press). Power and leadership. <i>Current Opinion in Psychology</i>. 3. Gurge, L., van Dijke, M. H., Zheng, X., & De Cremer, D. (in press). Power corrupts the mind? Power lowers moral reasoning Level. <i>The Leadership Quarterly</i>. 4. Zheng, X., Yuan, Y., van Dijke, M. H., De Cremer, D., & Van Hiel, A. (in press). The interactive effect of a leader's sense of uniqueness and sense of belongingness on followers' perceptions of leader authenticity. <i>Journal of Business Ethics</i>. 5. Van Dijke, M. H., Leunissen, J. M., Wildschut, T., & Sedikides, C. (2019). Nostalgia promotes intrinsic motivation in the

	<p>presence of low interactional justice. <i>Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes</i>, 150, 46-61.</p> <p>6. van Dijke, M. H, Gobena, L. B., & Verboon, P. (2019). Make me want to pay! A three-way interaction between procedural justice, distributive justice, and power on voluntary tax compliance. <i>Frontiers in Psychology</i>.</p> <p>7. De Cremer, D., van Dijke, M.H., Schminke, M., De Schutter, L., & Stouten, J. (2018). The trickle-down effects of perceived trustworthiness on subordinate performance. <i>Journal of Applied Psychology</i>, 1335-1357.</p> <p>8. van Dijke, M. H., Van Houwelingen, G., De Cremer, D., & De Schutter, L. (2018). So gross and yet so far away: Psychological distance moderates the effect of disgust on moral judgment. <i>Social Psychological and Personality Science</i>, 9, 689-701.</p> <p>9. Van Houwelingen, G., van Dijke, M. H., & De Cremer, D. (2018). Trust maintenance as a function of construal level and attributions: the case of apologies. <i>European Journal of Social Psychology</i> 48, 33-46.</p> <p>10. Van Dijke, M. H., De Cremer, D., Langendijk, G., & Anderson, C. (2018). Ranking low, feeling high: How hierarchical position and experienced power promote prosocial behavior in response to procedural justice. <i>Journal of Applied Psychology</i>, 103, 164–181.</p> <p>11. Zheng, X., van Dijke, M. H., Narayanan, J., & De Cremer, D. (2018). When expressing forgiveness backfires in the workplace: Victim power moderates the effect of expressing forgiveness on transgressor compliance. <i>European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology</i>, 27, 70-87.</p> <p>12. Gobena, L. B. & van Dijke, M. H. (2017). Fear and caring: The interactive effects of procedural justice, trust in authorities, and identification with the nation on voluntary tax compliance. <i>Journal of Economic Psychology</i> 62, 1-16.</p> <p>13. Van Houwelingen, G., van Dijke, M. H., & De Cremer, D. (2017). Unfair behavior at the top promotes bad behavior in the middle: The effect of social distance. <i>Journal of Management</i>, 43, 319-347.</p> <p>14. Zheng, X., van Dijke, M. H., Leunissen, J., Giurge, L., & De Cremer, D. (2016). When are apologies effective at the workplace?: Power of the transgressor moderates the effect of an apology on forgiveness. <i>Human Relations</i>, 69, 1387–1418.</p> <p>15. Gobena, L. B. & van Dijke, M. H. (2016). Power, procedural justice, and trust: A moderated mediation analysis of voluntary tax compliance among Ethiopian small business owners. <i>Journal of Economic Psychology</i>, 52, 24–37.</p> <p>16. DeSmet, P., van Hoogervorst, N., & van Dijke, M. H. (2015). Prophets vs. profits: How market competition influences leaders' disciplining behavior of ethical transgressions. <i>Leadership</i></p>
--	---

	<p><i>Quarterly</i>, 26, 1034-1050.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 17. van Houwelingen, G., van Dijke, M. H., & De Cremer, D. (2015). Getting it done and getting it right: Leader disciplinary reactions to followers' moral transgressions are determined by leader's construal level mindset. <i>Leadership Quarterly</i>, 26, 878-891. 18. van Dijke, M. H., De Cremer, D., Brebels, L., & van Quaquebeke, N. (2015). Willing and Able: Action-State Orientation and the relation between Procedural Justice and Employee Cooperation. <i>Journal of Management</i>, 41, 1982–2003. 19. Joosten, A., van Dijke, M. H., Van Hiel, A., & De Cremer, D. (2015). Out of control!? How loss of self-control influences prosocial behavior: the role of power and moral values. <i>PLOS ONE</i>, 10(5): e0126377. 20. van Gils, S., van Quaquebeke, N., van Knippenberg, D., van Dijke, M. H., & De Cremer, D. (2015). Ethical leadership and follower organizational deviance: The moderating role of follower moral attentiveness. <i>Leadership Quarterly</i>, 26, 190-203. 21. Van Dijke, M. H., Wildschut, T., & Leunissen, J. M. & Sedikides, C. (2015). Nostalgia Buffers the Negative Impact of Low Procedural Justice on Cooperation. <i>Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes</i>, 127, 15–29. 22. Bianchi, E., Brockner, J., van den Bos, K., Seifert, M., Moon, H., van Dijke, M. H., & De Cremer, D., (2015). Trust in decision-making authorities dictates the form of the interactive relationship between outcome favorability and procedural fairness. <i>Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin</i>, 41, 19-34.
	<p>Dr. Gijs van Houwelingen (daily supervisor) University of Amsterdam, Amsterdam Business School g.g.vanhouwelingen@uva.nl</p> <p>https://www.uva.nl/en/profile/h/o/g.g.vanhouwelingen/g.g.vanhouwelingen.html</p> <p><u>Publication list:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. van Dijke, M. H., Van Houwelingen, G., De Cremer, D., & De Schutter, L. (2018). So gross and yet so far away: Psychological distance moderates the effect of disgust on moral judgment. <i>Social Psychological and Personality Science</i>, 9, 689-701. 2. Van Houwelingen, G.G., Stam, D.A., & Giessner, S.R. (2018). So close and yet so far away: A psychological distance account of the effectiveness of leader appeals. <i>Journal of Applied Social Psychology</i>, advance online publication. 3. Van Houwelingen, G., van Dijke, M. H., & De Cremer, D.

	<p>(2018). Trust maintenance as a function of construal level and attributions: the case of apologies. <i>European Journal of Social Psychology</i> 48, 33-46.</p> <p>4. Van Houwelingen, G., van Dijke, M. H., & De Cremer, D. (2015). Getting it done and getting it right: Leader disciplinary reactions to followers' moral transgressions are determined by leader's construal level mindset. <i>Leadership Quarterly</i>, 26, 878-891.</p> <p>5. Van Houwelingen, G., van Dijke, M. H., & De Cremer, D. (2017). Unfair behavior at the top promotes bad behavior in the middle: The effect of social distance. <i>Journal of Management</i>, 43, 319-347.</p>
--	---

2020 CSC-PhD programme information will be shared and updated online:
<https://www.eur.nl/en/about-eur/erasmus-university-china-center-0/csc-scholarship/prospective-phd-candidates>