BUS87401: Organizational Behavior
Professor Molly Kern
Fall 2018

Phone: (646) 312-3673   **E-mail**: mary.kern@baruch.cuny.edu
Office: 9-264, Management Department   **Office Hrs**: by appointment

COURSE INFORMATION

We will meet on Fridays from 10:00a.m. – 12:00p.m. in the PhD conference room (NVC13-254).

The purpose of this course is to examine and understand fundamental theories and empirical research in the field of organizational behavior and to increase our understanding of people's behavior in organizations. To do so, we will study a blend of classic and contemporary literature so that we can appreciate the prevailing theories and findings within a broader context. I will encourage you to alter your perspective, re-frame the research questions, introduce new theory, and to consider the impact of the level of analysis.

The following is a partial list of course objectives:
- Provide exposure to a variety of topic areas in organizational behavior
- Assist students in the process of developing expertise in a domain of interest
- Assist students in learning to develop theoretically-based research propositions
- Explore new research ideas

COURSE OUTLINE

Meeting #1: September 7   Course Overview: What is OB?
Meeting #2: September 14   Person vs. Situation*
Meeting #3: September 21   Motivation
Meeting #4: September 28   The Person
Meeting #5: October 5   Equity & Fairness, & Trust*
Meeting #6: October 12   Power & Influence
Meeting #7: October 19   Creativity and Innovation
Meeting #8: October 26   Leadership
Meeting #9: November 2   Conflict
Meeting #10: November 9   Group Process & Diversity
Meeting #11: November 16   Organizations in denial: Work-life meets sustainability
Meeting #12: November 30   Counterproductive work behavior
Meeting #13: December 7   Presentations and Feedback*

* On dates noted with an asterisk we will meet from 8-10am, rather than 10am-12pm.

** We will not have class on August 31st. This session will be rescheduled. Other changes may be made to the schedule as the course progresses. All changes will be addressed in class and also communicated via Blackboard.

** Attendance at external seminars may also be requested.

PREPARING FOR CLASS

You are expected to come prepared to each class prepared to discuss all of the assigned readings for that session. The essence of this seminar is contained in the quality of the classroom discussion. As you review each reading you might consider the following questions:

- What is the basic formulation of the theory (constructs and relationships among them), and what drives the theory?
- What are the underlying assumptions?
- What is the main contribution of this paper? What are the interesting ideas?
- What is your analysis of the methods?
- What was done well, what is novel, and what could have been improved?
- Do you believe the argument? What would it take to convince you?
- What are the boundary conditions of the argument; in other words, under what circumstances does the argument apply and not apply?
- What are the critical differences between this author's argument and others you have read? Can these differences be resolved through an empirical test?

COURSE REQUIREMENTS AND GRADING

Your grade will be made up of three components: two idea papers, your participation in class, and a research paper.

1. Idea papers (15% each)
You are required to submit 2 short idea papers (2-3 pages, TNR 12 point, double-spaced). The first will be due on October 5th, and the second will be due on November 2nd. These papers should propose a novel hypothesis (something not already known or immediately obvious to researchers in OB) and should build on one or more of the ideas that have surfaced in the papers we have been reading. This brief paper should lay out the background of the area briefly and then get into the new idea. Please try to support the idea as logically as you can.

2. Participation and presentations in class (30%)
Our discussions will assume that everyone is familiar with the readings for that day. So, you should be prepared to discuss them in detail. Each class will explore what we know and what we don't know about the day's topic. We'll pursue what we would like to know and how we would go about discovering it. We will generate a variety of questions and we will try to outline actual research projects that might eliminate alternative explanations, assess and potentially validate the underlying assumptions of a model, and identify its boundary conditions, causally if possible.

Each week, one student (possibly two, depending upon class size) will lead the discussion of the readings. This will involve:

1. selecting either a theoretical or empirical paper (topically relevant to the other assigned reading) published in a top tier journal (e.g. AMR, AMJ, OBHDP, JPSP, PSPB, JAP, ASQ, JESP) within the last 12 months and distributing it to the class one week in advance; and
2. making an integrated presentation of the readings for that week. Specifically, the discussion leaders are expected to prepare a 1-page "gestalt" integration of the papers in a fashion that:
   a. accurately represents the key ideas and contributions of the papers
   b. serves as a mnemonic device for students to remember each paper at a later time.

   WARNING: please avoid doing any of the following:
   - exceed the one page limit
   - prepare a list of questions to discuss (instead: discussion leaders should make "assertions" and suggest "hypotheses")
   - provide a review of each paper in an annotated style (instead: discussion leaders should critique the paper, or better yet, suggest theoretical and empirical extensions of the paper)
   - provide a "boilerplate" critique (e.g., the shortcomings of lab experiments; small sample size, etc.).

If you are not leading the discussion, you should be prepared to actively respond to what the lead discussion person says. This role is meant to help you constructively develop your critical thinking abilities.

Remember, the purpose of the discussion is NOT to review the readings (everyone has read them), but rather, to articulate the central idea of the argument/finding and then discuss its internal consistency, psychological appeal, ability to account for data, and stimulate new research and connection to other areas.

Students are expected to attend all class meetings, to be prepared (i.e., complete readings in advance of every class meeting), to contribute constructively to the discussions, and to provide feedback to each other on their research ideas (throughout the course and specifically on the final papers). Please notify me in advance if you cannot attend a class.

3. Research paper (40%)
The culminating assignment for this seminar is a research paper which adds new knowledge or brings a new perspective to old findings within the field. It is perfectly acceptable to incorporate your idea papers into this longer paper, but this is not necessary or even preferred. The paper should review prior research on your topic or related literatures (if your topic is quite new), and then should pose a set of hypotheses that would be worth pursuing in future research (e.g. a grant agency would find sufficient merit to fund this research). You should then describe what

an empirical test of your ideas would look like through a description of a research design (e.g. the methods section). Note: Your paper should not be one you are working on for another course requirement.

Thus, your paper should look like the first half of a journal article and include:

- Introduction: What is the research question? Why is it important? What prior research has been done? What question(s) remain unanswered?
- Theory, model, and hypotheses: What are the independent and dependent variables? What relationships do you expect? Why?
- Methods: How would you collect data to test your hypotheses? What would you use to manipulate your factors and/or what measures would you use to operationalize your constructs? What statistics would you use to test your hypotheses? If the data confirmed your hypotheses what would the results of the statistical tests look like?

Feedback is a critical component of the research process. If you send the first readable version of one of your papers to a journal, its chances of getting a revise-and-resubmit decision are extremely low. In fact, editors are often angry and disappointed when they read papers that have obviously not been looked at by others first. Thus, the "friendly review" is one of those activities that will help make you a professional in the field. Developing a set of colleagues who can comment critically on your work is one of the many keys to success in our profession. We will share feedback in two ways. First, you will submit a rough draft with one randomly selected classmate on November 16th. They will provide feedback on this draft either in writing and/or verbally November 26th. Then, you will submit a stronger rough draft with the entire class on December 3rd. Everyone will read this draft in preparation for class on the 7th. During our last class on December 7th, you will each deliver a 15 minute "Academy"-style. Your presentation should follow the same bulleted outline as provided above and should be presented using PowerPoint (or something similar). Please bring copies of your slides for each classmate. After your presentation the class will provide approximately 15 minutes of comments based on their reading of your draft and the presentation.

When you have considered the comments shared by the class and revised your paper in line with their suggestions, you should submit your paper with a cover letter as if you were submitting it to a journal. Please submit both a hardcopy and a soft copy (via Blackboard) by December 14th at 9am.

ETHICS

Please make sure you understand the Graduate Center's policy on academic integrity and honesty (See http://web.gc.cuny.edu/provost/pdf/AvoidingPlagiarism.pdf). Written assignments are to be your own work. This course has a "zero tolerance" policy on cheating and plagiarism. Any student who breaks academic rules will receive a zero for that assignment. As required by Graduate Center policy, I will submit a report of suspected academic dishonesty to the Executive Officer for the program and Vice President for Student Affairs.

ASSIGNED READING

* Please note: We will be adding at least one empirical paper to each session beginning with motivation. I will also note when specific assigned reading can be skimmed.

Course Overview: What is OB?

Heath, C., & Sitkin, S. (2000). Big-B versus Big-O: An examination into what is distinctly organizational about organizational behavior. Journal of Organizational Behavior, 22, 1-16.

Johns, G. Advances in the treatment of context in organizational research. Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior, 5.

Mitchell, T. R. (2018). A dynamic, inclusive, and affective evolutionary view of organizational behavior. Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior, 5, 1-19.

Porter, W., & Scheneider, B. (2014). What was, what is, and what may be in op/ob. Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior, 1.

Person vs. Situation

van Viannen, A. E. M. (2018). Person-environment fit: A review of its basic tenets. Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior, 5, 75-101.

Schneider, B. et al (1995). The ASA framework: An update. Personnel Psychology, 48, 747-773.

Ross L. & Nisbett, R.E. (2011). Chapters 1 & 2. The person and the situation: Perspectives of social psychology.

Chatman, J. (1989). Improving interactional organizational research: A model of person-organization fit. Academy of Management Review, 14, 333-349.

Motivation

Botvinick, M., & Braver, T. (2015). Motivation and cognitive control: From behavior to neural mechanism. Annual Review of Psychology, 66, 83-113.

Crocker, J., Canevello, A., & Brown, A. A. (2017). Social motivation: Costs and benefits of selfishness and otherishness. Annual Review of Psychology, 68, 299-325.

Grant, A. M., & Shin, J. (2012). Work motivation: Directing, energizing, and maintaining effort (and research). In The Oxford Handbook of Human Motivation, Ryan, R. M. (Ed.)

Staw, B.M., (1974). Attitudinal and Behavioral Consequences of Changing a Major Organizational Reward: A Natural Field Experiment. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 29, 742-751.

Locke, E.A. & Latham, G.P. (2002). Building a practically useful theory of goal setting and task motivation: A 35 year odyssey. American Psychologist, 57, 705-717.

Rothbard, N. P. (2001). Enriching or Depleting? The Dynamics of Engagement in Work and Family Roles. Administrative Science Quarterly, 46, 655-684.

The Individual
Professor Stephan Dilchert

Connelly, B. S., Ones, D. S., & Hulsheger, U. R. (2017). Personality in industrial, work, and organizational psychology: Theory, measurement and application. The SAGE Handbook of Industrial, Work & Organizational Psychology (3rd ed.)

Dilchert, S. (2017). Cognitive ability. The SAGE Handbook of Industrial, Work & Organizational Psychology (3rd ed.)

Stanek, K. C., & Ones, D. S. (2017). Taxonomies and compendia of cognitive ability and personality and measures relevant to industrial, work and organizational psychology. The SAGE Handbook of Industrial, Work & Organizational Psychology (3rd ed.)
PLEASE READ LAST AND SKIM.

Equity, Fairness & Trust

Colquitt, J. A., Scott, B. A., Rodell, J. B., Long, D. M., Zapata, C. P., Conlon, D. E., & Wesson, M. J. (2013). Justice at the millennium, a decade later: A meta-analytic test of social exchange and affect-based perspectives. Journal of Applied Psychology, 98, 199-236.

Colquitt, J. A., & Zipay, K. P. (2015). Justice, fairness, and employee reactions. Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior, 2, 75-99.

Schäfer, M., Haun, D.B.M. & Tomasello, M. (2015). Fair is not fair everywhere. Psychological Science, 1-9.

Cropanzano, R., Bowen, D. E., & Gilliland, S. W. (2007). The management of organizational justice. The Academy of Management Perspectives, 34-48.

Greenberg, J. (1988). Equity & workplace status: A field experiment. Journal of Applied Psychology, 73, 606-613.

Adams, J. S. (1965). Inequity in social exchange. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.) Advances in Social Psychology, 2, 267-299. New York: Academic Press.

Power & Influence

Higgins, C. A., Judge, T. A., & Ferris, G. R. (2003) Influence tactics and work outcomes: A meta-analysis. Journal of Organizational Behavior, 24, 89-106.

Keltner, D., Gruenfeld, D. H., & Anderson, C. (2003). Power, approach, and inhibition. Psychological Review, 110, 265-284.

Scott, B. & Judge, T. (2009). The popularity contest at work: Who wins, why, and what do they receive? Journal of Applied Psychology, 94, 20-33.

Magee, J. C. & Galinsky, A. D. (2008). Social hierarchy: The self-reinforcing nature of power and status. Academy of Management Annals, 2, 351-398.

Salancik, G.R., & Pfeffer, J. 1977. Who gets power and how they hold on to it: A strategic contingency model of power. Organizational Dynamics, 5: 3–21.

Smith, P. K., Jostmann, N. B., Galinsky A. D. van Dijk, W. W. (2008). Lacking power impairs executive functions. Psychological Science, 19, 469-475.

Creativity and Innovation

Amabile, T., Barsade, S., Mueller, J. & Staw, B. (2005). Affect & creativity at work: A daily longitudinal study. Administrative Science Quarterly, 40, 367-403.

Amabile, T. M., & Pratt, M. G. (2016). The dynamic componential model of creativity and innovation in organizations: Making progress, making meaning. Research in Organizational Behavior, 36, 157–183.

Elsbach, K. D., & Hargadon, A. B. (2006). Enhancing creativity through "mindless" work: A framework of workday design. Organization Science, 17, 470-483.

Mueller, J. S., Melwani, S., & Goncalo, J. A. The bias against creativity: Why people desire but reject creative ideas. Psychological Science, 23, 13-17.

Staw, B. (1995). Why no one really wants creativity. In C. Ford & D. Gioia (Eds.). Creative action in organizations. Sage Publications: 162-166. (Very short)

Kanter, R. (1988). When a thousand flowers bloom: Structural, collective, & social conditions for innovation in organizations. In Staw & Cummings (eds.) Research in Organizational Behavior, Vol. 10. (skim).

Leadership
Professor Justice Tillman

Anderson, M. H., & Sun, P. Y. (2015). Reviewing leadership styles: Overlaps and the need for a new 'full-range'theory.*International Journal of Management Reviews*.

Avolio, B. J., Walumbwa, F. O., & Weber, T. J. (2009). Leadership: Current theories, research, and future directions. *Annual Review of Psychology*, *60*, 421-449.

Hannah, S. T., Sumanth, J. J., Lester, P., & Cavarretta, F. (2014). Debunking the false dichotomy of leadership idealism and pragmatism: Critical evaluation and support of newer genre leadership theories. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, *35*(5), 598-621.

Meuser, J. D., Gardner, W. L., Dinh, J. E., Hu, J., Liden, R. C., & Lord, R. G. (2016). A Network Analysis of Leadership Theory: The Infancy of Integration. *Journal of Management*, 0149206316647099.

Conflict

De Dreu, C. K. W., & Weingart, L. R. (2003). Task versus relationship conflict, team performance, and team member satisfaction: A meta-analysis. Journal of Applied Psychology, 88, 741-749.

Jehn, K. A. (1995). A multimethod examination of the benefits and detriments of intragroup conflict. Administrative Science Quarterly, 40, 256-282.

Thompson, L., & Brett, J. M. (2016). Negotiation. Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 136, 68-79.

Tjosvold, D., Wong, A. S. H., & Chen, N. Y. F. (2014). Constructively managing conflicts in organizations. Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior, 1, 545-568.

Group Process

de Wit, F. R., Greer, L. L., & Jehn, K. A. (2012). The paradox of intragroup conflict: A meta-analysis. Journal of Applied Psychology, 57(2), 360.

Murnighan, J. K., & Conlon, D. (1991). The dynamics of intense work teams: A study of British string quartets. Administrative Science Quarterly, 36, 165-186.

Ren, Y., Carley, K. M., & Argote, L. (2006). The contingent effects of transactive memory: When is it more beneficial to know what others know? Management Science, 52(5), 671-682.

Thibaut, J., & Kelley, H. H. (1959). The social psychology of groups, 9-30.

Zajonc, R. (1965). Social facilitation. Science, 149, 269-274.

Organizations in denial: Work-life meets sustainability
Professor Cindy Thompson

Greenhaus, G. H., & Allen, T. D. (2012). *Work-family balance: Exploration of a concept.* In L. Tetrick & J. C. Quick (Eds). *Handbook of Occupational Health Psychology*.

Jones, E. (2015). Reframing work-life balance: Lessons from sustainability. Presented at the Careers in the Rough Research Development Workshop, Academy of Management Annual Meeting, Boston, August.

Shockley, K.M. (in press). Managing the work-family interface. In N. Anderson, C. Viswesvaran, H.K. Sinangil & D. Ones (Eds.) *Handbook of Industrial, Work, and Organizational Psychology*, Sage.

Shockley, K.M., Thompson, C.A., & Andreassi, J.K. (2013). Workplace culture and work-life integration. In D. Major & R. Burke (Eds.) *Handbook of work-life integration of professionals: Challenges and opportunities*. Edward Elgar.

Thompson, C.A., Beauvais, L., & Lyness, K.S. (1999). When work-family benefits are not enough…The influence of work-family culture on benefit utilization, organizational attachment, and work-family conflict. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 54,* 392-415.

Diversity

Bunderson, J. S., & Van der Vegt, G. S. (2018). Diversity and inequality in management teams: A review and integration of research on vertical and horizontal member differences. Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior, 5, 47-73.

Harrison, D., & Klein, K. J. (). What's the difference? Diversity constructs as separation, variety, or disparity in organizations. Academy of Management Review, 32(4), 1199-1228.

Jehn, K. A., Northcraft, G. B., & Neale, M. A. Why differences make a difference: A field study of diversity, conflict, and performance in workgroups. Administrative Science Quarterly, 24(4), 741-763.

Van Knippenberg, D., & Schnippers, M. C. (2007). Work group diversity. Annual Review of Psychology, 58, 515-541.

Counterproductive Work Behaviors
Professor Stephan Dilchert

Mercado, B. K., Dilchert, S., Giordano, C., & Ones, D. S. (2017). Counterproductive work behaviors. The SAGE Handbook of Industrial, Work & Organizational Psychology (3rd ed.)