

BUS87401: Organizational Behavior
Professor Molly Kern
Spring 2021

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 Wednesdays from 10:00a.m. – 12:00p.m. via Zoom.

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

Session	Date	Topic	Due (by 8am each day)	Lead
1	February 3	Course Overview: What is OB?		Kern
2	February 10	Insights in OB Learned Through Meta-analysis		Rothstein
3	February 17	Person vs. Situation		Kern
4	February 24	Motivation		Kopelman
5	March 3	The Individual		Dilchert
6	March 10	Counterproductive Work Behavior	Idea paper	Dilchert
7	March 17	Creativity and Innovation	Idea paper	Halbinger
8	March 24	Power & Influence	Idea paper	Kern
9	April 7	Leadership	Idea paper	Tillman
10	April 14	Conflict	Idea paper	Kern
11	April 21	Equity, Fairness & Trust	Idea paper	Kern
12	April 28	Group Process & Diversity	Idea paper	Kern
13	May 5	Organizations in denial: Work-life Meets Sustainability	Idea paper	Thompson
14	May 12	Presentations and Feedback	Presentation slides	Kern; all invited
	May 17		Paper	

**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?

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.

Students are expected to attend all class meetings, to be prepared (i.e., complete readings in advance of every class meeting) and to contribute constructively to the discussions. Please notify me in advance if you cannot attend a class.

COURSE REQUIREMENTS AND GRADING

Your grade will be made up of two components: idea papers and a research paper.

1. Idea papers (50%)

You are required to submit an idea paper (1-2 pages, TNR 12 point, double-spaced) by 8am the day before class (Tuesday) for 8 of the modules indicated in the course outline. 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. The write up should include a paragraph that defines the relevant constructs, and also a paragraph that discusses the "real-world" impact (i.e., organizational benefits) of gaining knowledge about the proposed relationship. Please try to support the idea as logically as you can.

2. Research paper and presentation (50%)

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. 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 a classmate by May 1st. They will provide feedback on this draft either in writing and/or verbally by May 8th. Then, in our final class on May 12th you will deliver a 15 minute "Academy"-style presentation. Your presentation should follow the same bulleted outline as provided above and should be presented using PowerPoint (or something similar). The guest lecturers will be invited to attend and will have the opportunity to ask questions and provide feedback.

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

May 17th at 8am.

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

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.

Insights in OB Learned Through Meta-analysis

Barrick, M. R., & Mount, M. K. (1991). The Big Five personality dimensions and job performance: A meta-analysis. *Personnel Psychology*, 44(1), 1-26.

Cooper, H. M. (1982). Scientific Guidelines for Conducting Integrative Research Reviews. *Review of Educational Research*, 52(2), 291-302.

Field, AP & Gillett, R. How to do a meta-analysis (2010). *British Journal of Mathematical and Statistical Psychology*, 63, 665-694.

Richardson, K. M., & Rothstein, H. R. (2008). Effects of occupational stress management intervention programs: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 13(1), 69-93.

Pindek, S, Kessler, S, and Spector PE (2016). A quantitative and qualitative review of what meta-analyses have contributed to our understanding of human resource management. *Human Resource Management Review*, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.hrmr.2016.09.003>

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

Konopaske, R., Ivancevich, J. M., Matteson, M. T. (2017). *Organizational Behavior and Management*. United Kingdom: McGraw-Hill Education, Chapter 5.

Pinder, C. C. (1984). *Work Motivation: Theory, Issues, and Applications*. United Kingdom: Scott, Foresman, 140-147.

Kopelman, R. E., Liebman, A. M., & Yukl, G. A. (1978). Experimental Test of a Return on Effort Version of Expectancy Theory: Across-Person and Within-Person Analyses. *Journal of Management*, 4(1), 97–105.

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.

The Individual

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.

Counterproductive Work Behaviors

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

Creativity and Innovation

Amabile, T.M., Barsade, S.G., Mueller, J.S., Staw, B.M. 2005. Affect and Creativity at Work. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 50 (3): 367 - 403.

Grant, A. M., & Berry, J. W. 2011. The necessity of others is the mother of invention: Intrinsic and prosocial motivations, perspective taking, and creativity. *Academy of Management Journal*, 54(1): 73-96.

Baer, M. 2012. 2012: Putting creativity to work: The implementation of creative ideas in organizations. *Academy of Management Journal*, 55(5): 1102-1119.

Stock, R. M., von Hippel, E., & Gillert, N. L. (2016). Impacts of personality traits on consumer innovation success. *Research Policy*, 45(4), 757-769.

Franke, N., & Shah, S. (2003). How communities support innovative activities: an exploration of assistance and sharing among end-users. *Research policy*, 32(1), 157-178.

Recommended:

Perry-Smith, J. E., & Shalley, C. E. (2003). The social side of creativity: A static and dynamic social network perspective. *Academy of management review*, 28(1), 89-106.

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.

Leadership

Anderson, M. H., & Sun, P. Y. (2017). Reviewing leadership styles: Overlaps and the need for a new 'full-range' theory. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, 19, 76-96.

Gardner, W. L., Karam, E. P., Alvesson, M., & Einola, K. (In Press). Leadership: Current Authentic leadership theory: The case for and against. *The Leadership Quarterly*.

McClanahan, K. J. (2020). Viva la evolution: Using dual-strategies theory to explain leadership in modern organizations. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 31(1), 101315..

Mumford, M. D., & Fried, Y. (2014). Give them what they want or give them what they need? Ideology in the study of leadership. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 35(5), 622- 634.

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.

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., & Zapata, K. P. (2015). Justice, fairness, and employee reactions. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior*, 2, 75-99.

Matta, F. K., Scott, B.A., Colquitt, J.A., Koopman, J., & Passantino, L.G. (2017). Is consistently unfair better than sporadically fair? An investigation of justice variability and stress. *Academy of Management Journal*, 60(2), 743-770. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amj.2014.0455>

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.

Group Process & Diversity

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.

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.

Research on Work-life Integration

Subtopic: Work-life Roles versus Environmental Stewardship

Allers, K. S. Rethinking work-life balance for women of color. And how white women got it in the first place. March 5, 2018, Slate.com <https://slate.com/human-interest/2018/03/for-women-of-color-work-life-balance-is-a-different-kind-of-problem.html>

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.

Melo, P. C., et al., (2018). Does work-life balance affect pro-environmental behaviour? Evidence for the UK using longitudinal microdata. *Ecological Economics*, 145, 170-181.

Shockley, K.M. (2018). Managing the work-family interface. In N. Anderson, C. Viswesvaran, H.K. Sinangil & D. Ones (Eds.) *Handbook of Industrial, Work, and Organizational Psychology*, Sage.

Shen, W., & Shockley, K.M. (invited chapter in peer review). Work-family research: Questioning assumptions and looking forward for true impact. In E. K. Kelloway and C. Cooper (Eds.) *Research Agenda for Workplace Stress and Wellbeing*. Edward Elgar Pub.

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.

Optional Readings:

Shockley, et al., (2017). Disentangling the relationship between gender and work-family conflict: An integration of theoretical perspectives using meta-analytic methods. *Journal of Applied Psychology Monograph*, 102, 1601-1635.

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 Pub.