

**B791**  
**Field Survey: Organizational Behaviour & Organizational Theory**  
**Fall 2018 Course Outline**  
**Organizational Behaviour Component**

**Human Resources and Management Area**  
**DeGroote School of Business**  
**McMaster University**

**COURSE OBJECTIVE**

This seminar course provides an introduction to the core and emerging issues in organizational behaviour research. The objectives of this course are to (1) provide students with an overview of selected theories in OB, and (2) to develop students' abilities to critically assess and conduct research on OB topics.

This course will be conducted as a seminar. There will be six three-hour meetings. This format allows students to:

1. Test their understanding of theories and concepts presented in the readings.
2. Develop skills in communicating ideas, in developing and presenting arguments, in listening to and understanding others, and in challenging others' views in a way that advances everyone's understanding.
3. Learn to think independently and critically: you will need to be able to analyze the theoretical and methodological contributions and deficiencies of the articles that are being discussed. These skills will be useful to you when you conduct your own independent research.

In this course, the role of the professor will be to stimulate and guide student discussion. I will ask questions and encourage you to present, and support, different points of view in discussion.

**INSTRUCTOR AND CONTACT INFORMATION**

**Dr. Aaron Schat**  
Associate Professor of Organizational Behaviour  
& Human Resources Management  
[schata@mcmaster.ca](mailto:schata@mcmaster.ca)  
Office: DSB/417  
Office Hours:  
by appointment  
Tel: (905) 525-9140 x23946

<b>EVALUATION</b>
-------------------

There are three graded components to this part of the course. Students' grades will be calculated as follows:

Final Paper	50%
Weekly Summaries	25%
Discussion Leading	12%
Participation	13%
Total	100%

### **Conversion**

At the end of the course your overall percentage grade will be converted to your letter grade in accordance with the following conversion scheme.

LETTER GRADE	PERCENT
A+	90 - 100
A	85 - 89
A-	80 - 84
B+	75 - 79
B	70 - 74
B-	65 - 69
F	00 - 64

### **One-Page Reports (25%)**

Each week, **there are (usually) 4-6** assigned readings, that include review chapters and empirical articles. I would like you to summarize these assigned readings. For each reading, write a summary of approximately one page (between a ½ page and 1½ pages is fine; single spaced, 1" margins, 12-point Times New Roman font, name and student number can go in a header), where you answer the following questions: (1) what is the article saying – i.e., what is (are) the key contribution(s) of the study? (2) what do I agree with? (3) what do I disagree with? (4) what could have been improved in the study/article? (5) what is my overall assessment?

All work must be completed independently. Each week's article summaries should be submitted to me **via email the day before our class**, according to the order of the class schedule. Late submissions will not be accepted.

## ***Final Paper (50%)***

Your paper will consist of a research article proposal for an interesting OB topic. The paper will review the existing literature, provide theoretical justifications for the hypotheses, and describe how these hypotheses would be tested. That is, students will be writing a standard research article except that the data will not have yet been collected (therefore there will be no results or discussion section). The paper should be double spaced, with 1” margins, 12-point Times New Roman font, a title page with name and student number, maximum 40 pages including references.

I am flexible about your choice of topics (e.g., you might like to choose something related to your dissertation), but you should discuss your choice with me before beginning. You are not required to choose a topic that we have discussed in class, although I expect you to choose a micro- or meso-level topic.

This paper is due exactly two weeks after our final class meeting.

## ***Participation (13%) and Discussion Leading (12%)***

Participation. All students are expected to demonstrate their understanding of the course material, verbally, in class. Generally, you should err on the side of participating more than you would ordinarily. Your comments and questions help to make the entire course more interesting and enjoyable for everyone. There is no penalty for being “wrong” but there is a (small) penalty for being silent.

Professional academic demeanour is mandatory at all times. Academic discourse requires that opinions be expressed honestly and respectfully. Behaviours or comments that would be inappropriate in a conference or other classroom setting are also inappropriate in this seminar.

For each class, you should read all the assigned book chapters and articles. If you are not already familiar with the topics being covered, then you may find it useful to read an introductory textbook in organizational behaviour for some fundamental background on the topic.

Discussion Leading. In addition to participating in a discussion of the articles, you will also be responsible for initiating and leading the discussion of one of the assigned readings each week. Arrangements will be made to ensure that each student takes responsibility for a different article (I can assign these, or you can discuss and agree among yourselves). Your preparation to lead a discussion of an article would include preparing several questions related to the article (e.g., its introduction, methods, key findings, conclusions, etc.) that will stimulate a discussion among you and the other members of the class.

## **ACADEMIC DISHONESTY**

It is the student’s responsibility to understand what constitutes academic dishonesty. Please refer to the University Senate Academic Integrity Policy at the following URL:

<http://www.mcmaster.ca/univsec/policy/AcademicIntegrity.pdf>

This policy describes the responsibilities, procedures, and guidelines for students and faculty should a case of academic dishonesty arise. Academic dishonesty is defined as to knowingly act or fail to act in a way that results or could result in unearned academic credit or advantage. Please refer to the policy for a list of examples. The policy also provides faculty with procedures to follow in cases of academic dishonesty as well as general guidelines for penalties. For further information related to the policy, please refer to the Office of Academic Integrity at:

<http://www.mcmaster.ca/academicintegrity>

### **POTENTIAL MODIFICATIONS TO THE COURSE**

The instructor and university reserve the right to modify elements of the course during the term. The university may change the dates and deadlines for any or all courses in extreme circumstances. If either type of modification becomes necessary, reasonable notice and communication with the students will be given with explanation and the opportunity to comment on changes. It is the responsibility of the student to check their McMaster email and course websites weekly during the term and to note any changes.

### **MISSED WORK**

Late assignments will not be accepted. No extensions are available except under extraordinary circumstances. Please discuss any extenuating situation with me at the earliest possible opportunity.

<b>READING LIST</b>	
SESSION AND TOPIC	ARTICLES
<p><b>Week 1</b></p> <p><b>Topic(s): Introduction to OB / The Person and Situation</b></p>	<p>Heath, C., &amp; Sitkin, S. B. (2001). Big-B versus big-O: What is organizational about organizational behavior? <i>Journal of Organizational Behavior</i>, 22, 43-58.</p> <p>Staw, Barry. (2016). Stumbling toward a social psychology of organizations. <i>Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior</i>.</p> <p>Johns, G. (2006). The essential impact of context on organizational behavior. <i>Academy of Management Review</i>, 31, 386-408.</p> <p>Judge, T. A., Zapata, C. P. (2015). The person-situation debate revisited: Effect of situation strength and trait activation on the validity of the Big Five personality traits in predicting job performance. <i>Academy of Management Journal</i>, 58, 1149-1179.</p> <p>Hollenbeck, J. R., &amp; Wright, P. M. (2017). Harking, sharking, and tharking: Making the case for post hoc analysis of scientific data. <i>Journal of Management</i>, 43, 5-18.</p> <p>Recommended Reading: The article below presents the concepts of “moderation” and “mediation” which will help you to interpret and understand many of the papers you read throughout the term. If these concepts are not familiar to you, you should read this article.</p> <p>Baron, R. M. &amp; Kenny, D. A. (1986). The moderator-mediator variable distinction in social psychological research: Conceptual, strategic, and statistical considerations. <i>Journal of Personality and Social Psychology</i>, 51, 1173-1182.</p>
<p><b>Week 2</b></p> <p><b>Topic(s): Motivation, Engagement and Work Attitudes</b></p> <p><b>Focal Theories: Social Exchange Theory; Identity Theory; Self-</b></p>	<p>Greguras, G. J., &amp; Diefendorff, J. M. (2009). Different fits satisfy different needs: Linking person-environment fit to employee commitment and performance using self-determination theory. <i>Journal of Applied Psychology</i>, 94, 465-477.</p> <p>Meyer, J. P. (2017). Has engagement had its day. <i>Organizational Dynamics</i>, 2(46), 87-95.</p>

<p><b>Determination Theory</b></p>	<p>Meyer, J. P., Stanley, L. J., &amp; Parfyonova, N. M. (2012). Employee commitment in context: The nature and implication of commitment profiles. <i>Journal of Vocational Behavior</i>, 80(1), 1-16.</p> <p>Schabram, K., &amp; Maitlis, S. (2017). Negotiating the challenges of a calling: Emotion and enacted sensemaking in animal shelter work. <i>Academy of Management Journal</i>, 60(2), 584-609.</p> <p>Wrzesniewski, A., Schwartz, B., Cong, X., Kane, M., Omar, A., &amp; Kolditz, T. (2014). Multiple types of motives don't multiply the motivation of West Point cadets. <i>Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences</i>, 111(30), 10990-10995.</p>
------------------------------------	--

<p><b>Week 3</b></p> <p><b>Social Identity in Organizations</b></p>	<p>Baran, B.B., Rogelberg, S.G., &amp; Clausen, T. (2016). Routinized killing of animals: Going beyond dirty work and prestige to understand the well-being of slaughterhouse workers. <i>Organization</i>, 23, 351-369.</p> <p>Bartel, C. A., Wrzesniewski, A., &amp; Wiesenfeld, B. M. (2012). Knowing where you stand: Physical isolation, perceived respect, and organizational identification among virtual employees. <i>Organization Science</i>, 23(3), 743-757.</p> <p>Giessner, S. R., van Knippenberg, D., van Ginkel, W., &amp; Sleebos, E. (2013). Team-Oriented Leadership: The Interactive Effects of Leader Group Prototypicality, Accountability, and Team Identification. <i>Journal of Applied Psychology</i>, 98(4), 658-667.</p> <p>Reid, EM. (2015). Embracing, Passing, Revealing and the Ideal Worker Image: How People Navigate Expected and Experienced Professional Identities. <i>Organization Science</i>, 26(4): 997-1017.</p> <p>Ten Brummelhuis, L. T., Johns, G., Lyons, B. J., &amp; ter Hoeven, C. L. (2016). Why and when do employees imitate the absenteeism of co-workers? <i>Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Process</i>, 134, 16-30.</p>
---	--

<p><b>Week 4</b></p> <p><b>Topic(s): Affect and</b></p>	<p><b>Chapters / Review Articles</b></p>
---	--

<p><b>Emotions</b></p> <p><b>Focal Theories: Emotional Labour, Social Identity</b></p>	<p>Carmeli, A., Brammer, S., Gomes, E., &amp; Tarba, S. Y. (2017). Ethic of care and employee involvement in sustainability-related behaviors: A social identity perspective. <i>Journal of Organizational Behavior</i>, 38, 1380-1395.</p> <p>Kim, E., &amp; Glomb, T. M. (2014). Victimization of high performers: The roles of envy and work group identification. <i>Journal of Applied Psychology</i>, 99(4), 619.</p> <p>Uy, M. A., Lin, K. J., &amp; Ilies, R. (2017). Is it better to give or receive? The role of help in buffering the depleting effects of surface acting. <i>Academy of Management Journal</i>, 60(4), 1442-1461.</p> <p>Articles on Meetings co-authored by Steven Rogelberg (Visiting Scholar)</p> <p>Allen, J. S., Lehmann-Willenbrock, N., &amp; Rogelberg, S. G. (in press). Let's get this meeting started: Meeting lateness and actual meeting outcomes. <i>Journal of Organizational Behavior</i>.</p> <p>Thomas, J. S., Olien, J. L., Allen, J. A., Rogelberg, S. G., &amp; Kello, J. E. (2018). Faking it for the higher-ups: Status and surface acting in workplace meetings. <i>Group &amp; Organization Management</i>, 43, 72-100.</p>
<p><b>Week 5</b></p> <p><b>Topic(s): Work-related Stress and Health</b></p> <p><b>Focal Theories: Job demands and resources theory; Conservation of Resources theory; Self-regulation theory</b></p>	<p><b>Review/Theory article (do not provide summary)</b></p> <p>Demerouti, E., Bakker, A. B., Nachreiner, F., &amp; Schaufeli, W. B. (2001). The job demands-resources model of burnout. <i>Journal of Applied Psychology</i>, 86(3), 499.</p> <p>De Rond, M., &amp; Lok, J. (2016). Some things can never be unseen: The role of context in psychological injury at war. <i>Academy of Management Journal</i>, 59(6), 1965-1993.</p> <p>Schat, A. C. H., &amp; Frone, M. R. (2011). Exposure to psychological aggression at work and job performance: The mediating role of job attitudes and personal health. <i>Work &amp; Stress</i>, 25, 23-40.</p> <p>Zhang, Y., Lepine, J. A., Buckman, B. R., &amp; Wei, F. (2014). It's not fair... or is it? The role of justice and leadership in explaining work stressor-job performance relationships. <i>Academy of Management Journal</i>, 57, 675-697.</p>

<p><b>Week 6</b></p> <p><b>Topic(s): Functional and Dysfunctional Behaviours</b></p> <p><b>Focal Theories: Various</b></p>	<p>Connelly, C. E., &amp; Zweig, D. (2015). How perpetrators and targets construe knowledge hiding in organizations. <i>European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology, 24</i>(3), 479-489.</p> <p>Fernando, D., &amp; Prasad, A. (in press). Sex-based harassment and silencing in academia: How people are led to reluctant acquiescence. <i>Human Relations</i>.</p> <p>Sirola, N., &amp; Pitesa, M. (2017). Economic downturns undermine workplace helping by promoting a zero-sum construal of success. <i>Academy of Management Journal, 60</i>(4), 1339-1359.</p>
--	--