

B795
Research Issues: Organizational Behaviour and Organizational Theory
Organizational Behaviour Component

Course Objective

This seminar focuses on current research issues in organizational behaviour research. The objectives of this course are to provide you with an understanding of theories, issues and cumulative knowledge in selected areas of Organizational Behaviour (OB), and to develop your 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 provides you the opportunity to:

1. Develop your understanding of theories and concepts presented in the readings.
2. Enhance your skills in communicating ideas, in developing and presenting arguments, in listening to and understanding others, and in challenging others' views in a respectful way that advances understanding and generates novel and promising research ideas.
3. Learn to think independently and critically through analyzing the theoretical and methodological contributions and gaps in the assigned readings.

In this course my role 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

Name: Yair Berson	E-Mail: bersony@mcmaster.ca
Class Times: Tuesdays 12-3 pm, starting September 14	
Virtual Office Hours: By Appointment	

COURSE DELIVERY

LEARNING ACTIVITIES	DELIVERY	DESCRIPTION	TOOL(S)
Lecture Core Content and discussions	Sync	Course materials	Zoom
Readings and out of class tasks	Asynch	Tied to weekly discussion	

GRADE COMPONENT	WEIGHT	DESCRIPTION
Weekly Summaries	25 %	To be submitted by email
Leading Discussions and Class Participation	25%	Attendance & Contributions on Zoom
Research Proposal	50%	To be submitted by email

Conversion

Grade	Points	Equivalent Percentages	Pass/Fail
A+	12	90-100	P+
A	11	85-89	P
A-	10	80-84	
B+	9	77-79	
B	8	73-76	
B-	7	70-72	
F	0	69 and under	F

One-Page Reports (25%)

Each week you are to write a critical commentary on that week's readings. Your commentary will focus on **at least two** articles from the week's readings. It will include an integration of these articles. Your commentary is to reflect key issues that strike you as especially important, and worthy of investing your time and effort into a research project. It should capture critical questions that arise in your reading of the material, strengths and shortcomings, ideas you consider particularly promising, and an overall critical assessment of the literature. Identify the key "take aways". Where readings cover more than one topic area, identify common themes and connections, providing a "big picture" integrative assessment.

All work must be completed independently.

Seminar Participation and Leading (20%)

In addition to participating in a discussion of the articles, in each class (except the first one), one of the students will be responsible for initiating and leading the discussion about all the required readings assigned for that week. This student is responsible for integrating the different readings and leading a critical discussion of the topic. By "leading discussion," you are expected to engage your classmates in an exchange of ideas. You will be assessed in part by your ability to engage others in conversation throughout the seminar.

Arrangements will be made to ensure that each of the **other students** will take 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.

Research/manuscript Proposal (50%)

Your research proposal will provide a review of the relevant research, a compelling framing for the importance of the study for advancing scholarship and practice, theoretically grounded hypotheses and a methods section, including sample, and how you will collect and analyze your data. The proposal should be double spaced, 1" margins, 12-point Times New Roman font, title page with your name, maximum 40 pages including references, but maximum of 20 pages of text). The proposal should

follow the publication guidelines as provided by the American Psychological Association (APA). I am open to you writing a review article of a topic from within one of weekly themes – one that could serve as a first draft for submission to the Journal of Management’s annual review issue. This would substitute for a research proposal, but please discuss with me in advance if you choose this option.

<http://www.apastyle.org/manual/>

Please select a topic from those covered in the course outline.

Proposal/Review Due: December 9, 2020

ACADEMIC DISHONESTY

It your 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 in (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 university and I 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 you will be given with explanation and the opportunity to comment on changes. The most likely change would pertain to the readings assigned (that is, I may come across a more updated article on a particular topic as the term progresses).

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.

READING LIST	
SESSION AND TOPIC	ARTICLES
<p>Week 1 Teams September 14</p>	<p>Mathieu, J. E., Gallagher, P. T., Domingo, M. A., & Klock, E. A. (2019). Embracing complexity: Reviewing the past decade of team effectiveness research. <i>Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior</i>, 6, 17-46.</p> <p>Vashdi, D. R., Bamberger, P. A., & Erez, M. (2013). Can surgical teams ever learn? The role of coordination, complexity, and transitivity in action team learning. <i>Academy of Management Journal</i>, 56(4), 945-971.</p> <p>Luciano, M. M., Nahrgang, J., & Shropshire, C. (in press). Strategic leadership systems: Viewing top management teams and boards of directors from a multiteam systems perspective. <i>Academy of Management Review</i>.</p> <p>Mortensen, M. and M. R. Haas. 2018. Perspective—Rethinking teams: From bounded membership to dynamic participation. <i>Organization Science</i>, 29(2): 341–355.</p> <p>Tasa, K., Sears, G. J., & Schat, A. C. (2011). Personality and teamwork behavior in context: The cross-level moderating role of collective efficacy. <i>Journal of Organizational Behavior</i>, 32(1), 65-85.</p> <p><u>Supplementary Readings for Comprehensive Exam:</u></p> <p>Edmondson, A, (1999). Psychological safety and learning behavior in work teams. <i>Administrative Science Quarterly</i>, 44, 350-383.</p> <p>Barsade, Sigal G. (2002). “The Ripple Effect: Emotional Contagion and its Influence on Group Behavior.” <i>Administrative Science Quarterly</i>, 47, 644-675.</p> <p>Haas, M. R. (2010). The double-edged swords of autonomy and external knowledge: Analyzing team effectiveness in a multinational organization. <i>Academy of Management Journal</i>, 53(5), 989-1008.</p> <p>Lazar, M., Miron-Spektor, E., Agarwal, R., Erez, M., Goldfarb, B., & Chen, G. (2020). Entrepreneurial team formation. <i>Academy of Management Annals</i>, 14(1), 29-59.</p>

<p>Week 2 Leadership September 21</p>	<p>Berson, Y., & Oreg, S. (2016). The role of school principals in shaping children’s values. <i>Psychological Science</i>, 27(12), 1539-1549.</p> <p>Wang, G., & Hackett, R. D. (2016). Conceptualization and measurement of virtuous leadership: Doing well by doing good. <i>Journal of Business Ethics</i>, 137(2), 321-345.</p> <p>Antonakis, J., Bastardo, N., Jacquart, P., & Shamir, B. (2016). Charisma: An ill-defined and ill-measured gift. <i>Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior</i>, 3, 293-319.</p> <p>Carton, Andrew M., and Brian J. Lucas. "How can leaders overcome the blurry vision bias? Identifying an antidote to the paradox of vision communication." <i>Academy of Management Journal</i> 61.6 (2018): 2106-2129. And...</p> <p>Berson, Y., Halevy, N., Shamir, B., & Erez, M. (2015). Leading from different psychological distances: A construal-level perspective on vision communication, goal setting, and follower motivation. <i>The Leadership Quarterly</i>, 26(2), 143-155.</p> <p><u>Supplementary Readings for Comprehensive Exam:</u></p> <p>van Knippenberg, D., & van Kleef, G. A. (2016). Leadership and affect: Moving the hearts and minds of followers. <i>Academy of Management Annals</i>, 10(1), 799-840.</p> <p>Fischer, T., Dietz, J., & Antonakis, J. (2017). Leadership process models: A review and synthesis. <i>Journal of Management</i>, 43(6), 1726-1753.</p> <p>D’innocenzo, L., Mathieu, J.E., & Kukenberger, M.R. (2016). A meta-analysis of different forms of shared leadership-team performance relations. <i>Journal of Management</i>, 42:7, 1964-1991.</p> <p>Zhang, Y., Waldman, D. A., Han, Y. L., & Li, X. B. (2015). Paradoxical leader behaviors in people management: Antecedents and consequences. <i>Academy of Management Journal</i>, 58(2), 538-566.</p> <p>A snapshot of leadership development practices in Canada. The <u>Conference Board of Canada</u>, Report, April 2014.</p>
--	--

<p>Week 3 Culture September 28</p>	<p>Schneider, B., González-Romá, V., Ostroff, C., & West, M. A. (2017). Organizational climate and culture: Reflections on the history of the constructs in the Journal of Applied Psychology. <i>Journal of Applied Psychology</i>, 102(3), 468-482.</p> <p>Barsade, Sigal G & O'Neill Olivia A. (2014). "What's Love Got to do with It?: The Influence of a Culture of Companionate Love and Employee and Client Outcomes in a Long-term Care Setting," <i>Administrative Science Quarterly</i>, 59, 551-598.</p> <p>O'Reilly, C.A. & Chatman, J. & (2016). Paradigm lost: Reinvigorating the study of organizational culture. <i>Research in Organizational Behavior</i>, 36, 199-224.</p> <p>Godart, F.C., Maddux, W.M., Shipilov, A.V., & Galinsky, A.D. (2015). Fashion with a foreign flair: Professional experiences abroad facilitate the creative innovations of organizations. <i>Academy of Management Journal</i>, 58: 195-220.</p> <p>Zou, X. et al. (2009). Culture as common sense: Perceived consensus versus personal beliefs as mechanisms of cultural influence. <i>Journal of Personality and Social Psychology</i>, 97: 579-597.</p> <p><u>Supplementary Readings for Comprehensive Exam</u></p> <p>Gelfand, M.J. et al. (2011). Differences between tight and loose cultures: A 33-nation study. <i>Science</i>, 332: 1100-1104.</p> <p>O'Reilly, C.A., Chatman, J., & Caldwell, D.F. (1991). People and organizational culture: A profile comparison approach to assessing person-organization fit. <i>Academy of Management Journal</i>, 34: 487-516.</p> <p>Schneider, B., Ehrhart, M. G., & Macey, W. H. (2013). Organizational climate and culture. <i>Annual review of psychology</i>, 64, 361-388.</p> <p>Maddux, W. W., Lu, J., Affinito, S., & Galinsky, A. D. (in press). Multicultural Experiences: A Systematic Review and New Theoretical Framework. <i>Academy of Management Annals</i>.</p>
<p>Week 4 Organizational Change October 5</p>	<p>Weick, K. E., & Quinn, R. E. (1999). Organizational change and development. <i>Annual Review of Psychology</i>, 50(1), 361-386.</p> <p>Oreg, S., & Berson, Y. (2019). Leaders' Impact on Organizational Change: Bridging Theoretical and Methodological Chasms. <i>Academy of Management Annals</i>, 13(1), 272-307.</p>

	<p>Oreg, S., Bartunek, J. M., Lee, G., & Do, B. (2018). An affect-based model of recipients' responses to organizational change events. <i>Academy of Management Review</i>, 43(1), 65-86.</p> <p>Venus, M., Stam, D., & Van Knippenberg, D. (2019). Visions of change as visions of continuity. <i>Academy of Management Journal</i>, 62(3), 667-690.</p> <p><u>Supplementary Readings for Comprehensive Exam</u></p> <p>Stouten, J., Rousseau, D. M., & De Cremer, D. (2018). Successful organizational change: Integrating the management practice and scholarly literatures. <i>Academy of Management Annals</i>, 12(2), 752-788.</p> <p>Van de Ven, A. H., & Poole, M. S. (1995). Explaining development and change in organizations. <i>Academy of Management Review</i>, 20(3), 510-540.</p> <p>Lüscher, L. S., & Lewis, M. W. (2008). Organizational change and managerial sensemaking: Working through paradox. <i>Academy of Management Journal</i>, 51(2), 221-240.</p> <p>Dutton, J.E., Ashford, S.J., O'Neill, R.M., & Lawrence, K.A. (2001). Moves that matter: Issue selling and organizational change. <i>Academy of Management Journal</i>, 44, 716-736.</p> <p>Oreg, S., Vakola, M., & Armenakis, A. (2011). Change recipients' reactions to organizational change: A 60-year review of quantitative studies. <i>The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science</i>, 47(4), 461-524.</p>
<p>Week 5 Tensions, Creativity, and Innovation October 12</p>	<p>Amabile, T. M., & Pratt, M. G. (2016). The dynamic componential model of creativity and innovation in organizations: Making progress, making meaning. <i>Research in Organizational Behavior</i>, 36, 157-183.</p> <p>Miron-Spektor, E., Erez, M., & Naveh, E. (2011). The effect of conformist and attentive-to-detail members on team innovation: Reconciling the innovation paradox. <i>Academy of Management journal</i>, 54(4), 740-760.</p> <p>Mueller, J.S. Melwani, S., Goncalo, J.A. (2012). The bias against creativity: Why people desire but reject creative ideas. <i>Psychological Science</i>, 23:13-17.</p> <p>Miron-Spektor, E., Ingram, A., Keller, J., Smith, W. K., & Lewis, M. W. (2018). Microfoundations of organizational paradox: The problem is how we think about the problem. <i>Academy of Management Journal</i>, 61(1), 26-45.</p>

	<p><u>Supplementary Readings for Comprehensive Exam</u></p> <p>Grant, A. M., & Berry, J. W. (2011). The necessity of others is the mother of invention: Intrinsic and prosocial motivations, perspective taking, and creativity. <i>Academy of Management Journal</i>, 54(1), 73-96.</p> <p>Scott, S. G., & Bruce, R. A. (1994). Determinants of innovative behavior: A path model of individual innovation in the workplace. <i>Academy of Management Journal</i>, 37(3), 580-607.</p> <p>Putnam, L. L., Fairhurst, G. T., & Banghart, S. (2016). Contradictions, dialectics, and paradoxes in organizations: A constitutive approach. <i>Academy of Management Annals</i>, 10(1), 65-171.</p>
<p>Week 6 New Approaches to OB: Organizational Neuroscience October 19</p>	<p>Waldman, D. A., Ward, M., & Becker, W. J. (2017). Neuroscience in Organizational Behavior. <i>Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior</i>, 4, 425-444.</p> <p>Waldman, D. A., Wang, D., & Fenters, V. (2019). The added value of neuroscience methods in organizational research. <i>Organizational Research Methods</i>, 22(1), 223-249.</p> <p>Lindebaum, D., & Zundel, M. (2013). Not quite a revolution: Scrutinizing organizational neuroscience in leadership studies. <i>Human Relations</i>, 66(6), 857-877.</p> <p>Gordon, I., & Berson, Y. (2018). Oxytocin modulates charismatic influence in groups. <i>Journal of Experimental Psychology: General</i>, 147(1), 132-138.</p> <p>Becker, W. J., Cropanzano, R., & Sanfey, A. G. (2011). Organizational neuroscience: Taking organizational theory inside the neural black box. <i>Journal of Management</i>, 37(4), 933-961.</p> <p><u>Supplementary Readings</u></p> <p>Kosinski, M., Wang, Y., Lakkaraju, H., & Leskovec, J. (2016). Mining big data to extract patterns and predict real-life outcomes. <i>Psychological Methods</i>, 21(4), 493-506.</p>