

Subject Code	MM612
Subject Title	Current Issues in Organisational Behaviour
Credit Value	3
Level	6
Normal Duration	1-semester
Pre-requisite/ Co-requisite/ Exclusion	None
Role and Purposes	<p>This subject contributes to the achievement of the DBA/DMgt outcome by broadening, updating and deepening students' knowledge of business administration in general (Outcome 1).</p> <p>The subject will inform practitioners OB theory and research at an advanced level. Knowledge gained in this subject will enhance managers' effectiveness in identifying and solving people management problems.</p>
Subject Learning Outcomes	<p>Upon completion of the subject, students will be able to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> integrate theories of Organisational Behaviour (OB) and the practice of management; develop analytical and conceptual competencies required of senior executives; respond effectively to current organisational behaviour issues; demonstrate an ability to critique research methodologies and findings in the Organisational Behaviour literature.
Subject Synopsis/ Indicative Syllabus	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What is Organizational Behavior Theory? • Personality and Individual Differences • Cognition & Decision Making • Leadership • Emotions • Prosocial and Antisocial Behavior in Organizations • Self, Social, and Organizational Identity • Groups and Teams • Demography and Diversity
Teaching/Learning Methodology	<p>This subject will be taught by seminars. Readings from the academic literature form the basis of class seminars in which theories, methodologies and findings on selected topics will be thoroughly discussed. During each seminar, several articles will be evaluated. For each article, one student will provide a summary of the reading and another student will provide a critique of it. Both presenters of an article should prepare a short written summary of their presentation (around 1-2 pages), and distribute this to all class participants at the beginning of the presentation.</p> <p>A wide range of research topics are selected and participants will try to deal with the following general questions in relation to the specific topic(s) under discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What do the research studies tell us about this OB issue? • To what extent do the studies represent 'good' research? • What are the managerial implications of the research? • What are the research needs in this field?

Assessment Methods in Alignment with Intended Learning Outcomes	Specific assessment methods/tasks	% weighting	Intended subject learning outcomes to be assessed (Please tick as appropriate)			
			a.	b.	c.	d.
	Continuous Assessment*	100%				
1. Individual presentation	30%	✓	✓	✓	✓	
2. Individual assignment (Research proposal presentation)	30%	✓	✓	✓	✓	
3. Individual assignment (Research proposal written report)	40%	✓	✓	✓	✓	
Total	100 %					
<p><i>*Weighting of assessment methods/tasks in continuous assessment may be different, subject to each subject lecturer.</i></p> <p>To pass this subject, students are required to obtain Grade D or above in the Continuous Assessment component.</p> <p>Explanation of the appropriateness of the assessment methods in assessing the intended learning outcomes: the various methods are designed to ensure that all students taking this subject –</p> <p>Journal articles are assigned to course participants. They are required to critique these articles and write a review report. Students are assigned journal articles to read at home. They are then required to prepare written reviews on these articles. They also need to make presentations in class and exchange views regarding conceptual, methodological and managerial issues.</p> <p>To develop students’ abilities to integrate what OB theories they have learned in class, and more importantly, provide solutions to current people management problems, they are required to work independently to develop a research proposal on a topic related to this course. In doing so, they need to make a presentation in class and prepare a written report to exchange their ideas on the research topic. As a result, examination is excluded in this subject as it cannot help test the critical thinking of the students in developing their research on the topic of Organizational Behavior.</p> <p>Feedback is given to students immediately following the presentations and all students are invited to join this discussion.</p>						
Student Study Effort Expected	Class contact:					
	▪ Lectures	30 Hrs.				
	Other student study effort:					
	▪ Preparation for lectures	30 Hrs.				
	▪ Preparation for assignment / presentation / examination	60 Hrs.				
	Total student study effort		120 Hrs.			

Reading List and References

Introduction to Organizational Behavior

Required Reading

Brief, A.P., & Dukerich, J.M. (1991). Theory in organizational behavior: Can it be useful? *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 13: 327-352.

Prentice, D.A., & Miller, D.T. (1992). When small effects are impressive. *Psychological Bulletin*, 112: 160-164.

Sutton, R. & Staw, B. (1995). What theory is not. *Administrative Science Quarterly*. 40: 371-384.

Evans, G.W., & Johnson, D. (2000). Stress and open-office noise. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 85: 779-783.

Additional Recommended Reading

Bartunek, J.M., Rynes, S.L., & Ireland, R.D. (2006). What makes management research interesting, and why does it matter? *Academy of Management Journal*, 49, 9-15.

Barley, S. (2006). When I write my masterpiece: Thoughts on what makes a paper interesting. *Academy of Management Journal*, 49, 16-20.

Davis, M. (1971). That's Interesting! Towards a phenomenology of sociology and a sociology of phenomenology. *Philosophy of Social Science*, 1: 309-344.

Dutton, J.E. & Dukerich, J.M. (2006). The relational foundation of research: An underappreciated dimension of interesting research. *Academy of Management Journal*, 49, 21-26.

MacCoun, R. (1998). Biases in the interpretation and use of research results. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 49: 259-287.

McGuire, W.J. (1997). Creative hypothesis generating in psychology: Some useful heuristics. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 48: 1-30.

Mowday, R.T. and Sutton, R.I. (1993). Organizational behavior: Linking individuals and groups to organizational contexts. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 44: 195-229.

Staw, B. (1984). Organizational behavior: A review and reformulation of the field's outcome variables. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 35: 627-666.

Personality and Individual Differences

Required Reading

House, R.J., Shane, S.A., & Herold, D.M. (1996). Rumors of the death of dispositional research are vastly exaggerated. *Academy of Management Review*, 21: 203-224.

Bendersky, C., & Shaw, N.P. (2012). The downfall of extraverts and the rise of neurotics: The dynamic process of status allocation in task groups. *Academy of Management Journal*, 56: 387-406.

Judge, T.A., Hurst, C., & Simon, L.S. (2009). Does it pay to be smart, attractive, or confident (or all three?) Relationships among general mental ability, physical attractiveness, core self-evaluations, and income. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 94: 742-755.

Additional Recommended Reading

Davis-Blake, A. and Pfeffer, J. (1989). Just a mirage: The search for dispositional effects in organizational research. *Academy of Management Review*, 14: 385-400.

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

Funder, D. and Colvin, R. (1991). Exploration in behavioral consistency: Properties of persons, situations, and behaviors. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 60: 773-794.

Block, J.H. (1995). A contrarian view of the five-factor approach to personality description. *Psychological Bulletin*, 117: 187-215.

Buss, A. (1989). Personality as traits. *American Psychologist*, 44: 1378-1388.

Gosling, S., Ko, S., Manarelli, T., & Morris, M. (2002). A room with a cue: Personality judgments based on offices and bedrooms. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 82: 379-398.

Heine, S.J., Buchtel, E.E., & Norenzayan, A. (2008). What do cross-cultural comparisons of personality traits tell us? The case of conscientiousness. *Psychological Science*, 19: 309-313.

Hogan, R., Hogan, J., & Roberts, B. (1996). Personality measurement and employment decisions. *American Psychologist*, 51: 469-477.

Steel, R.P. & Rentsch, J.R. (1997). The dispositional model of job attitudes revisited: Findings of a 10 year study. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 82: 873-879.

Tetlock, P.E., Peterson, R.S., & Berry, J.M. (1993). Flattering and unflattering personality portraits of integratively simple and complex managers. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 64: 500-511.

Group and Teams

Required Reading

Wageman, R. (1995). Interdependence and group effectiveness. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 40: 145-180.

Shaw, J.D., Zhu, J., Duffy, M.K., Scott, K.D., Shih, H., & Susanto, E. (2011). A contingency model of conflict and team effectiveness. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 96: 391-400.

Dineen, B.R., Noe, R.A., Shaw, J.D., Duffy, M.K., & Wiethoff, C. (2007). Level and dispersion of satisfaction in teams: Using foci and social context to explain the satisfaction—absenteeism relationship. *Academy of Management Journal*, 50: 623-643.

Additional Recommended Reading

Weingart, L. (1997). How did they do that? The ways and means of studying group process. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 19: 189-239.

Anderson, C., Ames, D.R., & Gosling, S.D. (2008). Punishing hubris: The perils of overestimating one's status in a group. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 34: 90-101.

Ilgen, D. Hollenbeck, H., Johnson, M., & Jundt, D. (2004). Teams in organizations: From input-process-output models to IMO models. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 56: 517-543.

Van Der Vegt, G. & Bunderson, J.S. (2005). Learning and performance in multidisciplinary teams: The importance of collective team identification. *Academy of Management Journal*, 48: 532-547.

Hackman, J.R. & Wageman, R. (2005). When and how team leaders matter. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 26: 37-74.

Antisocial Behavior in Organizations

Required Reading

Tepper, B.J. (2000). Consequences of abusive supervision. *Academy of Management Journal*, 43: 178-190.

Duffy, M.K., Ganster, D.C., Shaw, J.D., Johnson, J.L., & Pagon, M. (2006). The social context of undermining behavior at work. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 101: 105-121.

Liu, D., Liao, H., & Loi, R. (2012). The dark side of leadership: A three-Level investigation of the cascading effect of abusive supervision on employee creativity. *Academy of Management Journal*, 55: 1187-1212.

Additional Recommended Reading

Lam, C., Van der Vegt, G. S., Walter, F. & Huang, X. (2011). Harming high performers: A social comparison perspective on interpersonal harming in work teams. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 96: 588-601.

Tepper, B.J. (2007). Abusive supervision in work organizations: Review, synthesis, and research agenda. *Journal of Management*, 33: 261-289.

Aquino, K. & Lamertz, K. (2004). A relational model of workplace victimization: Social roles and patterns of victimization in dyadic relationships. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 89: 10223-1034.

Baumeister, R.F., Bratlavsky, E., Finkenauer, C., & Vohs, K. (2001). Bad is stronger than good. *Review of General Psychology*, 3: 323-370.

Shao, R., Aquino, K., Freeman, D. (2008). Beyond moral reasoning: A review of moral identity research and its implications for business ethics. *Business Ethics Quarterly*, 18: 513-540.

Tepper, B.J., Duffy, M.K., & Shaw, J.D. (2001). Personality moderators of the relationship between abusive supervision and dysfunctional resistance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86: 974-983.

Citizenship, Performance, and Creativity

Required Reading

Jia, L., Shaw, J.D., Tsui, A.S., & Park, T.Y. (in press). A social-structural perspective on employee-organization relationships and team creativity. *Academy of Management Journal*.

LePine, J. A., Erez, A., & Johnson, D. E. (2002). The nature and dimensionality of organizational citizenship behavior: A critical review and meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87: 52-65.

Le, H., Oh, I-S., Robbins, S. B., Ilies, R., Holland, E., & Westrick, P. (2011). Too much of a good thing: Curvilinear relationships between personality traits and job performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 96: 113-133.

Additional Recommended Reading

Penner, L. Dovidio, J., Pillavin, J., & Schroeder, D. (2004). Prosocial behavior: Multilevel perspectives. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 56: 365-392.

Jong-sung, Y., & Khagram, S. (2005). A comparative study of inequality and corruption. *American Sociological Review*, 70: 36-157.

Bolino, B. (1999). Citizenship and impression management: Good soldiers or good actors. *Academy of Management Review*, 24: 82-98.

Baer, M. (2012). Putting creativity to work: the implementation of creative ideas in organizations. *Academy of Management Journal*, 24: 82-98.

Amabile, T.M. (1988). A model of creativity and innovations in work organizations. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 10: 123-167.

Justice

Required Reading

Colquitt, J.A., & Rodell, J.B. (2011). Justice, trust, and trustworthiness: A longitudinal analysis integrating three theoretical perspectives. *Academy of Management Journal*, 54: 1183-1206.

Aquino, K., Tripp, T.M., & Bies, R.J. (2006). Getting even or moving on: Power, procedural justice, and types of offense as predictors of revenge, forgiveness, reconciliation, and avoidance in organizations. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 91: 653-668.

Wang, M., Liao, H., Zhan, Y.J. & Shi, J.Q. (2011). Daily customer mistreatment and employee sabotage against customers: examining emotion and

resource perspectives. *Academy of Management Journal*, 54: 312-334.

Additional Recommended Reading

Blader, S.L. (2007). What leads organizational members to collectivize: Injustice and identification precursors of union certification. *Organization Science*, 18: 108-126.

Bies. (1987). The predicament of injustice: The management of moral outrage. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 9: 289-319.

Greenberg. (1987). A taxonomy of organizational justice theories. *Academy of Management Review*, 12: 9-22.

Meindl, J. (1989). Managing to be fair: An exploration of values, motives, and leadership. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 34: 252-276.

Morrison, E. W. & Robinson, S. L. (1997). When employees feel betrayed: A model of how psychological contract violation develops. *Academy of Management Review*, 22: 226

van den Bos, K. (2001). Uncertainty management: The influence of uncertainty salience on reactions to perceived procedural fairness. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 80: 931-941.

Emotions

Required Reading

Weiss, H. M. & Cropanzano, R. (1996). Affective events theory: A theoretical discussion of the structure, causes, and consequences of affective experiences at work. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 18: 1-74.

Oishi, S., Diener, E., & Lucas, R.E. (2007). The optimum level of well-being: Can people be too happy? *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 2: 346-360.

Duffy, M.K., Scott, K.L., Shaw, J.D., Tepper, B.J., & Aquino, K. (2012). A social context model of envy and social undermining. *Academy of Management Journal*, 55: 643-666.

Additional Recommended Reading

Watson, D., Clark, L., & Tellegen, A. (1988). Development and validation of brief measures of positive and negative affect: The PANAS scales. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 54: 1053-1070.

George, J. and Brief, A. (1992). Feeling good-doing good: A conceptual analysis of the mood at work-organizational spontaneity relationship. *Psychological Bulletin*, 112: 310-329.

Frederickson, B.L. (2001). The role of positive emotions in positive psychology: The broaden and build theory of positive emotions. *American Psychologist*, 56: 218-226.

Jordan, P. J. Ashkanasy, N.M., & Hartell, C. E. J. (2003). The case for emotional

intelligence in organizational research. *Academy of Management Review*, 28: 195-197.

Attitudes and Withdrawal

Required Readings

Liu, D., Mitchell, T. R., Lee, T. W., Holtom, B. C., & Hinkin, T. R. (2012). When employees are out of step with coworkers: How job satisfaction trajectory and dispersion influence individual- and unit-level voluntary turnover. *Academy of Management Journal*, 55: 1360-1380.

Shaw, J.D., Dineen, B.R., Fang, R., & Vellella, R.V. (2009). Employee-organization exchange relationships, HRM practices, and quit rates of good and poor performers. *Academy of Management Journal*, 52: 1016-1033.

Schaubroeck, J.M., Shaw, J.D., Duffy, M.K., & Mitra, A. (2008). An under-met and over-met expectations model of employee reactions to merit raises. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 93: 424-434.

Additional Recommended Readings

Judge, T.A., & Kammeyer-Mueller, J.D. (2012). Job attitudes. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 63: 341-367.

Bohner, G., & Dickel, N. (2011). Attitudes and attitude change. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 62: 391-417.

Chen, G., Ployhart, R. E., Cooper-Thomas, H. D., Anderson, N., & Bliese, P. D. (2011). The power of momentum: A new model of dynamic relationships between job satisfaction change and turnover decisions. *Academy of Management Journal*, 54: 159-181.

Hom, P. Mitchell, T., Lee, T., & Griffeth, R. (2012). Reviewing employee turnover: Focusing on proximal withdrawal states and an expanded criterion. *Psychological Bulletin*, 138: 831-858.

Diversity and Culture

Required Readings

Andrevski, G., Richard, O., Ferrier, W.J., & Shaw, J.D. (in press). Racial diversity and firm performance: The mediating role of competitive intensity. *Journal of Management*.

Gelfand, M. J., Raver, J. L., Nishii, L., Leslie, L. M., Lun, J., Lim, B. C. et al. (2011). Differences between tight and loose cultures: A 33-nation study. *Science*, 332: 1110-1114.

Van der Vegt, G., Van de Vliert, E., & Huang, X. (2005). Location-level links between diversity and innovative climate depend on national power distance. *Academy of Management Journal*, 48: 1171-1182.

Additional Recommended Readings

Riordan, C.M. and Shore, L.M. (1997). Demographic diversity and employee

attitudes: An empirical examination of relational demography within work units. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 82: 342-358.

Biernat, M. (2003). Toward a broader view of social stereotyping. *American Psychologist*, 58: 1019-1027.

van Knippenberg, D., & Schippers, M.C. (2007). Work group diversity. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 58: 515-541.

Riordan, C.M. and Shore, L.M. (1997). Demographic diversity and employee attitudes: An empirical examination of relational demography within work units. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 82:342-358.

Westphal, J. D. & Stern, I. (2007). Flattery will get you everywhere (especially if you are a male caucasian): Ingratiation, boardroom behavior, and demographic minority status affect the likelihood of gaining additional board appointments at U.S. companies. *Academy Management Journal*, 50: 267-288.

Jehn, K, Northcraft, G.B, & Neale M.A. (1999). Why differences make a difference: A field study of diversity, conflict, and performance in workgroups. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 44: 741-763.

McPherson, J. M., L. Smith-Lovin, & Cook, J.M. (2001). Birds of a feather: Homophily in social networks. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 27: 415-444.

Tsui, Anne S. & O'Reilly, C.A. (1989). Beyond simple demographic effects: The importance of relational demography in superior-subordinate dyads. *Academy of Management Journal*, 32: 402-423.

Wharton, A. S., and J. N. Baron (1987). So happy together? The impact of segregation on men at work. *American Sociological Review*, 52: 574-587.

Williams, K. Y. & C. A. O'Reilly (1998). Demography and diversity in organizations: A review of 40 years of research. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 20: 77-140.

Leadership

Required Readings

Huang, X., Wright, R., Chiu, C.K., & Chao, W. (2008). Relational schemes as sources of evaluation and misevaluation of leader member exchanges: Some initial evidence. *Leadership Quarterly*, 19: 266-282.

Herman, T., Lam, C., Lawrence, S., & Huang, X. (in press). When my supervisor dislikes you more than me: The effect of dissimilarity in leader-member exchange on coworkers' interpersonal emotion and perceived help. *Journal of Applied Psychology*.

Rockstuhl, T., Dulebohn, J.H., Ang, S., & Shore, LM. (2012). Leader-member exchange (LMX) and culture: A meta-analysis of correlates of LMX across 23 countries. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 97: 1097-1130.

Additional Recommended Readings

Hui, C.C., Chiu, C.K., Yu, P., & Cheung, K., Tse, H. (2007). The effects of service

climate and supervisor's leadership behavior on frontline employee's service quality: A multi-level analysis. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 80: 151-172.

Shin, S.J., & Zhou, J. (2003). Transformational leadership, conservation, and creativity: Evidence from Korea. *Academy of Management Journal*, 46: 703-714.

Wang, H., Law, K. S., Hackett, R. D., Wang, D., & Chen, Z. X. (2005). Leader-member exchange as a mediator of the relationship between transformational leadership and followers' performance and organizational citizenship behaviour. *Academy of Management Journal*, 48: 420-432.