



**ORGB 705 – Behavioural Science
Fall 2018 Syllabus**

Professor: Jean-Nicolas Reyt
Contact: jean-nicolas.reyt@mcgill.ca
Office Hours: By appointment, Bronfman #319

Assistant: TBD
Contact: TBD

DESCRIPTION

The purpose this PhD seminar is to familiarize students with the theories, methods, and approaches that characterize micro organizational behavior (micro OB), the study of individuals in organizations. We will explore classic and contemporary theories, enduring controversies, and emerging empirical research on a variety of major topics in OB. This PhD seminar will help students planning on a career in OB to kick start their own research agenda. This seminar will enable students planning a career in a related discipline to have a better understanding of the field of OB, to more critically evaluate all types of research, and to integrate approaches and insights from OB to their own research agenda.

ASSESSMENT

A. Class Participation (25%)

Your primary assignment in this course is to be actively engaged in class discussions. This means becoming immersed in the readings and showing up prepared to have a lively, vigorous discussion about the readings. Class participation grade will be based on your 1) engagement in class discussion, 2) acting as a session leader for our class meetings, 3) evaluation of a colleagues' paper.

1. Engaging in class discussion (10%): Each student is required to be prepared to discuss all the required readings for each class session. The essence of this seminar is contained in the quality of the classroom discussion. A list of questions to guide you in your reading appears later in this syllabus.
2. Acting as a session leader (10%): Each student will act as a session leader for several of our class meetings during the course of the semester. The role of the session leader is to lead the class through the discussion of the readings for a particular week. This does not mean simply summarizing the readings, but rather being prepared to lead a deep discussion of the main issues, strengths, weaknesses, controversies, and gaps in the readings for a particular week.

3. Reviewing a colleague's paper (5%): The peer review process is at the very foundation of academic research, and this is meant as an opportunity to hone these skills and to help out your classmates. Your job will be to read a draft of that classmate's research proposal at the end of the semester and provide a constructive review of it. You should plan on writing 1-2 pages single-spaced.

B. Opinion Papers (25%)

Please prepare three critical analyses about the readings. Each paper should be 1-2 pages long (double-spaced). In these papers, you can address one or more of the following topics: 1) critique one or more of the weekly readings, 2) develop an important theme by integrating across readings, and/or 3) propose a novel hypothesis that could be empirically tested (something not already known or immediately obvious to researchers in OB or psychology). These papers are due before class.

C. Final Paper (25%)

This paper will be an analysis of a topic of your choosing and should add new knowledge or bring a new perspective to old findings within the field. 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. It is expected that you will do some additional readings outside of the formal class list for this paper. The paper should also have a short "Method" section describing how you would empirically test your hypotheses, and a brief "Implications" section that outlines the limitations of your paper and methods, and its theoretical and practical contributions. The paper should be 10-15 pages, double spaced, Times New Roman 12 points.

D. Final Presentations

On the last day of class, we will hold a symposium on organizational behavior. Just like a conference, you will be preparing and presenting a 15-minute power-point presentation of your paper to the group. Several OB faculty members from Montreal-based Universities will be invited to attend these presentations, and will provide feedback.

PREPARATION QUESTIONS

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

- What is the basic formulation of the theory?
- What are the underlying assumptions?
- What is the main contribution of this paper? What are the interesting ideas?
- What did the author do well and do poorly?
- Do you believe the author's arguments? What would it take to convince you?
- What are the boundary conditions of the argument?

- What are the differences between the author’s argument and others you have read?

For empirical papers, you might want to consider the following questions:

- Does the research design make sense given the research question?
- Does the research design allow you to rule out alternative hypotheses?
- How are the variables operationalized, and is this consistent with the theory?
- Is the data analyzed and interpreted effectively?

GRADING RUBRIC

Grade	Participation	Assignments
A	Regular and timely attendance; consistent evidence of thorough class preparation; consistently thoughtful and relevant comments and/or questions that contribute substantially to individual and class learning (note that quality is far more important than quantity); thorough and timely completion of ungraded assignments	Responds fully to all aspects of the assignment; accurately applies a range of course concepts; incorporates multiple and appropriate references to the readings and other references, where appropriate; demonstrates serious reflection, sophisticated analysis, and insightful evaluation
B	Generally regular and timely attendance; frequent evidence of class preparation; generally thoughtful and relevant comments and/or questions that tend to contribute to individual and class learning; timely completion of ungraded assignments	Responds to the assignment; applies some concepts mostly accurately; makes some references to readings; demonstrates some reflection and plausible analysis and evaluation
C	Possibly some absences and/or timeliness issues; some evidence of class preparation; comments and/or questions only occasionally contribute to individual and class learning; late and/or careless completion of some ungraded assignments	Partially responds to the assignment; makes limited and/or somewhat inaccurate application of concepts; makes few appropriate references to readings; demonstrates little reflection and/or superficial analysis
D	Possibly significant absences and/or timeliness issues; little or no evidence of preparation; very few comments or questions that contribute anything to individual or class learning; late and/or incomplete ungraded assignments	Responds incompletely or inaccurately to the assignment; virtually no application (or inaccurate application) of concepts; makes no meaningful references to readings; demonstrates virtually no real reflection, analysis or evaluation

JOURNALS

Most people refer to the key journals in the field simply by acronyms; here's a list of acronyms you may not yet be familiar with:

- AMJ: Academy of Management Journal
- AMR: Academy of Management Review
- ASQ: Administrative Science Quarterly
- JAP: Journal of Applied Psychology
- JOB: Journal of Organizational Behavior
- JOM: Journal of Management
- JPSP: Journal of Personality and Social Psychology
- OBHDP: Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes
- Org Science: Organization Science
- PSPB: Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin
- ROB: Research in Organizational Behavior

MCGILL POLICIES

Academic Integrity. McGill University values academic integrity. Therefore, all students must understand the meaning and consequences of cheating, plagiarism, using someone else's clicker and other academic offences under the [Code of Student Conduct and Disciplinary Procedures](#).

English & French. Note that in accord with McGill University's Charter of Students' Rights, students in this course have the right to submit in English or in French any written work that is to be graded.

Disabilities. As the instructor of this course I endeavor to provide an inclusive learning environment. However, if you experience barriers to learning in this course, do not hesitate to discuss them with me and the [Office for Students with Disabilities](#), 514-398-6009.

Evaluation. End-of-course evaluations are one of the ways that McGill works towards maintaining and improving the quality of courses and the student's learning experience. You will be notified by e-mail when the evaluations are available on Mercury, the online course evaluation system. Please note that a minimum number of responses must be received for results to be available to students.

Sustainability. McGill has policies on sustainability, paper use and other initiatives to promote a culture of [sustainability at McGill](#).

Extraordinary Circumstances. Please note that in the event of extraordinary circumstances beyond the University's control, the content and/or evaluation scheme in this course is subject to change.



**ORGB 705 – Behavioural Science: Micro Organizational Behaviour
Fall 2018 Syllabus**

*This syllabus is subject to further adjustments or revision.
Any change will be clearly communicated in class and on McGill My Courses.*

INTRODUCTION

- Heath, C., & Sitkin, S. 2001. Big-B versus Big-O: What is organizational about organizational behavior? *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 22: 43-58.
- Chatman, J. A., & Flynn, F. 2005. Full-cycle micro-organizational behavior research. *Organization Science*, 16: 434-447.
- Davis, M.S. (1971). That’s interesting! *Philosophy of Social Science*, 1, 309-344.
- Sutton, R.I. & Staw, B.M. (1995). What theory is not. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 40(3), 371-384.
- Johns, G. 2006. The essential impact of context on organizational behavior. *Academy of Management Review*, 31: 386-408.
- Pillutla, M. & Thau, S. (2013). Organizational sciences’ obsession with “that’s interesting!”: Consequences and an alternative. *Organizational Psychology Review*, 3, 187–194.

PERSONALITY

- Johns, G. (2006). The essential impact of context on organizational behavior. *Academy of Management Review*, 31(2), 386-408.
- Davis-Blake, A. & Pfeffer, J. (1989). Just a mirage: The search for dispositional effects in organizational research. *Academy of Management Review*, 14: 385-400.
- Schneider, B. (1987). The people make the place. *Personnel Psychology*, 40: 437-453.
- Barrick, M.R. & Mount, M. (1991). The big five personality dimensions & job performance: A meta-analysis. *Personnel Psychology*, 44: 1-26. SKIM
- Seligman, M. & Schulman, P. (1986). Explanatory style as a predictor of productivity & quitting among life insurance agents. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 50: 832-838.
- Greenberg, D. M., Kosinski, M., Stillwell, D. J., Monteiro, B. L., Levitin, D. J., & Rentfrow, P. J. (2016). The song is you: Preferences for musical attribute dimensions reflect personality. *Social Psychological and Personality Science*.

PERCEPTION

- Apperly, I. A., Riggs, K. J., Simpson, A., Chiavarino, C., & Samson, D. (2006). Is belief reasoning automatic? *Psychological Science*, 17, 841 – 844.

- Ambady, N., & Rosenthal, R. (1993). Half a minute: Predicting teacher evaluations from thin slices of behavior and physical attractiveness. *Journal of Personality & Social Psychology*, 64 , 431 - 441.
- Fiske, S. T., Cuddy, A. J., Glick, P., & Xu, J. (2002) A model of (often mixed) stereotype content: C competence and warmth respectively follow from perceived status and competition. *Journal of Personality & Social Psychology*, 82 , 878 – 902 .
- Gilbert, D. T., & Malone, P. S. (1995). The correspondence bias. *Psychological Bulletin*, 117, 21 - 38.
- Haslam, N., & Loughnan, S. (2014). Dehumanization and inhumanization. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 65 , 399 - 423.
- Kozak, M. J., Marsh, A. A., & Wegner, D. M. (2006). What do I think you're doing? Action identification and mind attribution. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 90 , 543 – 555.
- Pronin, E. (2008). How we see ourselves and how we see others. *Science*, 320 , 1177 – 1180.

IDENTIFICATION

- Ashforth, B. E., & Mael, F. (1989). Social identity theory and the organization. *Academy of Management Review*, 14: 20-39.
- Brewer, M. (1991). The social self: On being the same and different at the same time. *Personality & Social Psychology Bulletin*, 17: 475 - 482.
- O'Reilly, C., & Chatman, J. (1986). Organizational commitment and psychological attachment: The effects of compliance, identification, and internalization on prosocial behavior. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 71: 492-499.
- Hewlin, P. F. (2009). Wearing the cloak: antecedents and consequences of creating facades of conformity. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 94(3), 727.
- Dutton, J. E., Dukerich, J. M., & Harquail, C. V. (1994). Organizational images and member identification. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 39: 239-263.
- Wiesenfeld, B. M., Raghuram, S., & Garud, R. (2001). Organizational identification among virtual workers: The role of need for affiliation and perceived work-based social support. *Journal of Management*, 27(2), 213-229.
- Elsbach, K. D., & Kramer, R. M. (1996). Members' responses to organizational identity threats: Encountering and countering the business week rankings. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 41: 442-476.

GENDER

- Brescoll, V. (2012). Who takes the floor and why: Gender, power, and volubility in organizations. *Administrative Science Quarterly* , 1 - 20.
- Desai, S. D., Chugh, D., & Brief, A. P. The implications of marriage structure for men's workplace attitudes, beliefs, and behaviors toward women. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 59 , 330 - 365.
- Eagly, A. & Wood, W. (1999). The origins of sex differences in human behavior. *American Psychologist*, 54 , 408 - 423.

- Ely, R., & Myerson, D. (2010). An organizational approach to undoing gender: The unlikely case of offshore oil platforms. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 30, 3 - 34.
- Joshi, A. (2014). By whom and when is women's expertise recognized? The interactive effects of gender and education in science and engineering teams. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 59, 202 - 239.
- Kennedy, J. & Kray, L. J. (in press). A pawn in someone else's game?: The cognitive, motivated, and paradigmatic barriers to women's excelling in negotiation. *Research in Organizational Behavior*.
- Major, B., McFarlin, D. B., & Gagnon, D. (1984). Overworked and underpaid: On the nature of gender differences in personal entitlement. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 47, 1399 - 1412.

LEADERSHIP

- Meindl, J., Ehrlich, S., & Dukerich, J. 1985. The romance of leadership. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 30: 78-102.
- Eagly, A. H., Johannesen-Schmidt, M. C., and van Engen, M. (2003). "Transformational, Transactional, and Laissez-Faire Leadership Styles: A Meta- Analysis Comparing Women and Men." *Psychological Bulletin*, 95, 569-591.
- Graen, G. B., & Uhl-Bien, M. (1995). Relationship-based approach to leadership: Development of leader-member exchange (LMX) theory of leadership over 25 years: Applying a multi-level multi-domain perspective. *The leadership quarterly*, 6(2), 219-247.
- Avolio, B. J., Walumbwa, F. O., & Weber, T. J. (2009). Leadership: Current theories, research, and future directions. *Annual review of psychology*, 60, 421-449.
- Fast, N. J., Burris, E. R., & Bartel, C. A. (2014). Managing to stay in the dark: managerial self-efficacy, ego defensiveness, and the aversion to employee voice. *Academy of Management Journal*, 57(4), 1013-1034.

CONSTRUAL LEVELS

- Trope, Y., & Liberman, N. (2010). Construal-level theory of psychological distance. *Psychological Review*, 117(2), 440.
- Liberman, N., & Trope, Y. (1998). The role of feasibility and desirability considerations in near and distant future decisions: A test of temporal construal theory. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, 75(1), 5.
- Fujita, K., Trope, Y., Liberman, N., & Levin-Sagi, M. (2006). Construal levels and self-control. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, 90(3), 351.
- Magee, J. C., Milliken, F. J., & Lurie, A. R. (2010). Power differences in the construal of a crisis: The immediate aftermath of September 11, 2001. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 36(3), 354-370.
- Wiesenfeld, B. M., Reyt, J. N., Brockner, J., & Trope, Y. (2017). Construal level theory in organizational research. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior*, 4, 367-400.

- Reyt, J. N., Wiesenfeld, B. M., & Trope, Y. (2016). Big picture is better: The social implications of construal level for advice taking. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 135, 22-31.

MOTIVATION

- Amabile, T. M., Hill, K. G., Hennessey, B. A., & Tighe, E. M. (1994). The Work Preference Inventory: assessing intrinsic and extrinsic motivational orientations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 66(5), 950.
- Grant, A. M. (2007). Relational job design and the motivation to make a prosocial difference. *Academy of Management Review*, 32(2), 393-417.
- Heath, C. (1999). On the social psychology of agency relationships: Lay theories of motivation overemphasize extrinsic incentives. *Organizational Behavior & Human Decision Processes*, 78: 25-62.
- Jenkins, G., Mitra, A., Gupta, N., & Shaw, J. (1998). Are financial incentives related to performance? A meta-analytic review of empirical research. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 83, 777-787.
- Elliott, E. S., & Dweck, C. S. (1988). Goals: An approach to motivation and achievement. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 54(1), 5.
- Iyengar, S. S., Wells, R. E., & Schwartz, B. 2006. Doing better but feeling worse: Looking for the 'best' job undermines satisfaction. *Psychological Science*, 17: 143- 150.

DECISION-MAKING

- Tversky, A. & Kahneman, D. 1974. Judgment under uncertainty: Heuristics and biases. *Science*, 185, 3-20.
- Heath, C., Larrick, R. P., & Klayman, J. (1998). Cognitive repairs: How organizations compensate for the shortcomings of individual learners. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 20, 1-37.
- Crowe, E., & Higgins, E. T. (1997). Regulatory focus and strategic inclinations: Promotion and prevention in decision-making. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 69(2), 117-132.
- Mintzberg, Raisinghani, & Theoret (1976). The structure of "unstructured" decision processes. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 21, 246 - 274. SKIM
- Cohen, M. D., March, J. G., & Olsen, J. P. (1972). A garbage can model of organizational choice. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 1-25.

POWER

- Raven, B. H. (1993). The bases of power: Origins and recent developments. *Journal of social issues*, 49(4), 227-251.
- Kipnis, D. (1972). Does power corrupt? *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 24: 33–41.
- Magee, J. C., & Galinsky, A. D. (2008). Social Hierarchy: The Self-Reinforcing Nature of Power and Status. *The Academy of Management Annals*, 2(1), 351-398.

- Blader, S. L., & Chen, Y. R. (2012). Differentiating the effects of status and power: a justice perspective. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 102(5), 994.
- Galinsky, A. D., Gruenfeld, D. H., & Magee, J. C. (2003). From power to action. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 85: 453-466.
- Ibarra, H. (1993). Network centrality, power and innovation involvement: Determinants of technical and administrative roles. *Academy of Management Journal*, 36: 471-501.
- Fast, N.J., Halevy, N., Galinsky, A.D. (2012). The destructive nature of power without status. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 48, 391-394.

CONFLICTS

- Kramer, R. 1999. Trust and distrust in organizations: Emerging perspectives, enduring questions. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 50: 569-598.
- Bazerman, M. H., Curhan, J. R., Moore, D. A., & Valley, K. L. 2000. Negotiation. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 51: 279-314.
- Neale, M.A. & Bazerman, M.H. (1985). The effects of framing and negotiator overconfidence on bargaining behaviors and outcomes. *Academy of Management Journal*, 28(1), 34-49.
- Thompson, L. & Hastie, R. (1990). Social perception in negotiation. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 47, 98-123.
- Jehn, K.A. (1995). A multi-method examination of the benefits and detriments of intragroup conflict. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 40(2), 256-282.

ETHICS

- Tyler, T. (1994). Psychological models of the justice motive. Antecedents of distributive and procedural justice. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 67, 850-863.
- Haidt, J. (2001). The emotional dog and its rational tail: A social intuitionist approach to moral judgment. *Psychological Review*, 108(4), 814-834.
- Monin, B. & Miller, D.T. (2001). Moral credentials and the expression of prejudice. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 81(1), 33-43.
- Moore, C., & Gino, F. (2013). Ethically adrift: How others pull our moral compass from true north, and how we can fix it. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 33, 53- 77.
- Bazerman, M. H., & Gino, F. (2012). Behavioral ethics: Toward a deeper understanding of moral judgment and dishonesty. *Annual Review of Law and Social Science*, 8, 85-104.

JUSTICE

- Greenberg, J. (1990). Employee theft as a reaction to underpayment inequity: The hidden cost of pay cuts. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 75: 561-568. Brockner, J., &
- Wiesenfeld, B. M. (1996). An integrative framework for explaining reactions to decisions: Interactive effects of outcomes and procedures. *Psychological Bulletin*, 120: 189-208.

- Tyler, T., Degoey, P., & Smith, H. (1996). Understanding why the justice of group procedures matters: A test of the psychological dynamics of the group-value model. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 70: 913-930.
- Ambrose, M. L., Seabright, M. A., Schminke, M. (2002). Sabotage in the workplace: The role of organizational injustice. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 89: 947-965.
- Robinson, S. R. (1996). Trust and breach of the psychological contract. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 41: 574-599.