City University of Hong Kong
Course Syllabus

offered by Department of Management
with effect from Semester A in 2022 / 2023

Part I   Course Overview

Course Title:	Advanced Topics in Organizational Behavior and Human Resource Management
Course Code:	MGT 8904
Course Duration:	One Semester
Credit Units:	3
Level:	R8
Medium of Instruction:	English
Medium of Assessment:	English
Prerequisites: *(Course Code and Title)*	A doctoral level, research-oriented course in organizational behavior/human resources management
Precursors: *(Course Code and Title)*	Nil
Equivalent Courses: *(Course Code and Title)*	Nil
Exclusive Courses: *(Course Code and Title)*	Nil

Part II   Course Details

1.   **Abstract**

   1.   **Course Aims:**

   - provide students with a critical understanding of the theories and concepts underlying organizational behavior and human resource management
   - help students gain insights into key research areas and research techniques in these fields and develop research hypotheses

2.   **Course Intended Learning Outcomes (CILOs)**

No.	CILOs	Weighting	Discovery-enriched curriculum related learning outcomes (please tick where appropriate)		
			A1	*A2*	*A3*
1.	Demonstrate knowledge of key research areas in the interrelated fields of organizational behavior and human resource management.	20%	✓	✓	✓
2.	Critically evaluate the theories and concepts underlying organizational behavior and human resource management	30%	✓	✓	✓
3.	Generate research hypotheses using theories and concepts relating to organizational behavior and human resource management logically	50%	✓	✓	✓
		100%			

A1:   *Attitude*
   Develop an attitude of discovery/innovation/creativity, as demonstrated by students possessing a strong sense of curiosity, asking questions actively, challenging assumptions or engaging in inquiry together with teachers.
A2:   *Ability*
   Develop the ability/skill needed to discover/innovate/create, as demonstrated by students possessing critical thinking skills to assess ideas, acquiring research skills, synthesizing knowledge across disciplines or applying academic knowledge to self-life problems.
A3:   Accomplishments
   Demonstrate accomplishment of discovery/innovation/creativity through producing /constructing creative works/new artefacts, effective solutions to real-life problems or new processes.

3. Teaching and Learning Activities (TLAs)

TLA	Brief Description	CILO No.			Hours/week (if applicable)
		1	2	3	
Emphasis in lectures is placed on knowledge building and theoretical understanding of important OB theories.	Students are required to read a number of theoretical and empirical papers for each topic. They are also required to provide critiques of class readings.	X	X		
Learning through discussions and presentations on prescribed readings	Students are required to lead class discussions on selected topics. They are expected to provide their own insights into assigned class readings.	X	X		
Learning through writing a research proposal	Students are expected to develop an independent research proposal on a selected research topic.			X	

4. Assessment Tasks/Activities (ATs)

Assessment Tasks/Activities	CILO No.			Weighting	Remarks
	1	2	3		
Continuous Assessment: 100%					
Contribution to class discussion Learning best occurs through active participation. Participation will be evaluated on two dimensions: 1. active engagement (50%) and 2. quality of contribution to discussions (50%). Indicators of active engagement include regular attendance, taking the initiative in raising questions and issues, as well as active participation in discussion. Quality of contribution will be evaluated by the relevance and usefulness of students' comments in the classes.	X	X		50%	
Theoretical project/paper The purpose of this research proposal is to help a student develop a research proposal using theories and concepts relating to organizational behavior and human resource management. Research proposal will be judged based on the following criteria: 1) Were the topics analyzed and explained clearly, with some depth, and appropriately illustrated?; 2) Was the proposal expanded through explicit use of theories, concepts, and ideas learned in readings and classes?; and 3) Were the research hypotheses developed logically with appropriate citations and theoretical arguments?	X	X	X	50%	
Examination: 0% (duration: , if applicable)					
				100%	

5. Assessment Rubrics

Applicable to students admitted in Semester A 2022/23 and thereafter

Assessment Task	Criterion	Excellent (A+, A, A-)	Good (B+, B)	Marginal (B-, C+, C)	Failure (F)
Contribution to class discussion (50%)	Assess students' theoretical understanding, knowledge, and ability to provide insights into assigned class readings.	Student is almost always prepared for class with relevant class materials. Student is almost always punctual and attends full-time. Student almost always contributes to class by offering ideas and asking questions more than once per class.	Student is frequently prepared for class with relevant class materials. Student is frequently punctual and attends full-time. Student frequently contributes to class by offering ideas and asking questions once per class.	Student is almost never prepared for class with relevant class materials. Student is almost always late to class and leaves early. Student almost never contributes to class by offering ideas and asking questions.	Not attending 70% of classes.
Theoretical project/paper (50%)	Assess students' ability to apply theories to develop independent research ideas.	As in B, but with higher degree of originality. Good evidence of reflection on own performance based on theory. Very strong justification of response based on theory and practice.	The evidence presents a good appreciation of the general thrust of the proposal. Good coverage with relevant and accurate support. A clear view of how various aspects of the concepts and theories integrate to form a thrust or purpose. The research hypotheses were well justified.	Pieces of evidence are relevant and accurate, but are isolated, addressing a limited number of issues. Demonstration of understanding in a minimally acceptable way. Poor coverage, no originality, weak justification of the research hypotheses.	Poor arguments, with little theoretical/conceptual grounding and understanding of the materials and the context involved. No originality, weak justification of conclusions and poorly structured.

Assessment Task	Criterion	Excellent (A+, A, A-)	Good (B+, B, B-)	Fair (C+, C, C-)	Marginal (D)	Failure (F)
Contribution to class discussion (50%)	Assess students' theoretical understanding, knowledge, and ability to provide insights into assigned class readings.	Student is almost always prepared for class with relevant class materials. Student is almost always punctual and attends full-time. Student almost always contributes to class by offering ideas and asking questions more than once per class.	Student is frequently prepared for class with relevant class materials. Student is frequently punctual and attends full-time. Student frequently contributes to class by offering ideas and asking questions once per class.	Student is occasionally prepared for class with relevant class materials. Student is occasionally late to class and leaves early. Student occasionally contributes to class by offering ideas and asking questions.	Student is almost never prepared for class with relevant class materials. Student is almost always late to class and leaves early. Student almost never contributes to class by offering ideas and asking questions.	Not attending 70% of classes.
Theoretical project/paper (50%)	Assess students' ability to apply theories to develop independent research ideas.	As in B, but with higher degree of originality. Good evidence of reflection on own performance based on theory. Very strong justification of response based on theory and practice.	The evidence presents a good appreciation of the general thrust of the proposal. Good coverage with relevant and accurate support. A clear view of how various aspects of the concepts and theories integrate to form a thrust or purpose. The	The evidence is relevant, accurate and covers a fair number of issues. However, there is little evidence of an overall view of the proposal. Demonstrates declarative understanding of a reasonable amount of content. Able to discuss content meaningfully but	Pieces of evidence are relevant and accurate, but are isolated, addressing a limited number of issues. Demonstration of understanding in a minimally acceptable way. Poor coverage, no originality, weak justification of the research hypotheses.	Poor arguments, with little theoretical/conceptual grounding and understanding of the materials and the context involved. No originality, weak justification of conclusions and poorly structured.

			research hypotheses were well justified.	little application or integration of items. Fair justification of the research hypotheses.		

Part III   Other Information

1.   Keyword Syllabus

Personality, Identity, Cognition, Emotion, Motivation, Decision-making, Incentives, Power, Status, Teams and groups, Leadership, Diversity, Creativity, Social Exchange, Justice & Fairness, Norms and Deviance, Trust, Ethics and Morality, Culture and Climate, Intra- and Inter-group Conflict, Social dilemmas.

2.   Reading List
2.1 Compulsory Readings

1.	Articles in the scholarly literature will be identified as required readings for each topic in the syllabus. Major journals include but are not limited to *Academy of Management Annals*, *Academy of Management Journal*, *Academy of Management Review, Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior, Annual Review of Psychology, Journal of Applied Psychology, Journal of Management, Journal of Organizational Behavior, Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Making Processes, Personnel Psychology, Psychological Bulletin, Psychological Review,* and *Research in Organizational Behavior*, etc.

2.2 Additional Readings

1.	Davis, G. F., & Marquis, C. (2005). Prospects for organization theory in the early twenty-first century: Institutional fields and mechanisms. *Organization Science*, *16*(4), 332-343.
2.	DiMaggio, P. J. (1995). Comments on" What theory is not". *Administrative Science Quarterly*, *40*(3), 391-397.
3.	Klein, K. J., & Zedeck, S. (2004). Introduction to the Special Section on Theoretical Models and Conceptual Analyses: Theory in Applied Psychology: Lessons (Re) Learned. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *89*(6), 931-933.
4.	Sutton, R. I., & Staw, B. M. (1995). What theory is not. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 371-384.
5.	Weick, K. E. (1995). What theory is not, theorizing is. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, *40*(3), 385-390.
6.	Feldman, D. C. (2004). What are we talking about when we talk about theory? *Journal of Management, 30(5),* 565-567.
7.	Wren, D. A. (2008). *The evolution of management thought*. 6th Edition, New York: Wiley.
8.	Porter, L. 1996. Forty years of organization studies: reflections from a micro perspective. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 41, 262-269.

9.	Porter, L. W. (2008). Organizational psychology: A look backward, outward, and forward. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 29*, 519-526.
10.	Staw, B. & Sutton, R.I. 1993. Macro organizational psychology, In J.K. Murnighan (Ed.) *Social Psychology in Organizations: Advances in Theory and Research*, 380-384.
11.	Heath, C., & Sitkin, S. 2001. Big-B versus Big-O: What is organizational about organizational behavior? *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 22:* 43-58.
12.	Colquitt, J. A., & Zapata, C. P. 2007. Trends in theory building and theory testing: A five-decade study of Academy of Management Journal. Academy Of Management Journal, 50: 1281-1303
13.	Staw, B. 1991. Dressing up like an organization: When psychological theories can explain organizational action. Journal of Management, 17: 805 - 819.
14.	Thibaut, J. & Kelly, H. H. (1969). *The social psychology of groups*. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 9-30.
15.	Sherif. M. (1936). *The psychology of social norms*. New York: Harper.
16.	Davis, M. S. (1971). That's interesting! Towards a phenomenology of sociology and a sociology of phenomenology. *Philosophy of the social sciences, 1*(2), 309-344.
17.	Molloy, J. C., Ployhart, R. E., & Wright, P. M. (2011). The myth of "the" micro-macro divide: Bridging system-level and disciplinary divides. *Journal of Management, 37*(2), 581-609.
18.	Davis, G. F. (2015). Editorial essay: What is organizational research for?. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 60*(2), 179-188.
19.	Rynes, S. L. (2012). The research-practice gap in I/O psychology and related fields: Challenges and potential solutions. *The Oxford handbook of organizational psychology, 1*, 409-452.