

**City University of Hong Kong
Course Syllabus**

**offered by Department of Management
with effect from Semester A in 2024/ 2025**

Part I Course Overview

Course Title:	Directed Studies in Organizational Behavior and Human Resource Management
Course Code:	MGT8907
Course Duration:	One Semester
Credit Units:	3
Level:	R8
Medium of Instruction:	English
Medium of Assessment:	English
Prerequisites: <i>(Course Code and Title)</i>	Nil
Precursors: <i>(Course Code and Title)</i>	Nil
Equivalent Courses: <i>(Course Code and Title)</i>	Nil
Exclusive Courses: <i>(Course Code and Title)</i>	Nil

Part II Course Details

1. Abstract

- 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 (if applicable)	Discovery-enriched curriculum related learning outcomes		
			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.	Design 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. Learning and Teaching Activities (LTAs)

LTA	Brief Description	CILO No.						Hours/week (if applicable)
		1	2	3	4	5	6	
Emphasis in lectures is placed on the rigorous use of fundamental techniques		X	X					
Learning through discussions and presentations on prescribed readings		X	X					
Learning through writing a research proposal				X				

4. Assessment Tasks/Activities (ATs)

Assessment Tasks/Activities	CILO No.						Weighting	Remarks
	1	2	3	4	5	6		
Continuous Assessment: <u>100%</u>								
Contribution to the Discussion	X	X					20%	Students will engage in 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.
Proposal Presentation	X	X				20%	Students will make a proposal presentation. The purpose of this presentation is to provide the supervisor with an overview of what the student has done. Design the presentation so that it highlights the work done on the research proposal. Presentation will be judged based on the following criteria: 1) Was it interesting and creative?; 2) Was it well-structured and organized?; and 3) Did a student effectively grab the audience's attention?
Research Proposal	X	X	X			60%	Students will write a research proposal. 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

							<p>resource management.</p> <p>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?</p>
Examination: _% (duration: , if applicable)							100%

5. Assessment Rubrics

Applicable to students admitted before Semester A 2022/23 and in Semester A 2024/25 & thereafter

Assessment Task	Criterion	Excellent (A+, A, A-)	Good (B+, B, B-)	Fair (C+, C, C-)	Marginal (D)	Failure (F)
1. Contribution to the Discussion		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.
2. Research Project		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	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	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	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.

			theories integrate to form a thrust or purpose. The research hypotheses were well justified.	of content. Able to discuss content meaningfully but little application or integration of items. Fair justification of the research hypotheses.	justification of the research hypotheses.	
--	--	--	--	---	---	--

Applicable to students admitted from Semester A 2022/23 to Summer Term 2024

Assessment Task	Criterion	Excellent (A+, A, A-)	Good (B+, B)	Marginal (B-, C+, C)	Failure (F)
1. Contribution to the Discussion		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.	Not attending 70% of classes.
2. Research Project		As in B, but with higher degree of originality. Good evidence of reflection on own performance based on theory. Very strong justification of response	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	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	Poor arguments, with little theoretical/conceptual grounding and understanding of the materials and the context involved. No originality, weak justification of

		based on theory and practice.	aspects of the concepts and theories integrate to form a thrust or purpose. The research hypotheses were well justified.	understanding of a reasonable amount of content. Able to discuss content meaningfully but little application or integration of items. Fair justification of the research hypotheses.	conclusions and poorly structured.
--	--	-------------------------------	--	--	------------------------------------

Assessing Proposal Presentation (20%)

Each presentation will last for 50 minutes followed by questions and answers for 10 minutes. The team presentations will be assessed as follows: Excellent = 5, Good = 4, Acceptable = 3, Poor = 2, Very poor = 1.

Aspects of presentation	Score				
Coverage of issues	1	2	3	4	5
Clarity of presentation	1	2	3	4	5
Questions and answers	1	2	3	4	5
Team coordination	1	2	3	4	5

Part III Other Information

1. Keyword Syllabus

Employee Behavior, Work Motivation, Job Attitudes, Job Stress and Employee Health, Work Teams, Leadership, Politics in Organizations, Cultures in Work Organizations, Societal Cultures and Work Organizations, Recruitment and Selection, Performance Appraisal and Feedback, Employee Compensation, Training and Development

2. Reading List

2.1 Compulsory Readings

1.	Wren, D. A. (2008). <i>The evolution of management thought</i> . 6 th Edition, New York: Wiley.
----	--

A list of articles for each topic will be distributed in classes.

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. <i>Organization Science</i> , 16(4), 332-343.
2.	DiMaggio, P. J. (1995). Comments on "What theory is not". <i>Administrative Science Quarterly</i> , 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. <i>Journal of Applied Psychology</i> , 89(6), 931-933.
4.	Sutton, R. I., & Staw, B. M. (1995). What theory is not. <i>Administrative Science Quarterly</i> , 371-384.
5.	Weick, K. E. (1995). What theory is not, theorizing is. <i>Administrative Science Quarterly</i> , 40(3), 385-390.
6.	Feldman, D. C. (2004). What are we talking about when we talk about theory? <i>Journal of Management</i> , 30(5), 565-567.