



Faculty of Management  
Faculté de gestion

**SEMINAR IN BEHAVIORAL SCIENCE  
ORGB 705**

**Professor Patricia Faison Hewlin**

**Mondays (11:35 am – 2 pm collectively; 30-35 minute peer meetings)**

**Zoom link: <https://mcgill.zoom.us/j/85795693477>**

***Office hours by appointment: [patricia.hewlin@mcgill.ca](mailto:patricia.hewlin@mcgill.ca)***

**COURSE OVERVIEW AND OBJECTIVES**

Broadly, behavioral science encompasses a wide range of disciplines (e.g., psychology, sociology, political science anthropology, economics, and others) that center on the behavior of people. In this seminar, we will evaluate the actions (and inaction) of people that have important implications to workplace settings. This subset of behavioral science is generally termed, “organizational behavior” (OB).

Over the next twelve weeks we will take a holistic approach to OB scholarship in which we will not only evaluate the interface between the work environment and the organization member, but also the effects of non-work dynamics on work attitudes, emotions, and choices individuals make at work. For example, societal relationships among dominant and non-dominant groups will influence power dynamics and perceptions members bring into the workplace. Accordingly, we will work together to develop integrative frameworks that explain organizational behavior as phenomena nested within societal, organizational, and community contexts.

This seminar will provide a survey of core OB topics that continue to receive attention in the field, however, it is important to note that this is not an exhaustive course. OB is quite broad with numerous topics and sub-topics such that not one or two (or even three!) seminars can comprehensively cover the entire field. Thus, if you are a new student, you will gain foundational exposure of OB research you can take along in your doctoral journey. If you are an advanced student, this seminar will complement what you already know toward becoming well-versed and well-spoken, as well as being able to critically think about and review OB research.

I expect all students in this course to build skills needed to be a productive scholar in the management field. I therefore encourage you to use this course to hone your own research agenda and contribute to the current dialogue in the field. Accordingly, a key objective of this

seminar is to improve your reviewing and academic writing abilities. You will learn the basics of theory development, practice writing hypotheses, and learn how to craft a strong introduction. I hope the topics we cover in this seminar will help you identify exciting and novel areas of scholarship for future research!

### GRADING PLAN

15%	Discussion Leadership
15%	Class Participation (in-class and team meetings)
20%	Introduction Assignment
10%	Hypothesis Assignment
25%	Research Dilemma Assignment
<u>15%</u>	<u>Research Dilemma Peer Review</u>
100 points	

### **COURSE REQUIREMENTS**

Participation: Students are expected to prepare for each class and to participate actively in the discussions. To be a good contributor requires preparation and listening attentively. Neither preparation nor listening is enough; both are foundational requirements. Participation means: presenting your ideas, articulating an argument, helping others clarify or articulate their ideas, and responding thoughtfully to the ideas and perspectives of others. Effective class comments may address questions raised by others, integrate material from this course and other theoretical domains, or pose new questions to the class.

Participation also includes Research Conversations with Peers: Starting the week of the 11<sup>th</sup>, you will hold 30–35-minute conversations with 1-2 peer(s) in the class. Collaborations and the exchange of ideas are critical to your success as a doctoral student and scholar in general. Therefore, research conversations with peers will be built into the seminar. The conversations are credited as class time, but they will be scheduled on your own between you and your peer(s) – virtually, on the phone, or even during a *socially distant* walk outside (if you are in town). The goal is to delve more deeply into some of topics discussed in class, challenges you are experiencing with your own research, etc. You can decide the content of the discussions but the conversations *must be related to research* and your team will submit via email a short paragraph that summarizes what you discussed before the start of the next class after the meeting. For example, I expect to receive your first team summary before 11:35 am on the 18<sup>th</sup>. In the spirit of expanding your network, *please be sure to take the opportunity to meet with every classmate in the class*. Each week, the class session will end at 2:00 to accommodate this assignment.

Discussion Leadership: Starting on the 18<sup>th</sup>, students will serve as discussion leaders for two class sessions. Your role begins during the last 40 minutes of the session after we discuss the individual articles due that day. The discussion leader is responsible for developing a creative structure that engages class members while facilitating learning and the creation of new insights into the literature. There are two key elements to this role.

First, you are responsible for generating a discussion of core issues, *challenges and dilemmas raised in the readings*. To start, you need to offer a brief review (no more than 15 minutes with 1-3 slides) of the key points and issues raised in the required articles. Given that everyone will have read and reviewed the readings, the goal is to set the foundation for the discussion. It is critical that you not only have an absolutely firm grasp of the readings that week, but also that you have given significant thought to the type of *questions* that engender *integration, debate and dialogue*. Some ideas include an assessment of the similarities and differences in the approaches, assumptions, methods and conclusions of the articles.

The second requirement for discussion leaders is that they need to help the group make *cross-topic connections between readings of the current session and past sessions*. You could offer this connection to the group, or have this be an exercise you conduct during the discussion. *This integration across topics* is critical for everyone to see the big picture of how different topic areas connect. Are there unifying frameworks that can help us integrate across topics? Perhaps we can diagram or model these relationships? What are the challenges with integrating across topics? What are the connecting points? What research needs to be conducted that integrates not only within, but also across the topics covered in this class? This can be a very creative and exciting portion of the class.

***Students will have the opportunity to provide me a maximum of four preferences of sessions they are interested in leading by January 15<sup>th</sup> at noon.***

Introduction Assignment: Due January 25<sup>th</sup> (Part 1) and March 15<sup>th</sup> (Part 2)

Part 1: Advanced students will submit the introduction of a paper they have written or are currently writing. This introduction must be developed based on the recommendations found in Grant and Pollock (2011). *For new students and other students who haven't yet taken a full semester OB course that has required a written paper, please contact me.* Your assignment is a one-page critique of an introduction that I will provide. The critique must include specific recommendations consistent with those found in the Grant and Pollock article.

Part 2: Advanced students will submit an updated introduction that incorporates my feedback. New students will write and submit their own introduction on a topic of interest.

Hypothesis Assignment: Due the day your selected article is discussed in class

Whether you primarily pursue qualitative or quantitative methods in your research, building a convincing argument is an important skill. For this assignment you will select an article from this course and create a completely new hypothesis to add to the research model in that article. Your hypothesis, of course, must be original. Thus, it will be important to conduct a literature search to ensure that your idea has not already been published in another article. **Please submit your choice and an alternative option before Friday, January 22<sup>nd</sup>.**

Research Dilemma Assignment

Peer review is a critical component of academic life and the process of reviewing yields an array of important insights into how to effectively frame and develop a manuscript.

On March 22<sup>nd</sup> we will have a “research dilemma” session. In these sessions you will have 10 minutes to present a dilemma you are facing in writing or conceptualizing a research paper. The role of the class is to help you solve your research dilemma. To make the most of your time, you need to develop a fleshed-out outline of a research paper/research ideas and distribute it to your colleagues before the session. In addition to the outline, you will present a clear statement of the dilemma you are facing and what type of help you would like from the group. Since there are no readings due that day, *the fleshed-out outlines will be due March 17<sup>th</sup> by noon via email to the entire class.* This will give everyone time to read your outline and bring materials to class that may help you with your dilemma. Everyone will have a chance to get and give help.

You will be assigned a “**review partner**” who will serve as a sounding board and will offer specific developmental and constructive feedback on your work based on the feedback you received during class as well as their own feedback. Your review partner will provide feedback of one page, which I will read and evaluate. This feedback is due to you and me by Monday, March 22<sup>nd</sup> before the start of class. On April 12<sup>th</sup> before the start of class, you will submit to your reviewer and me a thoughtful response to the comments, delineating how you will address each of the comments and issues raised. I will give you private feedback, however, you and your reviewer can certainly have a conversation about your response if you choose.

**READING LIST**

<p><u>Class 1</u> <u>January</u> <u>11</u></p>	<p><i>Getting Started – What is Organizational Behavior?</i></p> <p>Heath, C., &amp; Sitkin, S. 2000. Big-B versus Big-O: An examination into what is distinctly organizational about organizational behavior. <i>Journal of Organizational Behavior</i>, 22 (1): 1-16.</p>
--	---

	<p>Pfeffer, J. 1993. Barriers to the advance of organizational science: Paradigm development as a dependable variable. <i>Academy of Management Review</i>, 18, 599-616.</p> <p>Campion, M. A. 1993. Article review checklist: A criterion checklist for reviewing research articles in applied psychology. <i>Personnel Psychology</i>, 46(3), 705.</p>
<p><u>Class 2</u> <u>January</u> <u>18</u></p>	<p><i>Sensemaking and Introductions</i></p> <p>Grant, A. M., &amp; Pollock, T. G. 2011. Publishing in AMJ—part 3: Setting the hook. <i>Academy of Management Journal</i>, 54, 873-879.</p> <p>Heaphy, E. D. 2016. Dancing on hot coals: How emotional work facilitates collective sense-making. <i>Academy of Management Journal</i>, 60(2), 642-670.</p> <p>Vough, Heather C., and Brianna Barker Caza. 2017. Where do I go from here? Sensemaking and the construction of growth-based stories in the wake of denied promotions. <i>Academy of Management Review</i> 42: 103-128.</p> <p>Weick, K. E., Sutcliffe, K. M., &amp; Obstfeld, D. 2005. Organizing and the process of sensemaking. <i>Organization science</i>, 16(4), 409-421.</p> <p><i>Optional for this session but it should be read as soon as possible:</i> Pratt, M. G. 2009. From the editors: For the lack of a boilerplate: Tips on writing up (and reviewing) qualitative research. <i>Academy of Management Journal</i> VOL. 52, NO. 5   From the Editors</p>
<p><u>Class 3</u> <u>January</u> <u>25</u></p>	<p><i>Status and Theorizing Part 1</i></p> <p>Sutton, R.L., &amp; Staw, B.M. 1995. What theory is not. <i>Administrative Science Quarterly</i>, 40, 371-384.</p> <p>Bunderson, J. S. 2003. Recognizing and utilizing expertise in work groups: A status characteristics perspective. <i>Administrative Science Quarterly</i>, 48: 557-591.</p> <p>Al Dabbagh, M., Bowles, H. R., &amp; Thomason, B. 2016. Status reinforcement in emerging economies: The psychological experience of local candidates striving for global employment. <i>Organization Science</i>, 27(6), 1453-1471.</p> <p>Fragale, A. R., Overbeck, J. R., &amp; Neale, M. A. 2011. Resources versus respect: Social judgments based on targets' power and status positions. <i>Journal of Experimental Social Psychology</i>, 47(4), 767-775.</p>

<p><u>Class 4</u> <u>February</u> <u>1</u></p>	<p><i>Morality, Rule Breaking, and Hypothesis Development</i></p> <p>Sparrowe, R. T., &amp; Mayer, K. J. 2011. Publishing in AMJ—part 4: Grounding hypotheses. <i>Academy of Management Journal</i>, 54, 1098-1102.</p> <p>Deng, H., Coyle-Shapiro, J., &amp; Yang, Q. 2018. Beyond reciprocity: A conservation of resources view on the effects of psychological contract violation on third parties. <i>Journal of Applied Psychology</i>, 103(5), 561.</p> <p>Heaphy, E. D. 2013. Repairing breaches with rules: Maintaining institutions in the face of everyday disruptions. <i>Organization Science</i>, 24(5), 1291-1315.</p> <p>Desai, S. D., &amp; Kouchaki, M. 2017. Moral symbols: A necklace of garlic against unethical requests. <i>Academy of Management Journal</i>, 60(1), 7-28.</p>
<p><u>Class 5</u> <u>February</u> <u>8</u></p>	<p><i>Silence and Facades of Conformity and Theorizing Part 2</i></p> <p>Okhuysen, G., &amp; Bonardi, J-F. 2011. The challenge of building theory by combining lenses. <i>Academy of Management Review</i>, 36, 6-11.</p> <p>Schaubroeck, J. M. 2013. Pitfalls of appropriating prestigious theories to frame conceptual arguments. <i>Organizational Psychology Review</i>, 3(1), 86-97.</p> <p>Hewlin, P. F. 2003. And the award for best actor goes to.: Facades of conformity in organizational settings. <i>Academy of Management Review</i>, 28: 633-642.</p> <p>Rosette, A. S., Carton, A. M., Bowes-Sperry, L., &amp; Hewlin, P. F. (2013). Why do racial slurs remain prevalent in the workplace? Integrating theory on intergroup behavior. <i>Organization Science</i>, 24(5), 1402-1421.</p>
<p><u>Class 6</u> <u>February</u> <u>15</u></p>	<p><i>Intergroup Conflict and Choosing the Right Topic</i></p> <p>Colquitt, J. A., &amp; George, G. 2011. Publishing in AMJ—part 1: Topic choice. <i>Academy of Management Journal</i>, 54, 432-435.</p> <p>Eidelson, R.J., &amp; Eidelson, J.I. 2003. Dangerous ideas: Five beliefs that propel groups toward conflict. <i>American Psychologist</i>, 58,182–192.</p> <p>Lowery, B. S., Unzueta, M. M., Knowles, E. D., &amp; Goff, P. A. 2006. Concern for the ingroup and opposition to affirmative action. <i>Journal of Personality and Social Psychology</i>, 90, 961–974.</p> <p>Brief, A. P., Dietz, J., Cohen, R. R., Pugh, S. D., &amp; Vaslow, J. B. 2000. Just doing business: Modern racism and obedience to authority as explanations for</p>

	<p>employment discrimination. <i>Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Making Processes</i>, 81:72 - 97.</p>
<p><u>Class 7</u> <u>February</u> <u>22</u></p>	<p><i>Diversity &amp; The Role of Context</i></p> <p>Johns, G. 2006. The essential impact of context on organizational behavior. <i>Academy of Management Review</i>, 31, 386-408.</p> <p>Ely, R. J., &amp; Thomas, D. A. 2001. Cultural diversity at work: The effects of diversity perspectives on work group processes and outcomes. <i>Administrative Science Quarterly</i>, 46: 229-273.</p> <p>Phillips, K. W., &amp; Loyd, D. L. 2006. When surface and deep-level diversity collide: The effects on dissenting group members. <i>Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes</i>, 99, 143-160.</p> <p>Smith, A. N., Watkins, M. B., Ladge, J. J., &amp; Carlton, P. 2019. Making the invisible visible: Paradoxical effects of intersectional invisibility on the career experiences of executive Black women. <i>Academy of Management Journal</i>, 62: 1705-1734.</p>
<p><u>Class 8</u> <u>March 8</u></p>	<p><i>Social Stigma, Stigmatization and Discussing Implications</i></p> <p>Bono, J. E., &amp; McNamara, G. 2011. Publishing in AMJ—part 6: Discussing the implications. <i>Academy of Management Journal</i>, 55, 256-260.</p> <p>Crocker, J., &amp; Major, B. 1989. Social stigma and self-esteem: The self-protective properties of stigma. <i>Psychological Review</i>, 96: 608 – 630.</p> <p>Ali, A. A., Lyons, B. J., &amp; Ryan, A. M. 2017. Managing a perilous stigma: Ex-offenders' use of reparative impression management tactics in hiring contexts. <i>Journal of Applied Psychology</i>, 102(9), 1271.</p> <p>Toyoki, S., &amp; Brown, A. D. (2014). Stigma, identity and power: Managing stigmatized identities through discourse. <i>Human Relations</i>, 67(6), 715-737.</p>
<p><u>Class 9</u> <u>March</u> <u>15</u></p>	<p><i>Topics Around Gender</i></p> <p>Berdahl, J. L. 2007. The sexual harassment of uppity women. <i>Journal of Applied Psychology</i>, 92(2), 425.</p> <p>Meister, A., Sinclair, A., &amp; Jehn, K. A. 201). Identities under scrutiny: How women leaders navigate feeling misidentified at work. <i>The Leadership Quarterly</i>, 28(5), 672-690.</p>

	<p>Martin, A. E., &amp; Phillips, K. W. 2017. What “blindness” to gender differences helps women see and do: Implications for confidence, agency, and action in male-dominated environments. <i>Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes</i>, 142, 28-44.</p> <p>Elsbach, K. D., &amp; Bechky, B. A. 2018. How Observers Assess Women Who Cry in Professional Work Contexts. <i>Academy of Management Discoveries</i>, 4(2), 127–154.</p>
<u>Class 10</u> <u>March</u> <u>22</u>	<i>Research Dilemmas Presentations</i>
<u>Class 11</u> <u>March</u> <u>29</u>	<p><i>Emotions and Emotional Labor</i></p> <p>Amabile, T. M., Barsade, S., Mueller, J. S., &amp; Staw, B. 2005. Affect and creativity: A daily longitudinal test. <i>Administrative Science Quarterly</i>, 50: 367-403.</p> <p>Schabram, Kira, and Sally Maitlis. 2017. Negotiating the challenges of a calling: Emotion and enacted sensemaking in animal shelter work. <i>Academy of Management Journal</i> 60: 584-609.</p> <p>Sutton, R. I., &amp; Rafaeli, A. 1988. Untangling the relationship between displayed emotions and organizational sales: The case of convenience stores. <i>Academy of Management Journal</i>, 31: 461-487.</p> <p>Wolf, E. B., Lee, J. J., Sah, S., &amp; Brooks, A. W. 2016. Managing perceptions of distress at work: Reframing emotion as passion. <i>Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes</i>, 137, 1-12.</p>
<u>Class 12</u> <u>April 12</u>	<p><i>Authenticity, Identity and Self-Reflection</i></p> <p>Dutton, J. E. 2004. One scholar’s garden: A narrative of renewal. <i>Renewing research practice: Lessons from scholar’s journeys</i>, 5-17.</p> <p>Cha, S. E., &amp; Roberts, L. M. 2019. Leveraging Minority Identities at Work: An Individual-Level Framework of the Identity Mobilization Process. <i>Organization Science</i>, 30(4), 735-760.</p> <p>Gino, F., Sezer, O., &amp; Huang, L. 2020. To be or not to be your authentic self? Catering to others’ preferences hinders performance. <i>Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes</i>.</p>