

The Hong Kong Polytechnic University

Subject Description Form

Please read the notes at the end of the table carefully before completing the form.

Subject Code	MM6131
Subject Title	Social Psychological Foundations of Organisational Behaviour and Consumer Behaviour
Credit Value	3
Level	6
Pre-requisite/ Co-requisite/ Exclusion	None
Objectives	Applied disciplines, such as organizational behaviour (OB) and consumer behaviour (CB), often draw on theories developed in mother disciplines, such as psychology, sociology, and economics. The goal of this doctoral seminar is to provide students with the social psychological foundations of OB and CB by exposing them to a number of theories that are often applied in OB and CB along with theories that are highly relevant to OB and CB but not yet applied in this field.
Intended Learning Outcomes <i>(Note 1)</i>	Upon completion of the subject, students will be able to: a) Refine and extend existing theoretical frameworks in OB and CB integrating basic social psychological theories; b) Use a social psychological theory to explain a new phenomenon in OB / CB; c) Identify new theoretical explanations for phenomenon previously studied within OB and CB; d) Identify new mechanisms to explain existing phenomena in OB and CB; e) Identify new moderators that help in understanding the conditions under which a previously established OB and CB phenomenon occur; f) Introduce new elements to an existing OB or CB theory that failed to explain certain phenomena.
Subject Synopsis/ Indicative Syllabus <i>(Note 2)</i>	Class 1: Introduction Class 2: Power and status Class 3: Stereotypes, prejudice, and diversity Class 4: Motivation Class 5: Ethics, morality, fairness Class 6: Social norms, social exchange, social dilemmas Class 7: Dual Process Models Class 8: Heuristics and biases Class 9: Abstract-concrete construal, implementation intention, prevention-promotion focus, compensatory control

	Class 10: Culture Class 11: Sustainability and social responsibility Class 12: Machine learning in social psychology Class 13: Student presentations																																																												
Teaching/Learning Methodology <i>(Note 3)</i>	The teaching method will involve in-depth discussions about each paper, with a particular focus on how the theories discussed in each paper can be applied to OB and CB. Students would be encouraged to generate novel ideas within OB and CB during the discussion, and provide feedback on each other's ideas. Students would also be asked to enrich their ongoing research with the new ideas discussed in class.																																																												
Assessment Methods in Alignment with Intended Learning Outcomes <i>(Note 4)</i>	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th rowspan="2">Specific assessment methods/tasks</th><th rowspan="2">% weighting</th><th colspan="6">Intended subject learning outcomes to be assessed (Please tick as appropriate)</th></tr> <tr> <th>a</th><th>b</th><th>c</th><th>d</th><th>e</th><th>f</th></tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Continuous Assessment*</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr> <tr> <td>1. In-class discussion</td><td>50%</td><td>√</td><td>√</td><td>√</td><td>√</td><td>√</td><td>√</td></tr> <tr> <td>2. Final paper</td><td>50%</td><td>√</td><td>√</td><td>√</td><td>√</td><td>√</td><td>√</td></tr> <tr> <td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr> <tr> <td>Total</td><td>100 %</td><td colspan="6"></td></tr> </tbody> </table> <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 overall subject grade which is based on the sum of the two Continuous Assessment components.</p> <p>Explanation of the appropriateness of the assessment methods in assessing the intended learning outcomes:</p> <p>In-class discussions are essential in doctoral courses as students learn from critiquing the papers assigned for the week, brainstorming how they can apply the ideas discussed in the papers in their own research, and commenting on the strengths and benefits of each other's ideas.</p> <p>The final paper would require students to come up with a new research idea in OB or CB based on the papers discussed in class. The goal is that students would actually test that idea as part of their graduate research.</p>							Specific assessment methods/tasks	% weighting	Intended subject learning outcomes to be assessed (Please tick as appropriate)						a	b	c	d	e	f	Continuous Assessment*								1. In-class discussion	50%	√	√	√	√	√	√	2. Final paper	50%	√	√	√	√	√	√									Total	100 %						
Specific assessment methods/tasks	% weighting	Intended subject learning outcomes to be assessed (Please tick as appropriate)																																																											
		a	b	c	d	e	f																																																						
Continuous Assessment*																																																													
1. In-class discussion	50%	√	√	√	√	√	√																																																						
2. Final paper	50%	√	√	√	√	√	√																																																						
Total	100 %																																																												
Student Study Effort Expected	Class contact:																																																												
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lectures and discussion sessions 					39 Hrs.																																																							

	Other student study effort:	
	▪ Reading course materials	66 Hrs.
	▪ Writing the final paper	12 Hrs.
	Total student study effort	117 Hrs.
Reading List and References	<p>Class 1: Introduction</p> <p>Sutton, R. I., & Staw, B. M. (1995). What theory is not. <i>Administrative Science Quarterly</i>, 40, 371-384.</p> <p>Heath, C., & Sitkin, S. (2001). Big-B versus Big-O: What is organizational about organizational behavior? <i>Journal of Organizational Behavior</i>, 22: 43-58.</p> <p>Hambrick, D. C. (2007). The field of management's devotion to theory: too much of a good thing? <i>Academy of Management Journal</i>, 50(6), 1346-1352.</p> <p>DeCelles, K. A., Leslie, L. M., & Shaw, J. D. (2019). From the Editors—Disciplinary Code Switching at AMJ: The Tale of Goldilocks and the Three Journals. <i>Academy of Management Journal</i>, 62(3), 635-640.</p> <p>Kim, P. H., Ployhart, R. E., & Gibson, C. B. (2018). Editors' comments: Is organizational behavior overtheorized?. <i>Academy of Management Review</i>, 43(4), 541-545.</p> <p>Tourish, D. (2020). The triumph of nonsense in management studies. <i>Academy of Management Learning & Education</i>, 19(1), 99-109.</p> <p>Class 2: Power and status</p> <p>Keltner, D., Gruenfeld, D. & Anderson, C. (2003). Power, approach, and inhibition. <i>Psychological Review</i>, 110 (2), 265-284.</p> <p>Blader, S. L., & Chen, Y. (2012). Differentiating the effects of status and power: A justice perspective. <i>Journal of Personality and Social Psychology</i>, 102(5), 994-1014.</p> <p>Magee, J. C., & Smith, P. K. (2013). The social distance theory of power. <i>Personality and Social Psychology Review</i>, 17(2), 158-186.</p> <p><u>Optional readings:</u></p> <p>Kraus, M. W., Piff, P. K., Mendoza-Denton, R., Rheinschmidt, M. L., & Keltner, D. (2012). Social class, solipsism, and contextualism: how the rich are different from the poor. <i>Psychological review</i>, 119(3), 546.</p>	

Pratto, F., Sidanius, J., Stallworth, L. M., & Malle, B. F. (1994). Social dominance orientation: A personality variable predicting social and political attitudes. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, 67(4), 741.

Jost, J. T., Banaji, M. R., & Nosek, B. A. (2004). A decade of system justification theory: Accumulated evidence of conscious and unconscious bolstering of the status quo. *Political Psychology*, 25(6), 881-919.

Class 3: Stereotypes, prejudice, and diversity

Steele, C. M. (1997). A threat in the air: How stereotypes shape intellectual identity and performance. *American Psychologist*, 52(6), 613-629.

Cuddy, A. J., Fiske, S. T., & Glick, P. (2008). Warmth and competence as universal dimensions of social perception: The stereotype content model and the BIAS map. *Advances in experimental social psychology*, 40, 61-149.

Greenwald, A. G., & Banaji, M. R. (1995). Implicit social cognition: attitudes, self-esteem, and stereotypes. *Psychological Review*, 102(1), 4-27.

Galinsky, A. D., Todd, A. R., Homan, A. C., Phillips, K. W., Apfelbaum, E. P., Sasaki, S. J., ... & Maddux, W. W. (2015). Maximizing the gains and minimizing the pains of diversity: A policy perspective. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 10(6), 742-748.

Optional readings:

Nai, J., Narayanan, J., Hernandez, I., & Savani, K. (2018). People in more diverse neighborhoods are more prosocial. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 114, 497-515.

Feng, Z., Liu, Y., Wang, Z., & Savani, K. (2020). Let's choose one of each: Using the partition dependence bias to increase diversity in hiring decisions. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 158, 11-26.

Class 4: Motivation

Fishbach, A., & Woolley, K. (2022). The structure of intrinsic motivation. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior*, 9, 339-363.

Dweck, C. S., & Yeager, D. S. (2019). Mindsets: A view from two eras. *Perspectives on Psychological science*, 14(3), 481-496.

Vohs, K. D., Schmeichel, B. J., Lohmann, S., Gronau, Q. F., Finley, A. J., Ainsworth, S. E., ... & Albarracín, D. (2021). A multisite preregistered paradigmatic test of the ego-depletion effect. *Psychological Science*, 32(10), 1566-1581.

- This article documents the death of *ego-depletion*. Just skim it.

Bargh, J. A., & Chartrand, T. L. (1999). The unbearable automaticity of being. *American Psychologist*, 54(7), 462.

Optional readings:

Madan, S., Ma, A., Pandey, N., Rattan, A., & Savani, K. (2022). Support for increasing low-wage workers' compensation: The role of fixed-growth mindsets about intelligence. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General*.

O'Keefe, P. A., Horberg, E. J., Lee, F., & Dweck, C. S. (2022). Implicit theories of opportunity: When opportunity fails to knock, keep waiting, or start cultivating?. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*.

Canning, E. A., Murphy, M. C., Emerson, K. T., Chatman, J. A., Dweck, C. S., & Kray, L. J. (2020). Cultures of genius at work: Organizational mindsets predict cultural norms, trust, and commitment. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 46(4), 626-642.

Savani, K., & Job, V. (2017) Reverse ego-depletion: Acts of self-control can improve subsequent performance in Indian cultural contexts. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 113, 589-607.

Class 5: Ethics, morality, fairness

Bazerman, M. H., & Gino, F. (2012). Behavioral ethics: Toward a deeper understanding of moral judgment and dishonesty. *Annual Review of Law and Social Science*.

Fehr, E., & Schmidt, K. M. (1999). A theory of fairness, competition, and cooperation. *Quarterly journal of Economics*, 817-868.

Graham, J., Haidt, J., & Nosek, B. A. (2009). Liberals and conservatives rely on different sets of moral foundations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 96(5), 1029.

Rai, T. S., & Fiske, A. P. (2011). Moral psychology is relationship regulation: moral motives for unity, hierarchy, equality, and proportionality. *Psychological Review*, 118(1), 57.

Class 6: Social norms, social exchange, social dilemmas

Cialdini, R. B., Kallgren, C. A., & Reno, R. R. (1991). A focus theory of normative conduct: A theoretical refinement and reevaluation of the role of norms in human behavior. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, 24(20), 1-243.

Miller, D. T. (1999). The norm of self-interest. *American Psychologist*, 54(12), 1053.

Van Lange, P. A., Joireman, J., Parks, C. D., & Van Dijk, E. (2013). The psychology of social dilemmas: A review. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 120(2), 125-141.

Morris, M. W., Hong, Y. Y., Chiu, C. Y., & Liu, Z. (2015). Normology: Integrating insights about social norms to understand cultural dynamics. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 129, 1-13.

Class 7: Dual Process Models

Kahneman D. (2003) A perspective on judgement and choice. *American Psychologist*. 58, 697-720.

Evans, Jonathan St BT, and Keith E. Stanovich. "Dual-process theories of higher cognition advancing the debate." *Perspectives on Psychological Science* 8, no. 3 (2013): 223-241.

Keren, Gideon. "A tale of two systems a scientific advance or a theoretical stone soup? Commentary on Evans & Stanovich (2013)." *Perspectives on Psychological Science* 8, no. 3 (2013): 257-262.

Kruglanski, Arie W., and Gerd Gigerenzer. "Intuitive and deliberate judgments are based on common principles." *Psychological review* 118, no. 1 (2011): 97.

Bruine de Bruin, W., Parker, A. M., & Fischhoff, B. (2007). Individual differences in adult decision-making competence. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, 92(5), 938.

Class 8: Heuristics and biases

Tversky, A., & Kahneman, D. (1974). Judgment under uncertainty: Heuristics and biases. *Science*, 185(4157), 1124-1131.

	<p>Nisbett, R. E., & Wilson, T. D. (1977). Telling more than we can know: Verbal reports on mental processes. <i>Psychological review</i>, 84(3), 231.</p> <p>Tetlock, P. E. (2002). Social functionalist frameworks for judgment and choice: intuitive politicians, theologians, and prosecutors. <i>Psychological review</i>, 109(3), 451.</p> <p>Staw, B. M. (2010). The trouble with JDM: Some limitations to the influence of JDM on organizational research. <i>Industrial and Organizational Psychology</i>, 3(4), 411-416.</p> <p>Class 9: Abstract-concrete construal, implementation intention, prevention-promotion focus, compensatory control</p> <p>Trope, Y., & Liberman, N. (2010). Construal-level theory of psychological distance. <i>Psychological review</i>, 117(2), 440.</p> <p>Gollwitzer, P. M. (1999). Implementation intentions: strong effects of simple plans. <i>American Psychologist</i>, 54(7), 493.</p> <p>Higgins, E. T. (2006). Value from hedonic experience and engagement. <i>Psychological review</i>, 113(3), 439.</p> <p>Landau, M. J., Kay, A. C., & Whitson, J. A. (2015). Compensatory control and the appeal of a structured world. <i>Psychological Bulletin</i>, 141(3), 694.</p> <p>Class 10: Culture</p> <p>Markus, H. R., & Kitayama, S. (1991). Culture and the self: Implications for cognition, emotion, and motivation. <i>Psychological review</i>, 98(2), 224.</p> <p>Nisbett, R. E., Peng, K., Choi, I., & Norenzayan, A. (2001). Culture and systems of thought: holistic versus analytic cognition. <i>Psychological review</i>, 108(2), 291.</p> <p>Morris, M. W., Chiu, C. Y., & Liu, Z. (2015). Polycultural psychology. <i>Annual review of psychology</i>, 66, 631-659.</p> <p>Oishi, S., & Graham, J. (2010). Social ecology lost and found in psychological science. <i>Perspectives on Psychological Science</i>, 5(4), 356-377.</p> <p>Class 11: Sustainability and social responsibility</p> <p>Van der Linden, S., Maibach, E., & Leiserowitz, A. (2015). Improving public engagement with climate change: Five “best</p>
--	---

	<p>practice” insights from psychological science. <i>Perspectives on Psychological Science</i>, 10(6), 758-763.</p> <p>Lau, E. H., Rattan, A., Romero-Canyas, R., & Savani, K. (2022). Culturally Relevant Frames Increase Individuals’ Motivation to Contribute to Carbon Emissions Offsets. <i>Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology</i>, 53(10), 1211-1234.</p> <p>Eom, K., Papadakis, V., Sherman, D. K., & Kim, H. S. (2019). The psychology of proenvironmental support: In search of global solutions for a global problem. <i>Current Directions in Psychological Science</i>, 28(5), 490-495.</p> <p>Class 12: Machine learning in social psychology</p> <p>Yarkoni, T., & Westfall, J. (2017). Choosing prediction over explanation in psychology: Lessons from machine learning. <i>Perspectives on Psychological Science</i>, 12(6), 1100-1122.</p> <p>Sheetal, A., Feng, Z., & Savani, K. (2020). Using machine learning to generate novel hypotheses: Increasing optimism about COVID-19 makes people less willing to justify unethical behaviors. <i>Psychological Science</i>, 31(10), 1222-1235.</p> <p>Banker, S., Chatterjee, P., Mishra, H., & Mishra, A. (In press). Machine-assisted social psychology hypothesis generation. <i>American Psychologist</i>.</p> <p>Degefe, E., Savani, K., & Sheetal, A. (In press). Machine learning in management: A review. <i>Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Business and Management</i>.</p>
--	--

Note 1: Intended Learning Outcomes

Intended learning outcomes should state what students should be able to do or attain upon subject completion. Subject outcomes are expected to contribute to the attainment of the overall programme outcomes.

Note 2: Subject Synopsis/Indicative Syllabus

The syllabus should adequately address the intended learning outcomes. At the same time, overcrowding of the syllabus should be avoided.

Note 3: Teaching/Learning Methodology

This section should include a brief description of the teaching and learning methods to be employed to facilitate learning, and a justification of how the methods are aligned with the intended learning outcomes of the subject.

Note 4: Assessment Method

This section should include the assessment method(s) to be used and its relative weighting, and indicate which of the subject intended learning outcomes that each method is intended to assess. It should also provide a brief explanation of the appropriateness of the assessment methods in assessing the intended learning outcomes.

(Form AR 140) 8.2020