



The Leon Recanati Graduate School of Business Administration

1243.3424 – Human Resource Management and Employee Relations

(Prerequisites: Managing People and Systems – Micro AND Macro)

Second Semester – 2020/21

Section	Day	Hour	Final Task	Lecturer	Email	Telephone
01	Tuesday	18:45-21:30	Exam	Prof. Bamberger Peter	peterb@tauex.tau.ac.il	

Teaching Assistant (TA): Aya Zeiger, ayushze@gmail.com

Office Hours: By appointment

Course Units

2 course unit = 4 ECTS units

The ECTS (European Credit Transfer and Accumulation System) is a framework defined by the European Commission to allow for unified recognition of student academic achievements from different countries.

Course Description

This course is designed as an introduction to human resource managers for general managers. The intent of the course is not to provide technical skills in human resource management, but rather to provide a strategic framework for understanding human resource management.

Course Objectives

The course seeks to present human resource management as a strategic issue no less significant than the management of any other organizational strategic asset. Day-to-day human resource quandaries are discussed in the context of mainstream economic, psychological and sociological theory. By the end of the course, students should have a good understanding of the contingencies that need to be considered in the design of human resource systems that are congruent with and supportive of particular business strategies.

Evaluation of Student and Composition of Grade

Percentage (PROJECT course)	Percentage (REGULAR course)	Assignment	Submission Date	Group Size
30 (one individual case report)	70 (2 reports at 35 points per report)	One case report (if project course) or two case reports (if regular course)		INDIVIDUAL
70 (30 points for team portion + 40 points for individual portion)	30 (team portion only)	Final Project (regular course participants do team component only)		3-4 students for team portion

* Students must attend ALL class sessions. Students failing to attend a session without receiving permission from the instructor risk failing the course. (Students remain financially liable for the course even if they are removed.)

Course Assignments

Part (1): Individual Case Report (30% of final grade for Project students,)

Each student will be assigned one case study to analyze in detail, with the grade based on the quality of the responses to the case-specific questions. Worth a maximum of 10 points. **Case reports must be submitted before discussion in class.** Each case analysis should be no longer than 6 pages in length (double spaced, 12 point, Times-New Roman). **Questions to address in specific case reports are given below.**

Part (2): Final Project (70% of final grade)

These are to be done **IN TEAMS of 3-4 students**. You should view this project as an exercise in practical research. **You must present a 1 paragraph summary of your proposed project by the 7th week of the course for approval.** This proposal should: (a) specify the organization you intend to study, (b) highlight the problems to be addressed, and (c) specify at least 2 main articles per problem that will be used as a basis for the paper.

IF YOU ARE DOING THE COURSE AS YOUR PROJECT COURSE:

Your report should be *no longer than 16 pages long* (double spaced, 12 point, Times-New Roman type, 1 inch margins on top, bottom and sides). The first four pages should present the general HR context of the organization you examine and should be written as a group. The remaining 12 pages should present the analyses prepared by each group member (no more than 4 pages per member in a group of 3; no more than 3 pages per group member in a group of 4) as detailed below.

As a research project, your grade will be strongly influenced by the degree to which you ground each of your interpretations and suggestions on the relevant research literature (as cited in the text). **Papers that fail to ground their ideas, interpretations and conclusions on the basis of theory and empirical research literature will be penalized up to 30 points.**

The final project is due on the last day of the semester. For each week delay, 5 points will be deducted from the project grade.

The project requires that you do the following:

- BRIEFLY (up to 4 pages – worth **30% of final grade**) and *AS A TEAM*, describe each of the following HR subsystems following the approach covered in class:
 - Talent Management Subsystem (staffing, training & development)
 - Performance Evaluation and Management Subsystem
 - Reward/Compensation Subsystem
 - Employee Relations Subsystem

- Each team member must then identify **one** core problem in the design or implementation of a particular HR policy or practice associated with one of these four subsystems (**worth 40% of final grade**).
- Each team member should explain why they view this policy or practice as problematic. Use the required and recommended readings to reinforce your arguments by citing evidence regarding the adverse impact associated with this particular policy or practice in other organizations. **Be sure that the studies that you cite demonstrate that you have undertaken a thorough review of the relevant literature.**
- Using the required and recommended readings (and using an approach similar to that which we used in analyzing the Merck case), each team member should diagnose the problem and identify its root elements and causes.
- Again using the required and recommended readings, present one or two alternative strategies for addressing this problem. Be sure to defend the advantages of your proposed solution on the basis of theory and/or empirical findings. Additionally, be sure to highlight the limitations of (and risks inherent to) your proposed solution, again defending your arguments on the basis of theory and/or empirical findings included in the required and recommended readings.

IF YOU ARE TAKING THE COURSE AS A REGULAR COURSE OR AS A PREREQUISITE FOR THE HR PRACTICUM:

You need only submit the first four pages of the paper as described above, that is, in four pages describe each of the following HR subsystems following the approach covered in class:

- Talent Management Subsystem (staffing, training & development)
- Performance Evaluation and Management Subsystem
- Reward/Compensation Subsystem
- Employee Relations Subsystem

You will still be expected to ground your interpretations and suggestions on the relevant research literature (as cited in the text). **Papers that fail to ground their ideas, interpretations and conclusions on the basis of theory and empirical research literature will be penalized up to 30 points. The final project is due on the last day of the semester. For each week delay, 5 points will be deducted from the project grade.**

Grading Policy

In the 2008/9 academic year the Faculty instituted a grading policy for all graduate level courses that aims to maintain a certain level of the final course grade. Accordingly, this policy will be applied to this course's final grades.

Additional information regarding this policy can be found on the Faculty website.

<https://coller.tau.ac.il/MBA-students/programs/2020-21/MBA/regulations/exams>

Evaluation of the Course by Student

Following completion of the course students will participate in a teaching survey to evaluate the instructor and the course, to provide feedback for the benefit of the students, the teachers and the university.

Course Site (Moodle)

The course site will be the primary tool to communicate messages and material to students. You should check the course site regularly for information on classes, assignments and exams, at the end of the course as well.

Course material will be available on the course site.

Please note that topics that are not covered in the course material but are discussed in class are considered integral to the course and may be tested in examinations.

Course Outline*

Week	Date	Topic(s)	Required Reading (Those highlighted in Yellow should be read prior to the class session)	Submissions
1&2		HR Strategy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> BB&M Chaps. 1 and 7 Jiang, K., Lepak, D.P., Hu, J. & Baer, J.C. (2012). How does human resource management influence organizational outcomes? A meta-analytic investigation of mediating mechanisms. <i>Academy of Management Journal</i>, 55, 1264-1294. Hammonds K. H. (2005). Why We Hate HR. <i>Fast Company</i>, 97: 40 JetBlue Airways: Starting From Scratch" HBS 9-801-354 	JetBlue Airways
3&4		The Employment Relationship	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> BB&M Chap. 3 DeOrtentiis, P.S., Van Iddekinge, C.H., Ployhart, R.E. & Heetderks, T.D. (2018). "Build or Buy? The Individual and Unit-Level Performance of Internally Versus Externally Selected Managers Over Time" <i>Journal of Applied Psychology</i> United Parcel Service" HBS 9-488-016 	United Parcel Service
5-6		People Flow Subsystem	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Kulik - Chapters 3-5 (pages 29-82) Menkes, J. (2005). Hiring for smarts. <i>Harvard Business Review</i>, 83(11): 100–109. Allen, D.G., Bryant, P.C., & Vardaman, J. M. (2010). Retaining Talent: Replacing misconceptions with evidence-based strategies. <i>Academy of Management Perspectives</i>, 24, 48-64. Gladwell, M. (2009). "Most Likely to Succeed: How Do We Hire When We Can't Tell Who's Right for the Job??" in <i>What the Dog Saw</i>. New York: Little Brown. Gladwell, M. (2009). "The Talent Myth: Are Smart People Overrated?" in <i>What the Dog Saw</i>. New York: Little Brown. Gladwell, M. (2009). "The New-Boy Network: What Do Job Interviews Really Tell Us?" in <i>What the Dog Saw</i>. New York: Little Brown. Fernandez-Araoz, C., Groysberg, B., & Nohria, N. (2009, May). The Definitive Guide to Recruiting in Good Times and Bad. <i>Harvard Business Review</i>, 87 (5) Bitstream" HBS 5-898-255 	Bitstream
7		People Flow	GUEST LECTURE ON TALENT MANAGEMENT	TBA

Week	Date	Topic(s)	Required Reading (Those highlighted in Yellow should be read prior to the class session)	Submissions
8 & 9		Performance Management	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Levy, PE, Tseng, ST, Rosen, CC & Lueke, SB. (2017). Performance Management: A Marriage between Practice and Science – Just Say “I do. <i>Research in Personnel and Human Resources Management</i>. Published online: 25 Jul 2017; 155-213. https://doi.org/10.1108/S0742-73012017000035005 Kim, K. Y., Atwater, L., Patel, P. C., & Smither, J. W. (2016). Multisource Feedback, Human Capital, and the Financial Performance of Organizations. <i>Journal of Applied Psychology</i>. Advance online publication. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/apl0000125 Buckingham, M., & Goodall, A. (2019). The Feedback Fallacy. <i>Harvard Business Review</i>, March-April, 2019 GE Re-engineers Performance Reviews, Pay Practices (WSJ article) “Merck & Co., Inc. - A” HBS 9-491-005 	Merck & Co., Inc.
10-11		Compensation Basics	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> BB&M Chap. 5 (Required) Shaw, J. D. (2014). Pay dispersion. <i>Annual Rev. Organ. Psychol. Organ. Behav.</i>, 1(1), 521-544. Beer, M., Cannon, MD, Baron, JN, et al. (2004). Promise and peril in implementing pay-for-performance. <i>Human Resource Management</i>, 43: 3-48. Camp, Dresser & McGee: Getting Incentives Right” HBS 9-902-122 	Camp, Dresser & McGee
12		Pay for Performance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Gerhart, B., Rynes, S., & Fulmer, I. (2009). Pay and Performance: Individuals, Groups, and Executives. <i>Academy of Management Annals</i> (3), 251-315. 	
13		Pay for Performance	GUEST LECTURE ON PAY FOR PERFORMANCE	TBA
14		Employee Relations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> BB&M Chap. 6 Doucouliaagos, C. & LaRoche, P. (2003). What do unions do to productivity? A Meta-analysis. <i>Industrial Relations</i>.42:650-691. “Sprint-La Conexion Familiar A” HBS 97C001 	Sprint

*Subject to change

Required Reading

Readings listed in the table above are required, with yellow-highlighted readings required to be read prior to the specified class session.

Most readings come from:

Bamberger, P.A., Biron, M. and Meshulam, I. (2014) Human Resource Strategy: Formulation, Implementation and Impact. New York: Routledge. (Referred to below as BB&M).

Recommended Reading

Meetings 3&4: The Employment Relationship

Recommended Readings:

1. Datta, D.K, Guthrie, J.P. & Wright, P.M. (2005). Human resource management and labor productivity: Does industry matter? *Academy of Management Journal*. Vol.48, Iss. 1; pg. 135
2. Collins, C.J. & Clark, K.D. (2003) Strategic human resource practices, top management team social networks, and firm performance: The role of human resource practices in creating organizational competitive advantage. *Academy of Management Journal*. Vol.46, Iss. 6; pg. 740
3. Park, T.-Y., & Shaw, J. D. (2012, December 17). Turnover Rates and Organizational Performance: A Meta-Analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*. Advance online publication. doi: 10.1037/a0030723
4. Guest, D.E. (2004). The psychology of the employment relationship: An analysis based on the psychological contract. *Journal of Applied Psychology*. Volume 53, 4, pp. 541-555(15)
5. Lepak, D.P. & Snell, S.A. (2001) "The human resource architecture: toward a theory of human capital allocation and development" *The Academy of Management Journal*, vol.24, iss. 1. p.31
6. Pfeffer, J. (2005). Producing sustainable competitive advantage through the effective management of people. *Academy of Management Perspectives*, 19(4), 95-106.
- 7.

Meetings 5 – 7: People-Flow Subsystem

Recommended readings:

1. DeOrtentiis, P. S., Van Iddekinge, C. H., Ployhart, R. E., & Heetderks, T. D. (2018, April 16). Build or Buy? The Individual and Unit-Level Performance of Internally Versus Externally Selected Managers Over Time. *Journal of Applied Psychology*. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/apl0000312>
2. Anderson, N., Lievens, F., Van Dam, K. & Ryan, A.M. (2004). Future perspectives on employee selection: Key directions from future research and practice. *Journal of Applied Psychology* Volume 53, Number 4, pp. 487-501(15)
3. Tam, P.A, Murphy, K.R & Lyall, J.T. (2004). Can changes in differential dropout rates reduce adverse impact? A computer simulation study of a multi-wave selection system. *Personnel Psychology*. Vol.57, Iss. 4; pg. 905, 30 pgs
4. Hausknecht, J.P., Day, D.V.& Thomas, S.C. (2004). Applicant reactions to selection procedures: An updated model and meta-analysis. *Personnel Psychology*. Vol.57, Iss. 3; pg. 639, 45 pgs
5. Collins, C.J.& Han, J. (2004). Exploring applicant pool quantity and quality: the effects of early recruitment practice strategies corporate advertising, and firm reputation. *Personnel Psychology*, Vol.57, Iss. 3; pg. 685, 33 pgs
6. Allen. D.G., Van Scotter, J.R, Otondo, R.F. (2004). Recruitment communication medial: Impact on prehire outcomes. *Personnel Psychology*. Vol.57, Iss. 1; pg. 143, 29 pgs
8. Allen. D.G., Biggane, J.E. & Pitts, M. (2013). Reactions to Recruitment Web Sites: Visual and Verbal Attention, Attraction, and Intentions to Pursue Employment, *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 28, 263-285.
9. Earnest, D. R., Allen, D. G. and Landis, R. S. (2011), Mechanisms linking realistic job preview with turnover: A meta-analytic path analysis. *Personnel Psychology*, 64: 865–897.

Meetings 8 & 9: Performance Evaluation & Management

Recommended readings:

1. DeNisi, A.S. & Sonesh, S. (2011). The appraisal and management of performance at work . Pp. 255-279 in *The APA Handbook of Industrial and Organizational Psychology, Vol 2: Selecting and Developing Members for the Organization*. Washington, DC, US: American Psychological Association.
2. Van Dijk, D., & Kluger, A. N. (2011). Task type as a moderator of positive/negative feedback effects on motivation and performance: A regulatory focus perspective. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 32(8), 1084-1105. doi: 10.1002/job.725
3. Bamberger, P. (2007) Competitive appraising: A social dilemma perspective on the conditions in which multi-round peer evaluation may result in counter-productive team dynamics.” *Human Resource Management Review*, 17, 1-18.
4. Smither, J.W, London, M.& Reilly, R.R. (2005). Does performance improve following multi source feedback? A theoretical model, meta-analysis, and review of empirical findings. *Personnel Psychology*, Vol.58, Iss. 1; pg. 33, 34 pgs
5. Scullem, S.E., Bergey, P.K. & Aiman-Smith, L. (2005). Forced distribution rating systems and the improvement of workforce potential: A baseline simulation. *Personnel Psychology*. Vol.58, Iss. 1; pg. 1, 32 pgs
6. Bono, J.E. & Colbert, A.E. (2005). Understanding responses to mutli-source feedback: the role of core self-evaluations. *Personnel Psychology*. Vol.58, Iss. 1; pg. 171, 33 pgs
7. Den Hartog, D.N, Boselie, P. & Paauwe, J. (2004). Performance Management: A Model and Research Agenda. *Journal of Applied Psychology*. Volume 53, Number 4, pp. 556-569(14)

Meetings 10 - 13: Compensation

Recommended reading:

1. Brown, M. P., Sturman, M. C., & Simmering, M. J. (2003). Compensation policy and organizational performance: The efficiency, operational, and financial implications of pay levels and pay structure. *Academy of Management Journal*, 46(6), 752-762.
2. Blue, G.& Bordia, P.(2003). Moderating Effect of Allocentrism on the Pay Referent Comparison–Pay Level Satisfaction Relationship. *Applied psychology*. Volume 52, Number 4, pp. 499-514(16)
3. Currall, S.C., Towler, A.J., Judge, T.A. & Kohn, L. (2005). Pay satisfaction and organizational outcomes. *Personnel psychology*. Vol.58, Iss. 3; pg. 613, 28 pgs
4. Belogolovsky, E., & Bamberger, P. A. (2014). Signaling in secret: Pay for performance and the incentive and sorting effects of pay secrecy. *Academy of Management Journal*, 57(6), 1706-1733.
5. Judge, T. A., Piccolo, R. F., Podsakoff, N. P., Shaw, J. C., & Rich, B. L. (2010). The relationship between pay and job satisfaction: A meta-analysis of the literature. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 77(2), 157-167.
6. Park, S., & Sturman, M. C. (2015). Evaluating Form and Functionality of Pay-for-Performance Plans: The Relative Incentive and Sorting Effects of Merit Pay, Bonuses, and Long-Term Incentives. *Human Resource Management*.
7. Shaw, J. D. (2014). Pay dispersion. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior*, 1(1), 521-544.

Meeting 14: Employee Relations

Recommended readings:

1. David-Blake, A., Broschak, J.P & George, E. (2003). Happy together? How using nonstandard workers affects exit, voice, and loyalty among standard employees. *Academy of Management Journal* . Vol.46, Iss. 4; pg. 475
2. Flynn, F.J. (2005). Identity orientations and forms of social exchange in organizations. *Academy of Management Review*. Vol.30, Iss. 4; pg. 737
3. Bendersky, C. (2003). Organizational dispute resolution systems: A complementarities model. *Academy of Management Review*. Vol.28, Iss. 4; pg. 643

4. Ibsen, C. L., & Tapia, M. (2017). Trade union revitalisation: Where are we now? Where to next?. *Journal of Industrial Relations*, 59(2), 170-191.
5. Detert, J. R., & Burris, E. R. (2016). Can your employees really speak freely. *Harvard Business Review*, 94(1), 80-87.
6. Park, T. Y., Lee, E. S., & Budd, J. W. (2019). What do unions do for mothers? Paid maternity leave use and the multifaceted roles of labor unions. *ILR Review*, 72(3), 662-692.

Case report questions to address:

JetBlue Airlines

1. What are the key success factors for JetBlue to survive and continue to grow, and what will it take to execute on these factors?
2. This case was written at the beginning of 2001. With 9/11, all airlines experienced a drastic cut in passenger traffic. 9/11 occurred just after JetBlue hired some 1000 new employees. What should JetBlue do in order to handle this cut in projected demand?
3. With a growing organization came two problems: (a) Passenger complaints about poor/inconsistent service, (b) employee interest in being represented by a union. How should JetBlue respond to these challenges? (Hint: See any of the readings listed for Meetings 1-4).

United Parcel Service

1. Describe UPS's traditional approach to staffing and personnel advancement. Is this approach still appropriate given the change in UPS's external environment?
2. Describe UPS's traditional approach to controlling the way in which its employees do their job. Is this approach still appropriate given the change in UPS's external environment?
3. UPS currently enjoys a relatively low rate of employee turnover. How might the recruitment of IT staff change this and how might a higher turnover rate impact the company (Hint –See any of the readings listed for Meetings 1-4, and especially Park & Shaw)?
4. Suppose that UPS decides to grow on the basis of an acquisition – what steps would you recommend UPS implement and at what stage of the acquisition process to ensure the success of such a move from an HR perspective."

Bitstream

1. Jim Sole can either hire the head of the new network print manager project from within Bitstream, or go to the external labor market. What are the tradeoffs (i.e., advantages/disadvantages) of these two alternative recruitment sources (internal vs. external labor market)? (HINT: See DeOrtentiis et al in Recommended Reading).
2. Based on the details provided in the case, develop a job description for this new position and specify the job requirements.
3. How should Sole select from among the four remaining candidates? Present at least three selection mechanisms that might be used (e.g., interview, resume, references, simulation) and for each, specify strengths and weaknesses. If you chose interview as one of your mechanisms, be sure to indicate: (a) what type of interview you would use, (b) who you would ask to do the interviewing, and (c) what questions you would ask (and why). (HINT: See Menkes' article in Required Reading).

Merck A

1. Who is covered by Merck's Performance Appraisal System?
2. What are the major problems with Merck's Performance Appraisal System? Are these problems evident from Exhibit A2? Why or why not?
3. What is a compa-ratio, and how might performance scores influence an employee's compa-ratio? How might turnover be affected by having a large number of employees reaching a compa-ratio of 125% during a slow or no growth period? During a period of downsizing?
4. To what degree is pay (or change in pay) related to performance under the existing system? What would you recommend doing to strengthen the relationship? (HINT: See (1) DeNisi, &

Sonesh, Kim et al., and (2) Levy et al. in Readings).

Camp Dresser & McKee

1. In what ways does the BIPS system fit with and contribute to CDM's human resource strategy? In what way does the BIPS process provide a response to the firm's current business environment?
2. What are some of the problems that you can identify with the CDM's approach for pay for performance for titled employees? (HINT: See Gerhart, Rynes, & Fulmer article in Required Reading).
3. What, if anything, may be done to solve the problems with the BIPS process noted on pp. 7-9 of the case? (HINT: See the article by Beer et al. in Readings).

Sprint – La Conexion Familiar

1. What dilemmas must Sprint confront in having to respond to the union's attempt to organize its workers?
2. What would you recommend to Sprint's management to do? What are the likely implications of your recommendation with regard to Sprint's ability to remain competitive in the long-distance market? How is your recommendation superior to Sprint's other alternatives?
3. How should Sprint respond to Art Henderlon's interest in putting more effort into organizing a union than in making sales calls (his job)?
4. While Sprint is opposed to unionization, other companies that we have discussed (e.g., UPS, Southwest) have invited the union in. Why would management invite a union in and would that strategy work at Sprint? (Hint: See article by Doucouliagos, & LaRoche in Readings for Meeting 14).