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**Virtual CAMPUS**

**SCHOOL OF BUSINESS**

**SYLLABUS**

**Mission Statement**: Wayland Baptist University exists to educate students in an academically challenging, learning-focused and distinctively Christian environment for professional success and service to God and humankind.

**Course:** **MGMT 6313**–Seminar in Group and Team Processes

**Term:** Winter 2017

**Instructor:** Dr. Sheron Lawson

**Office Phone and email**: 620-755-7741; lawsons@wbu.edu

**Office Hours, Building, and Location:** Emails and telephone by appointment; Virtual

**Class Meeting Time and Location:** This course meets weekly through Virtual campus - Blackboard

**Catalog Description:** examination of interpersonal processes in organizations utilizing research from behavioral science and other areas with respect to how individuals interact with others to achieve personal and organizational goals.

**Prerequisites:** Doctoral student status

Required Textbook and Resources:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **BOOK** | **AUTHOR** | **ED** | **YEAR** | **PUBLISHER** | **ISBN#** |
| Making the Team: a Time for Managers | Leigh L. Thompson | 6th | 2016 | Pearson | 9780134484204 |
| Assigned Weekly Articles that are available in the WBU Library. |  |  |  |  |  |

**Optional Materials:**

* APA Manual
* Any text book that covers the basic functions of Groups and Teams

**Course Outcome Competencies:**

Upon completion of this course the student should be able to:

* Examine and evaluate group and team process theories
* Critique and synthesize group and team process theories
* Propose research projects that extend or combine research in group or team processes
* Apply group and team process theories to current group and team management issues

**Attendance Requirements:** Although our class will never meet face to face, it is imperative that you log on to Black board and participate in the weekly class discussion on-line. As with any doctoral seminar, you need to read the articles, and be prepared to discuss the articles in our virtual classroom. That’s just the foundation. Our goal is to transform Blackboard into a learning lab through interaction, engagement and participation. Participation reflects not only the presentation of your own ideas and insights, but also the degree to which you listen and thoughtfully build on your colleague’s comments and ideas. Moreover, a key goal of this course is to generate future research collaborations among the colleagues in the class, so offering ideas in a constructive, respectful and helpful way is critical towards creating a thriving intellectual climate within and outside of the classroom.

Effective online participation may include offering new and unique insights, clarifying issues and complexities, reframing and extending ideas in meaningful ways, and offering a perspective that helps the group integrate and synthesize readings, ideas, and topics. Debate and dialogue are part of the process, but always within the realm of respect and appreciation for the thoughts and feelings of others. In order to create a true learning laboratory, we need to engage in processes involving mutual learning and discovery. There are no stupid questions (or answers). Every idea has merit and the capacity to create something bigger.

**Statement on Plagiarism and Academic Dishonesty:** Wayland Baptist University observes a zero tolerance policy regarding academic dishonesty. Per university policy as described in the academic catalog, all cases of academic dishonesty will be reported and second offenses will result in suspension from the university.

**Disability Statement:** “In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (ADA), it is the policy of Wayland Baptist University that no otherwise qualified person with a disability be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subject to discrimination under any educational program or activity in the university. The Coordinator of Counseling Services serves as the coordinator of students with a disability and should be contacted concerning accommodation requests at (806) 291- 3765. Documentation of a disability must accompany any request for accommodations.”

**Course Requirements and Grading Criteria:**

Students shall have protection through orderly procedures against prejudices or capricious academic evaluation. A student who believes that he or she has not been held to realistic academic standards, just evaluation procedures, or appropriate grading, may appeal the final grade given in the course by using the student grade appeal process described in the Academic Catalog. Appeals may not be made for advanced placement examinations or course bypass examinations. Appeals are limited to the final course grade, which may be upheld, raised, or lowered at any stage of the appeal process. Any recommendation to lower a course grade must be submitted through the Executive Vice President/Provost to the Faculty Assembly Grade Appeals Committee for review and approval. The Faculty Assembly Grade Appeals Committee may instruct that the course grade be upheld, raised, or lowered to a more proper evaluation.

**Course Assignments:**

**Discussion Board/ Peer Response –** During the term, there will be four distinctive discussion board forums. The specific discussion board topic and due dates will be found in the Blackboard Discussion Board tab. Specific requirements and grading rubric will be found in Blackboard Course Content tab. Each student is required to respond to all classmates in a substantive manner, which should demonstrate scholarship and critical analysis. Use at least 1 outside source for each response to substantiate your assertions. The more you respond to classmates, and the more comprehensively you respond will increase your grade for this peer response. **The four (4) Discussion Board forums represent 20% of the total grade.**

**Mini Literature Reviews** – The students will develop eight mini literature reviews from the reading assignments topics included at the end of this syllabus. At least 5 peer reviewed journal articles should be including in this assignment. The specific requirements, format, grading rubric, and due date will be found in the Weekly Course Content tab, within Blackboard. **The Mini Literature Reviews represent 40% of the total course grade.**

**Research Paper-** A research paper will be completed on one of the topics discussed during this class. The paper should be a minimum of 15 pages of content, excluding coversheet, abstract and references. Twenty (20) peer reviewed, scholarly journal articles should be properly cited and noted in the bibliography. Please use APA format. Check the syllabus for the deadline to have your topic approved. The paper will be submitted to Safe Assignment. If Safe Assignment detects more than 20% match of previously written work we will have a discussion. The total point value for this research paper is 400 points. This paper should include an introduction, literature review, testable hypotheses (research questions), and a conclusion and discussion section. Please use these headings. **The Research Paper represents 40% of your grade.**

**Grading System:**

**Points**

Discussion Board (4 total worth 50 points each) 200 points

Mini Literature Review (8 total worth 50 points each) 400 points

Research Paper for these class 400 points

**1000 total points**

**Tentative Schedule: (Calendar, Topics, Assignments)**

**Tentative Schedule**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Date & Session** | **Activities** | **Assignments** |
| WEEK 1  November13 - 19 | * Types of Teams * Designing the Team | Read chapters 1 &2  See Blackboard for assignments |
| WEEK 2  November 27 – December 3 | * Leading Teams * Team Cohesion and Trust | Read chapters 3&4  See Blackboard for assignments |
| WEEK 3  December 4 - 10 | * Performance and Productivity * Team Communication and Collective Intelligence * Rewarding Teamwork | Read chapters 5 &6  See Blackboard for assignments |
| WEEK 4  December 11 - 17 | * Team Decision Making * Managing Team Conflict | Read chapters 7 & 8  See Blackboard for assignments |
| WEEK 5  January 1 - 7 | * Creativity and Innovation in Teams | Read chapter 9  See Blackboard for assignments |
| WEEK 6  January 8 - 14 | * Subgroups and Multi-Teams * Team Networking and Social Capital | Read chapters 10 & 11  See Blackboard for assignments |
| WEEK 7  January 15 - 21 | * Virtual Teamwork * Multicultural Teams | Read chapters 12 & 13  See Blackboard for assignments |
| WEEK 8  January 22 - 28 | * Managing Meetings * Creating Effective Study Groups | Read Appendices 2 & 3  See Blackboard for assignments |
| WEEK 9  January 29 – February 4 | * Work on Research Project | See Blackboard for assignments |
| WEEK 10  February 5 - 11 | * Work on Research Project | See Blackboard for assignments |
| WEEK 11  February 12 - 17 |  | RESEARCH PROJECT  • Submit your Research Paper by Thursday on Blackboard |

**Reading Assignments**

* GROUP EFFICACY AND TEAM PERFORMANCE

1. Tammy Rapp, Daniel Bachrach, and Adam Rapp. 2014. “The Role of Team Goal Monitoring in the Curvilinear Relationship Between Team Efficacy and Team Performance.” Journal of Applied Psychology. 99:5, 976-987.
2. Jing Du, Yuhyung Shin, and Jin Nam Choi. 2015. “Convergent Perceptions of Organizational Efficacy Among Team members and Positive Work outcomes in Organizational Teams.” Journal of occupational and Organizational Psychology. 88, 178-202.
3. J. A. Goncalo, E. Polman, and C. Maslach. 2010. “Can confidence come too son? Collective Efficacy, Conflict and Group Performance over Time.” Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 113, 13-24.
4. C. B. Gibson. 1999. “Do They Do What They Believe They Can? Groups Efficacy and Group Effectiveness Across Tasks and Cultures. Academy of Management Journal, 43, 138-152.
5. J. Mathieu, M. T. Maynard, T. Rapp, L. Gilson. 2008. Team effectiveness 1997-2007: A review of Recent Advancements and Glimpse into the future. Journal of Management 34, 410-476.

* DIVERSITY AND TEAM PERFORMANCE

1. A Homan, J. Hollenbeck, S. Van Knippenberg, D, Ilgen, and G. Van Kleef. 2008. “Facing differences with an open mind: Openness to ex0perience salience of intragroup difference, and performance of diverse work groups. Academy of Management Journal, 51, 1204-1222.
2. J. Chatman, F. Flynn. 2001. “The influence of demographic heterogeneity on the emergence and of cooperative norms in work teams.” Academy of Management Journal, 44, 956-974.
3. J. Hollenbeck, B. Beersma,and M. Schouten. 2012. “Beyond team types and taxonomies: A dimensional scaling conceptualization for team description.” Academy of Management Review, 37: 82-106.
4. G. Van der Vegt and J. Bunderson. 2005. “Learning and performance in mulitdisci0pinary teams: The importance of collective team identification.” Academy of Management Journal, 48: 532-547.
5. G. Van der Vegt and E. Van de Vegt. 2005. “Effects of perceived skill dissimilarity and task interdependence on helping in work teams. “ Journal of Management, 31: 73-89.

* CONFLICT AND TEAM PERFORMANCE

1. P.P. Shah and K. A. Jehn. 1993. “Do Friends Perform better than acquaintances? The interaction of friendship, conflict and task. Group Decision and negotiation.” 2, 149-165.
2. K. Jehn and C. Bendersky. 2003. “Intragroup conflict in organizations: A contingency perspective on the conflict-outcome relationship. Research in Organizational Behavior, 25, 187-242.
3. K. Behfar, R. Peterson, E. Mannix, W. Trochim. 2008. “The critical role of conflict resolution in teams: A close look at the links between conflict type, conflict management strategies, and team outcomes”, Journal of Applied Psychology, 93, 170-188.
4. JEHN, KAREN A.; RISPENS, SONJA; THATCHER, SHERRY M. B.” THE EFFECTS OF CONFLICT ASYMMETRY ON WORK GROUP AND INDIVIDUAL OUTCOMES.” Academy of Management Journal. Jun2010, Vol. 53 Issue 3, p596-616.
5. V. Gonzalez-Roma and A. Hernandez. 2014. “Climate uniformity: Its influence on team communication quality, task conflict, and team performance.” Journal of Applied Psychology. 99:6, 1042-1058.

* TEAM PERSONALITY AND MOOD AND PERFORMANCE

1. Bradley Owens and David Hekman. 2016. “How does Leader Humility Influence Tam Performance? Exploring the Mechanisms of Contagion and Collective Promotion Focus. Academy of Management Journal, 59:3, 1088-1111.
2. B. Barry and G. Stewart. 1997. “Composition, process, and performance in self-managed groups: The role of personality”. Journal of Applied Psychology, 82, 62-78.
3. M. Anderson. 2009. The role of group personality composition in the emergence of task and relationship conflict within groups. Journal of Management and Organization, 15, 82-96.
4. R. Liden, S. Wayne, C. Liao, and J. Meuser. 2014. “Servant leadership and serving culture: Influence on individual and unit performance”. Academy of Management Journal, 57: 1434-1452.
5. T. Sy, Cote, and R. Saavedra. 2005. “The contagious leader: Impact of the leader’s mood on the mood of group members, group affective tone, and group processes. The Journal of Applied Psychology, 90: 295-305.

* MANAGING CREATIVITY AND INNOVATIVENESS IN TEAMS

1. K. Lovelace, D. Shapiro, L. Weingart. 2001. “Maximizing cross-functional new product team’s innovativeness and constraint adherence: A conflict communications perspective. Academy of Management Journal, 44, 779-793.
2. G. Hirst, D. Van Knippenberg, J. Zhou. 2009. “A cross-level perspective on employee creativity: Goal orientation, team learning behavior, and individual creativity. Academy of Management Journal, 52, 280-293.
3. K. Boles, J. Fiset, and H. Gill. 2015. “Communication and trust are key: Unlocking the relationship between leadership and team performance and creativity.” The Leadership Quarterly. 26:6, 1080-1094.
4. F. Aime, S. Humphrey, D. Derue, and J. Paul. 2014. “The riddle of heterarchy: Power transitions in cross-functional teams.” Academy of Management Journal. 57:2, 327-352.
5. U. Hulsheger, N. Anderson, and J. Salgado. 2009. “Team-level predictors of innovation oat work: A comprehensive meta-analysis spanning three decades of research.” Journal of Applied Psychology. 94:5, 1128-1145.
6. C. Ruppel, E. Lawrence, and L. Twowroger. 2016. “organizational creativity and the top management team: An interactionist perspective.” Journal of Organizational Culture, Communications and Conflict. 20:1, 47.

* MOTIVATING TEAMS

1. Ning Li, Bradley Kirkman, Christopher Porter. 2014. “Toward a model of Work Team Altruism.” Academy of Management Review, 39:4, 541-565.
2. Jia Hu and Robert Liden. 2015. “Making a difference in the teamwork: Linking team prosocial motivation to team processes and effectiveness.” Academy of Management Journal, 58:4, 1102-1127.
3. R. Albanese, D. Van Fleet. 1985. “Relational behavior in groups: the free-riding tendency.” Academy of Management Review, 10, 244-255.
4. R. Liden, S. Wayne, C. Liao, and J. Meuser. 2014. “Servant leadership and serving culture: Influence on individual and unit performance. “ Academy of Management Journal. 57: 1434-1452.

* TOP MANAGEMENT TEAM

1. Donald Hambrick, Ming-Jer Chen. 1996. ”The influence of top management team heterogeneity of firms’ competitive moves.” Administrative Science Quarterly, 41: 659-684.
2. Margarethe Wiersema and Allan Bird. 1993. “organizational Demography in Japanese Firms: Group Heterogeneity, individual dissimilarity, and top management team turnover.” Academy of Management Journal, 5: 996-1025.
3. Mason Carpenter. 2002. “The implications of strategy and social context for the relationship between top management team heterogeneity and firm performance.” Strategic Management Journal, 23: 375-284.
4. Alexander Alexiev, Justin Jansen, Frans Van den Bosch, and Henk Volberda. 2010. “To Mangment Teams advice seeking and exploratory innovation: The moderating role of TMT Heterogeneity.” Journal of Mangement Studies, 47;7.
5. Donald Hambrick, Stephen Humbrey, and Abihinah Gupa. 2015. “Structural Interdependence within top management teams: A key moderator of upper echelons predictions.” Strategic Management Journal, 36:449-461.

* KNOWLEDGE TRANSFER AND TEAMS

1. Nadolska and H. Barkema. 2014. “Good learners: How top management teams affect the success and frequency of acquisitions.” Strategic Management Journal, 35:1483-1507.
2. H. Gardner, F. Gino, and B. Staats. 2012. “dynamically integrating knowledge in teams: Transforming resources into performance.” Academy of Management Journal, 55:4, 998-1022.
3. S. Ben-Menahem, G. Von Krogh, Z. Erden, E. Zurich, and A. Schneider. 2016. “Coordinating knowledge creation in multidisciplinary teams: Evidence from early-stage drug discovery.” Academy of Management Journal. 59:4, 1308-1338.
4. J. Mell, D. Van Knippenberg, and W. Van Ginkel. 2014. “The catalyst effect: The impact of transactive memory system structure on team performance.” Academy of Management Journal. 57:4, 1154-1173.
5. Y. Berson, R. Da’as, and D. Waldman. 2015. “How do leaders and their teams bring about organizational learning and outcomes?” Personnel Psychology. 68, 79-108.
6. Srivastave, K. Bartol, and E. Locke. 2006. “Empowering leadership in management teams: Effects on knowledge sharing, efficacy, and performance.” Academy of Management Journal. 49:6, 1239-1251.

* TRUST AND TEAMS

1. B. A. De Jong, and T. Elfring. 2010. “How Does Trust Affect the Performance of Ongoing Teams? The mediating Role of Reflexivity, Monitoring, an effort. Academy of Management Journal, 53, 535-549.
2. C. W. Langfred. 2004. “Too much of a Good Thing? Negative Effects of High Trust and Individual Autonomy in Self-Managing Teams.” Academy of Management Journal, 47, 385-399.
3. T. Basford, L. Offermann, and T. Behrend. 2014. “Please accept my sincerest apologies: Examining follower reactions to leader apology. Journal of Business Ethics, 119: 99-117.
4. B. De Jong, K. Dirks, N. Gillespie. 2016. :Trust and team performance: A meta-analysis of main effects, moderators, and covariates.” Journal of Applied Psychology. 101:8, 1134-1150.
5. C. Breuer, J. Huffmeier, and G. Hertel. 2016. “Does trust matter more in virtual teams? A meta-analysis of trust and team effectiveness considering virtuality and documentation as moderators.” Journal of Applied Psychology. 101:8, 1151-1177.

* VIRTUAL TEAMS

1. R. Ford, R. Piccolo, and L. Ford. 2016. “Strategies for building effective virtual teams: Trust is key.” Business horizons.
2. L. Gilson, t. Maynard, N. Jones, M. Vartiainen, and M. Hakonen. 2015. “Virtual teams research: 10 years, 10 themes, and 10 Opportunities.” Journal of Management. 41:5, 1313-1337.
3. J. Espinosa, N. Nan, and E. Carmel. 2015. “Temporal distance, communication patterns, and task performance in teams.” Journal of Management Information Systems. 32:1, 151-191.
4. S. Sarker, M. Ahuja, S. Sarker and S. Kirkeby. 2011. “the role of communication and trust in global virtual teams: A social network perspective.” Journal of Management Information Systems. 28:1, 273-309.
5. S. Jarvenpaa, K. Knoll, and D. Leidner. 1998. “Is anybody out there? Antecedents of trust in global virtual teams. Journal of Management Information Systems. 14:4, 29-64.