Texas A&M University
Departmental Request for a New Course
Undergraduate • Graduate • Professional
Submit original form and attach a course syllabus.

1. This request is submitted by the Department of Management

   MGMT 626 Teams in Organizations

2. Course prefix, number and complete title of course:

3. Catalog course description (not to exceed 50 words):

   Cutting edge thinking on leading in team-based organizations including the organizational changes required to move to a team-based structure and the organizational factors required to create successful work teams.

4. Prerequisite(s):

   Graduate classification

5. Is this a variable credit course?  □ Yes  □ No  If yes, from _______ to _______

6. Is this a repeatable course?  □ Yes  □ No  If yes, this course may be taken _______ times.

   Will this course be repeated within the same semester? □ Yes □ No

7. Has this course been taught as a 489/689?  □ Yes □ No  If yes, how many times?  06A=13; 09A=19

   Indicate the number of students enrolled for each academic period it was taught.

8. This course will be:

   a. required for students enrolled in the following degree program(s) (e.g., B.A. in history)

      Not required for any degree program.

   b. an elective for students enrolled in the following degree program(s) (e.g., M.S., Ph.D. in geography)

      MS in Management and other students interested in the subject.

9. If other departments are teaching or are responsible for related subject matter, the course must be coordinated with these departments.

   Attach approval letters.

10. Prefix  Course #  Title (excluding punctuation)

   MGMT  6  2  6  TEAMS IN ORGANIZATIONS

   Lect.  Lab  SCH  CIP and Fund Code  Admin. Unit  Acad. Year  FICE Code
   0  3  0  0  0  3  5  2  1  0  0  5  0  1  6  1  7  8  0  1  0  0  3  6  3  2

   Approval recommended by:

   Murray R. Barrick  3/5/09

   Department Head - Type Name & Sign  Date

   Department Head - Type Name & Sign

   (if cross-listed course)

   Submitted to Coordinating Board by:

   Associate Director, Curricular Services

   Date  Effective Date
Professor: Dr. Brad Kirkman
Office: WCBA #420N
Phone: Direct Line: 979-845-8813; Administrative Assistant (Patsy Hartmangruber): 979-845-4862
Email: brad.kirkman@tamu.edu

Course Description: Cutting edge thinking on leading in team-based organizations including the organizational changes required to move to a team-based structure and the organizational factors required to create successful work teams.

Prerequisite: Graduate classification

Course Learning Objectives: Upon successfully completing the course, students should be able to:

- Determine when the use of teams is (and is not) appropriate.
- Recognize the factors that must be changed to move to a team-based environment.
- Know how to best measure and reward team performance.
- Recognize the team design and individual inputs that are critical to team success.
- Increase the empowerment level of teams.
- Improve team communication and decision-making.
- Recognize the leadership skills that are necessary to lead and facilitate teams.
- Better manage conflict in a team-based environment.
- Recognize the cultural factors that affect the use of teams in a global environment.
- Create successful self-managing work teams.
- Increase the effectiveness of virtual teams.

OTHER READINGS (all provided, except for Harvard Business Review articles):


GRADE COMPONENT DESCRIPTIONS:

(1) **Team Presentation (20%).** Your team will choose a topic based on some aspect of teams (see p. 7 for a list of choices) to present to the class. Your team should find an interesting and visually stimulating way to present the material. Everyone must participate in the presentation. You will be graded on: (a) content coverage; (b) stated relevance to past or current experiences with teams (or, if there is no experience with teams, how would you use this information in your next job?); (c) creativity; and (d) adherence to a 30 minute time limit (excluding questions from the audience). Each component is weighted equally.

(2) **Journal (5 entries for a total of 15%).** Journal entries must be made for team exercises that include feedback or other class activities and exercises. Each journal entry should contain the following: (a) two to three MAIN POINTS from the readings and discussion that were especially compelling to you in thinking about your leadership of, or participation in, teams (i.e., put what you learned in context; *do not simply summarize or re-hash the material*); (b) a description of your feedback received from other group members (or self-generated feedback if feedback was not received from other members); and (c) a short list of goals for yourself that is based on your feedback (*make sure that there is a connection between your goals and your feedback*). When there is no feedback (i.e., self-generated or from others on your team), only “a” above is required. Journal entries are normally one page (if single-spaced, 12-point font) or two to three pages (if double-spaced, 12-point font). I will not count off for longer journal entries because they are to be used for your development. Therefore, if you feel as though you want to write more than the recommended length, feel free. You should use **bolded** sub-headings to separate each section (i.e., **Main Points, Feedback, and Goals Based on Feedback.**)

(3) **Cases (1st case 20%, 2nd case 25%).** You will have two weeks to complete each of the two cases that address some aspect of teams. You must work individually on the case. I will return the graded case one week after you turn it in. The cases can be purchased from the bookstore.

(4) **Final Paper (20%).** The final paper should consist of four parts:

(a) a summary of the most important MAIN POINTS you have learned that will help you in leading teams;

(b) a summary of your feedback that you received from your fellow team members and your team evaluations;

(c) a detailed description of goals that you have set for yourself that addresses both the self-generated and peer feedback you received and the new knowledge you have gained about leading teams from the class discussions;

(d) and a detailed action plan that outlines what you will do to accomplish the goals you have set and dates for when your actions will be taken. The final paper is an obvious extension of your weekly journals. Please keep your feedback (i.e., self-generated and other) throughout the semester. **Attach all of your feedback in an Appendix in the final paper.** All final papers are due the last day of class.
Grading

Grades will be assigned based on the following breakdown:

A = 90% or above; B = 80-89.9%; C = 70-79.9%; D = 60-69.9%; F = 59% or below

Class participation is very important in this course. Attendance is required for all team activities, case discussions, and presentations. The following provides a reasonable scale for assessing your grade:

A = Performs exceptionally well on all graded assignments including team presentation, journal entries, cases, and final paper. Attends all classes and is an active participant in class discussions, team activities, and video exercises. Has read all materials on the dates assigned and actively integrates assigned readings into discussions.

B = Performs well on all graded assignments including team presentation, journal entries, cases, and final paper. Attends most classes and is a relatively consistent participant in class discussions, team activities, and video exercises. Has read most materials on the dates assigned and occasionally integrates assigned readings into discussions.

C = Performs satisfactorily on all graded assignments including team presentation, journal entries, cases, and final paper. Attends most classes and is an occasional participant in class discussions, team activities, and video exercises. Has read most materials on the dates assigned.

D = Performs unsatisfactorily all graded assignments including team presentation, journal entries, cases, and final paper. Attends some classes and rarely participates in class discussions, team activities, and video exercises.

F = Fails to complete or completes only part of graded assignments including team presentation, journal entries, cases, and final paper. Attends few classes and never participates in class discussions, team activities, and video exercises.

Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) Policy Statement

The Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) is a federal anti-discrimination statute that provides comprehensive civil rights protection for persons with disabilities. Among other things, this legislation requires that all students with disabilities be guaranteed a learning environment that provides for reasonable accommodation of their disabilities. If you believe you have a disability requiring an accommodation, please contact Disability Services in Cain Hall, room B118, or call 845-1637 (http://disability.tamu.edu).
Academic Integrity Statement

Aggie Code of Honor

"An Aggie does not lie, cheat, or steal, nor do they tolerate those who do."

Upon accepting admission to Texas A&M University, a student immediately assumes a commitment to uphold the Honor Code, to accept responsibility for learning and to follow the philosophy and rules of the Honor System. Students will be required to state their commitment on examinations and other academic work. Ignorance of the rules does not exclude any member of the Texas A&M University community from the requirements of the processes of the Honor system. For additional information please visit http://www.tamu.edu/aggiehonor.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meeting</th>
<th>Day</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Discussions and Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 01      | W   | 1/21  | Introduction to the course, Myers-Briggs Instrument [link](http://www.humanmetrics.com/cgi-win/JTypes1.htm)  
Big Five Instrument [link](http://cac.psu.edu/~j5j/test/ipipneo120.htm)  
*Video:* Introduction to the Center for Creative Leadership |
| 02      | M   | 1/26  | Myers-Briggs and Big Five Feedback  
*Read:* Chapter 1 – Thompson – (Teams in Organizations: Facts and Myths)  
*Read:* Drexler and Forrester(1998); Dumaine(1994); Hallam(1997) |
| 03      | W   | 1/28  | Introduction to Teams (continued)  
*Exercise:* Top Problems with Teams – Self-Assessment of Team Skills and Team Assessment *(Journal)* |
| 04      | M   | 2/2   | Team Effectiveness Leadership Model  
*Read:* Chapter 2 – Thompson – (Performance and Productivity: Team Performance Criteria and Threats to Productivity)  
*Due:* Top Problems with Teams Journal Entry |
| 05      | W   | 2/4   | The Change to Teams – Getting to a Team-Based Organization  
*Exercise:* Team Rules and Mission Statement  
*Read:* King (1998); Kirkman, Shapiro, Novelli, & Brett (1996) |
| 06      | M   | 2/9   | Individual Inputs – Motivation, KSAs, and Values/Attitudes |
| 07      | W   | 2/11  | Teams 1 and 2 present Chapters 1 and 2 (Hackman, 2002) |
| 08      | M   | 2/16  | *Exercise:* Paper Tower  
| 09      | W   | 2/18  | Team Design – Task, Composition, and Norms  
*Read:* Chapter 4 – Thompson – (Designing the Team: Tasks, People, and Processes)  
*Due:* Paper Tower Questionnaire Journal Entry Due |
| 10      | M   | 2/23  | Teams 3 and 4 present Chapters 3 and 4 (Hackman, 2002) |
| 11      | W   | 2/25  | Team Empowerment; Self-Management  
*Read:* Kirkman and Rosen (2000); Wageman (1997) |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meeting</th>
<th>Day</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Discussions and Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 12      | M   | 3/2  | *Case Discussion:* Army Crew Team  
**Due:** Army Crew Team Case |
| 13      | W   | 3/4  | Organizational Inputs – Reward Systems  
**Read:** Chapter 3 – Thompson – (Rewarding Teamwork: Compensation and Performance)  
**Read:** Geber (1995); Merriman (2008) |
| 14      | M   | 3/9  | Teams 5 and 6 present Chapters 5 and 6 (Hackman, 2002) |
| M       | 3/16| SPRING BREAK (NO CLASS) |
| W       | 3/18| SPRING BREAK (NO CLASS) |
| 16      | M   | 3/23 | Team Communication and Decision Making  
**Read:** Chapter 5 – Thompson – (Sharpening the Team Mind: Communication and Collective Intelligence)  
**Read:** Chapter 7 – Thompson – (Team Decision Making: Pitfalls and Solutions)  
**Due:** Project Planning Journal Entry |
| 17      | W   | 3/25 | Team Leadership  
**Read:** Chapter 10 – Thompson – (Leadership: Managing the Paradox) |
| 18      | M   | 3/30 | *Exercise:* Last Place on Earth Video |
| 19      | W   | 4/1  | Last Place on Earth Video (continued) (*Journal*) |
| 20      | M   | 4/6  | Teams 7 and 8 present Chapters 7 and 8 (Hackman, 2002)  
Get “Leo Burnett Co., Ltd.” Case Questions |
| 21      | W   | 4/8  | *Exercise:* Win As Much As You Can – Dyer’s Team Development Scale and Peer Feedback (*Journal*)  
**Due:** Last Place on Earth Journal Entry |
| 22      | M   | 4/13 | Conflict and Intergroup Behavior  
**Read:** Chapter 7 – Thompson – (Conflict in Teams: Leveraging Differences to Create Opportunity)  
**Read:** Chapter 12 – Thompson – (Interteam Relations: Competition and Cooperation)  
**Due:** Win As Much As You Can Journal Entry  
**Read:** Weiss and Huges (2005) |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meeting</th>
<th>Day</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Discussions and Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>4/15</td>
<td>Exercise: Team Effectiveness Models – Interpersonal Processes and Rational Processes (Journal)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>4/20</td>
<td>Global Teams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hofstede Questionnaire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Read: Brett, Behfar, and Kern (2006); Kirkman, Gibson, and Shapiro (2001)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Due: Team Effectiveness Models Journal Entry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>4/22</td>
<td>Teams and Technology: Virtual Teams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Read: Thompson, Chapter 12: Teamwork via Information Technology: Teaming Across Distance and Cultures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Read: Kirkman, Rosen, Gibson, Tesluk, and McPherson (2002); Malhotra, Majchrzak, and Rosen (2007)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>4/27</td>
<td>Case Discussion: Leo Burnett Co., Ltd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Due: Leo Burnett Co., Ltd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>4/29</td>
<td>Poles Apart Video</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>5/4</td>
<td>Poles Apart Video (continued)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Poles Apart De-Brief</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MANAGEMENT 626 PRESENTATION TOPICS

1. Virtual teams: What are they, when should they be used, and how are they different from face-to-face teams?
2. Choosing between individual and group decision-making: What every manager should know.
4. Successful coaches of sports teams: What can team leaders use (and what can’t they use) from the team leadership that coaches exhibit in sports?
5. The Space Shuttle disasters: What went wrong, why, and what can we learn to improve group decision making?
6. Using teams in different countries: A manager’s guide to how cultural differences affect teamwork and self-management.
7. Electronic versus face-to-face team communication: Which is better, when, and why?
8. Work teams: Why so popular, what makes them work, and fad or here to stay?
9. What is the best way to pay/compensate teams in organizations?
10. Peer evaluations in teams: Can they work and, if so, what are the best practices?
11. Potency and collective efficacy in teams: Do they really do what they believe they can?
12. Emotions and mood in groups in teams: What is the impact of feelings in team processes and performance?
13. Team development and socialization: Beyond forming, storming, norming, performing?
14. Group decision making: Maximizing the advantages and minimizing the pitfalls.
15. Learning in teams: How to make the most of collective intelligence.
16. Creativity in teams: What do we know about how to make teams maximally creative?
17. Team mental models, collective cognition, and transactive memory: Understanding the group brain.
18. Understanding conflict in teams: Necessary evil or key ingredient for team success?
20. Leading teams: Best practices in managing the triangle of relationships.
21. Maximizing the effectiveness of team meetings: How to make the most of what teams typically dread.
22. Understanding the performance of student teams in academic settings: Turning pain into gain.
23. Team building: Do bowling nights and ropes courses really improve team performance?
24. The role of personality in team performance: Does team personality composition really make a difference?
25. Staffing for optimal team performance: The role of knowledge, skills, and abilities (KSAs).
26. Team training and development: Best practices for developing high performance teams.
27. Goal setting and feedback in teams: Motivating teams with objectives and performance information.
28. Teams and negotiations: What do we know about inter-team negotiation?
29. Group cohesiveness/cohesion: Are highly cohesive groups always better performing groups?
30. Social loafing in teams: Why slackers emerge in teams and what can we do about them?
32. Self-managing work teams (SMWTs): Origins, evidence for performance, problems, solutions, and the future of SMWTs
33. Shared leadership in teams: Can leadership really be shared among members or should there be a “one-leader” model?
34. Team empowerment: Definitions, evidence for performance, problems, solutions, and the future of empowered teams.
35. Team size: Does size matter?
36. Psychological safety in teams: What is the role of feeling “safe” in a team environment?
37. Minority influence and participation in teams: Getting the most from minority members.
38. Electronic brainstorming: Is it more effective than brainstorming face-to-face?
40. The role of team processes in team performance: Understanding action, transition, and interpersonal processes
42. The impact of human resource management systems on team performance in organizations.
43. Team viability: What is it, do teams need it, and, if so, how do get it?
44. Multicultural teams: How to improve the functioning of global teams.
45. Cross-functional project teams: How to get the most from these functionally diverse entities.
46. Group autonomy and participation: Does having a say translate into group effectiveness?
47. Group norms: Functional or dysfunctional?
49. The impact of task type on team performance: Is the task really the key to understanding team performance?
50. [YOUR OWN IDEA HERE]
TIPS FOR HIGH QUALITY PRESENTATIONS

- Make sure to practice your presentation several times. Not only will this increase the overall quality but it will help you meet the time requirement. Most teams, without practicing, will almost always exceed the time limit.

- Make sure that all team members have a roughly equal chance to speak (or contribute significantly) to the presentation.

- The attempt to satisfy one criterion might sacrifice another. For example, a highly creative presentation might end up being very unfocused and unclear. Strive to balance your presentation across all four criteria.

- Try not to read directly from note cards. You can use note cards (or, better yet, use overheads as a guide), but do not spend your entire presentation with your head down toward your cards or notes. Nothing turns an audience off more than this. Try to be conversational. The audience will instantly be engaged by a conversational style rather than a “reading from the note cards” style.

- Test the technology (e.g., video, PowerPoint, overhead projector) before you go on. There’s nothing more embarrassing than technology that suddenly doesn’t work and you don’t want to waste valuable presentation time solving technical problems.

- Just adhering to these guidelines won’t guarantee you an “A”. Try to strive for excellence in every respect.
TIPS FOR PREPARING GOOD CASES

1. Questions should be answered based on your experiences, your opinions and intuition, but also on the book chapters, articles, and discussions in class. Feel free to draw on the readings and discussions liberally.

2. Never underestimate the power of a model. When asked to evaluate someone or something, compare that someone or something to a normative framework or model. In other words, how close do the case events match team-based theories?

3. Try as best you can to be succinct. On the other hand, don’t answer questions incompletely. This is a balancing act that develops over time. Long-windedness (i.e., tell me everything you know) is not rewarded any more than a one-sentence answer (i.e., too narrow). Part of getting a good case grade is drawing on the right material from the course to answer a question.

4. When word-processing the case, re-type each question, bold it, and then answer underneath the bolded question. There is no need to have an introduction or conclusion. Just answer each question completely.

5. You can draw from the cases themselves, but don’t spend a lot of time re-writing the case or summarizing what has happened in the case. We all will have read the case and summarizing it is not necessary.

6. If you take a stand in a case (i.e., in response to a question about what someone should do), be sure to explain why you’re taking that stand with solid logic and sound reasoning. You must provide an explanation when you make a recommendation.

7. Think analytically. Look for the underlying causes of things, not the symptoms. Keep asking “why” questions. When you can no longer answer why, you’ve most likely arrived at the root cause of something.

8. Feel free to discuss the case with me anytime. Remember, you’re paying for this...
Case Questions
The Army Crew Team
Due for Class Discussion and In Writing, Monday, March 2, 2009

1. Why does the varsity team lose to the junior varsity team? Evaluate the root causes of this problem?

2. What type of task interdependence best characterizes this activity? How does the type of task interdependence affect the nature of the varsity team’s difficulties? Are these crew teams really “teams” or are they more like “groups?”

3. Evaluate the level of team empowerment of the varsity team. What about the junior varsity team? Make sure to discuss the level of team empowerment over the course of the time period in the case (i.e., how did team empowerment evolve over time in the two teams?).

4. What should Coach P. have done differently earlier in the season to resolve this problem? At exactly what point should he have intervened?

5. At the end of this case, what action should Coach P. take on Tuesday (e.g., switch the varsity and junior varsity boats, switch individual boat members, intervene to improve the varsity boat’s performance, or another action not discussed in the case)? Why do you recommend this action? How should he implement this action? What is the role of the context in his decision-making? Please be specific.

6. How would you compare the Army Crew team to other types of organizational teams? What are the key similarities and differences? What lessons can we learn from the Army Crew team to enhance team performance more generally?
Case Questions
Leo Burnett Co., Ltd.
Due for Class Discussion and In Writing, Monday, April 27, 2009

1. Using only what you read in the case (i.e., do not use models or readings), what are some of the difficulties that the Forever Young virtual team faced through the launch process? To what do you attribute these difficulties (i.e., what are the root causes)?

2. Should Carmichael give the Canadian team local market autonomy or maintain centralized control? Defend your answer.

3. If Carmichael maintained centralized control of the team, how could she improve virtual team dynamics and functioning? How can she maintain a strong sense of virtual team trust and team unity?

4. If Carmichael decentralized the virtual team, who would lead the brand, given that the main contacts in London and Toronto had left the company? Where is the knowledge that gives the brand the best possible chance for success – in Canada or the United Kingdom?

5. With all of the difficulties discussed above, should Carmichael consider moving away from virtual teams back to face-to-face teams? What are the advantages and disadvantages of virtual teams vs. face-to-face teams in this particular context?

6. What do the role of cultural values play in: (a) the functioning of the virtual team; and (b) the difficulties faced by the LBC organization more generally in the development of a marketing campaign for OBC?
BIOGRAPHY FOR BRADLEY L. KIRKMAN

Bradley L. Kirkman is the John E. Pearson Associate Professor of Management in the Mays Business School at Texas A&M University. He received his Ph.D. in Organizational Behavior from the Kenan-Flagler Business School at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill. His research centers on global virtual teams, work team effectiveness, international management, and organizational justice. He most recently worked in the College of Management at the Georgia Institute of Technology. He was also a Visiting Associate Professor in the School of Commerce and Economics at the University of Western Australia in 2006.

He has authored several articles and book chapters on topics such as increasing the effectiveness of virtual teams, cultural issues in global teams, team empowerment, and implementing high performance work teams. His articles have appeared in such journals as the Academy of Management Journal, the Academy of Management Review, the Academy of Management Executive, Journal of Applied Psychology, Personnel Psychology, Journal of Management, Journal of International Business Studies, Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, Group & Organization Management, Journal of Cross Cultural Psychology, Organizational Dynamics, and others. His book chapters have appeared in: Advances in International Management, Research in Organizational Change and Development, Trends in Organizational Behavior, and Advances in Organizational Justice. Published books include High Performance Work Organizations: Definitions, Practices, and an Annotated Bibliography.

He was the winner of the 2008 Ricky W. Griffin Outstanding Research Award at Texas A&M for his scholarly research contributions. He has also won several teaching awards including honorable mention for Undergraduate Excellence in Teaching in 2005 at Georgia Tech, the Junior Faculty Teaching Excellence Award at the University of North Carolina at Greensboro in 1999, and the Outstanding Ph.D. Student Teaching Award at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill in 1995. He also received Outstanding Reviewer Awards from the Academy of Management Journal in 2002, 2003, 2004, and 2008, and was an outstanding reviewer for the International Management Division of the Academy of Management in 2000, 2002, and 2003. He was an Associate Editor for the Academy of Management Journal from 2005-2008, and is a current Editorial Board member for both the Academy of Management Journal and Journal of Applied Psychology. He is a member of the Academy of Management (AOM), Academy of International Business (AIB), and Southern Academy of Management (SAM).

He has worked with several companies on issues such as leading global virtual teams, enhancing team effectiveness, working across cultural boundaries, facilitating organizational change and development, and increasing leadership effectiveness that include: Alcoa, R.H. Donnelley, Cisco Systems, CenterPoint Energy, the Texas Transportation Institute, The Home Depot, ExxonMobil, Halliburton, Conoco-Phillips, PPD, Sabre, the Centers for Disease Control, Motorola, General Electric, IBM, the Sara Lee Corporation (Sara Lee Knit Products), Prudential Insurance, Allstate Insurance, Eastman Chemical Company (Kodak), the Cone Corporation (Cone Mills), MEMC, the United States Bankruptcy Court, and the United States Postal Service. He has conducted research and presented papers in several countries including Argentina, Australia, Belgium, Canada, England, Finland, France, Mexico, the People’s Republic of China, the Philippines, Turkey, and the United States.