HIED 66733 (masters section)
Interpersonal & Group Dynamics in Educational Organizations
Kent State University
Summer 2009
Hybrid class, June 5 – 29 ● 03credits

Instructor:
Dr. Susan V. Iverson, assistant professor
Higher Education Administration and Student Personnel
College of Education, Health, & Human Services
Office: 411C White Hall   Email: siverson@kent.edu

> Tell me, and I will forget.
>   Show me, and I may remember.
>   Involve me, and I will understand.
>   - Confucius, around 450 BC

Catalog Description:
Participants work in task groups learning about interpersonal, group and inter-group dynamics in organizations through lectures, discussions and analysis of their in-group experiences.

Course Description:
Groups are one of the major means for bringing about changes in higher education. Whether grass roots, community based initiatives or structured, hierarchical committees charged from the top down, groups are a primary means of organizing work in colleges and universities. Educational leaders will find themselves in groups as advisers, supervisors, and members of offices, departments, and committees. This course will acquaint graduate students with theory and practice related to group behavior in college and university settings. Students in this course will be provided with a theoretical understanding of group processes and will understand group development stages, decision-making processes, and leadership, relevant to higher education.

Course Outline:
The following is an outline of topics that will be covered in course sessions.
- Introduction to group theory. Overview of components of group dynamics, group formation, and theory of group development.
- Roles and responsibilities of group members.
- Leadership in groups.
- How power is manifested in groups.
- Formal and informal decision-making structures.
- Interpersonal communication within groups.
- Group homogeneity and heterogeneity.
- Understanding and managing intra- and inter- group conflicts.
- Effectiveness. Principles of group success.

General Information

Accommodation: University policy 3342-3-18 requires that students with disabilities be provided reasonable accommodations to ensure their equal access to course content. If you have a documented disability and require accommodations, please contact the instructor at the beginning of the semester. Please note, you must first verify your eligibility for academic accommodation through Student Accessibility Services; they can be reached at 330-672-3391 and are located on the ground floor of the DeWeese Center. FMI about your rights and responsibilities, see http://www.registrars.kent.edu/disability/Current/StudentHandbook/RightsReas.htm

Statement of Inclusion: Kent State University, as an equal opportunity educational institution, encourages an atmosphere in which the diversity of its members is understood and appreciated; an atmosphere that is free of discrimination and harassment based on identity categories. Thus, all members of the university are expected to join in creating a positive atmosphere in which individuals can learn and work, an environment that is sympathetic, respectful and supportive. (See "University Policy Register")

The instructor of this course is committed to teaching equitably and inclusively, addressing the needs, concerns, and interests of each and every student, regardless of age, gender/sexual identity, race/ethnicity, class, sexual orientation, religion, English language experience, or disability.

Required Text:

Levi, D. (2007). *Group Dynamics for Teams*, 2nd ed. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Articles posted on VISTA.

Barker, L.J. (2005). When do group projects widen the student experience gap? Paper presented at *ITiCSE*, Monte de Caparica, Portugal. [June 9]

Berdahl, J.L. (1996). Gender and leadership in work groups: Six alternative models. *Leadership Quarterly, 7*(1), 21-40. [June 26]

Chang, S. & Tharenou, P. (2004). Competencies needed for managing a multicultural workgroup. *Asia Pacific Journal of Human Resources, 42*(1), pp. 57-74. [June 26]

Dewiyanti, S., Brand-Gruwel, S., & Jochems, W. (2005). Applying reflection and moderation in an asynchronous computer-supported collaborative learning environment in campus-based higher education. *British Journal of Educational Technology, 36*(4), 673-676. [June 12]

Engstrom, C.M., Hallock, H., & Riemer, C. (2002). How students negotiated power and authority issues in a residential community standards program: Implications for creating empowering educational settings. *NASPA Journal, 39*(3), pp. 181-203. [June 19]

Fall, K.A. & Wejnert, T.J. (2005). Co-Leader stages of development: An application of Tuckman and Jensen (1977). *The Journal for Specialists in Group Work, 30*(4), 309-327. [June 19]

Fear, F.A. & Doberneck, D.M. (2004). Collegial talk: A powerful tool for change. *About Campus, 9*(1), 11-19. [June 12]

Gurin, P. & Nagda, B.A. (2006). Getting to the *what*, *how*, and *why* of diversity on campus [inter-group dialogue]. *Educational Researcher, 35*(1), 20-24. [June 26]

Hare, L.R. & O'Neill, K. (2000). Effectiveness and efficiency in small academic peer groups: A case study. *Small Group Research, 31*(1), 24-53. [June 9]

Hensley, T.R. & Griffin, G.W. (1986). Victims of groupthink: The Kent State University Board of Trustees and the 1977 gymnasium controversy. *Journal of Conflict Resolution, 30*(3), 497-531. [June 23]

Hirsch, E.L. (1990). Sacrifice for the cause: Group processes, recruitment, and commitment in a student social movement. *American Sociological Review, 55*(2), 243-254. [June 16]

Holly, M.L. (2004). Learning in community: Small group leadership for educational change. *Educar* 34, pp. 113-130. [June 19]

Huang, H. & Ocker, R. (2006, April). Preliminary insights into the in-group/out-group effect in partially distributed teams: An analysis of participant reflections. *Proceedings of the 2006 ACM SIGMIS CPR conference on computer personnel research* (pp. 264-272). Claremont, CA: Association for Computer Machinery. [June 16]

Jehn, K.A. & Shah, P.P. (1997). Interpersonal relationships and task performance: An examination of mediating processes in friendship and acquaintance groups. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 72*(4), 775-790. [June 9]

Johnson, S.D., Suriya, C., Yoon, S.W., Berrett, J.V., & La Fleur, J. (2002). Team development and group processes of virtual learning teams. *Computers & Education, 39*(4), 379-393. [June 9]

Kezar, A. (2006). Redesigning for collaboration in learning initiatives: An examination of four highly collaborative campuses. *The Journal of Higher Education, 77*(5), 804-838. [June 9]

Klein, K. (2002). Dialogue: The key to moving beyond structural conflict. *About Campus*, *7*(1), pp. 9-15. [June 12]

Klein, K. (1997, Jan-Feb). Beyond the wilderness. *About Campus*, pp. 18-22. [June 9]

Lara, T.M. & Hughey, A.W. (2008). Implementing the team approach in higher education: Important questions and advice for administrators. *Industry & Higher Education, 22*(4), 245-251. [June 19]

Light, V., Nesbitt, E., Light, P., & Burns, J.R. (2000). 'Let's you and me have a little discussion': Computer mediated communication in support of campus-based university courses. *Studies in Higher Education, 25*(1), 85-96. [June 12]

Linstone, H.A. & Turoff, M. (2002). Chapter 1: Introduction, in *The Delphi Method: Techniques and Applications*. Newark, NJ: New Jersey Institute of Technology. Retrieved from http://www.is.njit.edu/pubs/delphibook/ch1.html. [June 12]

Marbley, A.F. (2004). His eye is on the sparrow: A counselor of color's perception of facilitating groups with predominantly white members. *The Journal for Specialists in Group Work, 29*(3), 247-258. [June 26]

Metcalfe, B. & Lindstead, A. (2003). Gendering Teamwork: Re-Writing the Feminine. *Gender, Work and Organization, 10*(1), pp. 94-119. [June 26]

Milsom, A., Akos, P., & Thompson, M. (2004). A psychosocial group approach to postsecondary transition planning for students with learning disabilities. *The Journal for Specialists in Group Work, 29*(4), 395-411. [June 26]

Neumann, A. (1991). The thinking team: Toward a cognitive model of administrative teamwork in higher education. *The Journal of Higher Education, 62*(5), pp. 485-513. [June 19]

Pace, D., Blumreich, K.M., & Merkle, H.B. (2006). Increasing collaboration between student and academic affairs: Application of the intergroup dialogue model. *NASPA Journal, 43*(2), 301-315. [June 26]

Price, V. (1989). Social identification and public opinion: Effects of communicating group conflict. *The Public Opinion Quarterly, 53*(2), 197-224. [June 16]

Steward, R. J. (1993). Black women and White women in groups: Suggestions for minority-sensitive group services on university campuses. *Journal of Counseling and Development, 72*(1), 39-41. [June 26]

Terrior, J.L. & Ashforth, B.E. (2002). From "I" to "we": The role of putdown humor and identity in the development of a temporary group. *Human Relations, 55*(1), p. 55-88. [June 12]

Zuckerman, R.A. & Kretovics, M.A. (2003). Member acquisition and retention model. *NASPA Journal, 41*(1), 149-166. [June 9]

Zuniga, X. (1998). Fostering Intergroup Dialogue on Campus: Essential Ingredients. *Diversity Digest*. Retrieved August 22, 2005 from http://www.diversityweb.org/Digest/W98/fostering.html. [June 26]

Recommended Texts:

Bensimon, E.M. & Neumann, A. (1993). *Redesigning collegiate leadership: Teams and teamwork in higher education*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Cheldelin, S., Druckman, D. & Fast, L. (2003).*Conflict: From analysis to intervention*. New York: Continuum.

Cohen, E.G. (1994). *Designing groupwork: Strategies for the heterogeneous classroom*, 2nd ed. New York: Teachers College Press.

Dunkel, N.W. and J.H. Schuh. (1998). *Advising student groups and organizations*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Forsyth, D. (2009). *Group dynamics*, 5th ed. Wadsworth Publishing.

Gardenswartz, L. & Rowe, A. (1994). *Diverse teams at work: Capitalizing on the power of diversity*. Chicago, IL: Irwin Professional Publishing.

Johnson, D.W. & Johnson, F.P. (2009). *Joining Together: Group Theory and Group Skills*, 10th ed. Pearson.

McClure, B.A. (2005). *Putting a new spin on groups: The science of chaos*, 2nd ed. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Michaelson, L.K., Knight, A.B., & Fink, L.D. (2002). (Eds.). *Team-Based Learning: A transformative use of small groups*. Greenwood.

Course Requirements

The reciprocal relationship between theory and practice serves as the central focus of this course. As such, students are expected to become proficient in understanding and applying theories delineated in the required course readings. Everyone enrolled in this course has experience working with/in groups in higher education, as students and practitioners. This realization provides all participants with a rich resource for linking theory with practice and an opportunity to consider various perspectives.

1. Participation: The format for this course consists of two classroom meetings and asynchronous online learning via WebCT VISTA8. Active participation is vital to the successful completion of this course. Students' thoughts and reactions to the readings and engagement in virtual discussion about the readings with other class members are valued and necessary. Participation is expected to include contributing to the creation of a learning community through active listening as well as stimulating discussion in class and via the discussion board on VISTA. Two reading modules will typically be assigned each week. Students will need to check their VISTA account regularly in order to progress successfully with the course.

Discussion Board: In order to engage an interactive discussion via VISTA, each student will **post (for each module) a reading reaction** *and* participate in a virtual discussion thread by commenting/responding to **at least two classmates** postings by dates provided. The reading reaction should address the following points:
   o   Key concept(s) and/or issue(s) described in reading.
   o   Your position on the concept(s) and/or issue(s). Offer your dis/agreement or critique.
   o   How does/will the concept(s) and/or issue(s) impact on your work in higher education (as student, administrator, teacher, policy maker)?
   o   What emerging question(s) do you have, spurred by the reading, regarding group dynamics?
The virtual interaction should foster deep and critical discussion threads. In this way, students should not respond to peers with simply "I agree." Rather, students should extend the thinking and the conversation; student are encouraged to post a quote from the reading with a comment, pose provocative questions, engage in reflection on practice, and model a critical stance.

2. Quizzes: will be administered on VISTA to gauge progress and reading comprehension. The lowest score will be dropped.

3. Group Facilitation: The best way to learn to facilitate and participate in a group is to do so! Each student will have an opportunity to co-facilitate a group activity during our final class session. In groups of 2-3, students will design and facilitate a team-building exercise. Considering the five types of team-building programs (Levi, pp. 296-299),

- o identify the goal for your team (e.g., problem solving), and
- o facilitate an exercise designed to help the group to reach this goal (e.g., desert survival exercise).

Students must submit to the instructor a description of the exercise (with appropriate attribution for its source) and an explanation of its intended purpose/goal.

4. Case Study – select one of the choices listed below:
Students will be expected to write an analytic paper (not to exceed 12 pages). Due by midnight on **July 6, 2009**. Paper must draw upon course content/concepts/scholarship; include at least 3 sources from the course; ensure accurate in-text citations and reference (utilize APA style manual); and show evidence of good mechanics of writing. <u>Note</u>: Students will also be asked to 'present' on key group issues on June 29.

> **a. Comparative Analysis** – Identify two groups of which you have been a member: the best group experience and the worst group experience. Describe elements of group process for both: group's formation and purpose, norms, how decisions are made, how conflict is handled, etc. Write a comparative analysis of the two groups, using course readings as a lens through which to make sense of the experiences. Note: this paper must be more than a descriptive summary of two different groups. Ensure you are providing analysis of the groups and integrate course scholarship.

> **b. Group Analysis** – Indicate a group to which you belong and describe elements of the group process: group's formation and purpose, norms, how decisions are made, how conflict is handled, etc. <u>Now</u>, identify a challenge faced by the group (e.g., member attrition, unclear goals/purpose, members' apathy, negative group climate, lack of leadership, poor communication) and delineate a plan for addressing/resolving this challenge. Note: this paper must be more than a descriptive summary of a group and its challenge. Ensure you are providing analysis of the group and integrate course scholarship.

Grading:
The activities in this course will be weighted as follows:

Participation	40%
Quizzes	15%
Group Facilitation	15%
Final Paper: Case Study	30%

Grades in this course will be based on the quality and completion of all requirements listed above. As a graduate level course, you are expected to exhibit high quality work that demonstrates sound understanding of concepts and their complexity. Your written work should reflect professional quality in spelling, grammar and composition.   Earning an "A" represents written and oral work that is of exceptionally high quality and demonstrates superb understanding of the course material. A

"B" grade represents written and oral work that is of good quality and demonstrates a sound understanding of course material. A "C" grade represents a minimally adequate completion of assignments and participation demonstrating a limited understanding of course material.

Grading Scale

A	(93-100%)	A-	(90-92%)	B+	(87-89%)
B	(83-86%)	B-	(80-82%)	C+	(77-79%)
C	(73-76%)	C-	(70-72%)	D+	(67-69%)
D	(63-66%)	D-	(60-62%)	F	(below 60%)

<u>Late Work</u>: It is expected that assignments will be submitted on the date due. Any student with extenuating or emergency circumstances that prevent submission on the due date should discuss his/her situation individually with the instructor. Late submissions will result in grade reduction.

Written work in the course is expected to be on time and of the professional quality required of graduate students. The style manual to be used is the *Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association*, 5th edition. Unless otherwise specified, written work is expected to be the result of individual effort.

ACADEMIC INTEGRITY

As members of the community of higher education, we are all subject to the standards of academic integrity. Students are subject to the Code of Student Conduct. Using another person's words, thoughts or ideas without proper attribution is plagiarism and a form of academic dishonesty. Academic dishonesty is a violation of University policy. All students must become familiar with and abide by the University's policy on academic integrity, which prohibits cheating and plagiarism. For more information about University policy see The University Policy Register at http://imagine.kent.edu/policyreg/ Further, I direct your attention to the APA style manual for a statement on plagiarism and a helpful example of how to paraphrase. Finally, Indiana University offers a useful guide regarding plagiarism:
http://www.indiana.edu/~wts/pamphlets/plagiarism.shtml

CALENDAR

This is a working calendar and is subject to change.

DATE	TOPICS	ASSIGNED READING & NOTES:
Fri, June 5 9am-4pm 109 white hall	Introductions & Course Overview Group Theory; Group Formation; Basic group processes	Levi, Ch. 1, 2, 3 Quiz #1
Tues, June 9 VISTA	Understanding Team Process Collaboration, cooperation, and competition	Levi, Ch 4, 5 Select **one** article: Barker "group projects"; Hare & O'Neill "effective peer groups"; Klein (1997) "beyond the wilderness"; Jehn & Shah "friendship groups"; Johnson et al "online teams"; Kezar "collaborative campuses"; Zuckerman & Kretovics "member acquisition" Quiz #2
Fri, June 12 VISTA	Communication and Cohesion	Levi: Ch. 6, 15 Select **one** article: Dewiyanti et al "computer-supported learning"; Fear & Doberneck "collegial talk"; Klein (2002) "structural conflict"; Light et al "computer-mediated communication"; Linstone & Turoff "Delphi method"; Terrion & Ashforth "putdown humor" Quiz #3
Tues, June 16 VISTA	Conflict and controversy Problem-solving	Levi, Ch 7, 11 Select **one** article: Hirsch "student social movement"; Huang & Ocker "in/out group effect"; Price "group conflict" Quiz #4
Fri, June 19 VISTA	Leadership and Power	Levi, Ch 8, 10 Select **one** article: Engstrom et al "student negotiate power"; Fall & Wejnert "co-leader stages"; Holly "small group leadership"; Lara & Hughey "team approach";

		Neumann "thinking team" Quiz #5
Tues, June 23 VISTA	Decision-making, creativity Groupthink	Levi, Ch 9, 12; article: Hensley & Griffin (1986) "KSU gym controversy" Quiz #6
Fri, June 26 VISTA	Organizational Culture Diversity and Groups Inter-group dialogue	Levi, Ch 13, 14 and **two** articles 1 - Select <u>one</u> of the following: Berdahl "gender and leadership"; Chang & Tharenou "multicultural competencies"; Marbley "counselor of color"; Metcalfe & Linstead "gender and teams"; Milsom et al "learning disabilities"; Steward "minority sensitive groups" 2 - Select <u>one</u> of the following: Gurin & Nagda "diversity on campus"; Pace et al "inter-group dialogue"; Zuniga "inter-group dialogue" Quiz #7
Mon, June 29 9am-4pm TBA	Training, evaluating Performing & Adjourning Theory to Practice	Levi, Ch 16, 17, 18 Group Facilitation Quiz #8 [extra credit]

6-3-09

NOTE: Portions of this syllabus are adapted from syllabi created by Nancy Evans & Jerry Gilley, Iowa State University; Michael Naumes, Southern Oregon University.