

GBUS 871
Group Dynamics
Winter 2026 Course Outline (subject to changes)

Instructor: [REDACTED]	Class Time: [REDACTED]
Phone: [REDACTED]	Classroom: [REDACTED]
Email: [REDACTED]	Term Dates: [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]
Office: [REDACTED]	Office hours: [REDACTED] by appointment

Land Acknowledgment: *The University of Regina is situated on the territories of the nêhiyawak, Anihšīnāpēk, Dakota, Lakota, and Nakoda, and the homeland of the Métis/Michif Nation. The University of Regina is on Treaty 4 lands with a presence in Treaty 6.*

Calendar Description

The course will study roles that exist in organizations and the dynamics of the interactions between these roles. In particular, focus will be on the interplay between the leadership role and decision-making, creative problem solving and conflict resolution with group members. Equity, diversity and inclusion in teams, team performance and leadership, groupthink, and psychological safety will also be discussed throughout the course.

Overview of the Course

This course focuses on work groups and team development. The course integrates theory and practice in creating effective groups and teams. It will offer a review of evidence-based best practices in group/team: decision-making, leadership, and effectiveness. Students will be expected to engage as reflective practitioners and consider the implications for organizations. Cases and research articles will be used to illuminate an organizational context of group dynamics. Students will learn to employ robust research evidence important for group/team effectiveness.

Learning Objectives

By the end of the course:

Students will:

- Understand the internal dynamics of group and team functioning
- Identify common and emerging challenges of group and team functioning
- Understand the basic psychological, social, and structural factors that affect group performance
- Know how to intervene as a manager and leader to improve team functioning.
- Be able to translate their learning into practices in their current or future workplace.
- Be able to apply evidence-based management practices in group or team-related decision-making.

Accessibility and Accommodations:

If there is any student in this course who, because of disability, may have a need for accommodation, please contact the Coordinator for Special Needs Services at (306)585-4631. It would also be beneficial for you to discuss the accommodation with me.

Format

This *Hyflex* course will involve lectures, group discussions, article reviews, and case studies. I use an evidence-based management and problem-based learning approach for teaching that focuses on translating research-based learning into practice. This approach is most effective when students fully engage with the materials and the weekly activities.

Zoom link for class:

TBD

To get the most out of this course, students must prepare in advance by completing the weekly readings and/or other assigned tasks before coming to class. There will be two sessions. The first session will focus on *providing students with a conceptual understanding of the topic*, and the second session will provide students with evidence-based learning to *understand real organizational problems and to solve those problems or recommend the best possible solutions based on robust research evidence*.

Writing Assistance

The Student Success Centre (www.uregina.ca/student/ssc) offers both on-line resources and in-person tutoring on writing skills.

Course Materials

Required Readings: There is no specific textbook for this course. Instead, I have assigned peer-reviewed articles based on the weekly content. You will need to read or skim these articles in addition to the assigned cases. When possible, I will post PDFs of the readings to our course website. Otherwise, they should all be available through the library. Please let me know if you are having difficulty accessing one of the articles.

Case Studies: TBD

Optional textbook: Creating Effective Teams: A Guide for Members and Leaders (Sixth Edition or new) - Wheelan, S.A., Akerlund, M., & Jacobsson, C.

STUDENT CONDUCT

Academic Integrity

“Assignments, tests, and examinations are designed for students to show the instructor how well they have mastered the course material. When the instructor evaluates the student's work, it must therefore be clear which ideas and words are the student's own. The general principles of academic integrity for students doing course work are that they are to do their own original, individual work, unless told otherwise by the course instructor, and are to give credit for other people's ideas or words. Students should be aware that while collaborative or group work on assignments may be encouraged in some disciplines, it is not acceptable in others. Discussion of ideas with faculty and other students (that is, intellectual debate) is both allowable and important, provided that credit is given in written work for ideas that are not one's own. Group study (as distinct from group work on an assignment that is to be graded) is likewise permissible unless explicitly forbidden by the instructor.”

“Acts of academic dishonesty or misconduct include acts which contravene the general principles described in section 2.1.2, above. In this section, some of these acts are described. Others which are not explicitly described here may also be considered academic misconduct. All forms of academic misconduct are considered serious offences within the University community.

Use of AI is NOT PERMITTED

Students are expected to complete assignments, tests, and other academic evaluations using their own knowledge and abilities. The use of generative AI tools, including but not limited to ChatGPT, Claude, Grammarly, Jasper, Scite AI, Gemini, Perplexity, CoPilot, is considered a breach of this expectation.

Cheating

Cheating constitutes academic misconduct. Cheating is dishonest behaviour (or the attempt to behave dishonestly), usually in tests or examinations. It includes:

1. Unless explicitly authorized by the course instructor or examiner, using books, notes, diagrams, electronic devices, or any other aids during an examination, either in the examination room itself or when permitted to leave temporarily
2. Copying from the work of other students
3. Communicating with others during an examination to give or receive information, either in the examination room or outside it
4. Consulting others on a take-home examination (unless authorized by the course instructor)
5. Commissioning or allowing another person to write an examination on one's behalf
6. Not following the rules of an examination
7. Using for personal advantage, or communicating to other students, advance knowledge of the content of an examination (for example, if permitted to write an examination early)
8. Altering answers on an assignment or examination that has been returned
9. Taking an examination out of the examination room if this has been forbidden

Plagiarism

Plagiarism is a form of academic dishonesty in which one person submits or presents the work of another person as his or her own, whether from intent to deceive, lack of understanding, or carelessness. Unless the course instructor states otherwise, it is allowable and expected that students will examine and refer to the ideas of others, but these ideas must be incorporated into the student's own analysis and must be clearly acknowledged through footnotes, endnotes, or other practices accepted by the academic community. Students' use of others' expression of ideas, whether quoted verbatim or paraphrased, must also be clearly acknowledged according to acceptable academic practice. It is the responsibility of each student to learn what constitutes acceptable academic practice. Plagiarism includes the following practices:

1. Not acknowledging an author or other source for one or more phrases, sentences, thoughts, code, formulae, or arguments incorporated in written work, software, or other assignments (substantial plagiarism);
2. Presenting the whole or substantial portions of another person's paper, report, piece of software, etc. as an assignment for credit, even if that paper or other work is cited as a source in the accompanying bibliography or list of references (complete plagiarism). This includes essays found on the Internet.

Students who are uncertain what plagiarism is should discuss their methodology with their instructors.

COMMON QUESTIONS

Formatting

There are many resources and websites on how to format and reference a document according to APA guidelines. When in doubt refer to the 7th edition APA resources provided by the Dr. John Archer library: <https://library.uregina.ca/c.php?g=606347&p=4202685>

At a minimum you must:

- Submit everything in MS Word
- Include a title page with a running header
- Page numbers on all pages including the title page
- Times New Roman 12" font with standard margins
- Double space
- Indent each new paragraph in the body text and use a hanging indent for the reference list (if you have a reference list)
- Use sub-headings to identify sections within your essay
- Have an introduction and a conclusion
- Reference list must be ordered alphabetically

Deadlines and Extensions

Any late submissions will be deducted 10% for each additional day. So, if something is due February 1 and submitted February 2, you will lose 10%. If submitted on February 3, you will lose 20%, and so on. This will continue for 10 days until you have lost 100% of the marks.

I understand that the life of a graduate student can be challenging sometimes. Please feel free to approach me to request extensions for any deliverables; however, I have a firm policy that no extensions requested within 24 hours of the original deadline will be granted. Should you require an extension, it must be requested well in advance of the day something is due to avoid late penalties.

Course Evaluation Overview (see rubric for full details)

Deliverable		2026 Due date	Value
I.	Individual Contribution	Ongoing	10%
II.	Article Review	February 12th by 11:59 pm	10%
III.	Individual Assignment - Invictus movie review (see rubric in appendices section for details)	February 24th by 11:59 pm	20%
IV.	In-class Group Case Assignment (Groups will be assigned by the Professor and these in-class assignments will be worth 10% each)	Case #1: February 2nd, 10 pm (10%) Case #2: March 2nd, 10 pm (10%)	20%
V.	Final Project and presentation (Everest Simulation – see rubric and assignment details in UR course)	Presentation (5%) slides by April 9 th by 10 am Final Paper (35%) due date April 20 th 11:59 pm	40%
Total			100%

Course Evaluation Details

I. Individual Contribution (10%) – Ongoing

This portion of your grade will be based on attendance and participation, level of preparation and engagement, and your ability to make consistent and thoughtful contributions throughout the entire term. This includes the ability to take part in appropriate collegial dialogue with fellow students and the instructor, participate in class activities, challenging assumptions, and providing innovative suggestions.

At a graduate level, students will have many great insights, firsthand experiences, ideas, and expectations that are critical to share to truly get the maximum value out of the course. Some suggested contribution opportunities include:

- Sharing firsthand experiences
- Offering observations that help clarify or integrate class concepts
- Sharing comparisons with various organizations, legal parameters, geographic locations, etc.
- Asking questions of classmates to drive further discussion and analysis

- Respectfully disagreeing and inquiring of additional information in information presented in class by the instructor and / or fellow students
- Bringing in additional research or current affairs into the course for discussion.

At a minimum, students are expected to be present and engaged in class. If a student cannot attend class, the instructor should be notified in advance whenever possible. If you miss a class, you can still earn your contribution grade by participating in the online discussion forum that pertains to the material covered in the class you missed. Either form of contribution (synchronous/in-class or asynchronous/online discussion) requires that you share your understanding of the material with your classmates. Elevated levels of participation would include active participation in class discussions, drawing others into discussions, demonstration of critical thinking (e.g., constructively criticizing articles discussed in class), and bringing in outside materials from popular press / current events and firsthand experiences/observations.

When evaluating your contribution, I pay attention to the quality and consistency of your contributions throughout the entire term. Contributing does not mean that you dominate in-class discussion or the online discussion forums – in fact dominating in either forum would most likely be detrimental to learning. Very often, listening attentively will be a more meaningful contribution. Being actively engaged, clearly prepared, and providing your comments when appropriate in a respectful manner will gain you higher grades in this aspect of the course.

The summary of your rankings for all classes will be used to determine an overall mark at the end of the term worth 15% of your total grade:

No in-class engagement/post(s) OR engagement/post(s) detrimental to learning	0
In-class engagement and/or online post(s) demonstrate adequate preparation	1
In-class engagement and/or online post(s) demonstrate extensive preparation and/or comprehensive understanding of material.	2

II. Journal Article Review (10%) Students are to submit an assignment that critiques one article of their choice (relevant to the topic/s related to group dynamics). The assignment is due on February 12th by 11:59 pm. Since this is a graduate-level course, students are expected to conduct an in-depth analysis, and therefore, your paper should go far beyond repeating the content of the chosen article. For the chosen article, students should discuss the following:

- Discussion of the material from the article (headings: Purpose, Methodology, Results, Limitations)
- Analysis of the article and how it can be used in in practice (heading: How Study Can be Applied)

- Overall analysis of transfer, in other words, can a practitioner easily use the material and apply it to the real world (why or why not) (heading: Summary)
- Writing style/grammar, etc. (APA style must be used for in-text citations and for reference pages).

Please note that the rubric provided in the appendices will serve as the primary basis for evaluating this assignment.

III. In-class Group Assignments (10% each for a total of 20%)

Groups will be assigned at the beginning of the term and comprised of 4 to 5 students. These groups will remain the same throughout the term, and groups will work together to complete two group assignments that will occur *during class time* on the dates below. These assignments may consist of working collaboratively to complete case analysis in various formats, including composing a memo, peer presentations, video analysis, and/or other interactive group tasks related to the assigned case.

In-class group assignments must be submitted on the same day they are assigned by 12:45pm at the end of class. If the in-class group assignment is handed in and has been adequately completed, full marks will be awarded to members of the group who were present (i.e., these are pass/fail). Each in-class group assignment is worth 10% of your final grade.

If a student expects to be absent on an in-class group assignment day, the student should advise the instructor and their group members as far in advance as possible.

Students who are absent during an in-class assignment may request a make-up assignment to be completed individually or with a group comprised of other students who were absent that day. This will be approved in situations where advance notice is provided and where the student was unable to participate in the group assignment due to illness, bereavement, or other acceptable cause. Should this occur, the student may apply, in writing and with supporting documents, for an alternate evaluation (e.g., adapted exercise, summary of a research article; individual assignment, etc.). This application must be made within one week of the original date of the regularly scheduled in-class group assignment to the course instructor.

In-class Group Assignments				
No.	Case	Assignment Date	Due	Value
1	Blake Sports Apparel and Switch Activewear: Bringing the Executive Team Together (HBR)	Feb 2 nd	same day 10 pm	10%
2	Morllex: Leading a Technology Start-Up in a Fast-Changing Environment (HBR Best Seller)	March 2 nd	same day 10 pm	10%

Total		20%
-------	--	-----

IV. Individual Assignment – Movie Review/Analysis (20%)

The key deliverable for this assignment is a four-page report that includes a summary of the issue or theme covered in the film, an interpretation of the piece in relation to group dynamics and issues shown in the video. As this is an academic paper, I expect you to provide citations to support your arguments. More details to be provided in the course shell.

Your submissions are to be a maximum of 4 pages, utilizing one-and-a-half line spacing, one-inch margins, and 12-point Times New Roman font. The cover page and reference list do not count towards the total page count.

VI. Final Project: Group Simulation Exercise & Presentation- Everest V3 (20%):

Find the attachment in the course shell for more details and the rubric.

Due date: presentation (April 9th by 10 am) and final project paper (April 20th; 11:59 am)

GRADUATE GRADING SYSTEM AND DESCRIPTIONS

I will adhere as closely as possible to the University of Regina's percentage grading system, which is outlined below.

Percentage grades

95-100

An exceptional performance:

- exemplary knowledge and understanding of the subject material, relevant issues, literature, and techniques
- the work is original and demonstrates insight, understanding and independent application or extension of course expectations in ways that would contribute significantly to expertise in the relevant field(s) (e.g., it is publishable)
- demonstrates exceptional depth/scope of research, theory, and techniques supported extensively by the relevant literature and far exceeding course expectations
- exceptional level of analytical and critical ability demonstrating independent application of unique and multi-perspective solutions to complex problems related to the subject material
- the work contains no errors in grammar, spelling, format, citation style, or referencing and is well communicated, coherent, clear, and highly persuasive

90-94

An outstanding performance:

- superior knowledge and understanding of the subject material, relevant issues, literature, and techniques

Kenneth Levene Graduate School of Business

- the work demonstrates original thinking, new analysis, or new interpretation and outstanding ability to integrate multiple perspectives in comprehensive and complex ways
- demonstrates outstanding depth/scope of research, theory, and techniques supported extensively by the relevant literature and exceeding course expectations
- outstanding level of integration of course material demonstrating analytical and critical insight, understanding, and independent application or extension of course expectations in relation to difficult problems related to the subject material
- the work contains no errors in grammar, spelling, format, citation style, or referencing and is well communicated, coherent, clear, and highly persuasive

85-89

An excellent performance:

- excellent knowledge and understanding of the subject material, relevant issues, literature, and techniques
- the work demonstrates original thinking, new analysis, or new interpretation and makes insightful points that represent a high level of integration, comprehensiveness and complexity
- demonstrates excellent depth/scope of research, theory, and techniques relevant to course expectations and appropriate literature
- excellent ability to solve difficult problems related to the subject material and/or to examine the material in a critical and analytical manner
- the work contains no errors in grammar, spelling, format, citation style, or referencing and is well communicated, coherent, clear, and highly persuasive

80-84

A very good performance:

- very good knowledge and understanding of the subject material, relevant issues, literature, and techniques
- the work demonstrates ability to apply knowledge and understanding in new ways and/or to provide new analysis or new interpretation
- demonstrates a good depth/scope of research, theory, and techniques relevant to course expectations and appropriate literature
- very good ability to solve moderately difficult problems related to the subject material and/or to examine the material in a critical and analytical manner
- the work is relatively free of errors in grammar, spelling, format, citation style, or referencing and demonstrates very good communication, coherence, and clarity

75-79

A good or satisfactory performance:

- good knowledge and understanding of the subject material, relevant issues, literature and techniques
- the work is complete and some new analysis or new interpretation is provided
- arguments are supported by evidence and demonstrate a good depth/scope relevant to course expectations and relevant literature

Kenneth Levene Graduate School of Business

- good ability to solve moderately difficult problems related to the subject material and/or to examine the material in a critical and analytical manner
- the work contains few errors in grammar, spelling, format, citation style, or referencing and demonstrates satisfactory communication, coherence, and clarity

70-74

A minimally acceptable performance or marginal pass:

- a basic grasp of the subject material, relevant issues, literature and techniques
- the work is complete, but little new analysis or new interpretation is provided
- arguments are sufficiently supported by evidence and demonstrate minimally acceptable depth/scope relevant to course expectations and relevant literature
- basic ability to solve moderately difficult problems related to the subject material and/or to examine the material in a critical and analytical manner
- the work contains multiple errors in grammar, spelling, format, citation style, or referencing and/or there are difficulties in effective communication, coherence, or clarity

0-69

An unacceptable or failing performance:

- a weak grasp of the subject material, relevant issues, literature and techniques
- the work is incomplete, with no new analysis or new interpretation
- arguments are not supported by evidence and/or demonstrate very limited depth/scope relevant to course expectations and relevant literature. See also the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research (FGSR) policy on '[academic conduct and misconduct](#)'.
- unsatisfactory ability to solve moderately difficult problems related to the subject material and/or to examine the material in a critical and analytical manner the work contains many errors in grammar, spelling, format, citation style, or referencing and/or there are substantial difficulties in effective communication, coherence, or clarity.

Tentative Course Schedule

Week No.	Date	Module	Required Material	Evaluation and Deliverables
1	Jan. 12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Introduction to Groups & Teams • Organizational support for teams • Evidence-based Management 	<p>Gilley, A., & Kerno Jr, S. J. (2010). Groups, teams, and communities of practice: A comparison. <i>Advances in Developing Human Resources</i>, 12(1), 46-60. (Focus only on Groups and Teams)</p> <p>Bashshur, M. R., Hernández, A., & González-Romá, V. (2011). When managers and their teams disagree: a longitudinal look at the consequences of differences in perceptions of organizational</p>	<p>Assessment of contribution begins</p> <p>In class discussion:</p> <p>How to read an article? How to analyze a case?</p>

Week No.	Date	Module	Required Material	Evaluation and Deliverables
			<p>support. <i>Journal of Applied Psychology</i>, 96(3), 558-573.</p> <p>Gubbins, C., & Rousseau, D. M. (2015). Embracing translational HRD research for evidence-based management: Let's talk about how to bridge the research–practice gap [Editorial]. <i>Human Resource Development Quarterly</i>, 26(2), 109–125.</p>	
2	Jan. 19th	Stages of group development & High Performing Teams	<p>Ilgen, D. R., Hollenbeck, J. R., Johnson, M., & Jundt, D. (2005). Teams in organizations: From input-process-output models to IMOI models. <i>Annu. Rev. Psychol.</i>, 56, 517-543.</p> <p>Friedman, R. (5). 5 Things High-Performing Teams Do Differently. <i>Harvard Business Review</i>. October, 21, 2021.</p> <p>Delizonna, L. (2017). High-performing teams need psychological safety. Here's how to create it. <i>Harvard Business Review</i>, 8, 1-5.</p>	In class article discussions. Ongoing individual contribution.
3	Jan 26th		Continue stages ... and High-Performing teams	
4	Feb 2nd	Effective Team Members and Leaders	<p>Hirschfeld, R. R., Jordan, M. H., Feild, H. S., Giles, W. F., & Armenakis, A. A. (2006). Becoming team players: Team members' mastery of teamwork knowledge as a predictor of team task proficiency and observed teamwork effectiveness. <i>Journal of Applied Psychology</i>, 91(2), 467–474.</p> <p>Homan, A. C., Gündemir, S., Buengeler, C., & van Kleef, G. A. (2020).</p>	Come to class on prepared to group discuss the Case Study " Blake Sports Apparel and Switch Activewear: Bringing the Executive Team Together (HBR) "

Week No.	Date	Module	Required Material	Evaluation and Deliverables
			Leading diversity: Towards a theory of functional leadership in diverse teams. <i>Journal of Applied Psychology</i> , 105(10), 1101–1128.	Due date – Feb 2 nd , 10 pm
5	Feb 9th	Team Diversity	<p>Kearney, E., Gebert, D., & Voelpel, S. C. (2009). When and how diversity benefits teams: The importance of team members' need for cognition. <i>Academy of Management Journal</i>, 52(3), 581-598.</p> <p>Ely, R. J., & Thomas, D. A. (2020). Getting serious about diversity. <i>Harvard Business Review</i>, 98(6), 114-122.</p> <p>Skim:</p> <p>Horwitz, S. K., & Horwitz, I. B. (2007). The effects of team diversity on team outcomes: A meta-analytic review of team demography. <i>Journal of Management</i>, 33(6), 987-1015.</p>	Article review assignment due: February 12 th 11:59 pm.
	Feb 16th	NO CLASSES	WINTER BREAK (FAMILY WEEK)	
6	Feb 23rd	Group decision-making	<p>Yates, J. F., & De Oliveira, S. (2016). Culture and decision making. <i>Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes</i>, 136, 106-118.</p> <p>Terwel, B. W., Harinck, F., Ellemers, N., & Daamen, D. D. L. (2010). Voice in political decision-making: The effect of group voice on perceived trustworthiness of decision makers and subsequent acceptance of decisions. <i>Journal of Experimental</i></p>	Mid-term assignment due date Invictus Movie Review: Feb 24th - 11:59 pm

Week No.	Date	Module	Required Material	Evaluation and Deliverables
			<i>Psychology: Applied</i> , 16(2), 173–186.	
7	Mar 2nd	Team conflicts and conflict resolution	<p>Maltarich, M. A., Kukenberger, M., Reilly, G., & Mathieu, J. (2018). Conflict in teams: Modeling early and late conflict states and the interactive effects of conflict processes. <i>Group & Organization Management</i>, 43(1), 6-37.</p> <p>Behfar, K. J., Peterson, R. S., Mannix, E. A., & Trochim, W. M. K. (2008). The critical role of conflict resolution in teams: A close look at the links between conflict type, conflict management strategies, and team outcomes. <i>Journal of Applied Psychology</i>, 93(1), 170–188.</p>	<p>Case: Morllex Case</p> <p>Due March 2nd, 10pm</p>

8	March 9th	Leadership & teamwork simulation exercise	Introduction to the topic; tutorial on simulation; Briefing on final assignment	Groups brainstorming
9	March 16th	Everest simulation run	In class simulation and group work	
10	March 23rd	Current issues in group dynamics research	<p>Jiang, X., Snyder, K., Li, J., & Manz, C. C. (2021). How followers create leaders: The impact of effective followership on leader emergence in self-managing teams. <i>Group Dynamics: Theory, Research, and Practice</i>, 25(4), 303–318</p> <p>Everest Simulation debriefing lecture and presentation</p>	<p>In-class discussion on contemporary research and practice topics on group/team dynamics.</p> <p>Ongoing individual contribution</p>
11	March 30th	Virtual Teams	Feitosa, J., & Salas, E. (2021). Today's virtual teams: Adapting lessons learned to the pandemic context. <i>Organizational dynamics</i> , 50(1), 1-4.	<p>In-class articles review on virtual teams. Ongoing individual contribution.</p>

			Ferrazzi, K. (2014). Getting virtual teams right. <i>Harvard Business Review</i> , 92(12), 120-123.	
12	April 13th		<i>Final project group presentation</i>	send slides by April 9th 10 am.
			<i>Final/term paper due April 20th by 11:59 am</i>	

Note: All weekly classes primarily consist of two sessions: First Session: Introduction, Conceptual review of the weekly topic. Second Session: Articles review and other class exercises with a focus on EvBM (Evidence based Management) practices.

APPENDICES

Individual Contribution Rubric:

Read Research Articles Like an Organizational Manager (GUIDE)

Managers read research differently from academics. They look for insights that help them make better decisions about people, teams, and organizations. Read strategically (don't read word by word). Use this guide to approach each assigned article with a leader's mindset.

1. Begin With a Managerial Lens

Before reading, ask:

- What organizational problem does this article speak to?
- How might this research inform decisions about people or strategy?
- What assumptions do I already hold about this topic?

2. Skim for Relevance First

Focus on:

- Abstract: What is the core message?
- Introduction: Why does this issue matter?
- Tables/Figures (if interested): What patterns stand out? What kind of effect sizes (strong/weak)?
- Discussion: What should managers do with this knowledge?

3. Identify the "So What?"

As you read:

- What problem does this research help solve?
- What decisions could it inform (e.g., hiring, training, DEI, leadership)?
- What risks or unintended consequences should managers consider?

4. Understand the Evidence (Without Getting Lost in Statistics)

Look for:

- Methods: Validity, sample size/characteristics, and generalizability.
- What was studied (context, sample, industry)
- What was found (direction and strength of relationships)

Kenneth Levene Graduate School of Business

- How confident should we be (limitations, boundary conditions)

Ask: *Would these findings likely hold in my organization?*

5. Translate Findings Into Action

After reading, articulate:

- Three practical takeaways for managers
- One policy or practice that could be improved
- One risk to consider before applying the findings

6. Evaluate Fit with Organizational Realities

Consider:

- Alignment with culture and values
- Resource constraints
- Likely organizational support or resistance

7. Reflect as a Manager

Write a brief reflection:

- What did I learn that could improve organizational effectiveness?
- What would I do differently as a manager?
- What questions remain?

Overall, be prepared to discuss these aspects when you come to class.

GBUS 871 – Journal Article Review Assignment Rubric

Empirical Articles (not review or conceptual) to be chosen from one of the following journals:

1. Group and Organization Management
2. Group Dynamics: Theory, Research and Practice
3. Small Group Research
4. Human Relations

Total: 10 marks — Length: 4–5 pages (excluding references, double-spaced, 12-point font, APA style).

Criteria	Description of Expectations	Marks
1. Discussion of Article Content (<i>Purpose, Methodology, Results, Limitations</i>)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clearly explains the purpose and research questions. • Accurately describes the methodology (design, sample, measures). • Summarizes the results without misinterpretation. • Identifies limitations (both author-stated and additional ones). 	/ 2

Criteria	Description of Expectations	Marks
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrates strong comprehension of the scholarly work. 	
2. Application to Organizational Group Dynamics Practice (e.g., teams and leadership) <i>(What managers could do with the findings)</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identifies specific group or leadership functions or decisions informed by the findings (e.g., team outcomes, training, team performance, DEI, leadership). • Explains how organizations could use the findings in practice. • Provides concrete examples of evidence-based actions or policy changes. • Focuses on <i>what practitioners could do</i> if they adopted the insights. 	/ 4
3. Transferability & Real-World Feasibility <i>(Whether managers realistically can do it, and under what conditions)</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evaluates whether the findings are realistically transferable to organizational settings. • Discusses conditions required for successful application (culture, resources, workforce characteristics, industry context). • Identifies barriers, constraints, or risks that may limit real-world use. • Addresses <i>why or why not</i> practitioners can easily apply the study's insights. 	/ 4
4. Writing Quality & APA Style	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Writing is clear, well-organized, and professional. • Grammar and mechanics meet graduate-level expectations. • APA style is correctly used for in-text citations and reference list. • Paper meets formatting requirements. 	/ -2

Rubric: Film Analysis Report – *Invictus* (2009)

Total: 20 marks

Criteria	Excellent	Good	Satisfactory	Needs Improvement	Marks
1. Summary of Film's Central Issue/Theme (5 marks)	Clear, accurate, concise summary; identifies key themes; strong relevance to group dynamics.	Accurate summary with minor omissions; generally clear and relevant.	Mostly accurate but may be overly descriptive or missing key themes; limited relevance to group dynamics.	Unclear, incomplete, or superficial summary; key themes missing or misrepresented.	/5
2. Interpretation & Application to Organizational Group Dynamics (10 marks)	Analytical, well-reasoned interpretation; strong integration of theory; insightful use of film examples; demonstrates deep analytical thinking.	Clear interpretation with relevant concepts; good use of examples; analysis solid but lacks depth in some areas.	Basic understanding of concepts; analysis may be descriptive; examples limited or loosely connected.	Superficial or inaccurate interpretation; weak or unclear links to group dynamics; minimal use of examples.	/10
3. Use of Scholarly Sources & Citation Quality (3 marks)	Multiple high-quality academic sources; strong integration; accurate and consistent citations.	Relevant academic sources; generally accurate citations with minor issues.	Limited or partially relevant sources; noticeable citation errors or weak integration.	Minimal or poor-quality sources; frequent citation errors; weak support for arguments.	/3
4. Organization, Structure & Writing Quality (2 marks)	Clear, coherent, well-structured writing; strong academic tone; excellent flow; meets all formatting requirements.	Generally clear and organized; minor issues in flow or clarity; meets formatting requirements.	Adequate organization; noticeable writing errors; minor formatting issues.	Poorly organized or unclear writing; frequent errors; does not meet formatting expectations.	/2