

Course syllabus

Organisational Management

2015 - 2016

Semester 2

Teachers

Coordinator: dr. E.A.C. (Esther) van Leeuwen
Teachers: dr. F.M. (Florien) Cramwinckel
H.A.H. (Hester) Ruigendijk, MSc

Contact details

Esther van Leeuwen: e.a.c.van.leeuwen@fsw.leidenuniv.nl

Florien Cramwinckel: f.m.cramwinckel@fsw.leidenuniv.nl

Hester Ruigendijk: h.a.h.ruigendijk@vu.nl

Course information

Credits: 5 EC

Work load

The total work load of the course is 140 hours:

- 14 hours meetings (workgroup meetings, guest lectures)
- 66 hours preparation for meetings
- 60 hours assignments

Admission requirements

This course is open to Master's students Psychology with specialisation Social and Organisational Psychology or Occupational Health Psychology.

Course description

Organisational management involves the coordination and facilitation of organisational processes to accomplish core organisational goals. The primary aim of this course is to familiarise students with some of the key topics in the domain of organisational management, and to train them in applying this knowledge to organisational practice. These key topics include human resource management, personnel selection, effective communication with both internal (e.g., employees) and external (e.g., clients) stakeholders, managing the organisation's identity, corporate social responsibility, and corporate restructures such as mergers and strategic alliances. These topics will be approached by integrating conceptual, empirical and case methods. A second aim of this course is to introduce students to the work field of organisational psychologists, in order to facilitate their orientation on their own future career.

Relevance of the course

This course will contribute to the foundations of students' development as future manager, consultant, policy advisor, researcher, trainer, recruiter, mediator, or coach. Students will learn to critically analyse organisational problems, and propose structural solutions to these problems based on theoretical insights from the field of social and organisational psychology.

Course objectives

- Students will acquire an understanding of the theoretical underpinnings of some of the key topics in organisational management
- Students will learn to apply their theoretical knowledge to organisational problems and generate theory-based solutions to these problems
- Students will learn to communicate their solutions during oral presentations
- Students will learn more about elements of the work field of organisational psychologists

Course content

The practice of organisational management involves three domains: 1) managing people in organisations, 2) managing organisational structures and processes, and 3) managing organisational practices. We begin with the management of individuals in the organisation, such as leadership, motivation, and human resource management. We then move to the broader topic of organisational identity and change. In doing so, we will learn more about the management of corporate restructuring such as mergers and reorganisations. In the subsequent meeting, we will focus on organisational practices by looking at managing communications, corporate reputation, and corporate social responsibility. Finally, we will focus on virtual teams and organisations as a special topic in organisational management.

Mode of instruction

The course is given in 8 interactive meetings of 2 hours each. Five meetings (meetings 1, 4 - 7) are workgroup meetings in small groups of (max.) 15 students. In the first workgroup meeting, students will learn how to apply scientific theories to analyse organisational problems and develop intervention plans. In the remaining four workgroup meetings, we will discuss relevant literature and present and discuss students' intervention plans for specific organisational problems.

Three meetings (meetings 2, 3, and 8) are plenary meetings (i.e., collective meetings) with guest speakers from the field. The first and second guest lectures, by Laura Monden, MSc, and dr. Jop Groeneweg, serve to demonstrate elements of the work field of organisational psychologists, and in particular how practitioners handle organisational problems. The third guest lecture, by organisation specialists from Studelta, will show students how to communicate effectively and persuasively with the field.

Assignments

Discussion questions

These are individual assignments, and timely submission of these is part of your 'attendance and participation' grade. All students (including students that deliver their presentation that week) should submit 4 discussion questions before workgroup meetings 3, 4, 5, and 6 (see 'deadlines'). Use the 'Discussion questions form' that can be downloaded from the Forms page on Blackboard (see Appendix 1 for a brief guide to the Organisational Management Blackboard site).

The discussion questions should cover all the mandatory literature (either one question per article or one or more questions combining/comparing articles). Please describe each discussion question in sufficient detail in a few sentences, and indicate after each question to which article(s) it pertains (authors & publication year is sufficient). Good discussion questions show a critical reflection of the content of the article(s). For example:

"In the Group Engagement Model, pride, respect and identification are all part of 'identity judgements'. Identity judgements are proposed to be affected by procedural justice. Does this mean that pride, respect, and identification as separate constructs are all affected (in the same way) by procedural justice?" Tyler & Blader (2003).

A discussion question can also build on the content of an article and translate it to other domains. For example:

"The Group Engagement Model argues that procedural justice informs people of their role and standing in a group or organisation. Would fairness of procedures that parents use to raise their children affect these children in a similar manner?" Tyler & Blader (2003).

Note that the primary goal of the discussion questions is to stimulate students to reflect critically on the literature. The discussion questions essentially depict this reflection, and will help the workgroup teacher to prepare the following workgroup meeting. Students will NOT receive feedback on their discussion questions, and discussion questions will only be marked as 'completed/not completed' based on their timely submission and whether or not they meet the above guidelines. Note that discussion questions may be included in the subsequent lecture and students may be asked to elaborate on their question in class.

How to submit: Submit the completed form via Blackboard, using the Turnitin link provided in the folder that is associated with your own workgroup.

Guest lecture reports

These are individual assignments, and part of your 'attendance and participation' grade. The purpose of writing these brief reports is to encourage you to listen actively to the guest lectures, and to reflect on what these lectures tell you about the work field of organisational psychologists. You should provide the following information:

- Summarize the content of the lecture in 150 - 300 words;
- Describe, in 150 - 300 words, what YOU learned from this lecture. To what extent did the lecture help you orient yourself on future career options? Did you learn something new, that may be useful for your own career?

Each report need to be submitted within 2 weeks following the guest lecture (see 'deadlines'). Use the 'Guest lecture report form' for each report. The reports will not be graded but marked as 'completed/not completed' to indicate that the report is submitted in time and that it meets the requirements. If you do not attend a guest lecture, you will also not be able to submit a report of this lecture (you cannot write a report of a meeting you didn't personally attend, after all).

How to submit: Submit the completed form via Blackboard, using the Turnitin link provided in the folder that is associated with your own workgroup.

Oral presentation

This is a group assignment. In meetings 4 - 7, two teams (of two persons) present their analysis of a specific problem, followed by a policy recommendation. The teams are composed in the first workgroup meeting. **Please register your team immediately after the first meeting on Blackboard** (see Appendix 1 for instructions how to register your presentation team).

The workgroup teacher will send the presentation assignment via Blackboard to registered presenting teams two weeks before the presentation date. To aid the teams in their preparation, each team should submit a draft presentation a week before their presentation. The workgroup teacher will provide feedback on the draft presentation to aid the presenting teams in their preparation. Feedback will be sent no later than two days before the presentation date. This draft presentation will not be graded. Presentation proposals submitted after the deadline or proposals that do not meet the criteria of the draft presentation form may not receive feedback, or may receive only limited feedback.

Both teams will present their problem analysis and solution in the workgroup meeting to a 'selection committee' ostensibly consisting of members of the board of directors, HR managers, and organisational psychology specialists (these roles are assumed by the remaining students in the workgroup and by the workgroup teacher), who will ask critical questions.

The presentation should take no more than **ten minutes**, followed by five minutes of discussion. Use PowerPoint and/or other tools to improve the communicative value of your presentation. All team members should participate actively in the presentation.

Your presentation will be graded on the following criteria:

1. Problem analysis (20%). Is it clear what the problem is, and why? Is the problem adequately analysed using relevant theories? Does the problem analysis provide clear insight into the fundamental underpinnings of the problem?
2. Process model (15%). Does the process model follow logically from the problem analysis? Is the process model useful not only for understanding the problem but also for generating concrete solutions? Does the model contain redundant variables? Are the variables in the model concrete and measurable?
3. Intervention plan - theory (15%). Does the intervention plan follow logically from the process model? Is the intervention plan sufficiently rooted in scientific theory?
4. Intervention plan - practice (15%). Are the interventions in proportion to the problem (i.e., strong enough to fix the problem without overkill)? Is the intervention plan realistic? Is it plausible that the intervention plan will be effective? Are unintended consequences also anticipated?
5. Evaluation plan (10%). Is a clear and sound evaluation plan proposed?
6. Turnaround time (5%). Is a realistic and sufficiently detailed overview of the turnaround time presented?
7. Presentation style (15%). Was the presentation clear and convincing? Were difficult constructs explained? Were the slides clear and supportive of the presentation, without distracting from the presentation? Did the presenters have good eye-contact with the audience? Was the language appropriate? Were the presenters able to hold the audience's attention until the end? Has the team convinced the audience that they are the right team for the job?

8. Feedback (5%). Was the team responsive to the workgroup teacher's feedback on their draft presentation?

How to submit the draft presentation: Use the form 'Draft presentation', and submit the completed form no later than one week (seven days) before your presentation date via the link 'submit your draft presentation here', that can be found on your presentation group page.

How to submit the presentation slides: Convert your slides to a PDF file. Submit the PDF file immediately after your presentation via the link 'submit your presentation here', that can be found on your presentation group page.

Paper

This is an individual assignment. Students will apply all that they have learned during this course to one final case study, in which they need to develop an intervention to a complex organisational problem. This assignment will be made available on Blackboard in due time.

Students are expected to make use of relevant literature that is part of the mandatory and optional course readings list, as well as any other scientific literature that is relevant to their problem analysis.

The paper should include at least the following elements:

- Title page with a title that is short, catchy, and appropriately captures the content. Your name, student number, workgroup number, and email address should also be listed on the title page
- A separate section that describes the reason for writing this paper (and no, we don't mean "because it is an Organisational Management assignment"), an analysis of the problem, identification of possible causes, and a process model.
- A separate section in which an intervention plan is proposed, as well as an evaluation plan and information pertaining to turnaround time.

The paper should be between 3000 and 4000 words (including title page, possible appendices etc., but excluding reference list). You do NOT need to adhere to APA style guidelines. You are free to format your paper as you like, as long as it supports the content and facilitates reading.

Your paper will be graded on the following criteria:

1. Problem analysis (20%). Is it clear what the problem is, and why? Is the problem adequately analysed using relevant theories? Does the problem analysis provide clear insight into the fundamental underpinnings of the problem?
2. Process model (15%). Does the process model follow logically from the problem analysis? Is the process model useful not only for understanding the problem but also for generating concrete solutions? Does the model contain redundant variables? Are the variables in the model concrete and measurable?
3. Intervention plan - theory (15%). Does the intervention plan follow logically from the process model? Is the intervention plan sufficiently rooted in scientific theory?
4. Intervention plan - practice (15%). Are the interventions in proportion to the problem (i.e., strong enough to fix the problem without overkill)? Is the intervention plan realistic? Is it plausible that the intervention plan will be effective? Are unintended consequences also anticipated?
5. Evaluation plan (10%). Is a clear and sound evaluation plan proposed?
6. Turnaround time (5%). Is a realistic and sufficiently detailed overview of the

- turnaround time presented?
7. Writing style (15%). Was the writing clear and convincing? Were difficult constructs explained? Was the language appropriate? Was the layout supportive of the content and did it facilitate reading the paper? Did you convince your reader that you are the right person for the job?
 8. Overall (5%). Did the paper in its entirety convince the reader that you should be hired to do the job?

How to submit: The paper should be submitted via Blackboard, using the Turnitin link in your own workgroup folder.

Grading

The final course grade will be the weighed average of the following components¹:

1. Oral presentation (group assessment): 40%
2. Paper (individual assessment): 40%
3. Class attendance and participation (individual assessment): 20%

ad 1. Oral presentation

Presentations are graded on a scale from 1 - 10. Please note that group assignments will result in the same grade for each individual group member, unless there is good reason to deviate from this rule. You cannot retake your presentation in case of an insufficient grade or absence for this part.

ad 2. Paper

Papers are graded on a scale from 1 - 10. The paper needs to be graded a 5 or higher in order to pass the course. Papers graded lower than a 5 will be sent back to students with feedback, and students subsequently have 2 weeks from that point onwards to improve their paper and resubmit it. A resubmitted paper can receive a maximum grade of 6. If the resubmitted paper is still insufficient (< 5), or if the overall course grade is insufficient (< 6), the student has failed the course.

ad 3. Attendance and participation

Attendance for all meetings (including plenary meetings) is mandatory. Students are expected to participate actively and constructively during discussions and activities. Active participation includes submitting discussion questions before each workgroup meeting, and submitting reports of all three guest lectures before the deadline. Assessment of attendance and participation will be reflected in a single grade (0-10).²

Students who fail to timely submit a set of discussion questions or their guest lecture

¹ No rights can be derived from grades published on Blackboard.

² To calculate your attendance and participation grade, we use a system of points. A total of 20 points can be obtained for this part of the course. For every attended meeting, a student receives 1 point (total: 8). For every submitted and sufficient guest lecture report, 2 points will be given (total: 6). Each submitted and sufficient set of discussion questions is awarded with 1,5 points (total: 6). To transfer the obtained points to a single grade for attendance and participation, the total number of points will be divided by 2 - the resulting number reflects your attendance and participation grade.

reports cannot retake these assignments. Students are allowed to miss 1 meeting with good reason provided they notify their own workgroup teacher before the meeting. If you are not sure whether your reason for missing a meeting is a valid one, you should check this with your workgroup teacher beforehand. A missed meeting will have to be compensated with an additional assignment (provided by the workgroup teacher). Students who miss more than one meeting or who miss a meeting without good reason or prior notification may fail the course.

A note on grading in Blackboard: At present, the Turnitin module in Blackboard works with 100 point scales instead of the 10-point scales that are customary in the Netherlands. All points and grades will therefore be presented on Blackboard on a scale of 10 - 100 (e.g., a 7,5 is presented as 75).

Timetable and deadlines

For a detailed overview of dates, times and locations of the meetings, see uSis.

Meetings

Meeting	Topic	Type	Date
1	Introduction to the course	workgroup	13 April
2	The work field of a trainer and HR expert	guest lecture Laura Monden	20 April 11:00 - 13:00
3	The work field of an organisational advisor	guest lecture Jop Groeneweg	29 April 13:00 - 15:00
4	Leadership, motivation, and HRM	workgroup	4 May
5	Organisational identity and change	workgroup	11 May
6	Corporate reputation and CSR	workgroup	18 May
7	Virtual teams and organisations	workgroup	25 May
8	Communicating with the field	guest lecture Studelta	27 May 15:00 - 17:00

Deadlines

Assignment	Deadline
discussion questions meeting 4*	2 May
discussion questions meeting 5	9 May
guest lecture report Monden	4 May
guest lecture report Groeneweg	13 May
discussion questions meeting 6	16 May
discussion questions meeting 7	23 May
guest lecture report Studelta	10 June
course paper	10 June

* all deadlines are at 8:00 (AM). Submission after this date and time is not possible.

Assessments or grades are available according to the following schedule:

Assignment	Availability assessment/grade
discussion questions	2 working days after submission deadline
guest lecture reports	14 days after submission deadline
presentation	14 days after submission of slides
course paper	21 days after submission deadline

Course literature

Every workgroup meeting should be prepared by studying 4 scientific articles ('mandatory readings'). There are also 3 optional articles for each meeting. The optional articles may provide valuable information for the presentation and/or paper assignment (so reading them, although not mandatory, is advised for students who wish to do well in these assignments).

Please note that reading 4 articles can consume a considerable amount of time (between 8 - 16 hours), so allow yourself sufficient time before each workgroup meeting to study the articles.

Meeting 1: Analysing organisational problems

Mandatory readings

1. Buunk, A.P. & van Vugt, M. (2013). *Applying Social Psychology*, Chapter 1. London, UK: Sage. On Blackboard.
2. Schultz, P.W. & Estrada-Hollenbeck, M. (2008). The USE of theory in applied social psychology. In: L. Steg, A.P. Buunk and T. Rothengatter (Eds.) *Applied Social Psychology* (pp. 28-56). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. On Blackboard.
3. *Analysing organisational problems*. On Blackboard.

Optional readings

- Whitley, B. E. (2012). Evaluation Research. In: B. E. Whitley (Ed.), *Principles of research in behavioral science* (pp. 478-509). On Blackboard.
- The PATH model. A summary of Buunk, P., & van Vugt, M. (2013). *Applying Social Psychology*. London, UK: Sage. On Blackboard.
- Buunk, P., & van Vugt, M. (2013). *Applying Social Psychology*. London, UK: Sage.

Meeting 4: Leadership, motivation, and HRM

Mandatory readings

1. Tyler, T. R., & Blader, S. L. (2003). The group engagement model: Procedural justice, social identity, and cooperative behavior. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 7, 349–361. doi:10.1207/S15327957PSPR0704.
http://sfx.leidenuniv.nl/sfx_local?volume=7&spage=349&issn=1088-8683&year=2003&issue=4
2. Macey, W. H., & Schneider, B. (2008). The meaning of employee engagement. *Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, 1, 3–30. doi:10.1111/j.1754-9434.2007.0002.x.
<http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.182.2845&rep=rep1&type=pdf>
3. Gagné, M., & Deci, E. L. (2005). Self-determination theory and work motivation. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 26, 331–362.
http://sfx.leidenuniv.nl:9003/sfx_local?volume=26&spage=331&issn=0894-3796&year=2005&issue=4

4. Hom, P. W., Mitchell, T. R., Lee, T. W., & Griffeth, R. W. (2012). Reviewing employee turnover: Focusing on proximal withdrawal states and an expanded criterion. *Psychological Bulletin*, 138, 831–858. doi:10.1037/a0027983. http://sfx.leidenuniv.nl/sfx_local?volume=138&spage=831&issn=0033-2909&year=2012&issue=5

Optional readings

- Jiang, J. Lepak, D. P., Hu, J., & Baer, J. C. (2012). How does human resource management influence organizational outcomes? A meta-analytic investigation of mediating mechanisms. *Academy of Management Journal*, 55, 1264–1294. http://sfx.leidenuniv.nl/sfx_local?volume=55&spage=1264&issn=0001-4273&year=2012&issue=6
- Blader, S. L., & Tyler, T. R. (2009). Testing and extending the group engagement model: Linkages between social identity, procedural justice, economic outcomes, and extrarole behavior. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 94, 445–464. doi:10.1037/a0013935. http://leu-sfx.hosted.exlibrisgroup.com/sfx_local?volume=94&spage=445&issn=0021-9010&year=2009&issue=2
- Griffeth, R. W, Hom, P.W., & Gaertner, S.. (2000). A meta-analysis of antecedents and correlates of employee turnover: Update, moderator tests, and research implications for the next millennium. *Journal of Management*, 26, 463–488. doi:10.1177/014920630002600305. http://sfx.leidenuniv.nl/sfx_local?volume=26&spage=463&issn=0149-2063&year=2000&issue=3

Meeting 5: Organisational identity and change

Mandatory readings

1. Ashforth, E., & Mael, F. (1989). Social identity theory and the organization. *The Academy of Management Review*, 14, 20–39. http://sfx.leidenuniv.nl/sfx_local?volume=14&spage=20&issn=03637425&year=1989&issue=1
2. Giessner, S. R., Ullrich, J., & van Dick, R. (2011). Social identity and corporate mergers. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass*, 5, 333–345. doi:10.1111/j.1751-9004.2011.00357.x. <http://scholar.google.nl/scholar?hl=nl&q=Social+identity+and+corporate+mergers&btnG=&lr=>
3. Van Dierendonck, D., & Jacobs, G. (2012). Survivors and victims, a meta-analytical review of fairness and organizational commitment after downsizing. *British Journal of Management*, 23, 96–109. doi:10.1111/j.1467-8551.2010.00724.x http://sfx.leidenuniv.nl/sfx_local?volume=23&spage=96&issn=1045-3172&year=2010&issue=1
4. Jimmieson, N. L., & White, K. M. (2011). Predicting employee intentions to support organizational change: An examination of identification processes during a re-brand. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 50, 331–341. doi:10.1111/j.2044-8309.2010.02005.x http://sfx.leidenuniv.nl/sfx_local?volume=50&spage=331&issn=0144-6665&year=2011&issue=Pt%202

Optional readings

- Puranam, P., Alexy, O., & Reitzig, M. (2014). What's "new" about new forms of organizing? *Academy of Management Review*, 39, 162–180. doi:10.5465/amr.2011.0436. http://sfx.leidenuniv.nl/sfx_local?volume=39&spage=162&issn=0363-7425&year=2014&issue=2
- Peters, K., Haslam, A. S., Ryan, M. K., & Fonseca, M. (2013). Working with subgroup identities to build organizational identification and support for organizational strategy: A test of the ASPIRe model. *Group & Organization Management*, 38, 128–144. doi:10.1177/1059601112472368 http://sfx.leidenuniv.nl/sfx_local?volume=38&spage=128&issn=1059-6011&year=2013&issue=1
- Millward, L. J., Haslam, S. a., & Postmes, T. (2007). Putting employees in their place: The impact of hot desking on organizational and team identification. *Organization Science*, 18, 547–559. doi:10.1287/orsc.1070.0265 http://sfx.leidenuniv.nl/sfx_local?volume=18&spage=547&issn=1047-7039&year=2007&issue=4

Meeting 6: Corporate reputation and CSR

Mandatory readings

1. Lange, D., Lee, P. M., & Dai, Y. (2010). Organizational reputation: A review. *Journal of Management*, 37, 153–184. doi:10.1177/0149206310390963 <http://scholar.google.nl/scholar?hl=nl&q=Organizational+reputation%3A+A+review&btnG=&lr=>
2. Leach, C. W., Ellemers, N., & Barreto, M. (2007). Group virtue: The importance of morality (vs. competence and sociability) in the positive evaluation of in-groups. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 93, 234–249. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.93.2.234 http://sfx.leidenuniv.nl/sfx_local?volume=93&spage=234&issn=0022-3514&year=2007&issue=2
3. Bauman, C. W., & Skitka, L. J. (2012). Corporate social responsibility as a source of employee satisfaction. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 32, 63–86. doi:10.1016/j.cognition.2008.05.007 http://scholar.google.nl/scholar?q=Corporate+social+responsibility+as+a+source+of+employee+satisfaction&btnG=&hl=nl&as_sdt=0%2C5
4. Aaker, J. L., Garbinsky, E. N., & Vohs, K. D. (2012). Cultivating admiration in brands: Warmth, competence, and landing in the “golden quadrant.” *Journal of Consumer Psychology*, 22, 191–194. doi:10.1016/j.jcps.2011.11.012 http://sfx.leidenuniv.nl/sfx_local?volume=22&atitle=Cultivating%20admiration%20in%20brands%3A%20Warmth%2C%20competence%2C%20and%20landing%20in%20the%20%22golden%20quadrant%22&spage=191&issn=1057-7408&year=2012&issue=2

Optional readings

- Aguinis, H., & Glavas, A. (2012). What we know and don't know about corporate social responsibility: A review and research agenda. *Journal of Management*, 38, 932–968. doi:10.1177/0149206311436079. http://sfx.leidenuniv.nl/sfx_local?volume=38&spage=932&issn=0149-2063&year=2012&issue=4

- Vallaster, C., & Lindgreen, A. (2012). Strategically leveraging corporate social responsibility: A corporate branding perspective. *California Management Review*, 54, 34–61.
http://sfx.leidenuniv.nl/sfx_local?volume=54&spage=34&issn=0008-1256&year=2012&issue=3
- Abratt, R., & Kleyn, N. (2012). Corporate identity, corporate branding and corporate reputations: Reconciliation and integration. *European Journal of Marketing*, 46, 1048–1063. doi:10.1108/03090561211230197.
http://sfx.leidenuniv.nl/sfx_local?volume=46&spage=1048&issn=0309-0566&year=2012&issue=7-8

Meeting 7: Virtual teams and organisations

Mandatory readings

1. Spears, R., Postmes, T., Lea, M., & Wolbert, A. (2002). When are net effects gross products? The power of influence and the influence of power in computer-mediated communication. *Journal of Social Issues*, 58, 91–107.
doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/1540-4560.00250
http://sfx.leidenuniv.nl/sfx_local?volume=58&spage=91&issn=0022-4537&year=2002&issue=1
2. Peters, L., & Karren, R. J. (2009). An examination of the roles of trust and functional diversity on virtual team performance ratings. *Group & Organization Management*, 34, 479–504.
http://sfx.leidenuniv.nl/sfx_local?volume=34&spage=479&issn=1059-6011&year=2009&issue=4
3. Hertel, G., Geister, S., & Konradt, U. (2005). Managing virtual teams: A review of current empirical research. *Human Resource Management Review*, 15, 69–95.
doi:10.1016/j.hrmr.2005.01.002.
http://sfx.leidenuniv.nl/sfx_local?volume=15&spage=69&issn=1053-4822&year=2005&issue=1
4. Gajendran, R. S., & Harrison, D. A. (2007). The good, the bad, and the unknown about telecommuting: Meta-analysis of psychological mediators and individual consequences. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 92, 1524–1541. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.92.6.1524.
http://sfx.leidenuniv.nl/sfx_local?volume=92&spage=1524&issn=0021-9010&year=2007&issue=6

Optional readings

- Ayoko, O. B., Konrad, A. M., & Boyle, M. V. (2012). Online work: Managing conflict and emotions for performance in virtual teams. *European Management Journal*, 30, 156–174. doi:10.1016/j.emj.2011.10.001
http://sfx.leidenuniv.nl/sfx_local?volume=30&spage=156&issn=0263-2373&year=2012&issue=2
- Davenport, S., & Daellenbach, U. (2011). “Belonging” to a virtual research centre: Exploring the influence of social capital formation processes on member identification in a virtual organization. *British Journal of Management*, 22, 54–76. doi:10.1111/j.1467-8551.2010.00713.x.
http://sfx.leidenuniv.nl/sfx_local?volume=22&spage=54&issn=1045-3172&year=2011&issue=1
- Mesmer-Magnus, J. R., DeChurch, L. A., Jimenez-Rodriguez, M., Wildman, J., & Shuffler, M. (2011). A meta-analytic investigation of virtuality and information

sharing in teams. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 115, 214–225. doi:10.1016/j.obhdp.2011.03.002.
http://sfx.leidenuniv.nl/sfx_local?volume=115&spage=214&issn=0749-5978&year=2011&issue=2

Appendix 1 Blackboard guide

Signing up for your presentation team

During the first meeting, 2-person teams will be created for the presentation assignments. Note that your team will be assigned a number (1-8). You and your team partner will need to sign up for your own presentation team on Blackboard. Follow these steps:

- Select 'Presentation groups' in the left panel, and look for your own workgroup number.
- Click the option 'View sign-up sheet to join a group' below our own workgroup number.
- You'll see a list of all the presentation teams in your own workgroup. Look for the number of your own presentation team that you received during the first workgroup meeting.
- Click 'Sign up' below your team to enrol in your team.

Note that you will not be able to sign out of a presentation team by yourself, so make sure you select the right team within the right workgroup before signing up. If you did happen to sign up for the wrong team, please contact your own workgroup teacher ASAP to have you removed from that team.

Using the presentation team page and submitting team assignments

Now that you've signed up for a team, you can access your team's page via the 'Presentation groups' option in the left panel. On your team's page, you can exchange files with your presentation partner using the 'File exchange' option, and contact each other via the 'Send email' option.

You will also see two links: 'Submit your draft presentation here' and 'Submit your presentation slides here'. Use these links to submit your draft presentation and the slides of your final presentation, respectively. After clicking on a link, you will see a page containing 3 sections: 'Assignment information', 'Assignment submission', and 'Add comments'. The 'Assignment submission' section allows you to upload and submit your completed draft presentation form. Make sure you submit the form using the 'Attach file' option. Do *not* select the 'Write submission' option. *Note that, since you're submitting on behalf of the team, only one team member needs to submit the draft presentation. Make sure the submission is coordinated with your team partner.*

The 'Presentation' link on your team page allows you to submit the actual presentation on behalf of your team. First convert your presentation slides to a PDF file. Upload the PDF file using the 'Attach file' option. Do *not* use the 'Write Submission' option. You can also view the evaluation form that will later be used to grade your presentation under the 'View rubric' button. Again, since you're submitting the presentation on behalf of the team, only one team member needs to upload the slides.

Submitting discussion questions, guest lecture reports, and your course paper

The 'Workgroups' page in the left menu shows a list of folders reflecting each workgroup ('WG'). In your own workgroup folder, you can see the Turnitin links for submitting your discussion questions, your guest lecture reports, and your course paper. Note that all Turnitin links close after their respective deadlines, which means that late submissions are not possible.