## Psy 457/557, Spring 2015, Tu \& Th 12-13:50, 101 Knight Library

| Professor/TA | Office | E-mail | Phone | Office Hours |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Dr. Holly Arrow | Straub 421 | harrow@uoregon.edu | $346-1996$ | M 11-12; Fri 8:30-9:30 |
| Erik Knight | Straub 461 | elk@uoregon.edu | $346-8012$ | Th 2:30-4:00 |

## Course Description Overview

This course has three interrelated goals:

1) acquaint you with theory and research on small groups, with an emphasis on recent work
2) improve your skills as participant in, observer of, and consultant to small groups
3) develop your ability to work collaboratively in producing and critiquing scientific writing

To accomplish these goals, readings, lecture, and discussion are paired with group exercises, practice in observing and interpreting group dynamics, several writing assignments, and comments on essays written by others.

## Work Load Overview and Time Estimates

Undergrads (457) will complete one short paper (2-3 pages), collaborate on five short (250 words max) group essays, read and comment on the essays of other groups, and complete a takehome final. Attendance and participation ( 40 hrs class time) is required. Estimate of time required to do all reading and assignments with care: About 40 hours for reading, 20 hours for the group essays, 5 hours to read and comment on essays of other students, and 15 hours for the short paper (draft and final revision) and take home final (short answer and essays).

Grad students (557) Along with the assigned readings and class time (80 hours) grads will complete a case analysis ( 15 hours including extra reading) a literature review ( 30 hours including reading), 5 short essays ( 25 hours), and read and make comments on the undergrad group essays and provide feedback on the draft lit reviews of other grad students (10 hours).

## Requirements for Undergrads (447) and Grads (557)

## 1. Participation

Attendance and participation is required. In Week 2, students will form permanent small groups of size 3-4, with undergrads and grad students in different groups. At the end of the class, each student will (confidentially) evaluate the quality of group members' participation, and there will be a chance to change group membership in Week 4 if some groups aren't working well together. Peer ratings will help determine participation grades.

## 2. Readings

Readings will be available on Blackboard, via Web links or (for several case studies) for purchase \& download on-line from the Harvard Business School site.

## 3a. Group Essays on WordPress Blog (457)

Every week you discuss the readings with your group. As a group, you will also develop and post 5 short integrative group essays that analyze a case or cases by drawing on readings / lecture. These will be posted on a blog (accessible to class members only) and will be due by 5 PM Friday. The strict length limit is 250 words. Each group will post a single essay. *Do not wait until the last minute to post! Allow a time buffer for technical difficulties*

## 3b. Grad Student Blog Essays (557)

Grad students will complete 5 blogs, some as a group, some individually or in pairs (depending on grad enrollment). For essays $2 \mathrm{a}-4 \mathrm{~b}$, grad students can choose which essay to write (a or b).

Essay Grades: Blog essays 1-4 will be graded on a 1-5 scale on two dimensions:
Content: Ideas/Insight/Integration of Literature/Innovative/Thought-Provoking
Execution: Writing clarity/Organization/Accuracy /Formatting of Cites
Assignments will be posted on Blackboard; see BB for grading rubric and writing tips.
Blog 0 will receive feedback but no grade: the first group project is always a bit stressful, so the focus for this first blog is on developing a sensible group process.

3c. Comments (All): After the blog essays are published, every student is responsible for reading all the essays. For the first two essays ( 0 and 1), all students are responsible for making at least one substantive comment on one of the other essays by Noon Monday.

For subsequent essays (which alternate between ODD and EVEN groups, 2a-4b), students in groups that did NOT write an essay that week are responsible for making at least one substantive comment by Noon Monday.

Comments should advance the conversation about the case being discussed. Specific connections back to the readings, thoughtful questions, and critical/constructive/specific feedback are all helpful. Vague comments with no specifics are less useful and will get half credit. Comments must be posted by the deadline to count.

## 4. Make observation notes (raw material for reflective essay or case)

Pick a group or two you are in or interact with and take notes on your observations and insights about during the term. Your observations will serve as raw material for either the Reflective Essay (457) or the Group Dynamics Case (557). Your notes are private - no need to turn in.

## 4a. Reflective Essay (457)

For the 2-3 page reflective essay (500-750 words), connect your observations of one or more groups to class readings. Either (1) focus on one group and examine 2-3 different aspects, or (2) pick a particular topic (e.g., conflict or leadership) and compare and contrast 2-3 groups. Cite specific readings: (Wheelan, 2009). See schedule for when to submit partial draft on Blackboard (different deadlines for Odd and Even group members). Both the partial draft and the final essay must be submitted when due to receive full credit. You will have some time in class to trade and peer review close-to-final drafts.

## 4b. Group Dynamics Case (GRADS only, 557)

Pick either a single group with that has an identifiable challenge or problem, or two groups that provide a useful contrast. These may be groups you belong to, groups you are observing directly, or other groups about which substantial documentation is available. Write a 5-7 page case analysis modeled after one of the cases assigned for class. Make connections to class readings and other relevant literature. Partial draft due on Blackboard Week 5; Final version due Week 6 (see schedule for dates/times). Both the draft and final case must be submitted when due to receive full credit. NOTE: Two extra HBS readings provide tips for case writing.

5a. Take Home Final (457). The final will consist of several short answers and essay questions. It will be open book, open notes, but you must complete it yourself. Completed finals must be submitted on Blackboard by the time/day of our final exam time. Early submission is welcome. ESL students may consult a tutor for writing assistance. *No other assistance* is permitted.

5b. Literature Review Paper (GRADS only, 557). Choose a substantive question about group dynamics and complete a literature review of relevant research. The paper should include a minimum of 20 sources, of which at least 10 are peer-reviewed articles published in 2000 or later. A 7-10 page double-spaced review essay should provide a critical summary of what these sources tell us about the question, what issues remain unresolved, and what you think is the most important direction for future research to take. The full paper (counting title page, reference list, etc.) should be 2500-3500 words. Partial draft due Week 9; Final version due Mon Finals week.

Grading

| UNDERGRADS | GRADS | \% | Course grades based on \% of 100 earned |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Participation | Participation | 20 | A | 93-100 | C | 73-76.9 |
| Reflective essay | Case analysis | 20 | A- | 90-92.9 | C- | 70-72.9 |
| Group blogs (1-4) | Blog essays (1-4) | 20 | B+ | 87-89.9 | D+ | 67-69.9 |
| Comments | Comments | 10 | B | 83-86.9 | D | 63-66.9 |
| Take home final | Lit review paper | 30 | B- | 80-82.9 | D- | 60-62.9 |
|  |  |  | C+ | 77-79.9 | N | $<70$ |
| TOTAL |  | 100 |  |  | P | 70 or higher |

For Psychology department grading standards, see http://psychology.uoregon.edu/courses/department-grading-standards/

## Special Needs

If you have a documented disability or are on a UO sports team and will miss class because of travel, have the relevant office (Acessible Education Center or Athletic Department) contact me regarding the appropriate accommodations. NOTE: if your schedule requires regular absences, you should not take this class. Non-native English speakers are encouraged to consult with writing coaches for assistance. Holly and Erik can also give you extra feedback on early drafts.

## Problem Situations

## Late Work

Points will be deducted if your Reflective Essay draft or final essay (or Case or Lit Review drafts or finals for grads) are late unless late submission is approved * in advance* by Holly due to some unusual circumstance. Blog comments made after the deadline will not count, and group blog essays *MUST* be submitted on time; otherwise you will mess up the schedule for the rest of the class.

## Alternative Arrangements not related to Disability, ESL, or UO Sports

If you have some kind of special circumstance and need an adjustment, this may well be possible with advance notice. Unexpected requests at the last minute (or after the fact) are much less likely to get a positive response.

## Academic Dishonesty

All work submitted must be your own (or your group's for group assignments) and produced exclusively for this course, unless you receive explicit permission to use the work for more than one course. Getting feedback on drafts from group members, friends, Holly, or Erik is encouraged and completely acceptable. Non-native English speakers are encouraged to consult with ALS or an English coach to improve their writing. However, you must *not* have others do the writing for you.

The use of sources must be properly acknowledged and documented (when in doubt, cite!). If I suspect academic dishonesty (cheating, plagiarism) I will contact you directly and if this does not clear up any suspicion I will also report this to the Student Conduct Committee. My preferred sanction is failing the course; the Student Conduct Committee may decide on additional actions. If you are unclear about what constitutes academic dishonesty, see http://www.uoregon.edu/~conduct/sai.htm for more information.
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