

MNGT 7970 Doctoral Seminar in Management - Advanced Organizational Behavior

Dr. Kevin Mossholder

Office: 412 Lowder Building, 844-6529

Office Hours: 2:00-5:00 pm Wednesday, or by appointment

E-mail: kmossh@auburn.edu

Time and Location: Thursday 2-4:30, Lowder 402

Grading system: Class deliverables and participation - 50%; Major paper - 50%

A 100 - 90; B 89 - 80; C 79 - 70; D 69 - 60; F 59 - 0

Class deliverables include topic and discussion leader roles, written literature critiques, participation in class discussion, and oral presentations.

Objectives:

1. To further your understanding of theory and research of organizational behavior (OB).
2. To develop a knowledge framework in OB that will contribute to your skill as an organizational scientist.
3. To develop skills in critically reading and evaluating scholarly works.
4. To develop communication skills important for professional endeavors.

Readings: Required articles are taken from various journals; most are available in full text pdf-format from available electronic resources.

Structure: This course offers an introduction to established and emerging trends, theory, and research within organizational behavior domain. Traditionally, scholars have taken an individual level focus in examining organizational behavior. However, contemporary perspectives have widened this lens to offer a more complete and thorough understanding of the role of individuals in organizational life and the effects of context on these relationships. In particular, current perspectives seek to explore and understand the behaviors, thoughts and emotions of individuals within the context of work relationships, teams, and organizational settings. Although still focusing on the individual, the scholars have acknowledged that individuals are nested within relationships and groups which also affect individual attitudes and behaviors. Accordingly, this seminar will highlight interconnections, exchanges, and relations among individuals, and outcomes that transpire as a result.

It is generally helpful for students to have taken graduate courses in statistics and research methodology. Also, as the second in a two part organizational behavior series, it presumes a working knowledge of dispositional (e.g., personality), cognitive (e.g., sensemaking), and attitudinal (e.g., job satisfaction) research within the domain. However, depending on one's background, participation in the first course in the series is not absolutely necessary.

As with any doctoral seminar, you need to attend class regularly, read the articles, and be prepared to discuss the articles in class. Readings should be well digested prior to class so that seminar participants are capable of freely discussing them without constantly referring to them.

Participation reflects not only your own ideas and insights, but also the degree to which you listen and offer insights on other students' comments and ideas.

COOPERATIVE LEARNING

To master the OB literature, you must conceptually integrate the assigned readings. To facilitate this, a variety of *cooperative learning* techniques will be employed over the course of the semester. Cooperative learning involves the instructional use of peer presentations, dyadic interactions, and small group activities so that students can work together to enhance their own and each other's learning. The specific techniques to be employed in this seminar are summarized below.

Class processes. Because this is a doctoral seminar, a substantial part of the learning occurs as part of a lively class discussion. To have a good and productive discussion, it's essential that you read and give substantial thought to the assigned articles and come to class with some key points you intend to make. That is, you should come to class prepared to pose questions, debate, defend, integrate, propose, apply, etc. Valuable contributions are: (a) relevant, (b) unique, and (c) advance the discussion. This is a better approach than simply highlighting and underlining material.

My role is to serve as a discussion catalyst or facilitator. I may provide brief overviews of topic areas to provide antecedent perspective or contextual background, and pose questions to augment those offered by topic and article experts. You will take turns playing two critical roles designed to enhance the cooperative learning experience: (a) topic expert, and (b) article expert. There are two purposes for these assignments: (a) to enhance your skill at organizing and presenting academic information to a group of your peers; and (b) to allow you to explore in depth a topic that interests you.

Topic expert. As topic expert, you will have an opportunity to lead the class discussion on topics we will cover (see the syllabus below). Although all students are responsible for reading the assigned material, the topic expert is expected to have also completed additional reading on his or her topic. Such reading may involve articles listed as suggested readings, or other material that you select. In general, your "presentation" will involve providing an overview of the topic and then leading the group through a discussion of what you consider to be the key questions, contributions, limitations, and directions for future research. Remember, *your role is to lead a discussion of the topic, not provide a lecture*. Thus, you may want to consider:

1. What are the issues, puzzles, dilemmas and conundrums raised in this set of readings?
2. What ideas did you find to be the most exciting or generative? Why? How might you use these ideas in your work?
3. In what ways do the readings in this session support, build on or contradict one another? What is the connection between the readings for this topic and others in the course?
4. Are there burning research questions that need answering? Are there methodological issues to face in answering these questions?

Topic experts may find some of the following techniques useful in facilitating interactive discussions:

Topical debates. For some topics areas (e.g., where disagreements or divisive issues exist), you could develop pro or con positions regarding the topic being discussed. Suggested readings and other sources could be used to support for their position. Debates could bring out varying positions and integrate divergent views. Alternatively, someone could play the role of devil's advocate vis-à-vis for certain perspectives within a particular topic.

Comparison tables. For some areas (e.g., leadership), students could formulate tables for comparing key theories. Such tables could be focal point of discussion.

Concept maps. Students may also generate concept maps which depict relations among focal constructs. Figures containing key concepts may be arranged to show such phenomena as lineage, nesting, branching, etc. Although conceptual maps should be based in the substance of theoretical domains, they may also include extensions and insights of their developers.

Article expert. In this role, you circulate in advance of the class one to two page abstract/critique of the article to which you have been assigned. You should also be prepared to field questions and lead a discussion of the article. The abstracts can contribute to your depth of knowledge regarding course concepts, and the empirical methods used in this area. As applicable, the abstract should include: a) article title in AOM or APA style; b) theoretical foundations, research questions or hypotheses; c) key research methods and analyses; and d) major findings and contributions. You should also include intriguing or puzzling issues, strengths and weakness of the article, ideas for future research and other points of interest.

MAJOR PAPER

Students will be required to prepare a major paper during the semester. A paper topic should be selected that is congruent with course content or related topics. It is okay if you want to pursue an OB stream not specifically addressed by the articles (e.g., creativity, culture). However, care must be taken not to select topics germane to content more appropriately covered in other courses (e.g., policy/strategy, employee compensation). The ties with OB must be clear, and all topics must be approved regarding acceptability within the framework of this course. Papers must be written explicitly for this course. Papers that are revised or modified from other courses will not be accepted.

Major papers generally fall into two categories, *review* and *research proposal*. In the review category, emphasis is placed on describing the state of research in a particular area, proposing new perspectives or structures, and generating broad research directions or propositions. This paper should be more than a description of research studies; it should synthesize trends and suggest what needs to be done in the future. It would follow after reviews found in journals like *Academy of Management Review* or *Journal of Management*. In the research proposal category, emphasis is on producing a more focused, theoretically driven proposal. The proposal would have characteristics similar to those found in journals like *Academy of Management Journal* or *Journal of Applied Psychology*. If you identify a topic for which data is available, you may

choose to produce an actual manuscript, subject to the same format constraints as the research proposal.

Regardless of the type chosen, the paper should be geared toward presentation at a suitable national or regional conference. You should prepare a one or two page summary of your paper topic, including the a) title, b) research question, substantive outline, or description of content that will be included, and c) likely presentation/publication outlet. You may have a topic in mind already. If not, you should start as soon as possible to identify and formulate a plan for the paper. You should okay the topic with me before formally working on your outline. An outline of the paper is due as specified on the syllabus, but can always be submitted earlier. You have some flexibility regarding changes to your formal outline, but check with me before making major changes. Paper outlines and papers are due as noted below. Both hard and electronic copies should be submitted along with hard and electronic copies of a two page (maximum) synopsis.

Special Accommodations: Any student needing special accommodations should contact me to discuss an “Accommodations Memo” as soon as possible. If you do not have an accommodation memo but need special accommodations, contact the Program for Students with Disabilities, 1244 Haley Center, 334-844-5943 (Voice T/O)

Academic Dishonesty: All portions of the Auburn University Honesty Code (Title XII) found in the *Tiger Cub* will apply to this class. Academic dishonesty is an offense that will be reported to the Academic Honesty Committee per the process described in the *Tiger Cub*.

Tentative Topic Schedule

| <u>Date</u> | <u>Topic Area (Topic Area Number)</u> |
|--------------------|--|
| Jan. 09 | Introduction and organizational session |
| 16 | Theory building and research in OB (1) |
| 23 | Individuals and interconnections (2) |
| 30 | Individuals and interconnections (2) |
| Feb. 06 | Social exchange and attachment (3) |
| 13 | Social exchange and attachment (3) |
| 20 | Social exchange and attachment (3) Outline for paper due |
| 27 | Justice, OCB, and deviance dynamics (4) |
| Mar. 06 | Justice, OCB, and deviance dynamics (4) |
| 10-14 | Spring Break |
| 20 | Justice, OCB, and deviance dynamics (4) |
| 27 | Influence and trust (5) |
| Apr. 03 | Influence and trust (5) |
| 10 | Influence and trust (5) |
| 17 | Group and team considerations (6) |
| 24 | Group and team considerations (6) |
| 28 | Finals week: Paper presentations (TBA); papers due day after presentations |

Topic Area 1: Theory building and research in OB**Required readings**

Bartunek, J., Rynes, S., & Ireland, D. (2006). What makes management research interesting and why does it matter? *Academy of Management Journal*, 49, 9-15.

Morrison, E. (2010). OB in AMJ: What is hot and what is not? *Academy of Management Journal*, 53, 932-936.

Rousseau, D. M. (2011). Reinforcing the micro/macro bridge: Organizational thinking and pluralistic vehicles. *Journal of Management*, 37, 429-442.

Mathieu, J. E., & Chen, G. (2011). The etiology of the multilevel paradigm in management research. *Journal of Management*, 37, 610-641.

Pierce, J. R., & Aguinis, H. (2013). The too-much-of-a-good-thing effect in management. *Journal of Management*, 39, 313-338.

Suggested readings

Hambrick, D. C. (2007). The field of management's devotion to theory: Too much of a good thing? *Academy of Management Journal*, 50, 1346-1352.

Colquitt, J. A. & Zapata-Phelan, C. P. (2007). Trends in theory building and theory testing: A five-decade study of the Academy of Management Journal. *Academy of Management Journal*, 50, 1281-1303.

Ashford, S. J. (2013). Having scholarly impact: The art of hitting academic home runs. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 12, 623-633.

Topic Area 2: Individuals and interconnections

Required readings

Jackson, S. E., & Joshi, A. (2011). Work team diversity. In S. Zedeck, (Ed.), *APA handbook of industrial and organizational psychology: Vol. 1. Building and developing the organization* (pp. 651-686). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Richards, D. A., & Schat A. C. H. (2011). Attachment at (not to) work: Applying attachment theory to explain individual behavior in organizations. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 96*, 169-182.

Chiaburu, D. S., & Harrison, D. A. (2008). Do peers make the place? Conceptual synthesis and meta-analysis of coworker effects on perceptions, attitudes, OCBs, and performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 93*, 1082-1103.

Zagenczyk, T. J., Scott, K. D., Gibney, R., Murrell, A. J., & Thatcher, J. B. (2010). Social influence and perceived organizational support: A social networks analysis. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 111*, 127-138.

Dierdorff, E. C., Rubin, R. S., & Bachrach, D. G. (2012). Role expectations as antecedents of citizenship and the moderating effects of work context. *Journal of Management, 38*, 573-598.

Lind, E. A., & van den Bos, K. (2013). Freeing organizational behavior from inhibitory constraints. *Research in Organizational Behavior, 33*, 79-95.

Ng, T. W. H., & Feldman, D. C. (2010). The effects of organizational embeddedness on development of social capital and human capital. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 95*, 696-712.

Mueller, J. S. (2012). Why individuals in larger teams perform worse. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 117*, 111-124.

Suggested readings

Kilduff, M., & Brass, D. J. (2010). Organizational social network research: Core ideas and key debates. *Academy of Management Annals, 4*, 317- 357.

Bell, S. T., Villado, A. J., Lukasik, M. A., Belau, L., & Briggs, A. L. (2011). Getting specific about demographic diversity variable and team performance relationships: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Management, 37*, 709-743.

Topic Area 3: Social exchange and attachment

Required readings

Cropanzano, R., & Mitchell, M. S. (2005). Social exchange theory: An interdisciplinary review. *Journal of Management*, *31*, 874-900.

Ferris, G. R., Liden, R. C., Munyon, T. P., Summers, J. K., Basik, K. J., & Buckley, M. R. (2009). Relationships at work: Toward a multidimensional conceptualization of dyadic work relationships. *Journal of Management*, *35*, 1379-1403.

Vidyardhi, P. R., Liden, R. C., Anand, S., Erdogan, B., & Ghosh, S. (2010). Where do I stand? Examining the effects of leader-member exchange social comparison on employee work behaviors. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *95*, 849-861

Shoss, M. K., Eisenberger, R., Restubog, S. L. D., & Zagenczyk, T. J. 2013. Blaming the organization for abusive supervision: The roles of perceived organizational support and supervisor's organizational embodiment. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *98*, 158-168.

Dulac, T., Coyle-Shapiro, J. A-M., Henderson, D. J., & Wayne, S. J. (2008). Not all responses to breach are the same: The interconnection of social exchange and psychological contract processes in organizations. *Academy of Management Journal*, *51*, 1079-1098.

Anand, S., Vidyardhi, P. R., Liden, R. C., & Rousseau, D. M. (2010). Good citizens in poor-quality relationships: Idiosyncratic deals as a substitute for relationship quality. *Academy of Management Journal*, *53*, 970-988.

Zapata, C. P., Olsen, J. E., & Martins, L. L. (2013). Social exchange from the supervisor's perspective: Employee trustworthiness as a predictor of interpersonal and informational justice. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, *121*, 1-12.

Treadway, D. C., Breland, J. W., Williams, L. M., Cho, J., Yang, J., & Ferris, G. R. (2013). Social influence and interpersonal power in organizations: Roles of performance in two studies. *Journal of Management*, *39*, 1529-1553.

Holtom, B. C., Mitchell, T. R., Lee, T. W., & Eberly, M. B. (2008). Turnover and retention research: A glance at the past, a closer review of the present, and a venture into the future. *Academy of Management Annals*, *2*, 231-274.

Allen, D. G., & Shanock, L. R. (2013). Perceived organizational support and embeddedness as key mechanisms connecting socialization tactics to commitment and turnover among new employees. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, *34*, 350-369.

Ramesh, A., & Gelfand, M. J. (2010). Will they stay or will they go? The role of job embeddedness in predicting turnover in individualistic and collectivistic cultures. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *95*, 807-823.

Felps, W., Mitchell, T. R., Hekman, D. R., Lee, T. W., Holtom, B. C., & Harman, W. S. (2009). Turnover contagion: How coworkers' job embeddedness and job search behaviors influence quitting. *Academy of Management Journal*, 52, 545-561.

Suggested readings

Bauer, T. N., & Erdogan, B. (2011). Organizational socialization: The effective onboarding of new employees. In S. Zedeck, (Ed.), *APA handbook of industrial and organizational psychology: Vol. 3. Maintaining, expanding, and contracting the organization* (pp. 51-64). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Zhao, H., Wayne, S. J., Glibkowski, B. C., & Bravo, J. (2007). The impact of psychological contract breach on work-related outcomes: A meta-analysis. *Personnel Psychology*, 60, 647-680.

Topic Area 4: Justice, OCB, and deviance dynamics

Required readings

ORGANIZATIONAL JUSTICE

Colquitt, J. A., Scott, B. A., Rodell, J. B., et al. (2013). Justice at the millennium, a decade later: A meta-analytic test of social exchange and affect-based perspectives. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 98*, 199-236.

Shao, R., Rupp, D. E., Skarlicki, D. P., & Jones, K. S. (2013). Employee justice across cultures: A meta-analytic review. *Journal of Management, 39*, 263-301.

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.

Ambrose, M. L., & Schminke, M. (2009). The role of overall justice judgments in organizational justice research: A test of mediation. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 94*, 491-500.

Ambrose, M. L., Schminke, M., & Mayer, D. M. (2013). Trickle-down effects of supervisor perceptions of interactional justice: A moderated mediation approach. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 98*, 678-689.

Colquitt, J. A., LePine, J. A., Piccolo, R. F., Zapata, C. P., & Rich, B. L. (2012). Explaining the justice-performance relationship: Trust as exchange deepener or trust as uncertainty reducer? *Journal of Applied Psychology, 97*, 1-15.

Collins, B. J., Mossholder, K. W., & Taylor, S. G. (2012). Does process fairness affect job performance? It only matters if they plan to stay. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 33*, 1007-1026.

OCB and deviance

Grant, A.M., & Mayer, D. M. (2009). Good soldiers and good actors: Prosocial and impression management motives as interactive predictors of affiliative citizenship behaviors. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 94*, 900-912.

Korsgaard, M. A., Meglino, B. M., Lester, S. W., & Jeong, S. S. (2010). Paying you back or paying me forward: Understanding rewarded and unrewarded organizational citizenship behavior. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 95*, 277-290.

Bolino, M. C., Turnley, W. H., Gilstrap, J. B. & Suazo, M. M. (2010). Citizenship under pressure: What's a "good soldier" to do? *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 31*, 835-855.

Bergeron, D. M., Shipp, A. J., Rosen, B., & Furst, S. A. (2013). Organizational citizenship behavior and career outcomes: The cost of being a good citizen. *Journal of Management*, 39, 958-984.

Aquino, K., & Thau, S. (2009). Workplace victimization: Aggression from the target's perspective. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 60, 717-741.

Mawritz, M. B., Mayer, D. M., Hoobler, J. M., Wayne, S. J., & Marinova, S. V. (2012). A trickle-down model of abusive supervision. *Personnel Psychology*, 65, 325-357.

Suggested readings

Organizational justice, OCB, and deviance

Greenberg, J. (2011). Organizational justice: The dynamics of fairness in the workplace. In S. Zedeck, (Ed.), *APA handbook of industrial and organizational psychology: Vol. 3. Maintaining, expanding, and contracting the organization* (pp. 271-328). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Brockner, J., Wiesenfeld, B. M., & Diekmann, K. A. (2009). Towards a "fairer" conception of process fairness: Why, when and how more may not always be better than less. *Academy of Management Annals*, 3, 183-216.

Podsakoff, N. P., Whiting, S. W., Podsakoff, P. M., & Blume, B. D. (2009). Individual- and organizational-level consequences of organizational citizenship behaviors: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 94, 122-141.

Tepper, B. J. (2007). Abusive supervision in work organizations: Review, synthesis, and research agenda. *Journal of Management*, 33, 261-289.

Topic Area 5: Influence and trust

Influence processes

Dulebohn, J. H., Bommer, W. H., Liden, R. C., Brouer, R. L., & Ferris, G. R. (2012). A meta-analysis of antecedents and consequences of leader-member exchange: Integrating the past with an eye toward the future. *Journal of Management*, *38*, 1715-1759.

Erdogan, B., & Bauer, T. N. (2010). Differentiated leader-member exchanges: The buffering role of justice climate. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *95*, 1104-1120.

Piccolo, R. F., Bono, J. E., Heinitz, K., Rowold, J., Duehr, E., & Judge, T. A. (2012). The relative impact of complementary leader behaviors: Which matter most? *Leadership Quarterly*, *23*, 567-581.

Sauer, S. J. (2011). Taking the reins: The effects of new leader status and leadership style on team performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *96*, 574-587.

Grant, A. M., Gino, F., & Hofmann, D. A. (2011). Reversing the extraverted leadership advantage: The role of employee proactivity. *Academy of Management Journal*, *54*, 528-550.

Carmeli, A., Ben-Hador, B., Waldman, D. A., & Rupp D. E. (2009). How leaders cultivate social capital and nurture employee vigor: Implications for job performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *94*, 1553-1561.

Liden, R. C., Wayne, S. J., Liao, C., & Meuser, J. D. (in press). Servant leadership and serving culture: Influence on individual and unit performance. *Academy of Management Journal*.

Eberly, M. B., Johnson, M. D., Hernandez, M., & Avolio, B. J. (2013). An integrative process model of leadership: Examining loci, mechanisms, and event cycles. *American Psychologist*, *68*, 427-443.

Trust processes

Fulmer, C. A., & Gelfand, M. J. (2012). At what level (and in whom) we trust: Trust across multiple organizational levels. *Journal of Management*, *38*, 1167-1230.

Brower, H. H., Lester, S. W., Korsgaard, M. A., & Dineen, B. R. (2009). A closer look at trust between managers and subordinates: Understanding the effects of both trusting and being trusted on subordinate outcomes. *Journal of Management*, *35*, 327-347.

Schaubroeck, J., Lam, S. S. K., & Peng, A. C. (2011). Cognition-based and affect-based trust as mediators of leader behavior influences on team performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *96*, 863-871.

Lau, D. C., Lam, L. W., & Wen, S. S. (2014). Examining the effects of feeling trusted by supervisors in the workplace: A self-evaluative perspective. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 35*, 112-127.

Suggested readings

INFLUENCE PROCESSES

Avolio, B. J., Walumbwa, F. O., & Weber, T. J. (2009). Leadership: Current theories, research, and future directions. *Annual Review of Psychology, 60*, 421-449.

Barling, J., Christie, A., & Hopton, C. (2011). Leadership. In S. Zedeck, (Ed.), *APA handbook of industrial and organizational psychology: Vol. 1. Building and developing the organization* (pp. 183-240). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

van Knippenberg, D., & Sitkin, S. B. (2013). A critical assessment of charismatic-transformational leadership research: Back to the drawing board? *Academy of Management Annals, 7*, 1-60.

TRUST

Lewicki, R. J., Tomlinson, E., C., & Gillespie, N. (2006). Models of interpersonal trust development: Theoretical approaches, empirical evidence, and future directions. *Journal of Management, 32*, 991-1022.

Kramer, R. M., & Lewicki, R. J. (2010). Repairing and enhancing trust: Approaches to reducing organizational trust deficits. *Academy of Management Annals, 4*, 245-277.

Holtz, B. C. (2013). Trust primacy: A model of the reciprocal relations between trust and perceived justice. *Journal of Management, 39*, 1891-1923.

Topic Area 6: Group and team considerations

Required readings

Mathieu, J. M., Maynard, T., Rapp, T., & Gilson, L. (2008). Team effectiveness 1997-2007: A review of recent advancements and a glimpse into the future. *Journal of Management*, *34*, 410-476.

LePine, J. A., Piccolo, R. F., Jackson, C. L., Mathieu, J. E., & Saul, J. R. (2008). A meta-analysis of teamwork processes: Tests of a multidimensional model and relationships with team effectiveness criteria. *Personnel Psychology*, *61*, 273-307.

Hu, J. & Liden, R. C. (2011). Antecedents of team potency and team effectiveness: An examination of goal and process clarity and servant leadership. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *96*, 851-862.

Kleingeld, A., van Mierlo, H., & Arends, L. (2011). The effect of goal setting on group performance: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *96*, 1289-1304.

Nielsen, T. M., Bachrach, D. G., Sundstrom, E. & Halfhill, T. R. (2012). Utility of OCB: Organizational citizenship behavior and group performance in a resource allocation framework. *Journal of Management*, *38*, 668-694.

de Jong, B. & Elfring, T. (2010). How does trust affect the performance of ongoing teams? The mediating role of reflexivity, monitoring, and effort. *Academy of Management Journal*, *53*, 535-549.

Barnes, C. M., Hollenbeck, J. R., Jundt, D. K., DeRue, S., & Harmon, S. J. (2011). Mixing individual incentives and group incentives: Best of both worlds or social dilemma? *Journal of Management*, *37*, 1611-1635.

Troth, A. C., Jordan, P. J., Lawrence, S. A., & Tse, H. H. M. (2012). A multilevel model of emotional skills, communication performance, and task performance in teams. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, *33*, 700-722.

Suggested readings

Cannon-Bowers, J. A., & Bowers, C. (2011). Team development and functioning. In S. Zedeck, (Ed.), *APA handbook of industrial and organizational psychology: Vol. 1. Building and developing the organization* (pp. 597-650). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.