Instructor's Manual

Leadership in Organizations

8th Edition

Gary Yukl

State University of Albany at New York

Preface

This manual is designed to facilitate learning and assessment of leadership theories, concepts, research findings, and practices in the seventh edition of *Leadership in Organizations.* The manual is organized by type of activity and book chapter.

The first section of the manual contains general guidelines for using the short cases found at the end of most chapters in the book. In the Table of Contents for the manual, the relevant chapter for each case is noted in parentheses. The cases facilitate learning and make the material more interesting for students. For each specific case there are notes about the answers to the case questions. The cases can be used for class activities, written assignments, or exams. Because the amount of time required for a case depends on how it is used, no recommended times were provided for the cases.

The manual also contains experiential exercises that can be used to help students learn skills that are important for effective leadership. Some of the exercises involve activities that can be used in the classroom, and other exercises involve activities more suitable for use outside the classroom. Role plays are a special type of classroom activity, and they are in a separate part of the section on exercises. Because of limited space, it was not possible to include exercises for each chapter in the book. Other relevant exercises and role plays can be found in skills books and experiential learning books on management and organizational behavior.

The next section of the manual contains a test bank with multiple choice items on each chapter. The items measure specific knowledge of leadership concepts, theories, research findings, and effective behaviors. General guidelines are provided for using the item bank.

I welcome feedback from professors who use the manual. Let me know what worked well, what problems were discovered, and what improvements are needed. If you discover other cases, exercises, or videos that are especially relevant and effective for teaching leadership skills, please let me know about them also. I can be contacted by email (G.yukl@albany.edu).

Contents

Cases

Outside Exercises

Classroom Exercises

Role Play Exercises

Case Notes

General Guidelines for Using the Cases

The cases provide concrete examples of the abstract concepts and principles discussed in the book. Most of the cases ask students to identify examples of appropriate and inappropriate behavior by the manager described in the case. Students may be asked to recommend what the manager should have done differently or what the manager should do next.

For the more complex cases, it is usually best to have students analyze the case alone as homework and come to class prepared to discuss it. The shorter, less complex cases can be read and analyzed right in class, but the analysis is usually better when it is done as homework prior to class. After a case is analyzed individually by students, there are a number of options for discussing it.

One option is to discuss the case with the entire class. Of course, the larger the class, the less opportunity each member has for participation in the discussion. A second option is to form small groups to discuss the case separately and report back to the class on their findings and recommendations. This option is most suitable for a small class. A third option is to select one team of students that will analyze the case prior to the class and present their analysis during class. The remaining students are asked to read the case individually and critique the analysis made by the presenting team. A different team gets a turn to present each week. This approach is more appropriate for a larger class.

The following guidelines will facilitate learning from the cases. Some of the guidelines assume the use of small groups to discuss a case following individual analysis of it.

- When assigning cases to students, explain the purpose of the case and how it will be used. Tell students what type of analysis they are expected to prepare for class.

- The focus of the initial analysis should be to understand the leadership dilemmas in the case and what the case says about effective leadership, not to find solutions for specific problems. In making this analysis, students should try to use the concepts and theories discussed in the chapter. After a broader understanding is achieved, it is easier to determine what problems exist (if any), how they could have been avoided, and what the manager should do next to deal with them.

- Emphasize the complexity of leadership situations and the tradeoffs faced by managers in making choices. Encourage students to consider different interpretations of the case rather than quickly focusing on a single, narrow interpretation. Encourage students to look for multiple causes of problems, rather than a simple explanation.

Students should try to understand why people acted the way they did in the case, rather than stereotyping them or looking for someone to blame for problems. Most of the cases depict managers with both strengths and weaknesses who are trying to do their job in a way they think is appropriate.

- Just as there are seldom simple explanations for leadership problems, there are seldom guaranteed remedies. In cases describing a manager who was generally successful, ask students to consider what the manager could do to be even more successful, or if there are some completely different approaches that may also be effective in that situation. In cases describing a manager who has gotten into trouble, ask students to consider whether the person has some strengths rather than focusing only on weaknesses.

- Encourage students to be open to alternative viewpoints when discussing the cases. Remind them that the group discussion will be more successful if one or two people do not try to dominate it and impose their ideas on the group. This guideline about being open minded also applies to the instructor. Different interpretations of a case provide an opportunity to demonstrate how people approach a problem with different assumptions, biases, and priorities.

- Vary the membership of small discussion groups over the semester so that students are exposed to different points of view.

- Encourage students to relate the case to their own experiences. For example, ask students to describe examples of similar incidents they have experienced in current or previous jobs or in other organizations in which they were members.

Acme Manufacturing Company

In this case students analyze the activities of a manager to identify effective and ineffective behavior. The analysis gives students an opportunity to identify weaknesses in time management and to propose remedies. The problems involve several managerial functions, including delegation, planning, and monitoring.

1. What specific things did Steve do wrong and what should have been done?

- Steve is late for work because he overslept. He should have been more careful to set a backup alarm or to have someone wake him up.

- Steve wastes time socializing with George Summers when he is already late. He should have greeted him and passed on quickly without inviting a lengthy discussion about home remodeling.

- Steve forgot the staff meeting with his boss at 9:30. He should have written it in his calendar and looked at the calendar before work.

- Steve has a disorderly office and could not find important memos and work orders. He should maintain a better system of files and records.

- Steve delegated the rush order to a production supervisor (Lucy Adams) but did not monitor progress. Since he doesn't know what is happening with the rush order, he is not able to deal with any problems with it. He needs to have a system for monitoring progress on the tasks for which he is responsible, even when they are delegated to a subordinate.

- Steve does not know where Lucy Adams is and has no easy way to contact her. He should have subordinate managers inform him (or his secretary) when they are leaving the work site, and they should carry a pager or cellular phone.

- Steve went to an important meeting unprepared. As a result, he failed to impress his boss and peers. Steve should review the agenda and background materials for important meetings and be prepared to make a meaningful contribution.

- Steve did not know about the appointment with Mr. Ferris. Steve, or his secretary, should put appointments like this one on his calendar.

- The meeting with Mr. Ferris was not productive because he needed to talk to an engineer. Steve should try to determine why someone wants to meet with him before scheduling the meeting. Two hours were wasted on a meeting that could have been avoided or completed quickly. If Steve had a good reason to talk to Mr. Ferris, the meeting could have been held in the company cafeteria.

- Steve concentrated on completing a production report that was less urgent than preparing quality figures for his boss. He should make a list of necessary activities with their priorities, and plan his time accordingly. If he were better organized, it is likely that Steve would seldom have to take work home.

- Steve spent more than an hour assembling the quality data for his boss. The task was urgent, but the time-consuming job of assembling the data was not difficult and should have been delegated to his assistant manager, or perhaps even to his secretary. Steve only needed to spend a few minutes to check the completed work and make sure it was done correctly before giving it to his boss.

- Steve wasted an hour attending a safety meeting that was not important when he had other things to do that was much more important. Unlike the earlier staff meeting, he was not required to attend the safety meeting and could have delegated this task to a subordinate qualified to handle it.

- Steve never did talk to Lucy about the rush order or get back to the Sales Vice President as he promised, thereby leaving a poor impression with a highly-placed executive. He should have had his secretary (or his assistant) arrange a meeting with Lucy as soon as she returned to the plant.

2. What should Steve do to become more effective as a manager?

Steve does not manage his time well. He is disorganized and messy, he does not plan his daily activities, he wastes time on activities that are not important, he forgets appointments and meetings, he does not delegate effectively, he does not monitor important activities for which he is responsible, he does not prepare for important meetings, and he fails to deliver on promises to important people. Steve needs to follow the principles of time management:

- Make a list of short and long-term objectives.

- Make a daily "to-do list" of activities relevant to the objectives, with priorities and deadlines. Use the to-do list and a calendar to plan and schedule relevant and required activities for each day.

- Delegate to qualified subordinates activities that are not critical, or that are important but require more time than he has available.

- Develop an information system to monitor projects and delegated activities.

- Use the secretary to screen calls and visitors effectively.

- Organize files, records, and desktop so important documents can be found easily.

Consolidated Products

The purpose of this case is to provide students with an opportunity to use the behavior concepts presented in Chapter 3. One basis for comparing the two successive plant managers is in terms of task-oriented and relations-oriented leadership. However these two broad categories are not sufficient for understanding what behavior is needed to be an effective plant manager in this company. Students also need to use more specific behavior categories to understand the limitations of each manager. Successive chapters in the book provide additional insights about this case that may not be evident after reading Chapter 3, and you may want to refer back to the case at later points in the course.

1. Describe and compare the managerial behavior of Ben and Phil. Describe each manager's use of specific task and relations behaviors. How much does each manager use participative or inspirational leadership?

Ben was very concerned about employees, and his concern was reflected in efforts to protect employee jobs and make the work environment more pleasant. He socialized with employees, was supportive, and maintained an extensive network of personal friendships with employees. However, Ben had a relatively weak concern for productivity and product quality. He was satisfied to maintain the same level of production, and he did not set high performance objectives and quality standards. Ben used supporting and some aspects of team building, but did little to develop employee skills and confidence. He did not use much planning, clarifying, and monitoring. Ben delegated the responsibility for supervising plant workers entirely to his first-line supervisors, but provided little guidance about what he expected. The case did not describe any active use of consultation by Ben.

In contrast to Ben, Phil used a significant amount of task-oriented behavior, (e.g., clarifying, monitoring, and operational planning). Phil set high performance standards, pressured people to achieve them, and checked closely on their performance. However, Phil had little concern for employees and did not hesitate to make decisions that cut costs at the expense of employee benefits and jobs. Phil was low on relations-oriented behaviors such as supporting, developing, and team building. He was very directive and autocratic in making decisions and used little consultation or delegation.

2. Compare the two managers in terms of their influence on employee attitudes, short-term performance, and long-term plant performance.

Under Ben's relationship-oriented leadership, employees were satisfied with the company, as evidenced by the very low turnover in his plant. However, employees were not highly motivated and did not perform up to their capacity. Ben's plant had the second worst performance of the company's five plants.

Phil's lack of concern for employees was reflected in growing dissatisfaction and increased turnover among the supervisors and machine operators. Phil had a very short-term perspective on plant performance, which resulted in cutting expenses for development of human resources and maintenance of machines. He is the type of manager who makes a good initial impression based on the short-term indicators of financial performance, such as quarterly costs and production levels. However, the longer-term effectiveness of the work unit will suffer, due to the decline in human and material resources. Unfortunately, by the time the delayed, adverse effects of Phil's actions become evident, he is likely be promoted and off to another position, leaving the mess for his successor to face.

3. If you were the manager of this plant, what would you do to achieve both high employee satisfaction and high performance?

A better balance of task and relationship behavior is needed. The plant manager should be supportive toward employees but also exhibit task-oriented behaviors such as setting challenging objectives and monitoring performance to ensure progress is being made toward achieving these objectives. It is better to delegate responsibility to supervisors (as Ben did) than to make all important decisions in an autocratic manner (as Phil did), but delegation without clear objectives and standards is ineffective. There was no evidence that either manager recognized and rewardedeffective performance, developed subordinate skills, consulted with subordinates, and inspired a strong sense of commitment to task objectives. Finally, investment in the development of human resources and maintenance of physical resources affects long-term performance and should not be sacrificed for temporary gains in short-term performance.

Air Force Supply Squadron

Like the preceding case, this one gives students an opportunity to use the behavior concepts presented in Chapter 3. The case provides an example of an effective military leader who uses a variety of different managerial behaviors to improve a weak organizational unit.

1. What effective leadership behaviors did Colonel Novak exhibit?

Evidence of several managerial behaviors can be found in this case:

- Motivating and inspiring. In his initial meeting with the men in his squadron Colonel Novak made a speech in which he talked about the importance of the mission to the war effort and the importance of each man's job. He also set an example of dedication by pitching in to help with manual work to load supplies desperately needed at the front lines.

- Supporting: Colonel Novak showed a personal interest in his men. He visited the men on and off duty, learned their names, learned something about their backgrounds, listened to their complaints, and tried to deal with their concerns about poor living conditions on the base.

- Clarifying and informing: Colonel Novak assigned responsibilities to each officer, delegated authority clearly to reduce confusion and avoid duplication of orders. The frequent staff meetings were a way to ensure that officers were better informed about the operations of the squadron and about decisions, plans, and responsibilities.

- Planning and organizing: Colonel Novak reorganized the squadron to place people where the best use could be made of their skills and experience.

- Monitoring: Colonel Novak held frequent meetings with his officers to find out about the operations of the squadron, he met with the enlisted men to find out about their concerns and complaints, and he flew along with the airplane crews to learn how the supply operations were being conducted.

- Consulting and delegating: Colonel Novak met with his officers to discuss the methods used to carry out the mission of the squadron. He delegated more authority to the non-commissioned officers to direct and supervise their men and supported most of their decisions.

- Conflict management: Colonel Novak used staff meetings to discuss disagreements among the officers and resolve them, and he assigned key responsibilities when all concerned were present to avoid any misunderstandings about who was responsible for what.

- In this brief case description there was little or no direct evidence that Novak used rewarding, recognizing, developing, or external networking. However, it is quite possible that he used some or all of these managerial behaviors to supplement the behaviors described in the case.

2. What does this case illustrate about effective leadership?

Effective leaders use a variety of managerial behaviors that reflect a dual concern for task objectives and interpersonal relationships. Colonel Novak was clearly concerned about accomplishing the mission of his squadron, as evidenced by his efforts to reorganize it, clarify roles and responsibilities, and find better ways to do the work. However, Novak also knew that it would not be possible to do accomplish their mission without improving morale, helping the men to manage the stress, reducing interpersonal conflict, and getting the men to work together as a team.

3. Compare the leadership behavior in this case with the leadership behavior in the preceding case.

The prior case described two leaders who lacked a balanced concern for task and relationships. Each leader emphasized one concern too much, and neither leader did much to inspire and empower subordinates. In contrast, the leader in this case had a more balanced approach, and his pattern of behavior was appropriate for the situation. In addition to appropriate task and relations behaviors, the leader inspired commitment and confidence, and he empowered subordinate leaders to carry out their own responsibilities effectively.

Ultimate Office Products

This purpose of this case is to help students understand effective leadership of change in an organization. The case describes a manager whose initial efforts to introduce change fail, but whose subsequent efforts are successful. Students are asked to explain these outcomes by identifying effective or ineffective behaviors and facilitating or constraining conditions.

1. Why did Richard fail in his first attempt to implement change?

The case does not provide much detail about the reasons for failure, but several strong possibilities can be identified.

- Richard failed to make a systematic diagnosis of the reason for the problem. His perception of the nature of the problem was biased by his functional background, and he too quickly assumed that the cause of the problem was obsolete technology. He did not understand the need for concurrent changes in operating procedures and better cooperation among the functional departments.

- People tend to resist new technology unless it is perceived to be relevant, beneficial, easy to use, and not a threat to their self esteem, values, or job security. Richard did not determine whose support was necessary to implement the change and then plan how to get the support. He could not get the functional managers to agree on the requirements of the new system, which was necessary to start operations.

- The new work stations represent a top-down change initiated without any participation by the key people who must implement it. The functional managers, over whom he had no direct authority, disagreed about the reason for the problems and blamed each other. They did not view the new technology as an adequate solution.

- Richard did not have much legitimate or expert power with the functional managers. He got the CEO's approval to purchase new computer workstations and software, but he did not have much visible support from the CEO for implementing the change.

2. Identify subsequent actions by Richard that were effective for implementing change in the organization.

After the failure of his initial efforts to implement change, Richard essentially started over again and did things the way he should have done them the first time. Most of the effective actions were the opposite of the ineffective actions just described. It is not clear how he knew what to do, perhaps the consultant mentioned in the case advised him, or perhaps he read a book on change leadership.

- Richard and his staff assistants conducted a workflow analysis to identify reasons for delays in processing orders. This analysis provided important insights into the reasons for the problem and the scope of the necessary changes, but it did not provide solutions.

- Then he formed cross-functional task forces to re-engineer the work procedures and identify the requirements for the new information system. He used several task forces in order to get more people involved in the change process. The task forces were encouraged to meet with key customers to learn about their needs and to visit other companies to learn how they processed orders more effectively. Participation on the task forces helped people understand the need for change and begin to take a systems view of the work.

- He formed a steering committee composed of himself and the functional managers to guide and coordinate the change process. He asked the CEO to attend these meetings to emphasize their importance and help to resolve disagreements among the functional managers.

- He secured the services of an outside consultant to advise the task forces in their work and help them understand the technical aspects of the needs analysis and the re-engineering process.

3. Evaluate the change leadership provided by the CEO.

The case does not include much information about the CEO, but this person does not appear to be doing much to create a sense of urgency about the need for change. New competitors and the changing needs of customers pose a threat to the older companies such as this one, and there is a need for more flexibility and proactive planning. The CEO apparently created the new position occupied by Richard, but more needs to be done to help the organization adapt to its environment. At first the CEO did not much provide direct support to Richard, although eventually this support is forthcoming. The changes in technology and work processes introduced by Richard are important, but they may not be enough to keep this company competitive. The efforts of the task forces to learn more about customer needs provide some information that would be useful for making a competitive analysis. However, more needs to be done to identify market trends, competitor actions, and the firm’s strengths, weaknesses, and core competencies. The CEO should ideally be leading these efforts.

Echo Electronics

The purpose of this case is to provide a better understanding of the potential benefits of participative leadership. Students are asked to read a case describing a decision for which an autocratic decision was unsuccessful. The mistakes made by the manager in this case demonstrate the importance of consultation in making decisions that have important implications both for subordinates and the organization.

1. What actions could Paul have taken to prevent the problem?

Use of participative leadership may have prevented this problem. Consultation with employees about major changes is useful for discovering potential resistance to the change, gaining commitment to it, and getting suggestions on ways to implement the change more effectively. A major change in the work such as introduction of new equipment can have a very disruptive effect on people. The new workstations may be perceived by the workers either as an improvement or as a threat. The workstations offer a number of advantages, such as making the work more interesting, raising the skill level of employees, and providing an opportunity to increase productivity and product quality, thereby making the company more competitive and protecting the jobs of workers. Conversely, the workers may perceive the new equipment as a threat to their job security, because fewer workers will be needed if productivity is increased. Moreover, workers who are not computer literate may be anxious about learning new skills and worried that their experience and technical skills will become obsolete in a computerized environment.

A major change of this type should be introduced carefully to avoid negative reactions. The potential benefits for the company and the workers should have been explained before the changes were made, and the supervisors and workers should have been invited to participate in meetings to plan how to implement the changes effectively. Employees should have been encouraged to express any concerns and doubts about the feasibility of the proposed changes. The opportunity to discuss changes and influence them reduces anxiety and helps to avoid false rumors. Whenever possible, Paul should have modified the planned changes to deal with employee concerns and utilize good suggestions, thereby giving the employees (and the supervisors) a sense of ownership of the changes.

Some other actions to ensure that the new workstations would be viewed as a positive change would help create trust and reduce anxiety. Paul should have tried to persuade top management to guarantee that no jobs would be lost as a result of the change. He should have looked for ways the workers could benefit from the changes, for example, by earning more after learning the new skills needed to operate the workstations. Paul should have made sure adequate training was provided to help the workers learn how to operate the new machines effectively.

2. What steps should Paul take now to deal with the problem?

The first step is to determine the cause of the problem. It is not clear why productivity and quality decreased. Paul’s four supervisors disagree about the cause, and there is insufficient evidence to support their opinions.

There is no obvious deficiency in the equipment, but more investigation is needed to completely rule out this possibility. Paul needs more information about the timing, scope, and intensity of the problem. He should determine whether productivity and quality has declined for all of the workers, or only for some workers, departments, or shifts. If the company has good records, data for the period prior to the introduction of workstations should be examined to see if the pattern was one of stable, increasing, or decreasing productivity and quality. Paul also needs to check with his contacts in other companies to determine whether they experienced a decline in productivity and quality the first few months after the workstations were introduced (it may be a natural part of the learning curve). Finally, Paul should consider the possibility that the problems are jointly caused by the workstations and some other condition unique to the company.

There is some evidence to suggest that the problem is due at least in part to worker resistance. Worker morale has declined, and two employees quit because they were upset about changes that were suddenly implemented. These reactions suggest that the new workstations may be viewed as a threat rather than a benefit, but Paul needs more information to confirm this diagnosis. He should set up meetings with groups of workers to discuss the problem and try to learn how the workers feel about the new work stations. If the workers trust Paul and share his objectives of improving productivity and quality, he can invite them to participate in finding ways to make the new workstations successful as a means improving quality and productivity.

Paul may find that the problem has multiple causes, each requiring a different type of solution. Changes may be required in compensation, job design, work rules, job security, or training procedures. For example, if the workers were not properly trained to operate the new equipment, then new training should be developed quickly. If the workstations are incompatible with existing production procedures, than some re-engineering may be needed. If the workers are afraid that the new machines threaten their job security, then the company needs to provide assurances that no jobs will be lost as a result of increased productivity. If the workers feel inequity, a pay increase may be appropriate to compensate them for learning the new skills needed to operate the work stations. Paul needs to persuade the CEO to approve any necessary changes. The fact that the CEO approved the initial plan for the change and shares part of the responsibility for its deficiencies may make it easier to get approval for the necessary changes.

Alvis Corporation

The purpose of this case is to provide students with a better understanding of the potential pitfalls of participative leadership. Students are asked to read this case describing two decisions for which a participative approach was unsuccessful. The mistakes made by the manager in this case demonstrate the importance of leader skill in making difficult decisions involving inherent conflicts of interest.

1. Were the two decisions suitable ones for a group decision procedure?

In the decision about production standards, decision quality is clearly important, because low standards cost the company more in incentive pay. Acceptance is also important, because the incentive system will not be effective if workers believe that the management is trying to exploit them. If workers become frustrated and angry with the way the incentives were handled, the quality of work will probably decline even further. The leader is expected by top management to reduce labor costs, but workers will resist any cuts in their incentive pay. Kathy has the information necessary to make a decision that would protect company profits, but an autocratic decision to raise production standards is unlikely to be accepted by employees. The most appropriate procedure for this type of decision is probably consultation. Kathy used a group decision, which risks decision quality, because worker objectives are not congruent with the organization's objectives.

In the vacation decision, decision quality is moderately important. The workers are not interchangeable in terms of their job skills, and different ways of setting up the vacation schedule have different implications for department performance. Decision acceptance is also important, since some workers feel strongly about taking their vacation at a particular time. Kathy lacks some of the information needed to make the decision, such as subordinate preferences about vacation times. If this information was available, she could probably make a high quality decision by herself. Finally, the subordinates may not share the leader's objectives to maintain high department performance. Thus, the most appropriate procedure for this type of decision is consultation. Kathy used a group decision, which risks decision quality if the workers may decide on a schedule that leaves some essential jobs without adequate coverage.

It is better to consult with individuals separately than to consult with the entire group together, which may aggravate the conflict. Kathy could start by asking each worker to indicate preferred weeks on a calendar or form, then determine if there is a schedule that would provide adequate job coverage and still satisfy everyone. If no simple solution is evident, Kathy could meet with workers who want the same vacation period to look for a solution. If no solution is found, Kathy could continue to use productivity as the criterion for deciding among people who want the same vacation period, or she could resort to a chance procedure such as flipping a coin or having people draw numbers to determine the order of choice for vacation periods.

2. **What mistakes were made in using participation, and what could have been done to avoid the difficulties the manager encountered?**

As noted earlier, a group decision is not the recommended procedure for making either of these decisions. Even if it had been a good procedure for this situation, Kathy made major mistakes in using it. She should have stayed with the group to serve as its discussion leader and facilitator. For the vacation decision she should have made it clear to the group that the options are limited to schedules that provide coverage for all essential tasks. To make an informed decision about production standards, Kathy should have introduced the issues in a way that would encourage and facilitate constructive problem solving.

Kathy's decision about production standards illustrates the importance of proper timing in use of decision procedures. The standards should have been adjusted before the new equipment was installed. It would have been easier to reach a satisfactory agreement before the workers became accustomed to receiving so much extra incentive pay. Even if information about productivity gains was insufficient to determine exactly what the standards should be beforehand, some tentative arrangements should have been made so that workers would clearly expect the standards to be corrected at a later time after some experience with the new equipment.

3. **Were these decisions appropriate ones for introducing participation into the department?**

The two decisions are a poor choice for introducing participative management into Kathy's department. It is best to begin with an issue that does not involve inherent conflicts among employees, or between employees and management. The incentive pay decision involves an inherent conflict between the workers and management over division of the benefits from higher productivity; the workers want a share of the benefits, but management wants to use all the benefits to pay for the new equipment. The vacation schedule decision involves a conflict among various individuals who want to take their vacations during the same time interval but disagree about the appropriate criteria for deciding the issue.

An example of a more suitable issue for introducing participation is product quality. Improving quality is an objective that can be embraced by all members of the organization, especially when quality and customer service are strong values in the organization culture. Participation by the workers in developing work procedures that improve both quality and efficiency would increase the amount of benefits to be divided between workers and management, thereby making it easier to find a mutually acceptable solution. For this approach to work, however, Kathy must also gain the cooperation of top management.

National Products

The purpose of this case is to develop a better understanding of the implications of different motive patterns for managerial effectiveness. Students are required to identify the dominant motive of three department managers and evaluate their likely effectiveness if selected for a general manager position. The case can be used in different ways, but I generally use it in the following way.

First ask each individual to do the analysis alone, either in class or as homework. Divide the class into small groups, and ask each group to reach consensus in about 15 minutes. When the groups have finished their discussion, ask the group leaders to post their results simultaneously. My experience is that most groups will be able to identify the dominant motive correctly. Discuss any discrepancies and then ask how many people identified dominant motives for all three managers correctly by themselves before the group discussion; the number is likely to be much lower.

1. What are the dominant motives for each candidate?

- For Charley Adam the dominant need is <u>affiliation</u>.

- For Bill Stuart the dominant need is <u>achievement</u>, and he also has a strong need for independence.

- For Ray Johnson the dominant need is <u>personalized power</u>, and he also has a strong need for esteem.

2. What are the implications of these traits for the success of each candidate if selected for the general manager position?

Most of the research on managerial motivation suggests that effective managers in large organizations are likely to have a socialized power motive (high need for power combined with emotional maturity), a moderately high need for achievement, and a relatively lower need for affiliation. None of the managers described in this case has the optimal motive pattern for a general manager in a large organization.

- Charley Adams would tend to emphasize harmonious relationships too much in relation to task objectives; he would avoid making controversial decisions that would put a strain on friendships (e.g., asking subordinates to do extra work or make sacrifices necessary to achieve high performance).

- Bill Stuart would tend to take too much personal responsibility for accomplishing the important and challenging tasks of the group and would not delegate enough or spend enough time developing subordinates.

- Ray Johnson would be domineering and insensitive with subordinates and would probably fail to develop cooperation, trust, and teamwork with them or with peers.

3. Should Susan recommend one of these candidates for the position or look for other candidates?

Susan should look for external candidates (or find other, better-qualified internal candidates). As noted earlier, none of the three current candidates has the motive pattern usually associated with effectiveness as a middle manager in a large organization. It is also important for a general manager to have some knowledge and appreciation of different functional areas in the organization. There is little evidence that the three department managers have much expertise outside of their area of functional specialization. Susan should also consider implementing a better management development system for the company to increase the number of internal managers who are qualified for promotion.

Foreign Auto Shop

This two-part case gives students an opportunity to develop greater understanding of the importance of flexible leadership in rapidly changing situations. Part 1 describes a normal situation, and Part 2 describes an unusual crisis situation. Students analyze each situation and determine what pattern of managerial behavior is appropriate. Part 1 should be completed before going on to Part 2. The case illustrates how effective leaders adapt their behavior to the changing requirements of the situation, while continuing to show concern both for task objectives and interpersonal relationships. The case also demonstrates that an effective leader need not be a "heroic figure" who knows everything and solves all the organization's problems without any assistance.

Part 1

1. **What is the usual leadership situation in the auto repair shop (consider the nature of the task, subordinates, and environment)?**

The repair tasks are mostly self-contained, and little coordination is needed between mechanics. Thus, little planning is needed except to determine the work schedule, assignments, and necessary supplies. Except for diagnosis and troubleshooting, most of the repair work is highly structured (there is a best way to do it). However, the tasks require considerable skill, and auto mechanics need to acquire new technical knowledge periodically to keep up with changes in car design and technology. Most of the mechanics in Alan's shop are highly skilled in their work and have considerable experience. The three least experienced mechanics are assigned easier tasks appropriate for their skill level. Although they receive more guidance than the others, even they do not need much supervision. None of the mechanics is younger than twenty-three. They are all highly motivated and interested in their work. Diagnosing problems in cars and repairing them is a challenging, self-contained task with moderate variety, and high feedback about results from the task itself and from customers. Thus, except for some routine tasks such as mounting tires and changing the oil, most of the work is intrinsically motivating and satisfying for the workers.

2. **Describe Alan’s typical leadership style and evaluate whether it is appropriate for the leadership situation.**

Alan's behavior is appropriate for the situation. He usually consults with subordinates in making decisions that affect them. He does not spend much time directing them or checking on their work. He makes assignments and provides coaching in a relaxed manner. He does not rely much on the authority stemming from his position as owner and manager of the business. Working alongside of the mechanics, he is viewed by them as “one of the crew” rather than as “the boss.”