**Case 2.1: Choosing a New Director of Research**

**Case synopsis and analysis**

Sandra Coke must select a new director of research. Three different candidates with varying leadership traits are being considered for the position. Candidate one is persistent and insightful; candidate two is extraordinarily intelligent and sociable; and candidate three has high levels of integrity. All three candidates seem to have adequate experience.

The case study provides interesting opportunities for discussion of trait theory. Students will debate which candidate has the best traits to lead simply because of their own internal biases about necessary leadership traits. In addition, without knowing more about the director of research position, it is difficult to determine the best traits for the job. For that reason, the case offers an opportunity to not only apply trait theory, but also understand its shortcomings.

**Learning objectives:**

* Students should be able to decipher the leading traits for three different groups of job candidates under trait theory.
* Students should gain a better understanding of the weaknesses of trait theory.

**Answers to questions in the text:**

1. Based on the information provided about the trait approach in Tables 2.1 and 2.2, if you were Sandra, whom would you select?

It is very difficult to select a candidate without more information about the director of research position and each individual candidate. Alexa Smith seems to have high levels of determination, persistence, and responsibility. Kelsey Motts has high levels of sociability, intelligence, and social intelligence. Thomas Santiago has high levels of integrity and is a strong problem solver. Seemingly, all three would have some level of intelligence, self-confidence, and determination since each completed successful projects in the past and seems well liked by their peers.

Some students will argue that persistence is crucial for success, and Alexa should be chosen for that reason. Others will claim that Kelsey surely has persistence as well but should be hired because she is already seen as a leader and has high levels of sociability and intelligence, two of the top five most common traits of leaders. A few may state that integrity is fundamental for a research job and argue for the selection of Thomas. Based on the limited information and solely applying trait theory, Kelsey or Alexa seems to be a better selection.

1. In what ways is the trait approach helpful in this type of selection?

Trait theory allows us to identify the key traits that make each candidate unique. Through application of the theory, we are able to accurately define Kelsey, Alexa, and Thomas’s differing traits and decide who is best for a particular job.

1. In what ways are the weaknesses of the trait approach highlighted in this case?

Trait approach has limited utility because it offers an almost endless list of traits and fails to adequately prioritize those traits. In this case, we can imagine that all three of the candidates likely possess a number of the traits listed in Tables 2.1 and 2.2. However, it is difficult to determine which trait is most important in a given scenario.

Through discussion, students should be able to see that sociability may be important for the director of research position if the role requires considerable collaboration. However, if that role is rather isolated, it may call for a leader with integrity and persistence over one who has high levels of sociability.

**Potential teaching approaches:**

This case study is conducive to group discussions and exercises.

Below is a way to structure a class, based on trait theory and case study 2.1:

* Begin the class in small groups, with students developing a list of the top 5 (or 10) major traits they believe are important for a strong leader. Students should prepare this list without reference to the book, based on their experiences.
* Large-group discussion of the top 5 (or 10) lists, followed by a lecture on Trait Theory.
* Students then read case 2.1 and make a list of the major traits of each candidate (again, in small groups). Students should discuss the traits in these groups for a couple of minutes.
* Professor discusses the questions from the case study. Large-group discussion should center on the limitations of the theory in this case.
* Finally, the professor may choose to conduct an in-class exercise below.

Exercises for this case study:

* In small groups, students will write a job description for the director of research role. Each group is assigned a candidate (Alexa, Kelsey, or Thomas). They are to write a job description that would lead to the selection of their candidate. Students should be careful to write a description that not only lists traits but also describes work that requires the traits of their candidate to shine through over and above the other traits.
* In small groups, students can write 10 interview questions aimed at helping them discover other leadership traits of the candidates. If time permits, students can role-play interviews (below).
* Students role-play interviews with each of the candidates. Here, students are assigned a role: Two students can be Sandra Coke and her assistant, with the others acting as each of the candidates. Coke and her assistant develop questions for the candidates and conduct 5-minute interviews in order to determine each one’s leadership traits and suitability for the job. Students then report their findings to the wider class and discuss the hires.