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**Critical Incident Overview**

Mike Gibson’s second chance as a team manager seemed doomed. Reassigned to lead the bottling and packaging line in a food production facility, members of his team falsified quality reports and were reprimanded. After the disciplinary incident, the team retaliated and gave Gibson an extremely low rating on an upward feedback appraisal. Although a graduate of a corporate management program and currently an MBA student, he seemed unable to apply the lessons of the classroom to his own work. The handwriting was on the wall—Gibson’s career was on the line.

This is a descriptive Critical Incident. The CI could be used in upper-level undergraduate and MBA courses in Organizational Behavior, Intercultural Communication, and Human Resources Management. An assigned pre-reading for the CI might be Drucker (1992), which explains different types of teams within the context of common U.S. sports; and Latham (2001), which explains the importance of empathy in understanding self and others. If the Myers-Briggs Temperament Inventory (MBTI) is not available, the no-cost Keirsey Temperament Sorter and online information at [www.keirsey.com](http://www.keirsey.com) may be beneficial.

**Learning Objectives**

1. Assess the implications of using metaphor in the workplace and apply the structured use of metaphor to a difficult managerial and team problem by deconstructing traditional sports analogies used in U.S. business in order to identify the existing team structure and its appropriateness to the situation.
2. Evaluate managerial dilemmas associated with doing the right thing when disciplinary action is needed.
3. Develop an action plan for improving team performance.
4. Analyze key components needed to effectively assess and mentor managerial performance when the mentee is not outgoing by nature.

**Research Methods**

This critical incident was based on information developed by one of the authors who experienced the situation described. The names of the individuals, the company, and its location have been disguised to preserve anonymity.

**Questions**

1. What are some challenges and advantages of using culture-specific metaphors? How can Gibson better understand the U.S. sports metaphors used in his work environment? What are the challenges of using culture specific metaphors? Using appropriate U.S. sports metaphors, what kind of team was Gibson leading and what are the implications of the existing team structure to current team performance? Please use Drucker’s analysis of business teams or Keidell’s (1987) theoretical framework.(Learning Objective 1)
2. Would you have gone to HR when you discovered the deception on your team? Are there alternatives? (Learning Objective 2)
3. There is evidence of team dysfunction. What are the problems and what should be done? Please use Wageman’s (1997) and Latham’s (2009) work to formulate your analysis. (Learning Objective 3)
4. If you were Gibson’s boss at Athenian, what would you tell him and why? Please be sure to incorporate ideas from Keirsey (1998) and Kellerman (2012) in your response. (Learning Objective 4)

Note: The appendix contains reproducible handouts and blank worksheets for class use.

A: Use for Question 1: Class handout on teaching from sports analogies

B: Use for Question 3: Blank form for use with Wageman’s (1997) factors

C: Use for Question 3: Blank empathy box for use with Latham’s (2001) model

D: Use for Question 4: Class handout on Kiersey’s (1998) temperament types

**Answers to Questions**

1. What are some challenges and advantages of using culture-specific metaphors? How can Gibson better understand the U.S. sports metaphors used in his work environment? Using appropriate U.S. sports metaphors, what kind of team was Gibson leading and what are the implications of the existing team structure to current team performance? Please use Drucker’s analysis of business teams or Keidell’s (1987) theoretical framework.

One of the main benefits of post-secondary business education is learning to talk like a credible business person (Grey, 2009). As the diversity of the student population increases, explicitly teaching language used in mainstream U.S. business becomes more important. Additionally, capturing the imaginations of students poses a perennial challenge. Analogy and metaphor are traditional tools that can help students move to higher levels of creative thinking when examining complex business problems. Sports analogies and metaphors are common in traditional U.S. business, although they may be divisive and exclusionary (Heim, 1995), not especially meaningful to those who are not sports fans (e.g., women who seek quilting bees as collaborative outlets or software engineers who consider online multi-player role playing games as preferred team activities), or puzzling to those who are not deeply familiar with this aspect of U.S. culture (e.g., those for whom passion surrounds soccer, hockey, or other national pastimes). For these excluded populations, it is especially useful to help them understand the *language* of sport as part of the rite of passage into the existing power structures of business, much as learning the other code words in business (e.g., earned value, cash flow). In scaffolding student understanding of the teaching tool (all students) and possibly to U.S. sport (excluded students), consider using two older sources, Keidell (1987) and Drucker (1992), to provide structure, detail, and instruction. Keidell provides a well-constructed model that clarifies vocabulary used in sports analogies in business.

Keidell’s (1987) article, because of its theoretical nature, may move those who find sports analogies inherently irrelevant, discriminatory, or distasteful to a level of acceptance that permits them to participate in the assignment and possibly to better assimilate in the workplace. Keidell’s article may neither be appropriate for the undergraduate classroom nor easily fit into the graduate required reading sequence; therefore, we present a simplified version in Table TN-1 that can be provided to create common understanding among students, thus obviating potential exclusionary practices in the classroom. Students can compare the attributes in the table with the conditions they find in the CI.

Table TN-1

*Sports Teams and their Attributes*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Sports Teams | | |
| Team Attributes | Baseball | Football | Basketball |
| Nature of Interdependence | Pooled–there is relatively little interaction among teammates | Sequential – there is a moderate amount of interdependence among team players | Reciprocal – highest level of interdependence |
| Information flow | Top-down and bottom- up | Top-down | Top-down, bottom-up, and lateral |
| Dominant Value | Self-reliance | Loyalty | Cooperation |
| Recruitment process | Select self-starters | Select dutiful soldiers | Select ready collaborators |
| Reward System | Contingent upon individual performance | Contingent upon both individual and team performance | Based on team performance |
| Management focus | Determining the lineup | Preparing the game plan | Manager needs to help team members learn how to coordinate themselves |
| Central challenge | Amassing strong individual talent and playing those individuals in the right sequence | Manager must establish a hierarchy within the team that is responsible for seeing that the game plan is accurately executed, and delegate authority to the team member at the top of the hierarchy | Manager’s role as one of integrator, who fosters a sense of shared responsibility among teammates |

*Note:* From “Team Sports Models as a Generic Organizational Framework,” by R. W. Keidell (1987), *Human Relations, 40*(9), pp. 591-612. Copyright 1987 by SAGE Publications. Adapted with permission.

Students should easily determine that Gibson’s team is most akin to a baseball team. They should note that the flow of information is top down and bottom up; the dominant value is self-reliance. Recruitment is geared to self-starters, rewards are contingent on individual performance. One of the manager’s most important tasks is determining the line up (who works in each position on the bottling line). The central challenge is assembling and assigning them to the right sequence in the production process.

Next, students can assess the appropriateness of the baseball-type team structure to the situation provided in the CI. Students at all levels will find Drucker’s (1992) article easy to understand. Drucker notes that managers often fail because of confusion about what type of team they need. He makes the useful distinction between three types of teams: baseball-type teams, football-type teams, and tennis-doubles type teams. Drucker references the struggles of the 1980s auto industry that provide rich opportunities for discussion within the context of the 2009 auto industry bailouts and bankruptcies as well as changing ideas about work.

Hill (1994) discusses the sports team analogy elucidated by Drucker (1992).

Drucker (1992) compares the baseball-type team to both the surgical team that performs open-heart surgery or the Henry Ford assembly line. He notes that on both such teams, “players play *on* the team”; they “do not play *as* a team” (Drucker, 1992, p. 16). They each have fixed positions that they rarely leave. The second baseman never pitches; the surgical nurse never does the anesthesiologist’s job. Drucker notes that some of the advantages of such teams are that individual members can clearly be held accountable for their performance and trained and developed to the fullest extent of their individual potential. Since the interdependency among members is relatively low, members have to make few adjustments to each other. Each position can be staffed with a “star, no matter how temperamental, jealous, or limelight-hogging each of them might be” (Drucker, 1992, p. 16).

Drucker (1992) compared the football team to a symphony orchestra, to an emergency room staff trying to save the life of a heart attack patient, and contemporary Japanese automakers’ design teams in which the design, manufacturing, and marketing people work in parallel. Like members of a baseball team, these members have fixed positions. As Drucker (1992) puts it, “the oboe never comes to the aid of the violas, however badly they flounder” (p. 16). However, on these teams, players do play *as* a team. There is a common score of music which must be followed. If there are stars on the team, they are featured only if the score calls for a solo. Otherwise, teammates must subordinate themselves to the team.

Finally, there is the tennis-doubles team, which Drucker (1992) compares to an instrumental jazz ensemble or self-managed manufacturing team. On these teams, the players have a primary rather than a fixed position. As Drucker (1992) observes, in this kind of team, “only the team performs; individual members contribute” (p. 16). Team members cover for their teammates, adjusting as necessary to their teammates talents and weaknesses and the changing demands of the game. (Hill, 1994, pp. 5-6)

From this analysis, students should determine that Gibson appears to have assembled a team with no apparent inconsistencies according to the baseball model proposed by both Drucker (1992) and Keidell (1987), but that the baseball team might not be the optimal structure for the situation and that a team structure with more interdependence might work better. Katz (2001) provides an important contribution on both the strengths and liabilities of using sports teams as metaphors for work teams.

1. Would you have gone to HR when you discovered the deception on your team? Are there alternatives?

Gibson does not have a lot of options about going to HR; he is ethically bound to do so. HR then decides the consequences and specifies subsequent actions. Despite Gibson’s warning about the importance on not signing off on false reports, some members of the team have deliberately disobeyed this important, company-wide directive. He needs to tell HR; however, Gibson might have chosen to discuss the issues with his team first so the members understood what was about to happen. He should have informed them of the imperative to tell HR. He would also be well advised to attempt to find out from them why his directive was deliberately ignored by a few team members. At this point, he could reiterate that he has no leeway in dealing with this serious digression from companywide policy. Gibson might have sought assistance about dealing with his team from his boss, peers or even experienced managers outside of his company. He might have posed this very question in one of his MBA classes to get real-time insight into the situation. He has leeway in the *process* that he takes in telling HR and top management (that is the way he goes about talking with his team) but the *content* is restricted (what he does) in that he must tell HR and his boss.

Students not familiar with traditional manufacturing or quality processes might need help developing personal connection to the managerial dilemma in the CI. This provides an opportunity to discuss a common concern (food safety) within the CI in order to expand the conversation to include the more complex idea of the systemic issues that might be causing problems. For example, it is not clear that the technicians see the relevance of the quality standards to food safety. Rather, they seem to view their jobs as having minimal impact on the wider community. If the people-friendly atmosphere at Athenian that allowed quality issues to be overlooked by Gibson’s predecessor obscures this understanding of technicians, then Gibson’s task is made doubly difficult. Gibson’s background in biology might give him understanding into the connections between food safety and bottling practices. He might share these insights with the team to help them find more relevance in the quality practices they must implement.

1. There is evidence of team dysfunction. What are the problems and what should be done? Please use Wageman’s (1997) and Latham’s (2009) work to formulate your analysis.

Some members of Gibson’s team falsified production reports concerning quality and the team has given Gibson the lowest score of the VOA (Voice of the Associate) of any received by production managers at Athenian. His team has indicated that they don’t trust him, rarely receive recognition, and are afraid of making mistakes. Gibson hasn’t taken time to clarify his specific expectations for his team, so he needs to remedy that deficiency. Wageman’s (1997) work with Xerox managers identified a set of key success factors related to high performance teams. She developed a set of critical questions for managers to answer about their team as a way of developing a team performance improvement plan.

Table TN-2 provides a set of diagnostic questions for team leaders who wish to improve team performance. By answering these questions, students should develop an action plan for Gibson for improving his team’s performance.

Table TN-2

*Critical Team Success Factors Answering Wageman’s (1997) Diagnostic Questions*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Diagnostic Questions | Gibson’s Team |
| **Clear direction**  Can team members articulate a clear direction, shared by its members, of the basic purpose that the team exists to achieve? | Not presently. It would be useful for Gibson to work with his team to develop a team charter (Clawson, 2012) to provide direction and guidance. |
| **A real team task**  Is the team assigned collective responsibility for the team’s customers and major outputs?  Is the team required to make collective decisions about work strategies (rather than leaving it to individuals)?  Are members cross-trained, able to help each other?  Does the team get team-level data and feedback about its performance  Is the team required to meet frequently, and does it do so? | Yes  Yes  Yes  Yes  Not as far as we know |
| **Team rewards**  Counting all dollars available, are more than 80% available to teams only and not to individuals? | No team rewards |
| **Basic material resources**  Does the team have its own meeting space?  Can the team easily get basic materials needed for the work? | ?  Yes |
| Authority to manage the work  Does the team have the authority to decide the following (without receiving special authorization)?  How to meet client demands?  What actions to take and when?  Whether to change their work strategies when they deem necessary? | ? |
| **Team goals**  Can the team articulate specific team goals?  Do these goals stretch their performance?  Have they specified a time by which they intend to accomplish these goals? | No  No  No |
| **Strategy norms**  Do team members encourage each other to detect problems without the leader’s intervention?  Do members openly discuss differences in what members have to contribute to the team?  Do members encourage experimentation with new ways of operating?  Does the team actively seek to learn from other teams? | No  No  No  No |

*Note:* From “Critical Success Factors for Creating Superb Self-managing Teams,” by R. Wageman, 1997, *Organizational Dynamics, 26*(1), p. 62. Copyright 1997 by Elsevier. Adapted with permission.

Responding to these questions will provide the basis for an action plan for Gibson to enhance his team’s effectiveness. Clawson (2012) argues that a team charter makes a significant difference in providing *clear direction* and focus to a team. An organization charter consists of the following elements: Mission – what is the purpose of the team; vision – what is it that the team aspires to be; values – how does the team propose/intend to treat each other at work while working as a team. This process is facilitated by the development of team norms during a team development session. The next component is determining which strategy the team intends to pursue to achieve its vision. Inherent in the strategy component is a clarification and specification of the team’s short term operating goals (STOGS).

The *real team task* component can be bolstered by providing the team with cross-training and scheduled meeting times for conducting After Action Reviews—AARs (Baird, 1999)—at the chronological midpoint of the team’s work (Gresnick, 1989). Athenian might consider providing teams with both an individual and team reward to enhance the feeling of “teamness” (identity) and to provide more significant motivation than just individual rewards (Latham, 2009). The team can develop further through job enrichment, which would provide a greater sense of being in charge of their work through increased autonomy, variety, feedback, recognition, and responsibility (Latham, 2009). Assigning specific hard team goals (both quantity and quality) is one of the most effective techniques for enhancing motivation given that the team has sufficient ability and goal commitment (Locke & Latham, 2002). Encouraging learning goals for the team through which teams are encouraged to learn, experiment, and even make mistakes is a powerful way to enhance norms for continual learning.

Gibson might want to work with individual team members on a ten step process to change their behavior from Latham (2009, pp. 135-137).

1. “Explain the behavior that you have observed or that has been reported to you” (p. 135). Gibson has observed deliberate falsification of quality date by three members on his team. In addition, the team has told him they don’t trust him, have given him the lowest VOA ratings, and receive very little recognition from him.
2. “Explain why a change in behavior is necessary” (p. 135). Is it critical for improving teamwork, meeting a deadline, or implementing strategy? In Gibson’s case, change is necessary for improved teamwork and implementing the organization’s strategy. Once the team sees that Gibson is sincere in wanting to serve as coach, trust is likely to develop.
3. “Ask your team members individually for an explanation of their behavior (or as a team)” (p. 135).
4. “Focus on one behavioral issue at a time so as not to get sidetracked by employee rebuttal/arguments” (p. 135).
5. “Ask your employees for solutions on how to change the behavior. Once the employee offers a response, this is the beginning of employee engagement” (p. 136). We also touch on this point later when we discuss the *empathy box* in the next question. If the employee does not see that the behavior identified is a problem or how the situation can be resolved, go to step 6.
6. “Offer your own solutions” (p. 136). Gibson might invite employees to approach him as a coach or team consultant whose reason for being is to help his team to succeed by providing all necessary information, resources, and support, while removing organizational and situational obstacles.
7. “Once you’ve agreed on a solution or solutions, summarize the commitment you hear from the employee” (p. 136). Gibson might say, “so at least once a day we will touch base on questions, concerns, or issues we might have.”
8. “Set up a follow-up meeting. This signals to the employee that there is a goal to attain that requires both commitment and accountability” (p. 136).
9. “Document the coaching conversation if it does not go well” (p. 137).
10. “Praise your employees’ changed behavior. By simply saying thank you or “I appreciate your hard work” you are providing recognition that your employees asked for and you are offering it when behavior change (goal attainment) is observed” (p. 137).

Latham (2009) cautions, “It is important to be realistic and not expect behavior change to occur from one conversation. Real change requires ongoing coaching” (p. 135).

An immediate explicit approach to take to improve team performance is to focus on team member outcome expectancies. According to Latham (2009, 102):

* “If you understand the outcomes people expect, you will *understand* their behavior” (p. 102);
* “If you change the outcomes people expect, you will *change* their behavior” (p. 102).

Latham (2001) recommends the use of the *empathy box* as a tool to understand and change your employees’ outcome expectancies. The idea behind this powerful concept is that you can determine what your employees’ outcome expectancies are for a given situation that you’d like to change. The best way to find out is to collect strictly confidential and anonymous data. Then by further probing and examining the response data, you can determine what management intervention is necessary to alter employee outcome expectations.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Empathy Box Analysis | | | | | | | |
|  | Before Managerial Action | | |  |  | After Managerial Action | |
|  | Goal: Honest Behavior | | |  |  | Goal: Honest Behavior | |
|  | Positive expected outcomes | | Negative expected outcomes |  |  | Positive expected outcomes | Negative expected outcomes |
| Goal commitment | Nothing  1 | Nothing  2 | | Managerial action analysis: What needs to change to get employees to commit to honest behavior? | Goal commitment | Praise and recognition  1 | Nothing  2 |
| Goal rejection | Challenging authority; getting away with taking a shortcut  3 | Internal team discipline  4 | | One response: Provide more recognition and praise for jobs well done; clear consequences for dishonest behavior | Goal rejection | Nothing  3 | Clear disciplinary action; rejection by peers on team  4 |
|  |  | |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | | Expected Outcome Questions | | | |  |
|  | What positive outcomes do you expect from being honest? | | | | | | |
|  | What negative outcomes do you expect from being honest? | | | | | | |
|  | What positive outcomes do you expect from falsifying data? | | | | | | |
|  | What negative outcomes do you expect from falsifying data? | | | | | | |

*Figure TN-1*. Empathy box analysis of CI modeled on Latham (2001).

*Note:* Modeled after the empathy box analytic concept from “The Importance of Understanding and Changing Employee Outcome Expectancies for Gaining Commitment to an Organizational Goal,” by G. P. Latham, 2001, *Personnel Psychology*, *54*(3), 707-717.

In our example we can see that if Gibson provides recognition and praise for a job well done on a regular basis as well as making it crystal clear what the repercussions are for falsifying quality data, he can alter the response dynamic of the situation in a much more favorable direction. It would be useful here to work through the cells of the empathy matrix with students to generate potential outcome expectancies under different scenarios to let them experience the power of this tool.

1. If you were Gibson’s boss at Athenian, what would you tell him and why? Please be sure to incorporate ideas from Keirsey (1998) and Kellerman (2012) in your response.

Throughout the past century, the normative expectation of corporate success has increasingly favored the extroverted and charismatic, which is unfortunate, since a significant portion of the population is introverted and reserved (Kellerman, 2010). Introverted persons become successful leaders throughout society (Keirsey, 1998; Kellerman, 2012); however, their education and training may not be well served by the current trend toward excessive group activities. Those who are profoundly introverted, yet have successfully traversed the corporate managerial ladder, may see their younger selves in Gibson’s situation. Having spent countless hours in corporate training replete with seemingly endless chatter and forced group activities, we can recall our own exhaustion while trying to survive these well-intended sessions. Extroverted teachers may not appreciate the amount of energy that introverted students must expend to simply engage in human interaction, often at the expense of learning content. For many of us introverts, the stronger lessons of leadership are found through personal introspection and one-on-one mentoring from caring persons who understand how to approach diversity of personality.

When mentoring someone not like yourself, it is helpful to understand your own frame of reference and where it can differ from others. Stephano, Gibson’s boss, would need to be mindful of such differences. Helping students understand their preferences and temperaments can be easily inserted at this juncture. If the Myers-Briggs Temperament Inventory (MBTI) is not available, the no-cost Keirsey Temperament Sorter and online information at [www.keirsey.com](http://www.keirsey.com) may be used, since most people are reliably aware of where they might fall on the introversion-extroversion continuum. The fundamental difference is that extroverts *derive* energy from group interaction whereas introverts *expend* energy in group interaction (Keirsey, 1998). It’s not a matter of friendliness: many introverts immensely enjoy people, just in smaller doses, so it’s important not to erroneously conflate reticence with shyness or inability to work in team settings.

Although the introversion-extroversion dichotomy is frequently talked about, it is much less important than temperamental differences (Keirsey, 1998). Often mentors and supervisors fall into the trap of misapplying the Golden Rule, believing that if they give others the types of advice and the support they themselves would appreciate, their mentees or subordinates will naturally benefit and appreciate the input. Unfortunately, this egocentric approach leads to confusion or resentment when the recipient’s worldview is different than that of the giver. In diversity circles, we often recommend applying the *platinum rule*—giving to others what they, themselves, would appreciate. Understanding the differing world views of persons with different temperaments from our own can help bridge differences and enhance mentoring effectiveness.

Have students take either the MBTI or Keirsey Temperament Sorter to form a good basis upon which to discuss differences based on temperament. After students review their own temperaments at [www.keirsey.com](http://www.keirsey.com) , they will be ready to discuss their own differences and similarities using the chart of temperament traits in Table TN-3, which is a handy compilation of the ideas found throughout Keirsey’s site (www.keirsey.com).

Table TN-3

*Traits of Temperament and Character*

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| *Communication* | *Concrete* | | *Abstract* | |
| Implementation  **Character** | Utilitarian  **Artisan** | Cooperative  **Guardian** | Cooperative  **Idealist** | Utilitarian  **Rational** |
| ***Language***  **Referential**  **Syntactical**  **Rhetorical** | ***Harmonic***  Indicative  Descriptive  Heterodox | ***Associative***  Imperative  Comparative  Orthodox | ***Inductive***  Interpretive  Metaphoric  Hyperbolic | ***Deductive***  Categorical  Subjunctive  Technical |
| ***Intellect***  **Directive Role**  · **Expressive**  · **Reserved**  **Informative Role**  · **Expressive**  · **Reserved** | ***Tactical***  Operator  · Promoter  · Crafter  Entertainer  · Performer  · Composer | ***Logistical***  Administrator  · Supervisor  · Inspector  Conservator  · Provider  · Protector | ***Diplomatic***  Mentor  · Teacher  · Counselor  Advocate  · Champion  · Healer | ***Strategic***  Coordinator  · Field marshal  · Mastermind  Engineer  · Inventor  · Architect |
| ***Interest***  **Education**  **Preoccupation**  **Vocation** | Artcraft  Technique  Equipment | Commerce  Morality  Materiel | Humanities  Morale  Personnel | Sciences  Technology  Systems |
| ***Orientation***  **Present**  **Future**  **Past**  **Place**  **Time** | Practical  Optimistic  Cynical  Here  Now | Dutiful  Pessimistic  Stoical  Gateways  Yesterday | Altruistic  Credulous  Mystical  Pathways  Tomorrow | Pragmatic  Skeptical  Relativistic  Intersection  Intervals |
| ***Self-image***  **Self-esteem**  **Self-respect**  **Self-confidence** | Artistic  Audacious  Adaptable | Dependable  Beneficent  Respectable | Empathetic  Benevolent  Authentic | Ingenious  Autonomous  Resolute |
| ***Value***  **Being**  **Trusting**  **Yearning**  **Seeking**  **Prizing**  **Aspiring** | Excited  Impulse  Impact  Stimulation  Generosity  Virtuoso | Concerned  Authority  Belonging  Security  Gratitude  Executive | Enthusiastic  Intuition  Romance  Identity  Recognition  Sage | Calm  Reason  Achievement  Knowledge  Deference  Wizard |
| ***Social Role***  **Mating**  **Parenting**  **Leading** | Playmate  Liberator  Negotiator | Helpmate  Socializer  Stabilizer | Soulmate  Harmonizer  Catalyst | Mindmate  Individuator  Visionary |

*Note:* From *Please Understand Me II: Temperament; Character; Intelligence* (p. 62), by D. Keirsey, 1998. Del Mar, CA: Prometheus Nemesis Book Company. Copyright 1998 by David Kiersey/ Prometheus Nemesis Book Company. Reprinted with permission.

Using Table 3 as a guide, ask students to consider the temperamental differences Gibson and his boss might have. From the CI we can surmise that Gibson may have an introverted, rational temperament—he majored in science (biology), values autonomy (loner), takes a pragmatic approach to process improvement (believes stated goals should be sufficient), is calm and resolute (mistaken for passivity), and yearns to achieve in his environment. We might also surmise that his boss has a guardian temperament, as this is a very common type for managers (Keirsey, 1998) and the CI indicates that Stephano is protective of Gibson, diligent in his assessment of the situation, and concerned that Gibson lacked the style preferred by the larger organization (yearned for belonging). Have students assume the rational-guardian dyad and identify possible areas of miscommunication and possible strategies for overcoming these differences. Remind students that Stephano has the greater responsibility here because of the power differential—Stephano is the boss.

In addition to overcoming communications differences with his subordinate, Gibson’s boss may be hampered by the corporate performance appraisal system’s inability to differentiate behavioral shortcomings. The CI indicates that Gibson’s performance appraisals have been consistently positive, although he is not on the fast track to the top levels of the organization. Without a valid performance appraisal system, a manager cannot provide reliable feedback to Gibson. Before giving any career advice, it would be useful to develop a performance appraisal system based on observable behaviors related to executing Athenian’s strategy.

Behavioral Observation Scales (BOS) are recommended as an instrument for assessing performance and coaching for high performance. Latham (2009) suggests using a scale of *almost never* to *almost always* to assess a manager’s team playing ability based on five important considerations:

1. Invites the input of team members on issues that will directly affect them before making a decision.
2. Explains to employees the rationale behind directives, decisions, and policies that may or will affect other divisions.
3. Keeps fellow managers informed of major changes in the department regarding people, policies, projects, construction, and so on.
4. Continually seeks input of fellow managers as a group on capital policy and plans rather than engaging primarily in interactions with individual managers.
5. Is open to criticism and questioning of decisions from fellow managers. (Latham, 2009, 121).

Next, it is important to collect information from various sources within the organization. Anonymous peer appraisals are among the most valid and reliable sources of information about a person’s performance. Subordinate appraisals, like Athenian’s use of the VOA, play an important part in solving the performance appraisal puzzle. Subordinate upward appraisal is shown to lead to a significant improvement in a manager’s behavior (Atwater, Roush, & Fischtal, 1995). Research has shown that managers who receive feedback that is more negative than their own self-evaluation show the greatest levels of subsequent improvement, and this improvement lasts for years (Bailey & Fletcher, 2002; Atkins & Wood, 2002). Self-appraisals are less accurate than those from other sources and tend to be more problematic in that highly competent employees underestimate their performance and less competent employees tend to overestimate. An interesting finding with self-appraisal research is that if your self-appraisal is in agreement with appraisals that you receive from others, then you are likely to be a high performer (Fletcher, 1997). The correlation indicates a good *self-awareness*, which is an excellent indicator of a manager’s ability to see the effects of her actions on the behavior of others (outcome expectancies).

Gibson’s boss ideally would triangulate data from multiple sources (peers, self, subordinates, superiors) with the caveats noted above, all centering on the use of a carefully developed BOS to ensure valid assessment of Gibson’s performance and for developing a performance improvement plan. The 10-step plan offered in response to question 3 to enhance team member performance would also be applicable to Gibson by his boss in a coaching role.

**Disclaimer**

This teaching note was prepared by the authors and is intended to be used as a basis for class discussion. The views presented here are those of the authors based on their professional judgment and do not necessarily reflect the views of the Society for Case Research. The names of individuals, the firm, and its location have been disguised to preserve anonymity. Copyright © 2013 by the Society for Case Research and the authors. No part of this work may be reproduced or used in any form or by any means without the written permission of the Society for Case Research.
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**Appendix**

The appendix contains reproducible handouts and blank worksheets for class use.

A: Use for Question 1: Class handout on teaching from sports analogies

B: Use for Question 3: Blank form for use with Wageman’s (1997) factors

C: Use for Question 3: Blank empathy box for use with Latham’s (2001) model

D: Use for Question 4: Class handout on Kiersey’s (1998) temperament types

A

*Sports Teams and their Attributes*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Sports Teams | | |
| Team Attributes | Baseball | Football | Basketball |
| Nature of Interdependence | Pooled–there is relatively little interaction among teammates | Sequential – there is a moderate amount of interdependence among team players | Reciprocal – highest level of interdependence |
| Information flow | Top-down and bottom- up | Top-down | Top-down, bottom-up, and lateral |
| Dominant Value | Self-reliance | Loyalty | Cooperation |
| Recruitment process | Select self-starters | Select dutiful soldiers | Select ready collaborators |
| Reward System | Contingent upon individual performance | Contingent upon both individual and team performance | Based on team performance |
| Management focus | Determining the lineup | Preparing the game plan | Manager needs to help team members learn how to coordinate themselves |
| Central challenge | Amassing strong individual talent and playing those individuals in the right sequence | Manager must establish a hierarchy within the team that is responsible for seeing that the game plan is accurately executed, and delegate authority to the team member at the top of the hierarchy | Manager’s role as one of integrator, who fosters a sense of shared responsibility among teammates |

*Note:* From “Team Sports Models as a Generic Organizational Framework,” by R. W. Keidell (1987), *Human Relations, 40*(9), pp. 591-612. Copyright 1987 by SAGE Publications. Adapted with permission.

B

*Critical Team Success Factors Answering Wageman’s (1997) Diagnostic Questions*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Diagnostic Questions | Gibson’s Team |
| **Clear direction**  Can team members articulate a clear direction, shared by its members, of the basic purpose that the team exists to achieve? |  |
| **A real team task**  Is the team assigned collective responsibility for the team’s customers and major outputs?  Is the team required to make collective decisions about work strategies (rather than leaving it to individuals)?  Are members cross-trained, able to help each other?  Does the team get team-level data and feedback about its performance  Is the team required to meet frequently, and does it do so? |  |
| **Team rewards**  Counting all dollars available, are more than 80% available to teams only and not to individuals? |  |
| **Basic material resources**  Does the team have its own meeting space?  Can the team easily get basic materials needed for the work? |  |
| Authority to manage the work  Does the team have the authority to decide the following (without receiving special authorization)?  How to meet client demands?  What actions to take and when?  Whether to change their work strategies when they deem necessary? |  |
| **Team goals**  Can the team articulate specific team goals?  Do these goals stretch their performance?  Have they specified a time by which they intend to accomplish these goals? |  |
| **Strategy norms**  Do team members encourage each other to detect problems without the leader’s intervention?  Do members openly discuss differences in what members have to contribute to the team?  Do members encourage experimentation with new ways of operating?  Does the team actively seek to learn from other teams? |  |

*Note:* From “Critical Success Factors for Creating Superb Self-managing Teams,” by R. Wageman, 1997, *Organizational Dynamics, 26*(1), p. 62. Copyright 1997 by Elsevier. Adapted with permission.

C

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Empathy Box Analysis | | | | | | | |
|  | Before Managerial Action | | |  |  | After Managerial Action | |
|  | Goal: Honest Behavior | | |  |  | Goal: Honest Behavior | |
|  | Positive expected outcomes | | Negative expected outcomes |  |  | Positive expected outcomes | Negative expected outcomes |
| Goal commitment |  |  | | Managerial action analysis: What needs to change to get employees to commit to honest behavior? | Goal commitment |  |  |
| Goal rejection |  |  | | One response: Provide more recognition and praise for jobs well done; clear consequences for dishonest behavior | Goal rejection |  |  |
|  |  | |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | | Expected Outcome Questions | | | |  |
|  | What positive outcomes do you expect from being honest? | | | | | | |
|  | What negative outcomes do you expect from being honest? | | | | | | |
|  | What positive outcomes do you expect from falsifying data? | | | | | | |
|  | What negative outcomes do you expect from falsifying data? | | | | | | |

*Note:* Modeled after the empathy box analytic concept from “The Importance of Understanding and Changing Employee Outcome Expectancies for Gaining Commitment to an Organizational Goal,” by G. P. Latham, 2001, *Personnel Psychology*, *54*(3), 707-717.

D

*Traits of Temperament and Character*

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| *Communication* | *Concrete* | | *Abstract* | |
| Implementation  **Character** | Utilitarian  **Artisan** | Cooperative  **Guardian** | Cooperative  **Idealist** | Utilitarian  **Rational** |
| ***Language***  **Referential**  **Syntactical**  **Rhetorical** | ***Harmonic***  Indicative  Descriptive  Heterodox | ***Associative***  Imperative  Comparative  Orthodox | ***Inductive***  Interpretive  Metaphoric  Hyperbolic | ***Deductive***  Categorical  Subjunctive  Technical |
| ***Intellect***  **Directive Role**  · **Expressive**  · **Reserved**  **Informative Role**  · **Expressive**  · **Reserved** | ***Tactical***  Operator  · Promoter  · Crafter  Entertainer  · Performer  · Composer | ***Logistical***  Administrator  · Supervisor  · Inspector  Conservator  · Provider  · Protector | ***Diplomatic***  Mentor  · Teacher  · Counselor  Advocate  · Champion  · Healer | ***Strategic***  Coordinator  · Field marshal  · Mastermind  Engineer  · Inventor  · Architect |
| ***Interest***  **Education**  **Preoccupation**  **Vocation** | Artcraft  Technique  Equipment | Commerce  Morality  Materiel | Humanities  Morale  Personnel | Sciences  Technology  Systems |
| ***Orientation***  **Present**  **Future**  **Past**  **Place**  **Time** | Practical  Optimistic  Cynical  Here  Now | Dutiful  Pessimistic  Stoical  Gateways  Yesterday | Altruistic  Credulous  Mystical  Pathways  Tomorrow | Pragmatic  Skeptical  Relativistic  Intersection  Intervals |
| ***Self-image***  **Self-esteem**  **Self-respect**  **Self-confidence** | Artistic  Audacious  Adaptable | Dependable  Beneficent  Respectable | Empathetic  Benevolent  Authentic | Ingenious  Autonomous  Resolute |
| ***Value***  **Being**  **Trusting**  **Yearning**  **Seeking**  **Prizing**  **Aspiring** | Excited  Impulse  Impact  Stimulation  Generosity  Virtuoso | Concerned  Authority  Belonging  Security  Gratitude  Executive | Enthusiastic  Intuition  Romance  Identity  Recognition  Sage | Calm  Reason  Achievement  Knowledge  Deference  Wizard |
| ***Social Role***  **Mating**  **Parenting**  **Leading** | Playmate  Liberator  Negotiator | Helpmate  Socializer  Stabilizer | Soulmate  Harmonizer  Catalyst | Mindmate  Individuator  Visionary |

*Note:* From *Please Understand Me II: Temperament; Character; Intelligence* (p. 62), by D. Keirsey, 1998. Del Mar, CA: Prometheus Nemesis Book Company. Copyright 1998 by David Kiersey/ Prometheus Nemesis Book Company. Reprinted with permission.