The Team Developer: An Assessment and Skill Building Program

Instructor’s Manual

Jack McGourty
Columbia University

Kenneth P. De Meuse
University of Wisconsin – Eau Claire
# TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction .................................................................................................................................. 1 - 2

Chapter 1. Incorporating teams into your courses ................................................................. 3 - 13

Chapter 2. How to introduce *The Team Developer.* .............................................................. 14 - 17

Chapter 3. Operating *The Team Developer Program* ............................................................. 18 - 28

Chapter 4. Facilitating team experiences — Skill building activities .................................... 29 - 43

Chapter 5. Complementary assessment and development efforts ........................................... 44 - 60

References .................................................................................................................................. 61 - 62
INTRODUCTION

In purchasing *The Team Developer*, you recognize two fundamental realities as an educator. First, the development of team skills is an important component of your students’ overall course experience. Today’s demanding workplace requires that employees possess the appreciation, sensitivity, and understanding of interpersonal dynamics. A student may have a 4.0 GPA, but unless s/he can effectively interact with others s/he will be expendable in the global marketplace of the 21st century. The ability to manage conflict, lead group discussions, communicate non-defensively, criticize constructively, and listen effectively — i.e., participate in teams — is critical for the next millennium. Second, you realize that your educational background and training appropriately lies in your area of specialty (be it engineering, history, art, chemistry, or accounting). Consequently, you may lack the familiarity and expertise needed to teach some of the interpersonal skills in the team building process.

The use of teams has become increasingly commonplace in undergraduate and graduate classrooms during the past decade. It seems that courses in every discipline, ranging from engineering and business to nursing and the humanities now include a team component as part of the curriculum. Instructors are trying to develop in their students the skills needed to be successful in today’s team-oriented workplace. For the most part, unfortunately, little class attention is given to the skills required to perform well in teams. Students are simply given a “team assignment” and expected to automatically work together effectively. Little or no class time and course resources are devoted to such issues as: (a) How does one get a group of individuals with different motives, likes, dislikes, personalities, and needs to work together? (b) What should students do when fellow team members fail to perform the work they promised? (c) How should students conduct group meetings? (d) How do students get someone to stop dominating their team? (e) How should instructors accurately evaluate individual student and team performance? A sink-or-swim mentality rarely yields the desired results. Indeed, some of a student’s worst nightmares about college frequently come from working on so-called “team projects.”

*The Team Developer* is a software feedback system designed to help instructors nurture important interpersonal skills in their students. It was developed in the mid-1990’s, and has been used in both academic and industrial settings since that time. Individuals who have used the assessment package uniformly regard it as a worthwhile experience. The format is designed to provide both the giver and receiver of feedback a safe, nurturing learning environment. *The Team Developer* enables all team members to share concerns, issues, and evaluations in a constructive fashion. When used properly, this feedback process will enhance team member communication and improve team performance.

In this Instructor’s Manual, we review how to effectively incorporate student teams into your courses. We examine how it is typically done and how it can be improved. Specific guidelines for grouping students into teams, “ice breaker” exercises to help students get to know one another, general instructions to students when assigning them group projects, and evaluation criteria are addressed. A chapter is devoted to examining how to introduce *The Team Developer* to your students. Another chapter presents how to operate
The Team Developer in your class. The final two chapters present team experiences to facilitate skill building and development.

It would be helpful for you to refer to the Student Guide Book. It enables you to assign those chapters from which your students will benefit most by reading. In addition, several chapters may cover topics that you personally might find interesting. The chapter reviewing the stages of team development, for example, or the chapter examining the principles of highly successful teams may be particularly informative.

The Team Developer Assessment and Skill Building Package is intended for students on teams at all levels. The program will help students recognize areas where they are somewhat deficient and offer them constructive suggestions on how to improve. Both undergraduate and graduate students will benefit from the concepts reviewed in the guidebook, which is intended as a supplemental text to the software. It should serve as a handy reference for team activity. We have designed it to serve as a guide for team-related projects in any course regardless of discipline. Therefore, we hope students will refer to it often whenever taking courses requiring a team component.

We want to thank many individuals for their insights, contributions, and encouragement in creating The Team Developer software and writing this book including Eli Fromm, the Principal Investigator of the Gateway Engineering Education Coalition (Drexel University), Richard R. Reilly (Stevens Institute of Technology), and Peter Dominick (Columbia University). Michael Kelly (Yale University), Margaret Kelly and Jenny Lee (both from Columbia University) were instrumental in ensuring that this book was properly edited and formatted. Finally, we are very grateful to the hundreds of individuals who have taken The Team Developer and contributed to its construction and refinement during the past several years.
More and more courses are being designed to provide students with an opportunity to experience what it feels like to work on a team. These experiences range from short, decision-making exercises to project management or business simulations that last the full length of the course. The trend toward team-based course design is due largely to the fact that working in teams is becoming the prevalent mode of work design in industry (Dumaine, 1994; Joinson, 1999; Mohrman, Cohen, & Mohrman, 1995; Thompson, 2000). In a recent Fortune magazine article, CEOs of the top 200 industrial companies cited the ability to work in teams as one of the most important skills to be acquired in MBA programs (O’Reilly, 1994).

Companies are using teams as an integral part of their product development, process improvement, and manufacturing activities. Such management techniques as concurrent engineering, total quality management, employee empowerment, business process re-engineering, and open-book management are founded on the principle of people working together effectively in teams (Case, 1995; Dean & Evans, 1994; Hammer & Champy, 1993; Mohrman, Galbraith, Lawler, & Associates, 1998). Recognizing these trends, educators are designing more and more courses that incorporate group projects. Programs such as MIT’s undergraduate design course and their “New Products Program” make extensive use of teams composed of students, faculty, and outside sponsors (Durfee, 1994). These project-driven classes provide students with the opportunity to experience design work from idea conception to completion in teams. When properly structured, such courses can teach students the interpersonal skills necessary to work successfully as a team member.

Unfortunately, educators frequently incorporate student teams into their courses with little thought as to how they can best be used. Minimal guidance is provided to students on group development, soliciting member input, consensus building, resolving conflict, conducting meetings, and team leadership. Evaluation is frequently subjective and simply a piecemeal integration of individual and team-level performance, with the emphasis not on success as a group but technical results. Consequently, much of the learning in group dynamics and behavior is lost. Students come away from the course experience with a bad taste in their mouths about teams in general. This bias is naturally transferred to the workplace when the student graduates.

In this chapter, we present a systematic approach to designing some of the basic components of team work into your courses. Special attention is given to (a) defining course objectives, (b) selecting course methodologies, (c) determining team size, (d)
establishing student teams, (e) team organization and structure, and (f) evaluation and grading team performance. We hope that this information will enable you to incorporate teams effectively into your curricula.

**Defining Course Objectives**

Before an educator can design a course to teach students how to work in a team environment, the course objectives should be defined by answering two fundamental questions: (a) “What kinds of teaming will my students experience when they enter the workplace?” and (b) “What are the critical team skill requirements for these jobs?” The answer to the first question will help decide several course design issues. For example, many employees today work in multiple, cross-functional teams of varying duration. Engineers interact with human resource professionals; graphic artists work closely with marketers; production employees partner with key customers. In addition, employees volunteer for United Way Committees, safety task forces, and strategic planning work teams. Consequently, course assignments should attempt to capture the diversity of team-related experiences your students likely will be performing in their jobs.

It is also important that the instructor identify the critical team skills and behaviors that will be relevant in the students’ early careers. Oftentimes, conflict management, creative problem solving, team project management, listening, persuasive communication, and conducting meetings are skills that students will need to acquire. Once these team skills are identified, the instructor should communicate clearly in the course syllabus that a critical component of the class structure is to develop team skills. For example, some objectives might be:

- At the end of this course, students will be able to conduct effective group meetings.
- At the end of this course, students will be able to constructively manage conflict during a group encounter.
- At the end of this course, students will be able to communicate their views persuasively in a group setting.

Once the course objectives are clearly defined, the instructor can decide on several key elements of course design including course methodologies, team size, team member selection procedures, team organization and structure, and evaluation criteria.

**Selecting Course Methodologies**

An important question that must be answered in designing a team-oriented class is “What are the most effective course methods to teach the desired team skills and behaviors?” Case analyses, simulations, written reports, and group discussions are examples of a few popular methods. Research has shown that experiential exercises are most effective for teaching skills in building consensus, appraising performance, and resolving conflict; simulations are best when teaching students systematic problem solving, effective decision making, and project management techniques (Teach & Govahi, 1993). There are also many case studies of successful and unsuccessful teams in industry that can be used to enhance students’ learning experience. In this section, three basic teaching methods will be reviewed: (a) experiential group activities, (b) case studies, and (c) class lectures.
**Experiential Activities.** There are several experiential activities that can help students understand the behaviors and skills of an effective team member. At one end of the spectrum, there are literally hundreds of “off-the-shelf” group exercises designed to give participants hands-on experience. On the other end, there are many elaborate game simulations designed to provide realistic conditions that allow students to experience teamwork. The choice of team task will depend on the instructor’s educational goals. For example, if the objective is to demonstrate and have students experience a specific aspect of teaming, such as brainstorming, group exercises in which students practice common methods of group brainstorming to generate new ideas can be used. However, if the objective is for students to experience a broad range of team processes and behaviors, then more complex activities are suitable. Two principles should be followed when choosing team activities — fidelity and complexity.

**Fidelity** is the similarity of the educational/training situation to the students’ present and future working conditions. Researchers have found that the higher the fidelity, the superior the transfer of learning to the workplace (Briggs & Naylor, 1964). The fidelity of a particular activity can be increased by matching the conditions of the class exercise to the conditions of the expected work environment as closely as possible. This task may prove difficult, especially when it comes to matching the physical parameters, but many workplace conditions can be simulated with some creative thinking. One example is the temporal environment, which involves such factors as time limits and deadlines. Research has shown that time has a definite effect on team performance (McGrath & Kelly, 1986; Sundstrom, De Meuse, & Futrell, 1990). Such conditions as actual time to complete the task or make decisions should be matched to real conditions whenever possible. **Social context** is another environmental condition that can be manipulated. Few teams work in a vacuum; they typically co-exist with other teams that are working within a similar context. The more **inter-group** activities are designed into the team activity, the more a team will engage in such common behaviors as inter-group communication, coordination, and conflict.

**Complexity** is defined by two sub-factors: (a) task interdependence and (b) cognitive effort. The more complex the activity, the more interdependent the tasks and the higher the cognitive effort — as well as the more team skills are required by the participant. In general, the higher the fidelity and complexity of an activity, the better the transfer of team skills to the workplace.

For example, programs such as MIT’s New Product Program are highly realistic with all the complexities experienced by any product design team. Some computer-generated simulations also can be highly realistic and very complex. For technology management students, a simulation used at the Center for Creative Leadership, called “COLAB,” is applicable. This simulation places students in cross-functional teams with a focus on making decisions about new polymer processes to be commercialized. Each competing team’s objective is to get the new process out in the marketplace in a timely manner. Students decide on the allocation of R&D resources, manufacturing, processes, and marketing plans. On a continuum, this type of activity would be considered high in both fidelity and complexity.

There are several group exercises that are used to train participants in specific team skills. These exercises tend to be rather low in fidelity and range in complexity. A good example of these activities are so-called “survival exercises.” Teams are given a scenario that requires them to reach a consensus on how to best survive in a life-threatening situation,
perhaps in the desert, on a lifeboat, or in the jungle. The exercise provides an opportunity for students to make decisions, reach a consensus, and resolve conflicts.

There are several advantages and disadvantages to each type of activity. Experiential activities that are classified as “high fidelity/high complexity” most closely resemble actual workplace conditions. However, these exercise are typically more difficult for the instructor to manage, are resource intensive, and are time-consuming for students. Activities that are low in fidelity are often more structured and easier to administer, but may be perceived as less relevant by the student. As a final consideration, team activities that are low in complexity will not challenge the team or provide the environment necessary for intense interaction among team members (see Figure 1.1).

![Figure 1.1](image)

**Figure 1.1**
Selecting experiential activities.

**Case Studies.** In addition to team exercises and simulations, educators may choose to use several published case studies to allow students to explore the characteristics of effective and dysfunctional teams. One of the best case studies is based on the Space Shuttle Challenger disaster. The Challenger case study provides a powerful, albeit tragic, example of the barriers and pitfalls to effective team functioning. Case study materials are
available which provide the student with background information on the case, as well as the findings of the presidential commission that investigated the causes of the tragedy. The case dramatizes the interpersonal conflicts that often arise across functions in organizations. CRM Films has produced a 25-minute video reviewing the Space Shuttle Challenger case entitled, *Groupthink (revised edition)*.

Another approach is to have student teams perform detailed case studies on a “real life” cross-functional team currently operating within an organization. Under this alternative, participants select a team for intensive study. They interview, observe, and collect archival data to analyze team processes and assess the effects of organizational and inter-group parameters on team functioning. This integrative case exercise permits the participants to observe the management of a cross-functional team in vivo and document the interplay of individual, group, and organizational factors and their effects on team performance.

**Class Lectures.** Of course, most team-oriented curricula include special lecture material. Lectures should expose the student to both general team information and specific issues associated with the type of work group the student will most likely experience. There are many issues to be taught regarding the management of teams and group process. These include how teams develop, managing within and inter-group conflict, conducting group meetings, and utilizing formal management processes for improving team performance. (Refer students to various chapter topics in the accompanying *Student Guide Book.* In addition, the application of electronic systems for group communication and decision-making (e.g., *groupware*) can be addressed. Naturally, class lectures can be supplemented with relevant videos that reinforce key lesson points.

**Determining Team Size**

When an instructor designs a team-oriented course, an important consideration is what the number of students on a given team should be. Research demonstrates that the size of a team influences its performance (Shaw, 1976; Sundstrom et al., 1990). For example, the larger the number of team members, the greater the coordination demands (Bass, 1982). Other investigators have found that as a team grows in size some members participate less (Gerard, Wilhelmy, & Conolley, 1968). Much research has been conducted on the effects of team size and individual members’ propensity for “social loafing” (Latane, Williams, & Harkins, 1979). Social loafing occurs when team members feel that they can do less work and allow other members to carry the brunt of the workload. These last two findings are pertinent to the design of any classroom activity.

A student’s participation is a critical prerequisite for learning team skills. However, there are many reasons why students might not participate, especially in large teams. One prevalent cause for low involvement is feelings of intimidation. There are always students who feel that they have nothing to offer the team. This outcome is especially likely to occur when students from different academic disciplines work together. If the activity leans heavily on knowledge from one discipline, members from other areas feel less qualified to contribute. When teams are large, students can easily “hide” and minimize their participation. Individual responsibility and accountability is reduced. In small groups, every member’s actions are salient, and activity tends to be more equal. Another factor to consider is that the majority of today’s students work part- or full-time in addition to
attending college. Consequently, scheduling out-of-class meetings becomes extremely difficult when team size is large.

“Off-the-shelf” team exercises frequently recommend the optimum team size for the particular activity. A general rule of thumb is that the size of the team should depend on the demands of the task to be performed. Many practitioners suggest that effective teams are usually small (Katzenbach & Smith, 1993). Overall, it has been our experience that most classroom activities appear to work best when teams contain between three and five members.

**Establishing Student Teams**

Once the classroom activity(s) and team size have been determined, the next concern is how to divide students into teams. There are three basic methods: (a) unilaterally assign students to teams, (b) employ a random basis for selection, or (c) allow students to self-select their teams. In addition, various hybrid approaches exist. The advantages and disadvantages of each method are presented below.

**Assigned Teams.** Assigning students to teams enables the instructor to balance membership in terms of knowledge, skills, experience, discipline, and various demographic characteristics. This method almost always enhances the learning experience for all involved by balancing students on certain criteria. The choice of criteria depends largely on the nature of the task to be performed. However, one generally considers (a) academic major, (b) amount of industrial work experience, (c) cultural representation, (d) gender, (e) age, and (f) year in school (e.g., junior, senior). By balancing the composition of the team, the instructor ensures that no team has an advantage over the others. Likewise, it enables the instructor to maximize team member diversity.

To facilitate balanced team assignments, the instructor should collect information regarding the students’ backgrounds very early in the semester. One approach is to design a questionnaire that students complete at the beginning of the course. The specific questions to be asked should depend on what factors the educator are attempting to balance. In general, assigned teams should be used when the classroom activity is long-term or ongoing throughout the semester. When team activities are only one- or two-sessions in duration, one of the following methods may be more appropriate.

**Random Team Assignment.** Team membership can be randomly assigned under certain circumstances. For example, there is little advantage in making pre-selected team assignments for short-term tasks, such as those lasting one class period. (An obvious exception is when the instructor wants to demonstrate how a specific team compositional arrangement affects team functioning or performance.) An advantage of random assignment is that it is very easy and quick to implement. Additionally, students perceive random assignment as fair, because it is not based on instructor selection biases. Naturally, research methodology dictates random assignment if one is trying to test whether a specific intervention or teaching method is more effective than another.

**Self-Selected Team Assignment.** The self-selection approach permits students to decide team membership. The primary disadvantage of self-selected teams is that students tend to choose friends and other familiar faces. Consequently, self-selection tends to create homogeneous groups made up of friends or cliques — a situation which often limits learning opportunities (Daly & Worrell, 1993). Self-selection nearly always leads to an
imbalance in membership skills, abilities, and demographic characteristics. On the other hand, this type of team assignment eases coordination problems and can facilitate team development. Members know each other personally, typically recognize each other’s strengths and weaknesses, and are somewhat familiar with each other’s out-of-class demands.

**Hybrid Assignment Approaches.** There are also a number of hybrid approaches through which the instructor can prescribe certain selection criteria, then allow members to select the team to be on once the criteria are satisfied. For example, Quarstein and McAfee’s (1993) self-selection methodology prescribes that teams have equal representation across each of five business majors. However, students can sign up for any team as long as there is no duplication of majors. The authors assert that this approach empowers students to feel that they are part of the selection process while allowing the instructor to ensure proper team composition.

Another approach is to designate team leaders. Subsequently, these team leaders serve the role of managers and select students to be on their respective teams. Such a selection methodology can teach valuable skills to all students (e.g., interviewing, orientation, and training). It is particularly useful when the instructor employs a business simulation in which teams are in competition. This approach requires the instructor to carefully select and train team leaders.

Overall, the duration of the team activity is the key consideration for the type of team assignment used. Different approaches should be implemented depending on whether the activity is a one-hour group decision-making exercise or a full-semester simulation. In the former case, experience has shown that the best selection method is to simply place students into teams on a random basis. This approach is especially beneficial if the instructor plans to administer several exercises throughout the course. By choosing membership randomly, students will get to experience and interact within several team compositions and be exposed to many diverse perspectives. In contrast, if the student team is to remain intact throughout the major portion of the semester, a more selective approach is desirable. The value of the student’s educational experience will be greatly influenced by the team’s composition. It is important that the instructor attempt to balance students’ skills, experiences, social abilities, and cultural backgrounds.

**Team Organization and Structure**

After team assignments have been made, the instructor needs to decide whether to specify the team’s internal organization or encourage students to organize themselves. This decision will be driven partially by the nature of the task. Again, there are advantages and disadvantages associated with each approach.

Specifying the internal organization gives the instructor a degree of control over the process. You may want to take advantage of the specific skills of certain students, such as choosing a behavioral science student to serve in the role of team facilitator or a business student for financial officer. On the other hand, you may decide to do the opposite — i.e., choosing students to function outside of their formal disciplines to provide them a more “rounding” experience. For example, we teach a management-oriented simulation as a capstone course for students completing a Management Master of Science degree. The course attracts both engineering and general management students. In this case, students are
encouraged to choose functions outside of their disciplines. Engineers are requested to take roles such as marketers or financial executives; business majors are encouraged to take on more technical roles. The disadvantage of the instructor’s choosing roles is that students miss the opportunity to make selection decisions and reach a consensus on how to capitalize on the skills of the membership.

Two roles critical to a team’s overall functioning are those of team leader and team facilitator. Most teams have a formal leader who coaches, empowers, and supports members to ensure commitment to a common purpose. The team facilitator acts as a process observer and works with individual members to improve their team skills, thus paving the way toward greater effectiveness.

**Team Leader.** In most team-oriented classroom activities, the role of team leader is left to the students to decide. Typically referred to as “leaderless teams,” the selection of a leader becomes part of the team’s development. In these instances, a formal leader will typically emerge or be designated by the group. Occasionally, however, a leader does not emerge, and the team usually begins to flounder. When this occurs, the instructor may want to provide the team with feedback on the importance of team leadership. One suggestion is to have the team formally rotate leadership, so every student has the opportunity to experience the role. This practice is quite common in industry with the increase in self-managed work teams (McGourty, De Meuse, & Dominick, 1994).

**Team Facilitator.** A team facilitator can provide much needed support to a team, particularly a newly formed one. However, this role rarely emerges naturally. Consequently, the instructor must design it into the activity. There are several decisions to be made regarding the role of a team facilitator and its use. For example, will the facilitator be a participating member of the team or function as an outside observer? There are advantages and disadvantages to either approach. As a participating member of the team, a student facilitator serves multiple roles. As facilitator, the student can provide the team with candid feedback regarding their group dynamics and effectiveness. As a participating member, the student has functional responsibilities. In the majority of classroom situations, learning about teams is only part of the course’s objectives. As a full participant, a student will experience the other elements of the course. The disadvantage is that the student may find it difficult to provide the team with objective feedback, diminishing the advantage of having a process facilitator.

Ultimately, the instructor’s decision should be influenced by the degree of importance placed on team experience within the course objectives. If the course’s primary purpose is to train students in a specific area of their discipline (e.g., marketing, engineering), then all students should participate. In these cases, the instructor may want to assert that teams rotate the facilitator role at each team meeting. When the primary focus of the course is on team development and process, it becomes critical to provide teams with as much information regarding their effectiveness as possible. Therefore, teams should incorporate students as independent facilitators.

**Evaluation and Grading Team Performance**

One of the most difficult decisions an instructor must make when designing a team-based course is the method by which students will be evaluated. This condition reflects the “real world” difficulties regarding decisions on how to best evaluate and reward teams in industry
There are several issues to consider before selecting evaluation criteria. First, “What are the overall objectives of the course?” Second, “How important is teamwork to these objectives?” Third, “To what degree will class activities be performed in teams versus on an individual student basis?”

As a general rule of thumb, team-based class activities should be evaluated at the team level. That is, all students on the team should receive the same grade on team projects. This approach will foster a “we-are-all-in-this-boat-together” team culture. Nevertheless, this approach can cause some problems. Some students inevitably will feel that their individual performance deserves a higher mark than the team’s overall grade. Further, some students will claim that they have worked harder and contributed more than their fellow team members. And perhaps they have!! Whenever all members of a team earn identical grades regardless of their individual performance, some students likely will be less productive than others (Kerr & Bruun, 1981). On the other hand, isn’t life in the workplace that way? There are slackers, laggards, and social loafers in most departments. There also are diligent workers, pacesetters, and highly motivated employees. Nearly every department has individuals who are difficult to get along with, as well as individuals who are kind, compassionate, and good-hearted. Part of the team experience for students is to learn how to work together with a variety of people. Some of these people will have values, motives, needs, and desires different from those of the student. By assigning the same grade to all students on a team, it will help capture the interpersonal dynamics and performance inequities existing in nearly all workplaces.

One way for instructors to alleviate some of the concerns students will voice regarding team grading is to communicate clearly their philosophy regarding the team concept and how students will be evaluated. This information should be presented in the course syllabus and distributed to students on the first day of class. As an example, the following paragraph on course structure is included on our Organizational Behavioral Management syllabus:

> In today’s business world, one of the keys to organizational performance is team work. Individuals must work together effectively for companies to remain competitive. Consequently, 25% of your course grade will be team-based. All individuals within a team will receive the same grade on the case study analysis and report and the case study presentation. Students will be assigned to a work team during the first day of class. Teams will have the right to request termination of a non-performing member.

The key objective is to clarify expectations with regard to how class activities will be evaluated and final grades will be computed.

A further way of gaining student commitment to the team-based grading system is to permit students to rid themselves of non-performing team members. Companies fire employees who do not perform at acceptable levels. Teams, likewise, should have the opportunity to “fire” a student who is not performing at an acceptable level. However, the instructor must convey the seriousness of such an action by a team. The instructor should require that all members of the team meet with him or her and share their perspectives on the situation. Only after candid dialogue and failure to improve should a student be dismissed from a team. An instructor will want to avoid a situation where three or four
students gang up on another student to kick him or her out of the group. In the event that a student is terminated, that student should be required to perform all the assignments that teams are responsible for during the remaining portion of the course. A deduction in the terminated student’s final course grade also may be warranted.

A final suggestion that will enhance the effectiveness of team grading is to provide students with specific criteria defining how performance will be evaluated. Obviously, the criteria need to be communicated before assigning the team activity. For example, in our Organizational Behavioral Management course, student teams are required to analyze a case study of a company in trouble and present their recommendations. The set of criteria used to evaluate student teams is displayed in Table 1.1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1.1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grading Criteria for Case Presentation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date ______________________</th>
<th>Team Name ______________________</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Case Title ___________________</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Rating Scale:** 1 = very poor; 4 = average; 7 = exceptional.

**A. Professional Image**  
- Appropriate business dress by all team members 1 2 3 4 5 6 7  
- Smooth transitions across presenters 1 2 3 4 5 6 7  
- Supportive of each other as team members 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

**B. Analysis of Case**  
- Identified relevant facts of the case 1 2 3 4 5 6 7  
- Identified key issue(s) 1 2 3 4 5 6 7  
- Reviewed potential managerial courses of action 1 2 3 4 5 6 7  
- Made logical recommendation [and justification] 1 2 3 4 5 6 7  
- Answered case questions competently and completely 1 2 3 4 5 6 7  
- Incorporated research studies and theory in support answers 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

**C. Communication Skills**  
- Absence of apparent reading 1 2 3 4 5 6 7  
- Note cards are appropriate size and composition 1 2 3 4 5 6 7  
- Displayed comfort, confidence, and enthusiasm 1 2 3 4 5 6 7  
- Eye contact, gestures, posture, voice quality 1 2 3 4 5 6 7  
- Use of visuals [easy to see and read; appropriate] 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

**D. General Delivery**  
- Creative, attention-getting approach was used 1 2 3 4 5 6 7  
- Overall organization of presentation 1 2 3 4 5 6 7  
- Conclusion was strong / summarized main points to be learned 1 2 3 4 5 6 7  
- Response to questions by audience and evaluators 1 2 3 4 5 6 7  
- Length of presentation [too long / too short] 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

**OVERALL GRADE:** A B C D F
**Conclusion**

Teams are an integral component of today’s workplace. A major contribution that educators can offer their students is developmental activities that nurture the necessary team skills. However, before simply jumping on the team’s bandwagon, instructors should carefully plan and design their courses to optimize the learning environment. This chapter provided a number of guidelines to consider if one chooses to incorporate teams into a course. In the chapters ahead, attention is focused on how to introduce and operate *The Team Developer* software package. The final two chapters are devoted to presenting team-based activities and exercises which instructors may want to use in their courses, as well as some additional assessment instruments that teams may use to function more effectively.
CHAPTER 2
HOW TO INTRODUCE THE TEAM DEVELOPER

At a birthday party, it came time to serve the cake. A little boy named Brian blurted out, “I want the biggest piece!”

His mother quickly scolded him. “Brian it’s not polite to ask for the biggest piece.”
The little guy looked at her in confusion, and asked, “Well then, how do you get it?”

Olive Freedman
Author

Society has conditioned us over time to be very reserved in how (and whether) we make our wishes known. We are taught, just like Brian in the above story, not to directly ask for things we want. As individuals undergo the transition to team members, it is important for them to express their needs and desires clearly. How else will team members recognize how to satisfy each other? Obviously, we need to balance our needs with the needs of others, as well as the needs of the group as a whole. Likewise, tact, diplomacy, and consideration should be used whenever communicating with others. The Team Developer is an instrument that enables team members to share their views in a candid, yet constructive, fashion. Members are provided a safe medium by which to receive and give feedback for individual and team growth.

In this chapter, we will examine how feedback frequently occurs in groups. Subsequently, we will distinguish between two types of feedback — evaluative and developmental. Finally, we will present The Team Developer and discuss how to introduce it to students.

Feedback in Teams — Two Typical Scenarios

Imagine driving a car without the ability to see the speedometer! Or view the fuel gauge! You wouldn’t know whether to speed up or slow down. You wouldn’t know whether to stop for fuel or continue traveling for 200 miles before driving into a gas station. Teams, indeed all systems, require feedback to function successfully. How would you realize where to improve if you did not know how you were presently performing? How would you enhance your individual performance or team’s performance if you did not recognize what you were doing well or poorly?

Unfortunately, members of most teams do not communicate very effectively. On many teams, individuals are extremely reluctant to voice candid perceptions regarding other team members’ behaviors. Individuals tend to be guarded and polite, avoiding the possibility of hurting another person’s feelings. Unless the behavior is an ongoing, serious problem (e.g., chronic tardiness or absence at scheduled team meetings, not completing agreed upon assignments), most times very little is said. And if the student is informed of the group’s dissatisfaction, members generally downplay or sugar-coat their criticism of the offending member.
In contrast, some teams are quite vocal in expressing their displeasure toward inappropriate behaviors. Members of these teams are quick to point out member weaknesses, unmet expectations, or suggestions for improvement. Oftentimes, team encounters evolve into emotional confrontations. Individuals become frustrated, embarrassed, or angry.

Neither of the above cases is constructive when providing feedback. The Team Developer software package is an approach for team members to give one another feedback in a positive, productive fashion. Individual members are encouraged to respond honestly to a series of questions concerning specific dimensions of team behavior. In turn, those responses are summarized and “fed-back to fellow team members in a manner that fosters individual and team development. In so doing, both the team member and the team benefit. Before describing The Team Developer, however, we would like to distinguish between two different types of feedback — evaluative and developmental.
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**Figure 2.1.**

Team member feedback can lead to interpersonal conflict.

**Types of Feedback**

**Evaluative Feedback.** This type of feedback captures how well an individual and/or team is performing a task. It represents an “evaluation” of success. Course grades are an example of evaluative feedback. The instructor informs the student how successfully he or she performed on an assignment or in the course. Evaluative feedback is a critical facet in both the workplace and the classroom. It provides input for merit increases, promotions, terminations, and many other personnel decisions in organizations (Smither, 1998). Obviously, in the classroom, evaluative feedback is used when assigning project and course grades. It is hard to imagine a world void of evaluative feedback.

Nevertheless, many researchers have pointed out the limitations of evaluative feedback. Quality management pioneer, W. Edwards Deming (1986), recommends that companies eliminate the performance appraisal process completely. Advocates of the 360°
feedback approach emphasize the importance of using developmental feedback to help employees grow and mature (Jackson & Greller, 1998; Tornow, 1993). Overall, researchers generally agree that evaluative feedback is not very effective for fostering learning and development.

**Developmental Feedback.** This form of feedback focuses on helping individuals learn from their performance. Whenever people complete a task or activity, mistakes can be made. In particular, errors are frequently made when individuals are learning new skills (e.g., how to perform on a team). Developmental feedback provides the student or employee constructive input on how to remedy the flawed performance or enhance an acceptable one. Evaluative judgments such as good/bad, pass/fail, or right/wrong are avoided. In contrast, the feedback is descriptive and often communicated in behavioral terms to promote understanding.

Research suggests that an individual’s satisfaction of the feedback and willingness to accept the input are important factors for improving performance (Cascio, 1978). The Team Developer emphasizes the developmental aspect of the feedback process. Information is systematically collected from fellow students on how to improve individual and team performance. In turn, these data are given to the students in a constructive fashion to foster positive reactions, acceptance, growth, and enhanced performance. The goal of the entire process is to nurture team skills, which your students can apply to their current and future jobs.

**Introducing The Team Developer Software Package**

Inform your students that The Team Developer is a feedback system that makes the process of receiving and giving feedback in teams relatively painless. Specifically, it is a computer-based survey consisting of 50 items that measure four behavioral dimensions and 10 roles critical to team functioning (see Table 2.1). Team members use a 1- to 5-point rating scale to anonymously rate themselves and all of their fellow team members on various team behaviors. Based upon these ratings, each team member receives a confidential feedback report. The report summarizes how each person sees him/herself, as well as how their team members perceive them.

The instrument is administered by providing each team member with a computer disk containing the survey items and the names of all team members. The disks are prepared by the course instructor (or a teaching assistant) who enters the individuals’ names and team affiliation into a data file and then copies this file onto disks. When team members access the file, they select their name from a list which in turn indicates to the computer program the team on which they are a member. The program prompts the user to rate him/herself and each of their team members on each of the survey items. When they are finished, team members simply return the disks to their course instructor who uses the Team Developer Statistical Program to analyze survey results and generate feedback reports. The enclosed sample disk provides an idea of how the package works.
Table 2.1
Critical Behaviors and Roles Individuals Can Perform in Teams

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Behaviors</th>
<th>Roles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>➢ Active Listener</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>➢ Influencer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision Making</td>
<td>➢ Analyzer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>➢ Innovator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>➢ Fact Seeker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration</td>
<td>➢ Conflict Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>➢ Team Builder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Management</td>
<td>➢ Goal Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>➢ Process Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>➢ Consensus Builder</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reassure your students that *The Team Developer* has been used by thousands of undergraduate and graduate students during the past several years. Student teams enrolled in engineering design courses, business simulation classes, organizational behavioral classes, and group dynamics courses have used the instrument. Universities such as Ohio State, The Stevens Institute of Technology, The University of Pittsburgh, and The New Jersey Institute of Technology have used *The Team Developer*. In many cases, the survey has been administered twice during a semester — once at the midpoint and again at the end of the term. This approach permits an additional assessment to ascertain whether a team (and its individual members) is progressing as the semester unfolds.

When completing the survey, it is imperative that students are honest with their ratings. The feedback is designed to be developmental. Students need to be made aware of the distinction between *developmental* and *evaluative* feedback. Confidentiality is ensured throughout the process. Only if students confide in fellow team members will anyone know what ratings a given individual reported. Overall, we recommend that you stress that *The Team Developer* provides every student an opportunity to nurture their interpersonal growth and development. Carefully observing individual behavior, candidly reporting one’s viewpoints, constructively dealing with interpersonal conflict, and developing an action plan to enhance performance — all are key skills very much needed to be successful in today’s dynamic workplace.
CHAPTER 3
OPERATING THE TEAM DEVELOPER PROGRAM

Technology is another word for “tool.”
There was a time when nails were high-tech.

Tom Clancy
Author

While hundreds of students have used *The Team Developer* without any problems, an instructor’s job as designer and administrator of the feedback system is obviously more complex. Although the package comes with a complete list of categories and survey items, instructors are encouraged to create new questions or modify existing ones to better suit their individual courses and educational goals. This chapter is included as part of this manual to help guide instructors (and teaching assistants) through the mechanics of using *The Team Developer* administrator software and designing their own surveys. Among other topics, we will discuss how to create files for teams, add or remove categories and questions, distribute the survey to a class, and tally the results.

1. How to Start and Navigate through the Team Developer Administrator Program

In order to initialize the program, download file from [www.wiley.com/college/mcgourty](http://www.wiley.com/college/mcgourty). Run set up program. An icon will be established. Click on it to start program.

The Team Developer splash screen will appear followed by the primary administrator’s screen (Exhibit #1). From this screen, you will be able to create new or select existing organizations/classes, list teams and team members to be rated, write and select survey items, make student disks and labels, and generate and print reports.
2. Creating New Organizations

To create a new group, enter the name of the new organization at the bottom of the center window and click on the New command. For example, you may call the organization after the course name, such as Engineering Design 101. The selected name will appear in the window (Exhibit #2). Highlight the newly created organization and enter Select to close window and continue the set up process.

Exhibit # 1
3. Setting up Teams and Team Members

Once the organization is selected, you will view the screen as shown in Exhibit #3. In the top left hand section of the screen, several command buttons are now available – Select, Teams, Questions, Categories, Instructions, Reports, Unscored, and Exit. Now that you have selected the new organization, you can proceed to create the template for the student survey disk.
You can start by clicking on TEAMS and a new screen will appear, allowing you to enter the First Name, Last Name, and Team Name for the members of the organization/class who will be using the Team Developer. To begin entering team member names and team names, click on ADD, located at the top left-hand section of the screen. A space will appear allowing you to enter the First Name, Last Name, and Team Name for the first team member. Begin typing First Name (Tab), Last Name (Tab), and Team Name, See Exhibit #4). Once all the names and their associated team names have been entered, click on SAVE. After successfully saving the new organization’s team members and teams, you are ready to enter the survey’s questions.

Exhibit #4

4. Entering Questions and Categories

Now that you are ready to create the actual survey questions, click on QUESTIONS. This screen allows you to create the survey questions. Additionally, for each survey question, you can designate a Category to enhance the reporting of the feedback to the student and to the instructor. To begin entering survey questions, along with categories, click on ADD, located at the top left-hand section of the screen. You can immediately begin entering survey questions. Once you click on ADD, the window will allow you to select a category and enter the survey item. Categories have to be further defined before they can be entered and will be discussed later in this section. [You may want to define the survey categories first, prior to entering the survey questions. If so, go to the next paragraph and then return to the beginning of this section.] Once you have entered all the survey items, you can go to the Category section and define the item categories. Again, you may want to do this first. In some cases, it may be an iterative process.
To define a category, enter CATEGORIES. As before, Click on ADD and begin entering the requested information. You can enter the name of category followed by a brief definition. This definition will help the survey respondent to understand what the associated survey questions are really asking. These definitions enhance the ability of all participating students to respond to the survey questions in an accurate fashion. Once all category definitions are entered, you must go back to the Questions section and add the category names to the appropriate survey questions. Once you are back in the question section, you can quickly add the categories to each survey question. For each survey question, the Category box has a drop down feature. You just click on the arrow, review the list of entered categories and click on the appropriate dimension. When you have completed selecting categories for each survey question, click on SAVE the file.
Once all the survey questions and their associated categories have been created, click on SAVE. You are now ready to create survey instructions for the student respondents.

5. Creating Instructions for the Student Respondents

By clicking on the INSTRUCTIONS button, you can create special instructions for your students. You can create three types of instructions – General information About the Team Developer, special Rating Instructions, and specific Review Instructions. Some generic text is supplied. You can edit as required.
6. Making a Disk Image

Once you have entered all the information required to create a Team Developer Survey, you can begin to create the electronic version for distribution purposes. The first step in this process is to create a disk image. This establishes a set of files in a folder labeled “Image”. To begin, click on FILE, and then MAKE DISK IMAGE. A dialogue box will appear and prompt you with a default subdirectory - C:\My Documents\Team Developer\New Folder\ - to store the disk image files (Exhibit #7). You can accept the default subdirectory or select another location. Once selected, enter MAKE IMAGE. If files exist in this location already, you will be asked to select another location or empty the existing file folder before storing the new disk image information. When the new disk image is created successfully, a pop-up screen will alert you to this fact and tell you in which directory the image is saved. Once the disk image is created, you are ready to distribute the survey application on to a floppy disk.
7. Making Disks

After the Disk Image has been created, you can begin to make disks to distribute to your students. These disks contain the files required to run the application from any PC-based computer system. You will make as many disks as there are students participating in your class or project. If there are 10 teams with 3 students in each team, then you will need to create 30 diskettes for distribution. After you have made the disk image, you will be asked if you want to create distribution disks now. You can enter YES or wait until later. In order to make a disk later, click on FILE, and MAKE DISKS. First, you will be asked to select the source directory (Exhibit # 9). This is the directory (or sub directories) that contain the Disk Image created earlier. Select the drive and directories. You will also be asked to select the destination drive and folder. If you are creating actual floppy disks to distribute to the students, you should enter A:/ . Finally, enter the number of disks or copies you wish to create. When you are ready, enter COPY.
The selection of the destination directory depends on how you plan to distribute The Team Developer Application to the students. The most common approach is to distribute the application on 3.5 inch floppy disks. However, you may want to download the application files to a hardrive to distribute later as an attachment to an email or some other distribution method. To download the required files on to a diskette, select drive used for floppy disks (for example A:/). Select the appropriate number of disks you want to make. Then, insert the first disk into the appropriate drive and click COPY. The program will ask if the destination drive is ready. Click OK, if a new disk is in the drive. The application will now copy the files on to the disk. When the copying process is completed, a window will appear asking if the destination drive is ready (for the next disk). You will continue this process for each disk corresponding to the number of students who need a copy of the application. Basically, this is a normal copy application. The files stored in the Image sub-directroy are being copied on to the floppy disk. [You may want to use your operating system’s copy function to handle this task. Some people may find it easier to copy and paste files as each disk is entered into the drive.]

8. Making Disk Labels

The Team Developer Application comes with the capacity to create labels for floppy disks. Using a commerical label, you can print labels for the disks you are making for the students. The information is generic and provides the student with information on how to start the Team Developer program. To use this application, go to FILE and Click on MAKE LABELS. You will be able to choose the number of labels you want to print (Exhibit # 10). First, you should select the number of labels that will print on one sheet (typically nine) and then how many copies. If you want to print 36 labels, you will choose 9 labels and 4 copies. When ready, enter PRINT. Again, you may want to create labels with custom information and not use this application.

![Exhibit # 10](image-url)
9. Tallying Results

Once you have received the disks back from the students you are ready to import the results and create reports from the data. In order to start this process, select the appropriate organization by clicking on FILE and SELECT ORGANIZATION. With the Select Organization window opened, double click on APPLICABLE ORGANIZATION. Then click on FILE and TALLY RESULTS. A screen appears prompting you to select the drive location from which to import the scores. In most cases, this will be from floppy disks received from the students and inserted in Drive A. Enter appropriate drive and Click TALLY RESULTS (Exhibit #11.) A window will appear telling you which organization you are about to import results from. Press OK when ready to import. If you have administered and collected your data from students on disks, you continue to insert each disk and follow the instructions for importing results. Once all the results have been imported, you are ready to review and print available reports.

Exhibit # 11

10. Reviewing and Printing Results

Once you begin to import results, you can review the data collected by student at any time. To do so, Click on REPORTS located on the top left screen A screen will display three options for reports – individual, team and organization or class results. Double Click screen to see the team names (Exhibit # 12). You can select individual member reports or any number of individuals for report viewing. If you want to print the report(s) showing on the screen, click on FILE and then PRINT. See appendix for sample Team Developer Report.

You have the capability to send the team results to a spreadsheet file, allowing you to manipulate the data for additional analysis. Just Click on SAVE TO FILE button on Report Window. You will be prompted to name the file and enter the directory where you want to save it.
11. Checking for Missing Users

Throughout the importing process or as you are running reports, you may want to check if any student survey data is missing. You can easily accomplish this by clicking on UNSCORED located on the top left portion of the screen.

12. Copying an Organization

Once you have created an organization and a set of survey questions, you may want to copy the organization as a starting point for a new organization. This is especially helpful if you want to retain the dimensions and survey questions. To copy an organization, click on FILE and SELECT ORGANIZATION. Highlight the organization you want to copy and press COPY ORGANIZATION. You will be asked to name the new organization. Once you have entered a new name, Click OK. Now you can go into any part of the database and make changes. Of course, a common change will be in student names and teams. The best way to handle this is to delete all names and then begin to enter student names from the new organization.

13. Deleting an Organization

You can easily delete an organization by clicking on FILE and SELECT ORGANIZATION. Highlight the organization you want to delete and press DELETE ORGANIZATION.
CHAPTER 4
FACILITATING TEAM EXPERIENCES:
SKILL BUILDING ACTIVITIES

Confucius recognized the importance of the teaching profession more than 2500 years ago. The “seeds” you plant in your students today will impact their work world for the rest of their lives. Your interest in educating them in various facets of teaming is commendable. The team skills they develop during your course will help them prepare to meet the interpersonal challenges that will face them in the workplace of the 21st century.

In this chapter, we present a number of activities that you can use to incorporate the team concept into your course. Initially, we provide some “ice breaker” exercises to introduce students to the basic idea of teams. We then review several case studies that students can analyze in groups and report back to you. The cases can be used as an in-class activity or be assigned to student groups to work on outside of class. Throughout this chapter, we try to be sensitive to the various disciplines that will be employing The Team Developer. Consequently, students in management, engineering, the humanities, or the sciences should all derive value from any of these activities.

Ice Breaker Exercises

The purpose of an icebreaker activity is to get students to know each other. The activity should get individuals to interact, discuss issues, and make decisions. The specific content of the activity is not as important as the process of interaction, communication, and cooperation. Ideally, the activity will cause students to find out about one another. From this sharing experience, an initial bond will evolve among members.

Student Interviews. A simple activity for the first or second session of the class is to have students interview one another. Initially, divide the class into groups of three to five students. Instruct each team that students should interview one another and be prepared to introduce any member of the team to the class in 15 minutes. Inform students that they can use notes during the introductions. Some questions you can have students address include:

- Name, major, and year in school;
- Hometown or place where they were born;
- Whether they work part-time or full-time, type of job, and company;
- Favorite sports team or music group;
- A personal tidbit (e.g., spent last semester studying overseas, member of university swim team, third cousin of Johnny Carson, went skydiving last year).

When it comes time for the students to introduce each other in front of the class, request that the entire team stand up. Randomly ask various members of the team to introduce one another. This exercise will take approximately one class period.

**The End of Planet Earth.** This is a fun exercise in which students get to learn some things about their own values, as well as learn about the values and personalities of others. Initially, have students individually respond to the story (see Table 4.1). Subsequently, collect and post the results on a white board, flipchart, or overhead projector so that the entire class can see. Now, divide the class into groups of three to five students, informing them that each group needs to come to a consensus with regard to which story characters should be saved. It is important that groups justify their answers. Allow the groups 15 to 30 minutes to process the information and make a decision. Again, collect and post the results.

If you desire, you can extend the exercise by allowing the student groups additional time to reconsider their decision. Permit them five minutes to re-evaluate their answers in light of any new information they obtained from other groups reporting their results. The total time required for this exercise is about one hour.

### Table 4.1
**Ice Breaker Exercise**

**The End of Planet Earth**

*Directions.* The 10 individuals listed below have been carefully screened and selected for a flight to another planet. For the past six months, scientists have predicted that a meteor the size of Texas was on a direct course to hit our planet. It appears those predictions will come true — tomorrow is D-day. However, NASA has determined that only seven individuals (rather than the original 10) may go due to last minute changes in space limitations.

Your assignment is to choose the three passengers who will have to be left behind on Earth. Place a number 1 by the individual you believe should be removed first; a number 2 by the individual you believe should be removed second; and a 3 by the individual who should be removed third.

___ An engineer  __ ___ A liberal arts coed

___ An engineer’s pregnant wife  ___ A Hispanic high school teacher

___ A botanist  ___ An intelligent female movie star

___ An armed police officer  ___ A professional baseball player

___ A Lutheran minister  ___ A black medical student
Down by the Sea. A final ice breaker exercise is presented in Table 4.2 (see McCool, 1990). Like the brain teaser activity, students generally enjoy this game. Simply divide the class into groups of three to five students and distribute a handout containing this exercise. The group that completes the task first wins a prize. As before, the focus of the ice breaker is to get students to work together on a playful activity. In so doing, they learn about each other.

Table 4.2
Down By the Sea

Rearrange the words at the left to form new words pertaining to the ocean. After completing the puzzle, transfer the letters above the numbers to the blanks to discover a difficult tongue twister.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Word</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DAN’S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO ACE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HE CAB</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WE RAT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IF SHE’S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SO LIAR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIN LAD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MASS COP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SENT TAX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEED AWE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAT PAIN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RENT CUR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A VAIN COT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHE AS SELL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The answers in descending order to Down by the Sea are: (1) sand, (2) ocean, (3) beach, (4) water, (5) fishes, (6) sailor, (7) island, (8) compass, (9) sextant, (10) seaweed, (11) captain, (12) current, (13) vacation, and (14) seashells. The tongue twister is “She sells seashells by the seashore.”
Case Studies

A case consists of conditions, attributes, and practices that exist at a particular time in an organization’s history. It usually describes a challenging problem or set of problems an organization is facing. One of the advantages of the case method is the extent to which it requires students to identify problems, discuss alternative solutions, and ultimately arrive at a recommendation to resolve the problem(s). Throughout the case analysis process, students have to interact, problem solve, and make consensus-based team decisions.

A case provides some, but usually not all, of the information available to managers at the time they need to resolve a problem. Because it attempts to reconstruct a real-life situation, a case is deliberately written in a way that requires the rearrangement of facts and an interpretation of these facts, including an evaluation of a company’s opinions, behaviors, and intentions. In addition, many (but not all) of the available facts are relevant to the solution of the problem. This simulates real-life experiences, since information used to solve an actual problem is seldom presented in a systematic and orderly fashion.

Case studies typically require students to perform the following four tasks: (a) identify relevant facts in the particular organization at the present time, (b) clearly articulate the major problem(s) facing the organization, (c) brainstorm possible courses of action which may resolve the problem(s), as well as identify the advantages and disadvantages of each, and (d) agree upon a recommendation to solve the case. In addition, specific questions relevant to the case analysis are often presented at the end of the scenario.

The following six case studies are provided here for possible use in your course:

1. The Case of Joe Smith;
2. The Case of Pete Doe;
3. The Value of Company Loyalty;
4. Violation of Smoking Policy Costs 13 PBI Workers Their Jobs; and
5. She’s Too Fat for Me.

All of these cases examine interpersonal and organizational issues, which should be pertinent for students in a variety of disciplines.
The Case of Joe Smith

Joe Smith, a computer applications specialist with ABC Software, was asked to give an early morning presentation to a prospective client in a distant city. At the last minute, Joe decided to travel a day early so that she could spend an evening with the client as well. The next day his presentation went extremely well, and she garnered a substantial contract for the company.

When he returned from her trip, he submitted an expense account, including a $185 hotel bill for the night prior to her client meeting. Company policy states that any lodging expense above $100 must be approved beforehand by a manager.

Three managers were asked how they would respond. Their comments are presented below.

**Manager A.** “I would double-check the policy, and if so, I would approve only $100 for the hotel room — despite Joe's contention that the hotel was the only one with vacancies in the area and that his staying there helped land the account.”

**Manager B.** “I would reluctantly approve the expense in full after discussing the situation with Joe and noting the special circumstances. I would make sure he submitted a supplemental memo explaining the details, as well as stress that it should not happen again.”

**Manager C.** “I would view the policy as only a general guide. I would be much more interested in what Joe accomplished during his trip. I would gladly approve the entire amount and commend Joe on his initiative and success.”

Questions:

1. Which manager’s approach would you endorse and why?

2. How do you think Joe would feel if you chose the approach recommended by Manager A (B or C)?
The Case of Pete Doe*

SCENE ONE

Pete Doe worked in the shipping department of the Johnson Paper Company for over 12 years and was generally regarded by those around him as a steady, dependable, hard-working employee. Last Wednesday, while working in an area of the department in which a NO SMOKING sign was conspicuously posted (because of the high concentration of flammable materials in the area), he lit up a cigarette. Just as he lit up, a co-worker pulled back the sliding door to the loading dock, and a strong gust of wind blew the cigarette from Pete’s lips onto the floor near some combustible chemicals. Pete, responding with speed and agility that belied his age of 55, pounced on the cigarette and extinguished it before any damage was done. Meanwhile, the foreman, John Thomas, saw what had happened.

Question:

If you were John, which of the following actions would you take?

[a] Do nothing, ignore what happened.
[b] Go over to Pete, point out that he has committed a serious violation, and promise him that you will have to penalize him if he ever does it again.
[c] Prepare a written reprimand to be placed in Pete’s personnel file.
[d] Levy a $100 fine.
[e] Suspend Pete from work for one day without pay.
[f] Discharge Pete from the company.

SCENE TWO

Now, go back to the story above, and revise the story to read: “Pete had worked for less than a year in the company and was generally regarded by those around him as an indifferent worker who needed constant pressure to do what was expected of him on the job. He was also absent more often than anyone else in the department.” The rest of the details of the story remain the same. What would you do?

SCENE THREE

Assume the same version of the story as in Scene Two above, with this additional change: “... a strong gust of wind blew the cigarette into some combustible materials and ignited a fire. By the time the fire had been extinguished, over $1000 worth of finished paper goods had been damaged.” Now, what would you do?

*The above case was adapted from Organ and Hamner (1982).
The Value of Company Loyalty

The punt was booming, backing the Toronto Beefers to their own two-yard line. Once again, Buddy was the hero. Once again, the Red Wave was most likely going to have excellent field position thanks to him.

Buddy was a special athlete. In 1965, he was named Athlete of the Year. Following college, he was drafted by two major league football teams. Unfortunately, Buddy could not adjust to being away from home and eventually quit both clubs.

His first real job was as an employment recruiter for a very small, upstart computer firm in Huntsville, Alabama. Again, Buddy was blessed with special talent. He had an uncanny ability to evaluate applicants and select the ones with the highest potential. He was superb!

Four years passed, and Buddy’s recruiting skills inside the company became well known. The company’s work force grew from 250 to nearly 2,000 during this time. The president saw the long hours Buddy worked, the unrelenting schedule he kept to interview all the candidates that needed to be “wined, dined, and evaluated,” and (most of all) his results. The company was now large enough that it needed a “Director of Personnel.” Buddy was the logical choice.

Buddy approached his new position with the same fervor as recruiting. He worked long and hard, very hard! Although he knew recruiting extremely well, he also knew he was unfamiliar with the other areas of personnel — compensation and benefits, employee relations, training and development, affirmative action, and personnel law. There was so much he had to learn, and he wanted to know every detail.

There was something else new for Buddy. This was the first time in his life he ever had to supervise anybody. “Oh well!” he thought, “That shouldn’t be too difficult. I will pick that up without any problem.”

Unfortunately, the transition to personnel director and management was not that easy for Buddy. He had tremendous difficulty mastering many of the basics of personnel policy. Moreover, his subordinates seemed to dislike him — even despise him. Many felt he was completely incompetent outside the arena of recruitment. They didn’t like his autocratic, do-it-my-way approach. He demanded to know every detail of every assignment they performed, appearing as though he didn’t trust them to do their jobs correctly. Not surprisingly, this caused them to be resentful and likewise not to trust him. They referred to him as the “Neanderthal Manager” because of his primitive style of managing.

During the past five years, the Personnel Division has been through “hell” with Buddy as its leader. Turnover has averaged 35% per year (the worst division in the company). “Morale,” in the words of one employee, “is the pits!” The company also has lost three employee lawsuits ($195,000) due to his lack of legal knowledge in proper employee termination practices. Other executive managers perceive Buddy and Personnel as the “laughing stock” of the company.
However, one must not forget that Buddy has maintained two of the president’s key objectives during these five years. First, he has kept the company union-free. And second, he has brought many, many more employees aboard. The work force now numbers 7,200; they have sales offices in 48 states and 26 countries; sales in 1998 approached $1 billion. In spite of his deteriorating health (e.g., bleeding ulcers, gaining 40 pounds) his loyalty and dedication to the company remains unquestionable.

Questions:

1. What, if anything, should be done with Buddy?

2. How important should “loyalty” be when making personnel decisions, such as promotions, retention, and terminations?

3. How seriously should a company president take signals that a manager might be supervising his/her subordinates very poorly (e.g., there is high turnover, many grievances filed, morale problems)?

4. If Buddy should die suddenly of a heart attack, is the company potentially liable?
Violation of Smoking Policy Costs 13 PBI Workers Their Jobs*

Thirteen Possible Builders, Inc. (PBI) employees were released from their jobs last week for violating the no smoking policy at this Sugar Bay, Illinois shipyard.

The Company Vice-President of human resources, confirmed that the production employees were released for “violating a major and significant rule of PBI by clandestinely leaving the work area during working hours and spending time smoking cigarettes in a no-smoking area.”

In 1990, PBI became one of the first large employers in Illinois to go totally smoke free during working hours. The V.P. said there was an informant who verified the violations.

“The company has taken a leadership role in the past couple of years, because a significant number of employees were concerned about sidebar smoke and lung cancer. A nonsmoker runs a greater risk than smokers because they get the smoke without the filter,” the V.P. asserted.

“Our New Year’s resolution January 1, 1990 was to go smoke free, and at that same time we offered counseling and group health programs for any employee (free of charge) who wanted to quit smoking,” he said. “We consider it to be a real success story, because well in excess of 100 employees have quit smoking during the past two years.”

The V.P. said the reasons for the firings came, “because we felt smoking during working hours was a health hazard, not only for the individual smoking but also for people who don’t smoke. We felt it was unfair to allow smokers to stop working to smoke while nonsmokers continued on the job. The smokers would stop welding and have a cigarette, and that costs us in terms of productivity.”

“Probably the most critical issue was fire hazard,” he said. “We’ve had some fires at the yard and one was directly attributed to smoking. The company wanted to make sure we weren’t at risk of having a building burn down which would put 1,000 people out of work.”

Discussing the discharges, he further explained there had been employee meetings and training with respect to the no smoking policy. He said that employees had been told they would be fired if they smoked during working hours.

“In the past, three other employees were discharged for the same rule violations, and this time the company was just being consistent with policy. The entire company was warned that if employees were caught smoking during working hours they would be discharged.”

The V.P. also said that rising health insurance prices was another issue at stake in the company’s decision to go smoke free. “Health insurance costs are 35% greater for people who smoke versus people who don’t smoke.”

In 1991, PBI received awards from the Illinois Health Association and the Cancer Society for being one of the first major state employers to go totally smoke free.
“I feel very badly that 13 otherwise good employees had to lose their jobs, one had over 20 years with the company,” the V.P. said in an interview. “It was a very sad day when we had to make that tough decision. We know it affects the lives of the family members as well, but the company felt strongly about the principle and we had to be firm and live up to our obligation to the rest of our employees.”

The fired workers plan to hold a meeting to discuss what action to take, if any, in the wake of the dismissals. They declined comment on the issue until after the meeting.

*The above case was adapted from a news story appearing in *The Door County Advocate*, April 28, 1992.

**Questions:**

1. Do you agree or disagree with the disciplinary action taken by PBI management? Be sure to clearly justify your answer.

2. Describe the differences between “discipline” and “punishment.” What implication does this distinction have (if any) for the management of employees?

3. If a new supervisor asked you to give her the “five keys” to effective discipline, what would they be?
She’s Too Fat for Me*

A financial settlement reached a few days ago has not soothed the anger that seethes inside Ellen Jones as she recalls her brief employment as a front desk clerk at the So-So Hotel in Laramie, Wisconsin. “It was so humiliating. I have never been so humiliated in my whole life,” Jones says of her firing May 15th from a job she thoroughly enjoyed.

“I wanted to strip naked and picket in front of the place. That’s how I felt!” she asserted. “I wasn’t judged by my ability to do the job. I was judged by one person’s opinion of what’s attractive.”

That person is Dave Malloy, who fired Jones just a month after a promotion made him the hotel’s front desk manager. While contending Jones was fired for incompetence and unprofessional conduct, hotel officials agreed to pay her a financial settlement to dismiss a complaint she filed with the Equal Rights Division of the state Department of Industry, Labor, and Human Relations (DILHR) claiming the firing was the result of discrimination.

Jones, who is in her 40's, is 5-foot-4 and weighs 240 pounds, contends she was fired because Malloy (a younger man) deemed her to be too old and too fat. “Malloy wanted a staff of younger, slimmer women working for him,” Jones declares.

John Timony, the DILHR equal rights officer who investigated her complaint, essentially agreed. In an “initial determination” issued earlier this year, Timony found probable cause to believe the So-So Hotel, had violated the Wisconsin Fair Employment Act by dismissing Jacobs. A judicial hearing on Timony's conclusions was canceled after Jones accepted the hotel's financial settlement.

Terms of the settlement are confidential, but Jacobs says it does not come close to salving her emotional pain. “No, it’s not satisfactory,” she says of the settlement. “But the law basically says that’s all I can get.”

Jones says her attorney advised her that the most she could win by continuing to pursue her discrimination complaint would be wages lost during the three months she was unemployed after her firing. She earned $6.50 an hour at the hotel. However, the settlement does offer Jones some satisfaction. She says it “absolutely” amounts to an admission of wrongdoing on the part of hotel officials.

Mr. Malloy declined to discuss Jones’ firing when contacted Thursday. Sara Solace, the hotel’s general manager, also declined to discuss the case and even refused to reveal what Malloy's current position is at the hotel. Solace did state, however, that the hotel does not discriminate and is an equal opportunity employer.

Not according to Jones. She claims that from the time she was hired in February, Malloy made his animosity toward her clear. “From the first day, the man was just rude,” Jones argued. “I would say, ‘Good morning,’ and he’d just grunt or say nothing at all.” Meanwhile, she says, Malloy was openly friendly with the young college women who comprised the majority of the front desk staff.
When Jones was hired, Malloy worked as the hotel’s night auditor. “Basically, he was at the same level as I was,” Jones says. Despite his lack of authority, Jones asserts, Malloy began to raise insignificant issues with her, often about things that had nothing to do with his job. For example, he chastised her for keeping her coat in the office of the person who was the front desk manager.

After Malloy became front desk manager, Jones says, he consistently criticized her for actions that were acceptable for the younger desk clerks — things like drinking coffee at the desk and keeping her purse under her work station. “It was just a bunch of little things,” Jones claims. “Maybe he was just trying to egg me into quitting.”

According to Jones, Malloy constantly made comments to other hotel employees about her weight. “He just continued to do that,” she says. “It was just a thing with him, an obsession.”

As DILHR’s Timony discovered during his investigation of Jones’ complaint, she never received a verbal or written reprimand about her job performance during the four months she worked at the hotel. But just a month after Malloy’s promotion, she was asked to report to work early one day. Malloy called her into his office and said, “he wasn’t happy with my performance” and that “my work was less than professional,” Jones recalls.

“I said, Dave, what are you trying to do? Are you trying to fire me?”

Indeed, he was! Indeed, he did! Timony concluded Malloy acted inappropriately — and probably illegally. “During her employment, Mr. Malloy exhibited negative behavior toward Ms. Jones, unlike behavior toward young, average-weight female employees,” Jones wrote.

Mr. Malloy’s stated reasons for terminating Jacobs included his allegation that “... the image she portrayed to guests was totally unprofessional and unsatisfactory.” The alleged image referred to by Malloy may well have included his perception of Jones as being too old and handicapped, due to her being overweight. Other of Malloy’s reasons for terminating Jones’ employment were believed by the investigator to be related to behavior that was “common and acceptable to him when younger and average-weight employees were involved in like behavior.”

Had Jones’ complaint gone to a judicial hearing, seven women who worked with her at the hotel were prepared to testify on Jones’ behalf. That kind of support from co-workers was one of the many reasons Jacobs was distressed by her firing. “It was an ideal job for me,” she asserts. “There was room to grow.”

Fortunately, though, Jones says the job she found three months after her firing from the hotel has turned out to be much better for her. Jones now manages an apartment complex for the Housing Authority, a firm that owns or manages 1,400 apartments in Wisconsin and Minnesota.
Reflecting on the manner of her dismissal from the So-So Hotel, Jones says, “It makes me feel good to say I won [at her new place of employment] manager-of-the-year award this year.”

But the bitterness remains.

“OK, I am considered overweight,” Jones admits. “But I’m clean. I’m well-dressed. I wear make-up. My hair’s made up. My size in no way prevented me from doing a good job at the hotel. Besides, the So-So’s a family place. It’s not the Playboy Club!”

“I have a perfect work record, except for this,” she says. “The humiliation that I was put through, you can’t even put a price on it.”

**Questions:**

1. Do you agree that Ms. Jones should have received a financial settlement? Why or why not? If you feel she should have received some financial remuneration, how much would you recommend?

2. Specifically, what (if anything) did the hotel management do wrong?

3. Does a place of business have the right to hire, retain, and promote the types of people it deems most suitable? Explain your answer.

4. What would you recommend the So-So Hotel do with Mr. Dave Malloy?

*The above case was adapted from a news story appearing in the *Eau Claire Leader-Telegram* on December 18, 1994. The names of individuals and the hotel have been changed to maintain confidentiality.*
CHAPTER 5
COMPLEMENTARY ASSESSMENT AND
DEVELOPMENTAL EFFORTS

A whale is as unique as a cactus. But don’t ask a whale to survive Death Valley. We all have special gifts. Where we use them and how determines whether we attain our potential (and are happy).

Max DePree
CEO and Author

To know oneself is wisdom, but to know one’s neighbor is genius.

Minna Antrium
Author

One of the fundamental ingredients in the recipe for team success is the awareness that all individuals are different. Physically, people come in all shapes, sizes, and colors — that observation is obvious. However, people are likewise very different psychologically. For example, some individuals deal with conflict head-on; others avoid it whenever possible. Some individuals are brash and bold, attempting to dominate every personal interaction; others are more quiet and cautious, preferring to keep their views to themselves. When a meeting is scheduled for 10:00 a.m., some team members consistently arrive early, some invariably arrive late no matter when the meeting is scheduled, while others may or may not attend the meeting at all.

In this chapter, we present three assessment instruments you can utilize to capture some key areas where team members differ. One instrument is the Thomas-Kilmann Conflict Mode Instrument. This inventory measures how individuals deal with interpersonal conflict. Another instrument we present is the Reaction-to-Change Inventory. This assessment is a short exercise to determine how an individual perceives and reacts to organizational change. Finally, we review the Personal Profile System. This assessment is frequently referred to as the DISC Model and is used widely to examine individual differences with regard to behavioral style preferences.

It is important to remember that no one mode, style, preference, etc. is always best. All individual differences can be beneficial for team functioning. The proper respect for those differences and the appropriate management of those differences will ultimately determine whether or not a team is successful. It is also important to realize that there are many, many other assessment “tools” in the marketplace. The above three were selected because we personally have employed them in a variety of team settings and found them to be useful. Further, they represent three critical areas where team members may have problems working together. None of the three instruments needs to be used in order to effectively introduce students to the team concept. Also, none of them needs to be
employed to successfully use *The Team Developer*. The measures are presented here simply for your information. We believe that you may find them useful in your personal journey to incorporate teams into your courses.

**The Thomas-Kilmann Conflict Mode Instrument**

The *Thomas-Kilmann Conflict Mode Instrument* is designed to measure an individual’s behavior in conflict situations (Thomas & Kilmann, 1974). “Conflict situations” are situations in which the concerns of two or more people appear to be incompatible. In such instances, we can describe an individual’s behavior along two basic dimensions: (a) assertiveness — the extent to which the individual attempts to satisfy his or her own concerns, and (b) cooperativeness — the extent to which the individual attempts to satisfy the other person’s concerns. These two basic dimensions of behavior can be used to define the following five specific methods of dealing with conflict in general (see Figure 5.1):

- **Avoiding** — unassertive and uncooperative;
- **Accommodating** — unassertive and cooperative;
- **Competing** — assertive and uncooperative;
- **Compromising** — somewhat assertive and somewhat cooperative; and
- **Collaborating** — assertive and cooperative.

It is important for students (and employees) to recognize their own preferred way of dealing with conflict, as well as the preferred ways of their teammates. Each method has its strengths and weaknesses and each may be more appropriate in different settings. In order to provide you with some background on each method, we present the following information for each mode of dealing with conflict: (a) its goal, (b) a slogan depicting the mode, (c) guidelines on the most appropriate use of the mode, and (d) organizational implications for when this mode is overused and underused.
Avoiding Mode

GOAL: To delay.

SLOGAN: *I’ll think about it tomorrow!*

MOST APPROPRIATE WHEN:
- Issues are of low importance.
- Tensions are high.
- One wants to buy additional time.
- One is in a position of little power or control.
- Others should take ownership and responsibility for problem.

WHEN AVOIDING MODE IS OVERUSED:
- Decisions are made by default without one’s views or ideas.
- One loses credibility and influence in the eyes of the organization.
- Decisions linger and problems fester.
- May foster a cautious decision-making posture that is contagious in the organization.

WHEN AVOIDING IS UNDERUSED:
- May be sending a signal that one is a “busybody” or a “bully.”
- May cause one to have no time or energy for important decisions.
- May be robbing others of the opportunity to stand up for themselves or find their own solutions.
- Causes one’s contributions to be withheld.

Accommodating Mode

GOAL: To yield.

SLOGAN: *It would be my pleasure!*

MOST APPROPRIATE WHEN:
- One wants to demonstrate that s/he is reasonable and fair.
- One wants to encourage risk taking and empowerment.
- Creating good will (or building favors).
- Keeping “peace” and preserving harmony.
- In situations where one is outmatched or losing ground.
- Issues are of low importance.
WHEN ACCOMMODATING MODE IS OVERUSED:
Ideas get little attention.
Influence and credibility is restricted.
Contributions are lost.
Others may take advantage of you.

WHEN ACCOMMODATING IS UNDERUSED:
Rapport and positive support is lost.
Morale can be damaged because employees may feel unappreciated.
One may have trouble recognizing when exceptions are justified.

Competing Mode

GOAL: To win.

SLOGAN: My way or the highway!

MOST APPROPRIATE WHEN:
Quick action is needed.
Facing an unpopular decision.
Issue is of critical importance.

WHEN COMPETING MODE IS OVERUSED:
Receive little feedback or input from others.
Reduces learning.
Leads to low employee empowerment.
Tends to foster a “yes boss” corporate culture.

WHEN COMPETING IS UNDERUSED:
One has restricted influence on decisions.
Tends to lead to indecisiveness.
Causes one to be “slow to act.”
Causes one’s contributions to be withheld.

Compromising Mode

GOAL: To find a middle ground.

SLOGAN: Let’s make a deal!

MOST APPROPRIATE WHEN:
Issues are of moderate importance.
Parties are of equal power and equally committed.
Seeking temporary solutions.
Seeking an expedient solution that somewhat satisfies all parties.
Competing and collaborating do not seem to be working.

**WHEN COMPROMISING MODE IS OVERUSED:**
One may get so preoccupied with the tactics of compromise that s/he loses sight of the big picture.
People may view you as someone who does not hold any firm values or principles.
May foster a “tit-for-tat,” cynical work environment.

**WHEN COMPROMISING IS UNDERUSED:**
May be involved in frequent unnecessary confrontations.
May be involved in frequent power struggles.
One fails to develop effective negotiating skills.

---

**Collaborating Mode**

**GOAL:** To find a win-win solution.

**SLOGAN:** *Two heads are better than one!*

**MOST APPROPRIATE WHEN:**
An integrative solution is needed.
One wants to learn, test an assumption, or understand another position.
One wants to find an innovative solution to a complex problem.
Seeking buy-in or commitment to a decision or course of action.
One wants to build rapport or improve a relationship.

**WHEN COLLABORATING IS OVERUSED:**
Too much time is spent on trivial matters.
Risk and responsibility are diffused.
Others may take advantage of you.

**WHEN COLLABORATING IS UNDERUSED:**
One may apply “quick fix” solutions that do not address the root cause of a problem.
One may lose support for decisions.
Leads to low employee empowerment.
Fails to take advantage of group synergy.
If you decide to use the *Thomas-Kilmann Conflict Mode Instrument*, the administration and discussion will take one-to-two hours of class time.

**If you are interested in ordering copies of the *Thomas-Kilmann Conflict Mode Instrument* contact:**

Xicom  
60 Woods Road  
Tuxedo, New York 10987  
[800-759-4266]
Reaction-to-Change Inventory

The Reaction-to-Change (R-T-C) Inventory is an easy to use, broadly applicable exercise to explore and discuss individual perceptions regarding change (De Meuse & McDaris, 1994). This type of discussion helps people understand and modify their own reaction to change and understand and adapt to the reactions of others (e.g., teammates, supervisors, subordinates). By exploring how individuals react to changes, the R-T-C Inventory casts light on how the team or organization as a whole responds to change. As an instructor, you can use these insights in an effort to prepare students for change, keep them informed of changes, and get them involved in fostering change in their teams.

The R-T-C Inventory consists of 30 carefully selected words that illustrate the ways in which people can react to change. Participants are asked to circle the words that they most strongly associate with change. Based on their word choices, an assessment is made with regard to their perceptions and reactions to organizational change. The value of this exercise resides in a group discussion of how different people have scored, what these scores reflect, and how change should be introduced to make various individuals comfortable with it. You should direct the class discussion toward how students can work together to manage the introduction and implementation of the change process.

If you are interested in using the R-T-C Inventory exercise, have your students initially complete the inventory (see Table 5.1). Next, discuss how people can react to change in general. What is it about change that people fear? What is it about change that people desire? Identify the following three types of individuals with regard to change: (a) change agents, (b) change compliers, and (c) change challengers. Change agents respond to change with commitment. They have a whole-hearted involvement and support for the change. These individuals generally like variety; overall, they readily embrace change, any change. They are generally leaders of organizational change efforts. Change compliers respond to change by adapting to the new circumstances. These individuals will change, but may (or will) not like it. They frequently have some strong reservations about the proposed changes. However, they will go along with the change efforts because they are “good soldiers.” Their natural tendency is to have a “wait-and-see” attitude. Change challengers respond to change through resistance. These individuals show active or passive opposition to change in general. They often try to undermine change efforts every step of the way. Change is exceedingly difficult for these people. Their natural tendency is to cling to the status quo. These individuals tend to be very fearful of change, uncertainty, and ambiguity. Stress to the students that all organizations have all three types. Further, it is important to realize that all organizations most likely need all three types to function effectively. If companies would employ all change agents, it would lead to chaos — change simply for the sake of change would be the norm. In contrast, if only change challengers were employed, innovation would likely come to a standstill.

Subsequently, ask students to speculate about their own style and the styles of fellow team members. Now, score the inventory (see Table 5.2) and share the norms presented in Table 5.3. Plot the number of change agents, compliers, and challengers on the board. Discuss what students perceive are the pros and cons of each style. Divide the students into their respective teams, and ask them to discuss how an organizational change (e.g., new technology, new procedure or policy) should be introduced for them to feel comfortable
with (and supportive of) it. In total, this assessment exercise will take about one hour to conduct in class.

If you are interested in ordering copies of the *Reaction-to-Change Inventory*, contact:
Wisconsin Management Group, Inc.
3391 Evergreen Lane
Eau Claire, Wisconsin  54701
[715-836-2953]

Table 5.1
Reaction-To-Change Inventory

| Directions: Circle all the words you most frequently associate with change. |
|-------------------|-----------------|------------------|
| Fun               | Transition      | Vary             |
| Death             | Stress          | Deteriorate      |
| Modify            | Different       | Opportunity      |
| Better            | Uncertainty     | Upheaval         |
| Grow              | Rebirth         | Disruption       |
| Replace           | Learn           | Adjust           |
| New               | Revise          | Challenging      |
| Fear              | Improve         | Transfer         |
| Alter             | Concern         | Exciting         |
| Anxiety           | Chance          | Ambiguity        |

Table 5.2
Scoring System for the R-T-C Inventory

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Positive Words</th>
<th>Negative Words</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fun</td>
<td>Death</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learn</td>
<td>Disruption</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunity</td>
<td>Stress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New</td>
<td>Concern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better</td>
<td>Deteriorate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenging</td>
<td>Uncertainty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rebirth</td>
<td>Ambiguity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve</td>
<td>Upheaval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exciting</td>
<td>Anxiety</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For each of the following words a student circled, s/he earns 10 points:

For each of the following words a student circled, s/he subtracts 10 points:

For each of the following words a student circled, they do not earn any points; nor do they subtract points (i.e., these words have a value of “0”).

In total, a student’s score can range from a low of “-100” (if all 10 negative words were selected and no positive words) to a high of “+100” (if all 10 positive words were selected and no negative words).

Note: Refer to De Meuse and McDaris (1994) for detailed scoring instructions.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale Values</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Change Agents</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+40 to +100</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+20 to +30</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Change Compliers</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-10 to +10</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Change Challengers</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-20 to -30</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-40 to -100</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Data \( N = 427 \) were collected from five manufacturing firms, a government agency, a bank, and a large regional hospital. No meaningful, statistical differences were found between the eight organizations. In general, managers had slightly more supportive change scores than non-managers.
The Personal Profile System

The Personal Profile System is frequently referred to as the DISC Model, because the measure divides individuals into four categories — each category title beginning with the letters D, I, S, or C. The instrument was developed by Dr. John Geier at The University of Minnesota in the early 1970s and is widely used today to help team members work together more effectively (O’Connor & Merwin, 1992). The objective of the measure is twofold: (a) to help individuals understand and appreciate their unique behavioral differences as team members, and (b) to enable individuals to systematically evaluate their strengths and areas for growth as team members. It is hoped that team members will become sensitive to the needs of one another and be able to take advantage of each member’s unique characteristics for goal attainment.

Whenever using the Personal Profile System, we distinguish between the “golden rule” and the “platinum rule.” Most students are familiar with the premise of the golden rule — that individuals should treat others the way they personally want to be treated. There is a major assumption of the golden rule that may no longer be valid. That individuals all are alike; thus, what one individual likes or dislikes others also do. The diverse workforce of today demands that we rethink this premise. Consequently, the platinum rule is more applicable in this new millennium. The fundamental tenet of the platinum rule is that we should treat others the way they want to be treated, not the way we want to be treated. After all, people are different. They have different personalities, motives, needs, skill sets, “hot buttons,” and “cold buttons.” The Personal Profile System emphasizes that team members must be sensitive to such interpersonal differences and, rather than have members repress them or try to change them, embrace them. Such differences should be carefully nurtured and taken advantage of when team members interact.

This instrument is not a personality test. One’s personality is established early in life and is relatively permanent. Personality is quite consistent across social settings, such as school, play, church, and work (McCrae & Costa, 1987). The Personal Profile System is a measure of behavioral style. One’s behavior can and does change across time and social context. Specifically, the Personal Profile System assesses an individual’s behavior relative to two dimensions: (a) assertiveness and (b) emotional responsiveness. These dimensions are integrated to form a matrix or grid of four cells (see Figure 5.2). Each cell represents a different behavioral style:

- **D** — Dominance,
- **I** — Influencing,
- **S** — Steadiness, and
- **C** — Conscientiousness.

We recommend that you employ the Personal Profile System or DISC Model as a team building exercise. Initially, explain briefly to students the purpose of the measure, and have them complete the instrument. Subsequently, describe the four unique behavioral styles individuals can possess. For your reference, the primary focus, desire, celebrity examples, etc. of each style are presented on the following pages. Once familiar with the four different styles, students should be asked to speculate on what is their own style, as well as the styles of all their teammates. Finally, the instrument is scored and team members discuss each other’s speculated and scored style. Special attention should be given to examining why two team members may be “butting heads” most of the time, while other
members may have experienced “instant chemistry.” The role that behavioral style plays in interpersonal dynamics is discussed. Group members are asked how they can utilize the information they gleaned from this assessment to make their teams function more effectively.

Overall, you as an instructor should help students realize that their individual behavioral styles can greatly influence the interpersonal dynamics and performance of their respective teams. Rather than students longing to be placed in teams with students with similar styles as themselves, have students examine how they can take advantage of each other’s unique style when completing assignments in their present team. In total, the Personal Profile System will take about two-to-three hours of class time to administer, score, and interpret. We recommend an additional hour for the team members to discuss their individual styles and how they impact how the group functions. This latter activity can occur outside of class.

If you are interested in ordering copies of the Personal Profile System or DISC Model, contact:
Zitzloff Training Resources, Inc.
12500 Wayzata Boulevard
Suite B
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55305
[612-745-7907]
THE PERSONAL PROFILE GRID

Dominance Style

PRIMARY FOCUS:
- Action-oriented
- Getting immediate results
- Taking authority and responsibility
- Making snap decisions
- Trouble-shooting
- Bottom-line orientation

DESIREs:
- Control and power
- Prestige
- Direct answers
- Freedom to call one’s own shots
- Wide scope of operations
- Challenges
- Opportunities for advancement

EXAMPLES:
- General Patton
- Rambo
- Vince Lombardi

Influence Style

PRIMARY FOCUS:
- Relationship-oriented
- Generating enthusiasm
- Entertaining people
- Risk-taker (fly by seat of pants)
- Creative
- Intuitive

DESIREs:
- Being popular
- To help others
Freedom of expression
Freedom from control and detail
Moving quickly
Team activities

EXAMPLES:
Jay Leno
Tim “The Tool-Man” Taylor from *Home Improvement*
Bill Clinton

**Steadiness Style**

**PRIMARY FOCUS:**
- Security-oriented
- Skill specialization
- Dependability, reliability
- Easy-going, agreeable
- Excellent listener
- Team player

**DESires:**
- Security
- Stability (status quo)
- Long friendships
- Team acceptance
- Routine work
- Moving slowly when making decisions

**EXAMPLES:**
Al Gore
Al, Tim’s sidekick
“Accountant” stereotype

**Conscientiousness Style**

**PRIMARY FOCUS:**
- Detail-oriented
- Logical and methodical
- Precise
- Critical thinker
- Cool and detached
- Working within known conditions
- Very business-like
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DESIRE:
- Quality and accuracy
- Order and organization
- Standard operating procedures (S.O.P.)
- Recognition for personal accomplishment
- Protected environment

EXAMPLES:
- Mr. Data from *Star Trek: The Next Generation*
- Tom Landry
- “Scientist” stereotype
## DAILY EXAMPLES OF THE FOUR STYLES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STRENGTHS</th>
<th>WEAKNESSES</th>
<th>IRRITATIONS</th>
<th>UNDER STRESS</th>
<th>DECISION MAKING</th>
<th>OCCUPATIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Listening</td>
<td>Oversensitive</td>
<td>Insensitivity</td>
<td>Submissive</td>
<td>Conferring</td>
<td>Family doctor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team work</td>
<td>Slow to begin action</td>
<td>Impatience</td>
<td>Indecisive</td>
<td>Deliberate</td>
<td>Engineer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follow-through</td>
<td>Lacks global perspective</td>
<td>Critical</td>
<td>Withdrawn</td>
<td>Decisive</td>
<td>Executive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Unresponsive</td>
<td>Headstrong</td>
<td></td>
<td>Engineer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>Perfectionist</td>
<td>Disorganization</td>
<td>Dictatorial</td>
<td></td>
<td>Military leader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Systematizing</td>
<td>Critical</td>
<td>Impropriety</td>
<td>Critical</td>
<td></td>
<td>Newspaper editor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orchestration</td>
<td>Unresponsive</td>
<td>Inefficiency</td>
<td>Superficial</td>
<td></td>
<td>Actor/actress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Indecision</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Routines</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Complexity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OCCUPATIONS</th>
<th>OCCUPATIONS</th>
<th>OCCUPATIONS</th>
<th>OCCUPATIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FAMILY DOCTOR</td>
<td>ENGINEER</td>
<td>EXECUTIVE</td>
<td>SALES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCIAL SERVICES</td>
<td>RESEARCHER</td>
<td>MILITARY LEADER</td>
<td>PUBLIC RELATIONS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEACHER</td>
<td>ARTIST</td>
<td>NEWSPAPER EDITOR</td>
<td>ACTOR/ACTRESS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## DISTINGUISHING CHARACTERISTICS OF THE FOUR STYLES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>STEADINESS</th>
<th>CONSCIENTIOUSNESS</th>
<th>DOMINANCE</th>
<th>INFLUENCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>BEHAVIOR</strong></td>
<td>Indirect</td>
<td>Indirect</td>
<td>Direct</td>
<td>Direct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PATTERN</strong></td>
<td>Supporting</td>
<td>Controlling</td>
<td>Controlling</td>
<td>Supporting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PACE</strong></td>
<td>Slower</td>
<td>Slower</td>
<td>Faster</td>
<td>Faster</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Relaxed</td>
<td>Systematic</td>
<td>Decisive</td>
<td>Spontaneous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PRIORITY</strong></td>
<td>The relationship</td>
<td>The task</td>
<td>The task</td>
<td>The relationship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>Process</td>
<td>Results</td>
<td>Interaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FEARS</strong></td>
<td>Sudden changes</td>
<td>Personal criticism</td>
<td>Being taken</td>
<td>Loss of social</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Instability</td>
<td>of their work efforts</td>
<td>advantage of</td>
<td>recognition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GAINS</strong></td>
<td>Friendship</td>
<td>Preparation</td>
<td>Control</td>
<td>Playfulness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SECURITY</strong></td>
<td>Cooperation</td>
<td>Thoroughness</td>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>THROUGH</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MEASURES</strong></td>
<td>Compatibility with others</td>
<td>Precision &amp; accuracy</td>
<td>Impact of results</td>
<td>Compliments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PERSONAL</strong></td>
<td>Depth of contribution</td>
<td>Quality of results</td>
<td>Track record</td>
<td>Applause</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WORTH BY</strong></td>
<td>The participation</td>
<td>The process</td>
<td>The win</td>
<td>The show</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>INTERNAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MOTIVATOR</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>APPEARANCE</strong></td>
<td>Casual</td>
<td>Formal</td>
<td>Business-like</td>
<td>Fashionable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Conforming</td>
<td>Conservative</td>
<td>Functional</td>
<td>Stylish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WORKPLACE</strong></td>
<td>Friendly</td>
<td>Formal</td>
<td>Efficient</td>
<td>Interacting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Functional</td>
<td>Functional</td>
<td>Busy</td>
<td>Busy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Personal</td>
<td>Structured</td>
<td>Structured</td>
<td>Personal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note:* This page and the previous one were adapted from Alessandra, O’Connor, & Alessandra (1990).
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