JOURNAL OF MANAGEMENT EDUCATION

JOURNAL OF
MANAGEMENT EDUCATION

—— CONTENTS ——

Reviewer Acknowledgement

Gib Akin	Meg Brindle	Carolyn Egri
Ben Arbaugh	Paula Caproni	Max Elden
Rasool Azari	Thomas Carey	Michael Elmes
Don Bacon	Mike Cavanaugh	Cathy Enz
Lori Bakken	Kevin Celuch	Dafna Eylon
Elango Balasubramanian	Joseph Champoux	Dyanne Ferk
	David Chappell	Steve Fink
Tim Baldwin	Jim Clawson	Steven Floyd
John Bantham	Mary Correa	Jeanie Forray
Randall Barker	Melinda Costello	Jeff Ford
Carole Barnett	Marcy Crary	Razelle Frankl
Frank Barone	Ann Cunliffe	Joan Gallos
Henry Beam	Joe Daly	Joseph Garcia
Christian Bechtel	Martin Davidson	Dan Gilbert
Carole Bennett	Robert DeFillipi	Janet Gillepsie
Natalie Berger	Andre Delbecq	Sue Godar
Michael Berlin	Giusseppe Delmestri	David Gray
Rama Bhalla-Hart	Bob Dennehy	Diana Grimes
Deb Bickford	Peter Diplock	Hugh Gunz
John Bigelow	Joe Dobson	Rama Hart
Ngaire Bissett	Diana Dodd-McCue	Nell Hartley
Allen Bluedorn	Meredith Downes	Susan Herman
Tom Bogart	Jack Drexler	Miggy Hopkins
Lee Bolman	Vanessa Druskat	Courtney Hunt
Robert Boozer	Mike Dumler	Jim Jawaher
Richard Boyatzis	Rita Durant	Colleen Jones
David Bradford	Gibb Dyer	Bill Kahn
Nancy Bragg	Deborah Ettington	Kathleen Kane

Ken Keleman
Terry Kinnear
Illene Kleinsorge
Greg Konz
Robert Kramer
Bob Ledman
Roy Lewicki
Marianne Lewis
Jeanne Liedtka
Cindy Lindsay
Linda Parrack
   Livingstone
Sharon Lobel
Doug Love
David Luechauer
Craig Lundberg
Mark Maier
Mark Malinger
Dorothy Marcic
Jennifer Martin
Bob Marx
Tish Matuszek
Douglas May
Magid Mazen
Anne McCarthy
Don McCormick
Michael McCullough
Jim McGee
Cathleen McGrath
Steve Meisel
Mary Catherine
   Meisenhelter
Jeff Mello
Gordon Meyer
Doug Mickilich

John Miller
Daniel Moore
Sandra Morgan
Eric Neilsen
Laurel Newman
Stella Nkomo
David O'Connell
Anshuman Prasad
Robert Quinn
Anthony Raia
Jean Ramsey
Khalid Razaki
Louise Rehling
Anne Reilly
Ken Rhee
Rick Ringer
Carol Roever
Kathryn Rogers
Grace Ann Rosile
Robert Rubin
Dale Rude
Gail Russ
Yolanda Sarason
Robert Scherer
Susan Schor
Susan Schragle-Law
Joseph Seltzer
Ben Shaw
Tracey Sigler
Mark Slama
Ken Slaysman
Randy Sleeth
Becky Smith
Jonathan Smith
Vic Sower

Duncan Spelman
Lynda St. Clair
David Steingard
William Stevenson
Kim Stewart
Greg Stone
Jim Stoner
Bill Stratton
Judi Strauss
Steven Taylor
Linda Townzen
Cheryl Tromley
Mary Tschirhart
Howard Tu
Mary Tucker
Peter Vaill
David Van Fleet
Iris Varner
Charles Wankel
Sandra Washington
Jane Webster
Karl Weick
Stephanie Welcomer
Edward Wertheim
Jane Wheeler
Ken Wheeler
Judith White
Joan Winn
Joseph Wolfe
Cheryl Wyrick
Leodones Yballe
Kenneth York
Kent Zimmerman

ABSTRACTS

Courtney Shelton Hunt—*Must See TV: The Timelessness of Television as a Teaching Tool*

Although television is a potentially rich source of examples of management and organizational behavior concepts, relatively few academics have advocated the use of this medium in the classroom. This article promotes the use of television as a tool for both teaching and testing in undergraduate organizational behavior courses by providing specific examples of how themes and characters from a variety of television shows can be used as the bases for creating both class exercises and exam questions. The article concludes with a set of guidelines for instructors who want to incorporate television in their future teaching methods.

Eric B. Dent—Seinfeld, *Professor of Organizational Behavior: The Psychological Contract and Systems Thinking*

The television sitcom *Seinfeld* provides management educators with a fun and thorough tool for teaching two concepts that are often part of organizational behavior or general management courses: the concepts of the psychological contract and interdependence in systems thinking. Especially in the case of the latter concept, students have a difficult time comprehending the central ideas through typical classroom learning. Viewing several episodes of *Seinfeld* seems to greatly clarify the concepts and sensitize students to seeing interdependencies in their own lives.

Tammy Bunn Hiller and Amy B. Hietapelto—*Contract Grading: Encouraging Commitment to the Learning Process Through Voice in the Evaluation Process*

Contract grading allows students to make important choices about what, how, and when to learn, thereby facilitating the development of a partnership learning environment in which students are likely to retain more information, make better use of information, and be more highly motivated to learn than in teacher-directed learning environments. This article argues the central role of contract grading in postmodern pedagogy and discusses in depth how to implement contract grading efficiently and effectively. It also addresses a significant benefit of using contract grading: Students learn multiple fundamental management concepts and skills experientially by engaging in the contract grading process.

Suzanne C. de Janasz—*Teaching Facilitation: A Play in Three Acts*

Practitioners and scholars alike are enamored of teams in the workplace. In an attempt to emulate this winning formula, many companies create teams, only to watch them fail. One reason is that merely bringing together a group of professionals does not ensure that they will function as an effective team or make appropriate decisions. By providing teams with facilitators, organizations can strengthen teams' abilities to function and achieve stated goals. Facilitation skills can be learned, and the purpose of this article is to offer a highly interactive simulation and supporting materials and activities that provide an effective means for doing so.

John E. Barbuto, Jr.—*Understanding and Applying an Integrative Taxonomy of Motivation Sources to Professional and Personal Settings*

This exercise incorporates an innovative teaching approach to demonstrate how motivation sources are evident in behavior and decisions. The exercise is based on the integrative typology proposed by Leonard, Beauvais, and Scholl and validated by Barbuto and Scholl. The taxonomy includes five sources of motivation: intrinsic process, instrumental, self-concept external, self-concept internal, and goal internalization. This article provides a brief summary and review of the five sources of motivation, complete instructions for conducting and processing the class exercise for both instructors and students, and a photocopy-ready handout for students.

Paul R. Lyons and David M. Nicol—*Structuring-by-the-Numbers: A Process for Discovering and Understanding Organizational Structure*

Structuring-by-the-Numbers is an experiential classroom activity intended to promote understanding of organizational design and structure, particularly in the context of organizational activities and objectives. It provides a forum for challenging assumptions and conventional wisdom through a sequential, stepped process in which students, with instructor guidance, create an organizational structure in response to a given situation. The activity transforms what is often perceived as pure context, part of the wallpaper, into something that can be seen to have direct relevance to organizational action. Structuring-by-the-Numbers presents an opportunity for the deconstruction of commonly held ideas and models of structure.

Natalie S. Berger—*Musavi-Lari: An Experiential Exercise in Diversity Awareness*

The Musavi-Lari exercise is an experiential activity designed to facilitate awareness of unconscious biases, prejudices, and hidden assumptions that influence our judgment. It can be used to illustrate the processes at work in social perception, decision making, group dynamics, groupthink, or diversity management. Participants report that the activity is engaging, is enlightening, and provides understanding of forces affecting the success of work groups and as well as global corporations.

MUST SEE TV: THE TIMELESSNESS OF TELEVISION AS A TEACHING TOOL

Courtney Shelton Hunt
Northern Illinois University

One of the struggles that many instructors face is the perennial need to come up with meaningful, concrete examples that demonstrate the conceptual points they are trying to make. This is especially problematic in applied courses such as management, human resources, and organizational behavior (OB), in which one of the primary pedagogical goals is to ensure that students develop a set of analytical and critical thinking skills that will help them be more effective when they enter the business world after they graduate. Professors in these courses strive to demonstrate that the theories and concepts that students learn in class are not just academic—something to be memorized for a test and quickly forgotten—but in fact are very practical and pervasive.

In recognition of this point, many management and OB texts provide business examples throughout their chapters to help link the theoretical material to real-world experiences. They also provide videotapes that contain excerpts from news programs intended to reflect various course-related concepts. Although these examples can be useful, they are still somewhat artificial to students because they do not have personal meaning for them (unless examples are based on McDonald's or Disney or another organization with which

students are intimately familiar). In addition, such examples tend to lack a certain richness in terms of how the information is conveyed. Consequently, students do not always benefit from these examples as much as they could.

Given the rather sterile nature of the typical textbook examples, many in the OB teaching community have recognized the benefits of also using examples from films, both commercial and documentary, as supplements to the examples and cases provided by their texts (for a summary of the uses of film as a teaching resource, see Champoux, 1999). Because of the drama involved, students often become engaged in a film's story line both intellectually and emotionally and are therefore better able to identify the links between the story details and related course concepts (Champoux, 1999; Michaelsen & Schultheiss, 1987; Vande Berg & Trujillo, 1989). *The Magnificent Seven*, for example, demonstrates a variety of influence tactics (Michaelsen & Schultheiss, 1987); *Aliens* demonstrates leadership and power concepts (Harrington & Griffin, 1989); *Twilight Zone: The Movie* illustrates issues related to diversity (Livingstone & Livingstone, 1998); and Martin Scorsese's *The Age of Innocence* provides a rich example of escalation theory (Ross, 1996). Various OB and management concepts are also revealed by *Dead Poets Society* (Gallos, 1993; Serey, 1992), *Other People's Money* (Graham, Pena, & Kocher, 1999), and the documentary films of Frederick Wiseman (Scherer & Baker, 1999).

Although management educators have recognized the benefits of using film in the classroom, there has been relatively little focus on the opportunities provided by television shows to similarly serve as examples of OB concepts in action. Gioia and Brass (1985) originally promoted the use of television shows as an opportunity to provide students with something they called "observational learning." They argued that because virtually all of our students have grown up watching television regularly, they have a different approach to learning than those of older generations whose development was not so strongly influenced by vivid visual images. Starting with *Sesame Street*, students now acquire a great deal of understanding and knowledge through the apparently passive activity of watching television and have learned how to "cognitively engage" (Serey, 1992, p. 374) the medium to learn from simple observation.

Because television shows, like movies, compress complex stories into rich, visually intense images, they can provide many of the same benefits. In particular, students are likely to become more engaged in an activity linked to a television show and will find it relatively easy to relate course material to various aspects of the show. The typical process when using movies is to show clips from a film or to have students view it in its entirety, either in class or on their own time. The students then link what they watched with course

concepts through discussion, group exercises, or written assignments. A similar strategy may be used with examples from television programs; however, given certain significant differences in the two media, it may be better to take a different approach to using television than one would take when using film.

Whereas movies focus on telling a single story in a relatively short amount of time using a finite set of characters, television shows incorporate multiple story lines with casts of characters that change over time. Having story lines that are stretched over weeks, months, and even years may make it difficult to select specific examples to demonstrate particular points. In addition, many of the specific events and episodes that occur in television shows may not be as realistic as we would like, which could make focusing on these particular events problematic. Nevertheless, the characters in television shows, as well as the cultural values and priorities they reflect, may be quite realistic because they incorporate general themes and issues that are important in society at a given time (Johns, 1992; Vande Berg & Trujillo, 1989). Consequently, it may be that greater value can be derived from using television shows in a general manner rather than focusing on specific events. Instead of viewing and analyzing particular clips from television shows, it may be more practical and meaningful to use characters and themes from these programs as the basis for creating experiential exercises and other activities that reflect relevant course concepts.

Given the relative lack of attention that academics have paid to television as a teaching resource, the goal of this article is to encourage faculty members to think about how they can incorporate television in their management and OB courses. In the sections that follow, I provide examples of some of the ways in which I have used general themes and characters from television shows to create both class exercises and test questions. The article concludes with a set of guidelines for instructors who wish to incorporate television into their courses.

Using Television Characters in
Homework and Class Exercises

One of the ways in which I incorporate television into my teaching is to include television themes and characters in exercises I have created. These exercises can be done as homework assignments and reviewed in class, or they may be done completely in class. They may be completed either individually or in groups. I normally lecture on the relevant material first and then provide students with the assignment as a way for them to apply the knowledge that they have gained from class and/or the reading. The exercises pri-

marily focus on the application of basic concepts; however, I also use them to point out some of the more important nuances in a given theory. Appendices A through D contain four exercises I use regularly to demonstrate certain course concepts, each of which is described in the sections that follow.

NEED THEORIES OF MOTIVATION

To demonstrate the similarities and differences between Abraham Maslow's hierarchy of needs and Clay Alderfer's existence-relatedness-growth (ERG) theory, I have created an exercise in which students assess the needs of the four main characters of the show *Seinfeld* (Elaine, George, Jerry, and Kramer). A copy of this exercise, along with the correct answers, is included in Appendix A. To complete the first part of this exercise, students must read through the descriptions of the needs of the four individuals and identify the levels at which they would be placed on Maslow's hierarchy of needs. They must also provide rationales or explanations for why they think a given level is most descriptive of an individual's dominant needs. In the second part of the exercise, students make similar assessments, this time using Alderfer's ERG theory.

When we review the exercise in class, I ask students to identify the most appropriate need levels and provide their rationales. As we discuss students' responses and their reasoning, we are able to work out some of the nuances in Maslow's hierarchy. For example, the fact that getting good reviews is so important to Jerry places him at the esteem level in Maslow's hierarchy rather than at the self-actualization level because Jerry relies on feedback from others rather than being completely intrinsically motivated (Johns, 1996). (Note that if this is not a nuance you wish to emphasize, you may also consider self-actualization to be a correct response because Jerry is dedicated to being the best stand-up comic he can be.) Similarly, George's motivation for getting a job is not to demonstrate his capabilities, which would put him at the esteem level, but rather to allow him to provide more stability in his life (because living with his parents is considered temporary), which places him at the safety level.

In contrast with Maslow's theory, the identification of the *Seinfeld* characters' need levels using Alderfer's theory is much more straightforward, which helps demonstrate its relative simplicity. With Jerry, for example, we no longer have to worry about the nuance of the importance of feedback from others, and with George, the fact that he is at the existence level rather than the growth level is much more clear cut.

PERCEPTUAL BIASES AND ERRORS

To demonstrate how perceptual biases and errors can manifest themselves, I have created an exercise in which students identify the various biases and errors to which the two main characters on *The X Files* can fall prey. An abbreviated version of this exercise is included in Appendix B (please contact the author for a complete version of the exercise, which includes 12 errors and biases rather than just 4). To complete this exercise, students must read through the scenario and then match the various descriptions of related events with one of the perceptual biases or errors listed after the scenario. Each of the errors is reflected in a single example. The correct responses, their construct definitions (Johns, 1996), and the rationale for each are also included in Appendix B.

As we review the students' responses in class, I ask them to provide their rationales for various responses and to tie those rationales back to the definition from the text or their class notes. The ensuing discussion allows us to go back over the definitions of the concepts and clarify some of the nuances in the concepts that might not have been clear to them earlier. Because each of the perceptual errors can be assigned to only one example, they are forced to give greater thought to the differences among the concepts and how they are reflected in the various examples.

I have also used another version of this exercise in which I list the various biases and errors and ask the students to provide an example of a way in which the bias might manifest itself given the initial scenario. This alternative gives the students the opportunity to be creative, but it is also much harder for them to do, particularly for the more complex biases (e.g., central traits).

EQUITY THEORY

To demonstrate equity theory concepts, I have created an exercise based on the show *Home Improvement*. A copy of this exercise is included in Appendix C. In completing the first part of the exercise, I expect students to do two things. First, they must assess the situation from both Tim's and Al's (the two main characters) perspectives, which helps drive home the point that equity is a subjective assessment. In creating the two perspectives, I also expect students to create a set of ratios that compare Tim's and Al's relative inputs and outcomes. Sample ratios for both Tim and Al are included in Appendix C. In completing the second part of the exercise, I expect students to link the example back to the various possible reactions to perceptions of inequity (e.g., reducing one's inputs) and provide concrete examples of

things that Al might do to restore equity in this situation. Possible responses for this portion are also included in Appendix C.

When we review the exercise in class, I usually have one of the students come up and start things off by putting his or her ratios for Tim and Al on the board. Then, I have other students identify additional inputs for each of the men, because salary is really the only identified outcome. Because most students are very familiar with the show, they will often add inputs that go beyond the details given in the introductory paragraph. Once we seem to have exhausted all the possible responses, we compare Tim's and Al's perceptions, noting how two people can view the same situation in very different ways. We then discuss the fact that Tim is probably experiencing overpayment inequity, whereas Al is experiencing underpayment inequity (George & Jones, 1999). That leads us to a discussion of some of the ways in which Al can respond to this situation.

EQUITY THEORY AND JUSTICE PERCEPTIONS

As an extension of the *Home Improvement* exercise, and to demonstrate the similarities and differences between equity theory and justice perceptions, I have created an exercise based on *The Brady Bunch*, an abbreviated version of which is included in Appendix D (Weiss and Miller, 1998, have also created an experiential exercise using the entire Brady family that focuses primarily on equity theory concepts). To complete the exercise, students are expected to read each vignette and identify which of the equity or justice concepts is best reflected in the example (i.e., equity theory, distributive justice, procedural justice) as well as provide rationales for their responses. The correct responses and the rationale for each are also provided in Appendix D (note that the complete version of the exercise includes all six Brady children; please contact the author for a copy).

When we review the exercise in class, I ask the students to identify which justice concept is reflected in each vignette and provide their rationales as to why their answers are the best. As we review the answers, we are able to clarify the differences in the concepts, particularly between equity theory and distributive justice, which seems to create the most confusion. The example for one of the Brady girls, Jan, emphasizes the importance of creating and comparing the ratio of inputs and outcomes between the self and a referent other as a means of identifying a situation as one of equity versus distributive justice, which is best reflected in the vignette focused on one of the Brady boys, Peter.

Using Television Characters in Examinations

In addition to creating homework and in-class exercises, I have also created a number of short-answer and open-ended exam questions that use television themes and characters to reflect various OB concepts. These items could also be used as homework or in-class assignments if desired. Appendix E contains a couple of the items that I have created along with their correct answers.

For example, to test students' knowledge of the core job characteristics in Hackman and Oldham's job characteristics model, I have created a question based on the show *Lois and Clark: The New Adventures of Superman* (although the concepts presented also tie with the comic book series and the movies). This question contains descriptions of several aspects of Lois's and Clark's jobs. Students are required to identify the five core job characteristics and indicate which aspect of each character's job corresponds with that characteristic.

The second example reflects how I test students' knowledge of French and Raven's bases of individual power by using several of the doctors from the show *ER*. In this question, a number of the doctors describe their abilities to influence others to a medical student who is thinking about interning at the hospital. Students must read the doctors' responses and then identify which power base they appear to rely on.

In addition to the samples provided in Appendix E, I have also created questions based on the following television shows, copies of which are available on request:

- *Murphy Brown*: operant learning concepts
- *Frasier*: the folly of rewarding A while hoping for B (Kerr, 1995)
- *Roseanne*: McClelland's theory of needs
- *Friends*: Maslow's and Alderfer's need theories
- *Star Trek: Voyager*: workplace attitudes
- *NewsRadio*: decision-making biases
- *The Brady Bunch*: social loafing and the sucker effect
- *The Flintstones*: role concepts

In addition to short-answer and open-ended response questions, I have also created a number of multiple choice exam questions that use television characters and scenarios. A sample of these questions is provided in Appendix F. Additional examples, which cover topics such as attribution theory, conflict, and barriers to effective communication, are available on request.

Conclusion

This article provides just a few examples of the many ways that instructors of OB courses can add television to their bag of pedagogical tricks. Hopefully, these examples have demonstrated how characters and themes from various shows can create a strong foundation for rich applications of course concepts. These applications demonstrate how pervasive the concepts we teach are, thereby helping students see that the "book learning" they get in an OB course is relevant to the "real" world (even if it is fictitious!). In addition, the examples allow instructors to inject some humor and fun into their courses and may also serve to bridge the generation gap between students and teachers. I myself have used much of the material included herein with undergraduates at three different universities and with three different texts. In each environment, the material was well received and effective at demonstrating course concepts.

One potential concern about this proposal is that it has a distinctly American flavor because all of the shows discussed are based in the United States. The importance of this concern to an individual instructor will likely vary depending on the characteristics of the students he or she teaches. Instructors who have large numbers of foreign-born students in their classrooms, as well as those who teach overseas, may find that their students are less able to relate to the examples, which may limit their usefulness. In most of the examples, however, although knowledge of the television shows on which they are based may help, it is probably not critical to understanding the situation. In addition, because entertainment is one of America's biggest exports and many programs are internationally syndicated, these instructors may find that their non-American students are almost equally as familiar with the television programs as their American students are.

Although this article contains a number of examples of how television shows can be incorporated into OB courses, it is not intended to provide an exhaustive set of specific exercises and test questions that OB instructors can use. Instead, the goal is to get instructors thinking about how they can adapt their own teaching materials to incorporate television examples. Readers of this article are welcome to use any of the materials I have created in their own courses, either with or without modification. I also encourage instructors to come up with their own material that complements their particular course content, text, or approach to teaching.

For those who are interested in incorporating television into their teaching methods, I offer the following tips to ensure that the exercises and questions you create are most effective:

Use examples with which you are familiar. In creating exercises and questions, make sure they are based on television shows about which you have more than passing knowledge. In other words, although shows such as *Buffy the Vampire Slayer* and *Angel* are currently quite popular with younger viewers, if these are not shows that you watch on a regular basis, it will be difficult to think of ways to create meaningful and valuable examples.

Use examples with which your students are familiar. Just as you should not venture into territory with which you are unfamiliar, you should also make sure that you do not base your examples on shows with which your students are unfamiliar. Although you may find the adventures of Hercule Poirot fascinating, or you may think that Horatio Hornblower's experiences provide rich examples of leadership and power and conflict, it is unlikely that your students will have the same level of familiarity with these characters and the situations they encounter that you have. Consequently, the value of the examples you create on the basis of characters and shows such as these may be lost on them.

When in doubt, rely on the classics. If you are not currently a big television watcher and are therefore uncertain about the kinds of programs that would be most appropriate for both you and your students, you can always rely on classic shows such as *I Love Lucy*, *Gilligan's Island*, *The Mary Tyler Moore Show*, *M*A*S*H*, or *Cheers*. In this era of syndication and cable channels such as Nickelodeon, it is highly likely that shows you watched during their original runs are shows that your students have seen in reruns. Given the immense popularity of some of these classics, they have permeated our popular culture and are almost universally understood.

Make sure that the examples are realistic vis-à-vis the show. If you employ shows and characters with which you and the students are both familiar, it should be relatively easy to come up with examples and scenarios that make sense given the basic premise of the show and the typical experiences of the characters. If you are familiar with the shows on which the examples in this article are based, then you understand why it makes sense to use Tim and Al from *Home Improvement* as the basis for an equity theory example, as well as why Lois and Clark find their jobs to be high in intrinsic motivation, given Hackman and Oldham's core job characteristics. In coming up with examples, you should also make sure they are relatively generic. Rather than relying on something that happened in a specific episode of a given show, you should create situations that reflect general themes, such as the fact that newcomers were always arriving on *Gilligan's Island*.

Employ a level of creativity with which you are comfortable. If the task of integrating television into an OB course seems daunting, then you should start with smaller efforts. As I said earlier, you are certainly welcome to use the homework assignments and test questions I have referred to in this article, either with or without modification. In addition, you may also find that it is relatively easy to rewrite some of your existing multiple choice test questions to change the names of characters and modify situations to correspond with a given television show. As you become more comfortable with the endeavor, you may begin to pay special attention to shows that you watch in the future to see how OB concepts may manifest themselves and use this knowledge as the basis for an assignment or test question. Once your awareness of the possibilities increases, you will eventually discover that it is actually quite easy to come up with appropriate and meaningful examples.

Whether you love it or hate it, barely have time for it or cannot live without it, television is a permanent fixture in American culture. Most of our students have grown up watching television on a regular basis and are quite familiar with the characters and typical situations encountered in many shows. As a result, these shows are a potential gold mine of fun and meaningful examples that can be used to demonstrate a variety of OB concepts. All you have to do is start digging!

Appendix A
Assessing Individual Need Levels

Jerry, George, Kramer and Elaine have different needs. Jerry is really dedicated to being the best stand-up comic he can, and he is very concerned about getting good reviews and being recognized in the entertainment industry. George just wants to be able to find a job he can hold on to so that he can move out of his parents' house into a place of his own. Kramer only cares about good food, having clothes on his back and a roof over his head. Elaine wants to have good, honest relationships with her friends, and find a stable, long-term romantic relationship.

At what level in his Hierarchy of Needs would Abraham Maslow place each of these four friends and why?

Jerry: *Esteem. Dedicated to being the best; concerned with good reviews and being recognized*

George: *Safety. Wants to find a stable job so he can move out of his parents' house*

Kramer: *Physiological. Primary concerns are good food, clothes on his back, roof over his head*

Elaine: *Belongingness. Wants good relationships with friends and a stable romantic relationship*

How would Clay Alderfer characterize their needs using ERG theory and why?

> **Jerry**: *Growth. Dedicated to being the best; concerned with good reviews and being recognized*
>
> **George**: *Existence. Wants to find a stable job so he can move out of his parents' house*
>
> **Kramer**: *Existence. Primary concerns are good food, clothes on his back, roof over his head*
>
> **Elaine**: *Relatedness. Wants good relationships with friends and a stable romantic relationship*

NOTE: ERG = existence-relatedness-growth.

Appendix B
Applying What You Know About Perceptual Biases and Rater Errors

Scully and Mulder have to speak with a number of informants about a UFO sighting that occurred in Flatbush, Kansas. The informants are all poor, middle-aged farmers who have little education and strong rural accents. It appears that they don't bathe very often, and they also happen to have poor dental hygiene (many in fact are missing their teeth). Listed below are a number of perceptual biases and rater errors and examples of how Scully and Mulder may be susceptible to each of them when interacting with these people or evaluating the quality of their stories. Match each of the biases with the example that best reflects that error.

Primacy effect	**Projection**
Contrast effects	**Similar-to-me effect**

a. At the beginning of her first interview, Scully discovers that the informant can't read and has very slow, drawn out speech, which leads her to conclude that the person is probably mentally disabled. She conducts the rest of her interview based on that assumption.
    Primacy effect: The tendency for a perceiver to rely on early cues or first impressions. Scully bases her perception of the informant on the first information she obtains about him.

b. Scully is a Christian, and her religion is very important to her. As a result, she is very skeptical about the whole UFO phenomenon and thinks that others are as well. Her interview questions are often phrased to reflect her skepticism: Do you think the light you saw might have been an airplane? You don't really believe that what you saw was visitors from another planet, do you?
    Projection: The tendency for perceivers to attribute their own thoughts and feelings to others. Since Scully is a non-believer, she assumes that the farmers are non-believers as well. The phrasing of her questions projects her disbelief.

c. Mulder has interviewed three people, all of whom fit the general description of the residents of this area. The fourth person who arrives is clean and well-dressed and very articulate. The difference is amazing and leads Mulder to put more weight on what this individual has to tell him.
    Contrast effects: The tendency to let previous experiences with other people or in other situations lead to an exaggeration of differences between those people/ situations and the current one. The differences between the fourth informant and the first three, who were all similar and fit the general profile of the residents, causes Mulder to put undue weight on the fourth person's account.

d. One person whom Scully interviews is also a devout Christian, and she articulates many of the same concerns and skepticism that Scully has. Because of their obvious similarities, Scully is predisposed to like this woman and to believe her version of events.
    Similar-to-me effect: The tendency to perceive others who are similar to oneself more positively than those who are dissimilar. Because Scully can identify with this informant, she tends to put greater weight on her version of events.

Appendix C
Equity Theory in Action

The President of Binford Tools wanted to create a permanent vehicle for advertising the company's products, so he decided to start a cable show called Tool Time. He chose Tim Taylor to be the host of the show because of his love and knowledge of tools and because he had been Binford's best sales rep for the past ten years. He decided to give Tim a starting salary of $80,000. Tim decided that he needed an assistant for the show, so he hired Al Borland. Al had been a master craftsman for 15 years and had worked on building or renovating almost a dozen houses. Al's starting salary was $50,000. Tim's perception is that his role in the show is to promote Binford's products and to make people enthusiastic about initiating home improvement projects. Al's perception is that his role in the show is to do all the "real" work so that the viewers can see how the tools work and know how to use them safely. Assuming that each man knows the other's starting salary, use equity theory to demonstrate how Tim and Al are each likely to perceive this situation. Use the ratios to show your analysis.

Tim:

	Self (Tim)	*Other (Al)*
Outcomes:	*$80,000*	*$50,000*
Inputs:	*Host of the show*	*My assistant*
	Love and knowledge of tools	*Less direct experience with Binford*
	10 years as Binford's best sales rep	*No sales experience*
	Promotes products & makes viewers enthusiastic	

Al:

	Self (Al)	*Other (Tim)*
<u>Outcomes:</u>	<u>$50,000</u>	<u>$80,000</u>
Inputs:	Master craftsman for 15 years	Less knowledge about how
	Built/renovated a dozen houses	to use tools
	Does all the real work	More form than substance
	Promotes safety	Uses unsafe practices

Assuming that Al perceives an underpayment inequity, what are some of the ways he might try to restore equity?

Change his inputs: Reduce his efforts, come in late, leave early, not bail Tim out when he gets in a jam
Change his outcomes: Ask Mr. Binford for a raise
Change his perceptions of his inputs or outcomes: Rationalize that Tim really is the star of the show and that his role is just to assist Tim
Change his referent: Compare his situation to Heidi (the tool girl) or to Norm Abrams (who had a similar role on "This Old House") or to other craftsmen who aren't on TV
Withdraw from the situation: Quit

Appendix D
Hey, That's Not Fair!

Listed below are several vignettes depicting situations in which the Brady kids have perceived an unfair situation. For each vignette, identify the equity/justice concept that is best reflected in the description.

- Jan studied about 5 hours for her geometry final, but her friend Sue only spent about 30 minutes cramming at the last minute. They just got back their test results today—much to Jan's surprise, she only got a B–, but Sue got an A!
  Equity theory: Jan is upset about the difference in hers and Sue's relative inputs and outcomes. Sue's inputs were lower but her outcomes were higher, causing her overall ratio to be greater than Jan's.

- Peter has been working really hard at the malt shop for the past six months, doing extra chores and helping out other employees when they needed it. The manager of the store just told him that he was going to give him a raise, but Peter is frustrated by the fact that it's only an extra 15¢ an hour. He thought he deserved more.
  Distributive justice: Peter is unhappy about his outcomes relative to his inputs. He put in a lot of work but only got a 15¢ per hour raise.

- Cindy is upset because her science teacher selected three people to compete in the upcoming science fair without first asking if anybody wanted to volunteer to participate in it.

Procedural justice: Cindy is unhappy about how the teacher decided who would participate. He/she made a unilateral decision without first asking for volunteers.

Appendix E
Sample Test Questions: Short-Answer
and Open-Ended Responses

Lois and Clark love being reporters for *The Daily Planet*. Every day is an adventure. They get to meet lots of interesting people, and they work on lots of different of stories, many of which require them to tap into talents they didn't know they had. Some of their stories have exposed major criminals like Lex Luthor, and others have helped save lives. Both Lois and Clark derive a lot of satisfaction from the feelings of accomplishment they get when they complete a story. Their boss, Perry, is a really great editor because he gives them lots of freedom to develop a story as they see fit. He is also really terrific about letting them know how good a story is, but they don't always need to wait for his approval. Most of the time, in fact, they themselves can tell when a story is good because the words just seem to sing! Link the various aspects of this job with each of the five core job characteristics in the Job Characteristics Model. In providing your response, be sure to identify the core characteristic and specify at least one job aspect that reflects this characteristic.

Core Characteristic	Related job aspect(s)
Skill variety	*Meet lots of people, work on different stories, tap talents they didn't know they had*
Task identity	*Work on stories from beginning to end*
Task significance	*Stories have exposed major criminals like Lex Luthor and saved lives*
Autonomy	*Perry lets them develop stories as they see fit*
Feedback	*From both Perry and the stories themselves*

A medical student is trying to decide where to do her internship at Cook County General Hospital. During the course of her interviews, she asks each doctor with whom she speaks the same question: "How do you influence people to do what you want them to do?" Their respective answers are as follows:

Dr. Romano: My staff knows that if they don't give me what I want they could lose their jobs.

Dr. Benton: I guess that because I have skills that no one else has, people have to trust me and do what I tell them.

Dr. Weaver: My people know that if they do what I ask them to, I'll remember that when it comes time to determine pay raises.

Dr. Greene: I'm a real easy-going kind of person and I get along with everyone here. I never have trouble getting people to do what I ask them to.

What bases of power are best represented by the comments of each of these doctors?

Dr. Romano: *Coercive power*
Dr. Benton: *Expert power*
Dr. Weaver: *Reward power*
Dr. Greene: *Referent power*

Appendix F
Sample Test Questions—Multiple Choice

Lois and Clark love their jobs as reporters at *The Daily Planet*. One of the aspects of their work they like best is that some of their stories have exposed major criminals like Lex Luthor, and others have helped save lives. Based on this information and your knowledge of the JCM, you could conclude that their jobs are

    a. high in autonomy.
    b. high in task identity.
    c. low in monotony.
    d. high in significance.

OB concept: Hackman and Oldham's Job Characteristics Model

Murphy is having a hard time getting her new secretary to complete tasks on time. Her friend and colleague Frank has advised her to try hovering over him and hounding him before every deadline so he will be sure to "meet it or beat it." This *advice* best reflects the operant learning concept of

    a. punishment by application.
    b. punishment by removal.
    c. negative reinforcement.
    d. the folly.

OB concept: Operant learning

Ross is a dedicated scientist who is up for the "Paleontologist of the Year" award. He really wants the award because it will prove to everyone who ever doubted him that he truly is one of the rising stars in his field. According to Maslow's theory of needs, Ross is motivated by a need for

    a. achievement.
    b. self actualization.
    c. power.
    d. esteem.

OB concept: Maslow's Hierarchy of Needs

While doing a visual inspection of some uncharted desert islands, a pilot had to eject from his plane because it was about to crash. He washed ashore on one of the

islands where the crew and guests of the S. S. Minnow had been marooned years before. During his first few days on the island, he learned that he had to get up very early if he wanted to eat a good breakfast; otherwise, all he would get is leftovers. Which of the following motives for conformity best reflects the reason for the pilot's behavior?

    a. Internalization
    b. Positive reinforcement
    c. Compliance
    d. Negative reinforcement

OB concept: Socialization

NOTE: JCM = job characteristics model, OB = organizational behavior.

References

Champoux, J. E. (1999). Film as a teaching resource. *Journal of Management Inquiry*, *8*, 206-217.

Gallos, J. V. (1993). Teaching about reframing with films and videos. *Journal of Management Education*, *17*, 127-132.

George, J. M., & Jones, G. R. (1999). *Understanding and managing organizational behavior* (2nd ed.). Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Gioia, D. A., & Brass, D. J. (1985). Teaching the TV generation: The case for observational learning. *Organizational Behavior Teaching Review*, *10*(2), 11-15.

Graham, L., Pena, L., & Kocher, C. (1999). "Other people's money": A visual technology for teaching corporate restructuring cross-functionally. *Journal of Management Education*, *23*, 53-64.

Harrington, K. V., & Griffin, R. W. (1989). Ripley, Burke, Gorman, and friends: Using the film "Aliens" to teach leadership and power. *Organizational Behavior Teaching Review*, *14*, 79-86.

Johns, G. (1992). *Organizational behavior: Understanding life at work* (3rd ed.). New York: HarperCollins.

Johns, G. (1996). *Organizational behavior: Understanding life at work* (4th ed.). New York: HarperCollins.

Kerr, S. (1995). On the folly of rewarding A, while hoping for B. *Academy of Management Executive*, *9*, 7-16.

Livingstone, L. P., & Livingstone, B. T. (1998). The twilight zone of diversity. *Journal of Management Education*, *22*, 204-207.

Michaelsen, L. K., & Schultheiss, E. E. (1987). Bronson, Brenner, and McQueen: Do they have something to teach us about influencing others? *Organizational Behavior Teaching Review*, *12*, 144-154.

Ross, J. (1996). Scorcese's "The Age of Innocence": An escalation interpretation. *Journal of Management Education*, *20*, 276-285.

Scherer, R. F., & Baker, B. (1999). Exploring social institutions through the films of Frederick Wiseman. *Journal of Management Education*, *23*, 143-153.

Serey, T. T. (1992). Carpe diem: Lessons about life and management from "Dead Poets Society." *Journal of Management Education*, *16*, 374-381.

Vande Berg, L., & Trujillo, N. (1989). *Organizational life on television*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Weiss, R. M., & Miller, L. E. (1998). The Brady Bunch experience equity theory. In D. Marcic & J. Seltzer (Eds.), *Organizational behavior: Experiences and cases* (5th ed., pp. 79-81). Cincinnati, OH: South-Western College Publishing.

SEINFELD, PROFESSOR OF ORGANIZATIONAL BEHAVIOR: THE PSYCHOLOGICAL CONTRACT AND SYSTEMS THINKING

Eric B. Dent
University of Maryland University College

By now, the hoopla and hype of the end of the television series *Seinfeld* is a memory. The syndication of sitcoms ensures the availability of episodes of *Seinfeld* daily in many countries of the world for the foreseeable future. This is very good news for faculty members and students of organizational behavior or general management classes. Although the viewing of television shows is often thought to be contrary to the goals of higher education, *Seinfeld* is a showcase for two very important concepts in such classes.

The first of these concepts is that of the "psychological contract." Kolb, Rubin, and Osland (1995) noted,

> When individuals join an organization, they form an unwritten, implicit, or (less frequently) explicit, psychological contract with the organization. This contract consists of the mutual expectation employees and employers have of each other. The psychological contract is based on the perception of both the employee and the employer that their contributions obligate the other party to reciprocate. (p. 5)

Sherwood and Glidewell (1972) suggested that the ideal way of addressing these unstated expectations is to make them explicit by articulating them. Although *Seinfeld* is not specifically about organizational life, part of the

brilliance of the show is that nearly every episode articulates the social psychological contract in many dimensions of life. Characters on the show frequently find themselves wondering about unstated expectations in social settings and in "pinch points," the term Sherwood and Glidewell used to describe an incompatibility in expectations.

The second concept is the notion of interdependence as it relates to systems thinking. I have found that in general, my working, adult graduate students have a very difficult time completely grasping the interrelatedness of the aspects of a system. Other professors have noted the same difficulty, even among senior executives of Fortune 50 companies (Vaill, 1996, p. 104). Interdependence is a central component of several systems approaches that identify feedback loops within whole systems (Capra, 1993; Senge, 1990). Interdependence is manifest in a number of ways: when apparently independent phenomena are in fact connected somehow, when there are gaps in time or space between feedback loops, or when cause and effect are so enmeshed that each cannot be clearly distinguished. The notion of unintended consequences is often used to reveal interdependencies that are not obvious on the surface. In the past, the top policy makers in the United States did not realize, for example, that rent control legislation and the building of low-cost housing units are indirectly related through feedback loops. Even today, most people do not see a connection between, for example, electric garage door openers and the possible loss of a sense of neighborhood community because neighbors do not have to see one another when they park their cars in the street or their driveways. Nearly every *Seinfeld* episode reveals a surprising connection between seemingly unrelated plot lines. Over time, as students get sensitized to look for the interdependencies on *Seinfeld*, I have found that they get much better at seeing the indirect connections in their work and nonwork lives.

Seinfeld: An Introduction

For those readers not familiar with the television show, it is relatively easy to explain. It is a show about "nothing" (although Jerry Seinfeld has noted that a show about nothing is also about everything). The four principal characters are Jerry Seinfeld (played by Jerry Seinfeld), George Costanza (played by Jason Alexander), Elaine Benes (played by Julia Louis-Dreyfus), and Cosmo Kramer (played by Michael Richards). The series revolves around these four single characters, who live in Manhattan. Jerry seems to date a different girl on nearly every episode. Kramer introduces some crazy antic on nearly every episode (warming his clothes in the oven before putting them on,

reversing the peephole in the door to his apartment, enlisting homeless people to pull rickshaws through Manhattan, etc.). Much of the show takes place in Jerry's apartment or in Monk's, a coffee shop frequently visited by the four characters. The sitcom, cocreated by Larry David and Jerry Seinfeld, often comprises meandering chitchat about trivial subjects that define the relationships among the four lead characters, or as one commentator put it, "anthropologically speaking, it's about the mores and folkways practiced by a small but fascinating tribe that's native to certain stretches of Manhattan's Upper West Side" (Wild, 1998, p. 8).[1]

The Social Psychological Contract

Although Seinfeld and David have probably never heard of Sherwood and Glidewell (1972) or their pinch model, they describe their show in the same way. "We didn't change the culture," Seinfeld has said, "we just reflected it a little more intimately" (Marin & Hammer, 1998, p. 55). David has said that the show filled the gap of collective shorthand for the neurotica of our everyday lives (Marin & Hammer, 1998, p. 55).

This collective shorthand, this intimate reflection, is the articulation of the social psychological contract. A *New York Times* article noted that *Seinfeld* is about the way people really are with their friends and suggested that " 'the beauty of "Seinfeld" was that art and life were often indistinguishable' " (Wild, 1998, p. 43). Before *Seinfeld*, there were always ways in which people were with their friends, but people did not talk about them. When do two friends discuss whether or not they are close enough for one to expect a ride to the airport from the other? Or, when do they discuss whether their friendship is such that one can call the other on the telephone and say, "It's me," rather than saying his or her name?

Let's go to film to see two detailed examples of *Seinfeld* characters giving voice to the mutual expectations people have in various settings. In "The Wife" (Mehlman, 1994), which first aired March 17, 1994, Elaine finishes a workout at her health club. She has a departing conversation with an acquaintance, Greg, who then leans over and gives her an "open-lipped kiss." Elaine doesn't expect this from an acquaintance and interprets it to mean that Greg wants to change their relationship. See how many other assumptions Elaine makes in the abridged dialogue below. We rejoin the characters at their next encounter in the health club:[2]

Greg: Do you know where I can get some good olives?
Elaine: Hmm. I can find out.

Greg: Would you?

Elaine: [to herself: So, now I have a project. That's a definite signal!]

Greg: You know, by the way, you look really great in that leotard.

Elaine: Oh, thanks. [to herself: That's no signal. Who wouldn't like me in this leotard? I look *amazing* in this leotard.]

Greg: Hey, you know what's weird? I think I had a dream about you last night.

Elaine: [to herself: Okay, he open lips me, he dreams about me, we have an olive project. That's it, I'm asking this guy out.] Um, you know, Greg— [he interrupts]

Greg: Can I have a sip of your water? [He vigorously wipes the bottle opening before drinking.]

Elaine: [to herself: Oh my God!]

Greg: I'm sorry, what were you saying?

Elaine: It was nothing . . . .

Scene: Later that day, in Jerry's apartment.

George: You said the guy gave you an open-lipped kiss.

Elaine: Yes, but then he wiped his hand on the top of the bottle when I offered him water.

George: That doesn't mean anything!

Elaine: Are you kidding? That's very significant! If he was interested in me he would want my germs, he would just crave my germs!

Jerry: [authoritatively] She's right, George. Bottle wipe is big.

George: But what about the open-mouthed kiss?

Jerry: [still authoritatively] Bottle wipe supersedes it.

George: Yah, you're right. You're right.

Scene: Inside the New York Health Club. [Elaine is talking to Greg as he works out on an exercise machine.]

Elaine: I got the machine next buddy [to a guy walking up to the machine].

Greg: [he gets off the sweat-covered machine] It's all yours!

Elaine: [to George] Look at the signal I just got. He knew I was going to use the machine next and he didn't wipe the machine off. That's a gesture of intimacy! . . .

Greg: There's the manager. . . . I'll take any chance I can to talk to her.

Elaine: Oh, you are interested in her?

Greg: Very!

What is the psychological contract Elaine has with Greg? She receives an open-lipped kiss, gets a project assignment, receives a favorable comment on her appearance, and is dreamed about, and she is convinced that these are all signs of his interest in a romantic relationship. All of this evidence, however, is more than offset in her mind by his dreaded wiping of the bottle to rid it of her germs. The teaching value of this episode is enhanced by the final scene, in which Elaine's assumptions are proved wrong. Elaine has very clearly articulated her assumptions, but to Jerry and George, not Greg.

A second classic example of the articulation of the unstated expectations in a work context is found in "The Caddy" (Kavet & Robin, 1996), which first aired January 25, 1996. George works for the New York Yankees. The Yankee executives make the common assumption that someone who spends more time at the office is getting more work done. They further assume that if an employee's car is in the parking lot, he is actually at work.

Scene: George has locked his keys in his car. His immediate boss is Mr. Wilhelm, who, in turn, reports to Yankee owner George Steinbrenner. George begins in Jerry's apartment, explaining the situation.

Jerry: How did you lock your keys in the car?
George: How? Because I'm an idiot.
Jerry: So why don't you get a locksmith?
George: I was going to, but then I found out the auto club has this free locksmith service, so I signed up. Just waiting for the membership to kick in.
Jerry: How long has your car been sitting in the Yankees' parking lot?
George: I don't know, about 3 days.

Scene: In the offices of the New York Yankees.

Mr. Wilhelm: George.
George: Mr. Wilhelm?
Mr. Wilhelm: I'm sorry to interrupt you, but Mr. Steinbrenner and I *really* want you to know we appreciate all the hours you've been putting in. And, confidentially, Sezunko, our assistant to the general manager hasn't really been working out and the boss thinks you're the man for the job. So keep it under your hat.

Scene: Back in Jerry's apartment.

George: Assistant to the general manager. Do you know what that means. He could be asking my advice on trades. Trades, Jerry. I'm a heartbeat away!

Jerry: That's a hell of an organization they are running up there. I can't understand why they haven't won a pennant in 15 years.

George: And, it is all because of that car. See, Steinbrenner is like the first guy in at the crack of dawn. He sees my car, he figures *I'm* the first guy in. Then, the last person to leave is Wilhelm. He sees my car, he figures I'm burning the midnight oil. Between the two of them, they think I'm working an 18-hour day.

Jerry: Locking your keys in the car is the best career move you ever made.

Although these two lengthy examples show how the psychological contract gets verbalized on *Seinfeld*, some of the most brilliant articulations are briefer yet delicious snippets. How long should one retain a greeting card from his girlfriend? (It depends on whether he has a mantel or other appropriate display place.) Can you make a condolence call from a cellular telephone? (No.) If Elaine has dinner with a man who asks his parents to join them, does that automatically make it a date? (Yes.) *Seinfeld* has given America (and management education students) a clear example of how to articulate the psychological contract.

Interdependence

The second management education concept that *Seinfeld* episodes beautifully illustrate is the interdependence aspect of the systems perspective. One of the breakthroughs of *Seinfeld* was that it dramatically increased the number of scenes in a half-hour sitcom. The traditional formula called for about 6 scenes, but *Seinfeld* (and many sitcoms thereafter) would feature up to 20 scenes (Wild, 1998, p. 3). The larger number of scene changes often allowed the show to pursue four separate plot lines, one for each major character (Marin & Hammer, 1998, p. 50). At first, each of these plot lines seems completely unrelated: A new girlfriend will come into Jerry's life, George and Kramer will order Chinese takeout food, and Elaine will run her car into a delivery person. Soon, however, the plot lines will form a web of interdependence. The delivery person Elaine hits was making the delivery to Kramer and George. Jerry's girlfriend will turn out to be the attorney the delivery person retains to sue Elaine.

In "The Marine Biologist" (Hague & Rubin, 1994), which first aired February 10, 1994, Elaine, Jerry, George, and Kramer seem to have some unrelated experiences. Elaine learns that there is no entry about George in his alumni magazine, but Jerry receives positive publicity for his successful

career as a comedian. Later, Jerry and George are having a conversation about how impressed George is with marine biologists who study whales.

Next, Kramer joins the two and tells them about one of his typically crazy antics. Somehow, he has come into the possession of 600 Titleist golf balls, and he is incredibly excited about the prospect of going to the ocean and practicing his golf swing by driving balls into the sea. Later still, Jerry is running an errand when he runs into a friend from college, Diane. She inquires about George. Jerry, trying to bolster his friend's reputation, lies, telling Diane that George is a successful marine biologist. Diane is suitably impressed.

As it turns out, Diane was George's main college heartthrob, and he is ecstatic that she might be interested in him. George, posing as a marine biologist, calls Diane and initiates a relationship. On one date, they go for a walk along the beach. Suddenly, they come on a group of people who are surrounding a whale that seems to be dying in the surf. Someone calls out, "Is anyone here a marine biologist?" Diane says, "Save the whale, George . . . for me." Faced with the choice of blowing his cover and relationship or trying to save the whale, George walks slowly into the ocean. He has an experience of divine intervention or "kinship of all living things" as he comes face to face with the dying beast. He sees that something is obstructing the whale's breathing. A huge wave pushes George to the top of the whale, where he reaches into the blowhole and pulls out a Titleist golf ball.

A second detailed example comes from "The Stall" (Charles, 1994), which first aired January 6, 1994. While attending a movie, Elaine uses the women's restroom and discovers that her stall contains no toilet paper. She tries to negotiate with the woman in the adjoining stall for even one square of toilet paper, but the other woman, who just happens to be Jerry's current girlfriend Jane, refuses to share any toilet paper with Elaine. The two women have not met yet, so they don't recognize each other's voices. Meanwhile, Kramer has gotten hooked on the telephone service for which callers are charged by the minute for erotic, sexual conversation. Sometimes, he makes these calls from Jerry's telephone. Once, Jerry picks up the phone to make a call and hears some of the banter between "Erica" and "Andre" (Kramer's phone pseudonym) before he realizes that Kramer is using his phone.

Later, Elaine explains to Jerry the awful experience she had at the movie theater restroom. Jerry realizes that Elaine's altercation was with his girlfriend (who had told him her side of the story), but he doesn't mention this connection to Elaine. In subsequent scenes, Jerry and Kramer have the sensation that Erica's voice is familiar to them, but they cannot place it. In the hilarious final minutes of the episode, the web of interconnections is made clear. Kramer is suspicious that Erica is Jane, and he invites Erica to meet him at

Monk's coffee shop. Kramer, Jerry, and Elaine are in Monk's when Jane walks in. Elaine asks Jane for a tissue, and when Jane refuses, Elaine becomes suspicious that Jane is the woman from the movie theater restroom. When Jane goes to use the restroom at Monk's, Elaine races ahead of her and removes all of the toilet paper from the restroom. The show ends with Jane realizing that she had "met" Elaine in the movie theater restroom and acknowledging that she is Erica of the phone sex line.

As with the example of the psychological contract, the "mini" interdependencies are often as surprising, insightful, and funny as these two more elaborate examples. Elaine throws her boyfriend's coat out of a tall Manhattan apartment building, and of all the people in Manhattan to find it, Kramer and his friend Newman (played by Wayne Knight) are the ones. Jerry throws a watch away in a sidewalk trash can, and it is later salvaged by his Uncle Leo (played by Len Lesser). Elaine accidentally knocks a sharp object out of an apartment window, and it punctures a Macy's Thanksgiving Day parade balloon manned by her boss.

At one level, these incidents can seem contrived and improbable. Yet, Bell's theorem, proposed in 1964 and confirmed experimentally in 1972, demonstrates that there are no pure coincidences. In ways we do not yet understand, everything is connected to everything else. I use *Seinfeld* episodes with my students to help develop this consciousness, which Jaworski (1996, p. 81) has suggested may be the most critical change needed in American society.

Using *Seinfeld* in the Classroom

The students in our program all have access to televisions and VCRs to record episodes that may air at a time that conflicts with another activity. Thus, an additional benefit of *Seinfeld* to a professor is that students can watch the episodes outside of class so that class time is not used viewing footage (and the students don't experience it as extra work). Because the show airs at least five times per week in every major television market in the United States (and many other countries), and so many episodes include excellent examples, I have had no difficulty selecting a couple of episodes for the students to watch near the times in the course when the concept is discussed. I typically ask the students to watch three or four episodes during the semester, and I refer to several others in class (most of which are familiar to most of our students).

I use the *Seinfeld* clips in two main ways:

1. As part of introducing the concepts of the psychological contract or interdependence, I use a dialogical "lecturette" in which I explain the concepts but also get constant feedback from the students about how well they understand the concepts. When the students get "stuck" and don't seem to be understanding the relevant concept, I find that introducing an analogy from *Seinfeld* often causes the "aha" experience of a concept understood.
2. In my classes, I often have students write case studies, role plays, or scenarios to help them retain the concepts. I find that having the students shift "modes" into pretending to be writing a *Seinfeld* episode again brings a clarity to their thinking about interdependence that otherwise doesn't occur.

Let me illustrate these two uses with examples. In teaching the psychological contract, my objective is to have students define the concept and offer several examples of psychological contracts from their own life experiences. The text I use (Kolb et al., 1995) provides several excellent workplace examples of psychological contracts. Yet, many students often have difficulty grasping the contract and identifying psychological contracts to which they are a party. By sharing some of the examples listed above, students seem able to make the lateral thinking shift (de Bono, 1992) necessary to understand a concept that had been foreign to them and "see" psychological contracts operative in their lives.[3]

Students report that they better understand a number of concepts pertaining to the psychological contract by viewing and discussing *Seinfeld* episodes. Perhaps foremost, the huge number and variety of unstated assumptions become clear. Students claim not to talk about subjects important to them (e.g., what is your obligation to someone you have dated three times who then has a life crisis, or after how many dates can you no longer break up with someone over the phone?). Students learn the importance of trying to articulate up front any important expectations and assumptions they hold. Secondly, they see more clearly pinch points and "crunch points" in action when implicit assumptions have been unmet.

In the case of the concept of interdependence in systems thinking, one session objective is for the students to be able to make linkages among apparently unrelated dynamics in an organization so that the organization is viewed as a system. The supplementary reading is "Paradigms and Systems Thinking" (Dent, 1995, chap. 3). I begin with several examples on which to conduct the "The Five Whys" exercise (Senge, Ross, Smith, Roberts, & Kleiner, 1994, pp. 108-112). This technique has students trace an effect back at least five steps to its often surprising root cause. Students usually have a fairly easy time grasping the linear trace back to the root cause. The difficulty arises when students are asked to see and describe parallel, interdependent phenomena. Ashby (1956, pp. 53-54) has demonstrated that human minds

lose comprehension of systems with as few as four interdependent parts. Karl Weick (1979, p. 88) has also observed that managers are not oriented to thinking systemically. To increase their comprehension, the next step is for students to develop an interdependence diagram of their own organizations. Putting some things on paper relieves some of the strain of tracing parallel paths mentally. I also encourage them to play with some "simulation" programs outside of class, such as SimCity, a computer game that creates complex interactions of tax rates, unemployment rates, zoning, pollution, infrastructure creation, and other municipal concerns.

If students have difficulty "seeing" the interdependence in their own organizations, I invite them to write about their organization as if they were *Seinfeld* episodes. Senge et al. (1994, pp. 103-105) encouraged storytelling as a successful mechanism for surfacing interdependence. Such storytelling is a method for initial model building. In doing so, students will often even think of Jerry as a representative of their finance organization, Kramer in marketing, and so forth. Somehow, this mental shift taps into a patterning system that is more familiar to students and allows them to develop an interdependence diagram in their own organizations or lives. For example, I have students diagram all of the interdependencies they can discern. Next, I ask them to visualize a conversation between Jerry (in finance) and Kramer (in marketing) if Kramer were to drop by Jerry's office.[4] I ask them, "What would they discuss? What would Kramer say? What would Jerry say?" Probing with questions such as these has always resulted in students identifying interdependencies they had not previously discerned.

Students seem to learn and retain better a number of systems-thinking concepts after viewing and discussing *Seinfeld* episodes. They are more attuned to "synchronicity" (Jaworski, 1996), the apparently chance meeting of unrelated causal chains that are in fact connected. They are better trained to look for an effect several steps removed from a root cause, a cause having different effects in the short and long terms, a cause having different effects locally and at a distance, and an obvious action leading to an unintended consequence. Finally, they are more persuaded that cause and effect are often not distinct entities. In many instances in organizations and on *Seinfeld*, cause and effect are so blurred as to be indistinguishable.

Conclusion

Learning in the 21st century will occur in many different ways. Learning opportunities will arise in places not commonly thought of as learning venues. One such opportunity is the television show *Seinfeld*. It more vividly and

thoroughly addresses the concepts of interdependence and the psychological contract than can occur within the constraints of the typical college classroom. It also makes for a fun way to learn, "not that there's anything wrong with that."[5]

Notes

1. The show is rightly criticized for rarely portraying a perspective other than those of the four White Manhattanites.

2. All dialogue was transcribed by the author.

3. Some *Seinfeld* episodes include work examples. My experience has been, though, that these are not the best examples to use. The workplaces of the *Seinfeld* characters are more like caricatures of the workplaces of students. These scenes do not convey the same powerful social commentary that the *Seinfeld* interpersonal examples do. The students say that they can relate directly to the social examples but not as directly to the workplace examples. Having said that, the most useful are George's experiences as an employee of the New York Yankees.

4. On *Seinfeld*, Kramer routinely drops by Jerry's apartment, so this similarity begins tapping the pattern.

5. A phrase made famous in the episode "The Outing" (Charles, 1993).

References

Ashby, W. R. (1956). *An introduction to cybernetics*. London: Methuen.

Capra, F. (1993). A systems approach to the emerging paradigm. In M. Ray & A. Rinzler (Eds.), *The new paradigm in business: Emerging strategies for leadership and organizational change* (pp. 230-237). New York: G. P. Putnam.

Charles, L. (1993, February 11). The outing (T. Cherones, Director). In *Seinfeld*. New York: National Broadcasting Company.

Charles, L. (1994, January 6). The stall (T. Cherones, Director). In *Seinfeld*. New York: National Broadcasting Company.

de Bono, E. (1992). *Serious creativity: Using the power of lateral thinking to create new ideas*. New York: HarperBusiness.

Dent, E. B. (1995). *Management: Perspectives, processes, and productivity*. College Park: University of Maryland Press.

Hague, R., & Rubin, C. (1994, February 10). The marine biologist (T. Cherones, Director). In *Seinfeld*. New York: National Broadcasting Company.

Jaworski, J. (1996). *Synchronicity: The inner path of leadership*. San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler.

Kavet, G., & A. Robin. (1996, January 25). The caddy (A. Ackerman, Director). In *Seinfeld*. New York: National Broadcasting Company.

Kolb, D. A., Rubin, I. M., & Osland, J. S. (1995). *Organizational behavior: An experiential approach* (6th ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Marin, R., & Hammer, J. (1998, April 20). The last laugh. *Newsweek*, 48-56.

Mehlman, P. (1994, March 17). The wife (T. Cherones, Director). In *Seinfeld*. New York: National Broadcasting Company.

Senge, P. M. (1990). *The fifth discipline: The art and practice of the learning organization.* New York: Doubleday.

Senge, P. M., Ross, R. B., Smith, B. J., Roberts, C., & Kleiner, A. (1994). *The fifth discipline fieldbook: Strategies and tools for building a learning organization.* New York: Doubleday.

Sherwood, J. J., & Glidewell, J. C. (1972). Planned renegotiation: A norm setting OD intervention. In W. W. Burke (Ed.), *Contemporary organization development: Orientations and interventions* (pp. 35-46). Washington, DC: NTL Institute.

Vaill, P. B. (1996). *Learning as a way of being: Strategies for survival in a world of permanent white water.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Weick, K. E. (1979). *The social psychology of organizing* (2nd ed.). Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Wild, D. (1998). *Seinfeld: The totally unauthorized tribute.* New York: Three Rivers.

CONTRACT GRADING: ENCOURAGING COMMITMENT TO THE LEARNING PROCESS THROUGH VOICE IN THE EVALUATION PROCESS

Tammy Bunn Hiller
Bucknell University

Amy B. Hietapelto
Michigan Technological University

"Few practices in education are as sacred and yet deleterious as grading" (Edwards & Edwards, 1999, p. 260). Grading frequently takes its toll early in life, undermining student learning and inhibiting social, emotional, and ethical development. When grades are used as extrinsic rewards to reinforce learning, students' attention is diverted from the intrinsic rewards of learning to the goal of obtaining the reward of a "good" grade (Edwards & Edwards, 1999). Sadly, students can come to despise the activities required to achieve the reward (Lepper, Greene, & Nisbett, 1973), further diminishing the intrinsic rewards they experience from learning. Traditional grading practices, furthermore, reduce students' sense of control over their fate and, when students are faced with possible failure, can encourage them to cheat to regain some control and stave off the hurt of failure (Milton, Pollio, & Eison, 1986).

Far too many of our students evince what researchers have variously called a grade orientation (Janzow & Eison, 1990) or performance orientation (e.g., Dweck, 1986; Pintrich & Schunk, 1996) that inhibits their learning.

They focus not on learning but instead on successfully earning the grades that will allow them to maintain their images of competence. In addition, students often fixate on their grades because of imposed reward structures that use grade point average as a significant criterion for job and graduate school placements, fellowships, teaching assistantships, and other rewards. Although we are not arguing that performance-based orientations are unreasonable, we are suggesting that the benefits of evoking a mastery orientation are significant. In contrast to students with performance-based orientations, students with mastery orientations are more intrinsically motivated—more interested in their learning than their grades (Svinicki, 1998). They focus on mastering new content, skills, and ways of learning; exhibit greater curiosity, creativity, innovativeness, and intellectual risk taking; make fewer errors; use more effective problem-solving strategies; do higher quality work; and perform better under challenging conditions than their extrinsically motivated peers (Butler, 1992; Condray, 1977; Kohn, 1993).

Many students display both performance and mastery orientations to learning, with the operative orientation dependent on the context (Svinicki, 1998). An essential part of that context is how the teacher views grading, structures the grading process, and communicates about grading. We have tried to create a context in which our students' mastery orientations to learning are evoked through the use of contract grading. Contract grading gives students voice in their learning goals and in how they are evaluated against those goals. The way we have implemented contract grading, students are empowered to choose some or all of the assignments they will be held responsible for in our courses and how much each of the assignments will be weighted, within broad constraints. This evaluation system emphasizes individual learning progress, which should contribute to the development of more healthy attitudes about grades (Ames & Ames, 1991) and more intrinsic desire to learn. Development or enhancement of intrinsic motivation to learn is critical to our students' success in postacademic, information-rich, ambiguous, and unstructured work environments.

Contract Grading as a Central Element of Postmodern Pedagogy

We contend that contract grading is an elemental structural component of postmodern pedagogy. As discussed by Bilimoria (1995), a shift from modern to postmodern pedagogical perspectives means a shift from a performance paradigm in which the teacher's central role is to provide instruction to a learning paradigm in which his or her role is to facilitate learning. In the

performance paradigm, knowledge exists "out there" and is delivered in chunks by teachers to students (Barr & Tagg, 1995); "teaching is telling, knowledge is facts, and learning is recall" (Bilimoria, 1995, p. 445). The relationships between teachers and students are hierarchical and distant, with sharp power differences. Classroom culture tends to be competitive, individualistic, and results oriented, with students striving to demonstrate that they have "gotten it"—met the teacher's expectations for reproducing what is already known (Barr & Tagg, 1995; Bilimoria, 1995). Under these assumptions, grades are the mechanism for differentiating between different levels of student accomplishment. "The grade received indicates the extent to which the student has been able to meet the expectations of and criteria set by the teacher, who determines the standards and evaluates the performance" (Bilimoria, 1995, p. 447).

In contrast, the learning paradigm begins with the assumption that knowledge exists not out there but rather in each person's mind. Knowledge is emergent, constructed, and shaped by individual experience (Barr & Tagg, 1995). "Teaching is enabling, knowledge is understanding, and learning is the active construction of subject matter" (Elmore, 1991, p. xii). The learning paradigm implies collaborative, cooperative, and supportive learning environments where there are shared governance and teamwork (Barr & Tagg, 1995). The authority relationships in the classroom are reshaped to "partnership learning," in which "teacher and learners negotiate learning goals, teaching methods, and evaluation schemes" (Ramsey & Couch, 1994, p. 148). The instructor's role is one of managing the learning environment and facilitating knowledge discovery (Bilimoria & Wheeler, 1995; Boyatzis, Cowen, & Kolb, 1992). Classroom authority is shared and shifts back and forth between teacher and students as they share ownership of, responsibility for, and leadership in the learning process (Bilimoria, 1995).

Joint responsibility for the learning process implies that teachers and students should share ownership of the evaluation process. Because knowledge is emergent under the postmodern paradigm, an individual's learning experience will be highly dependent on the particular group of individuals involved. Therefore, definitive criteria and requirements for learning cannot be established in advance by the teacher (Bilimoria, 1995). Using contract grading to structure the evaluation process emphasizes mutual trust between teacher and students (Malehorn, 1994), acknowledges that there are multiple things to learn in the same course and multiple ways for students to demonstrate the learning they have generated, transfers some control of the learning and evaluation agendas from the hands of the teacher to those of the students, and results in a shared evaluation process. Contract grading, as we have imple-

mented it, allows students to make important choices about what, how, and when to learn, thereby facilitating the development of a partnership learning environment in which students are likely to retain more information, make better use of information, and be more highly motivated to learn than in teacher-directed learning environments (Candy, 1991; Knowles, 1975).

Acknowledging and Capitalizing on Students' Diverse Learning Styles

Students have diverse learning styles. Research using the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI) has found significant differences in learning styles associated with different cognitive style preferences. For example, extroverts prefer to learn through active experimentation and collaboration (DiTiberio, 1996) and prefer instructors who clearly explain course expectations and objectives (Zerges, 1984). Introverts value reflective observation, lectures, and abstract sequential learning (DiTiberio, 1996). Sensing students prefer experiential learning (DiTiberio, 1996) and value teachers who use examples and respond to students' individual needs (Zerges, 1984). Video-based learning favors sensing types, whereas essay exams, written assignments, and interdisciplinary environments favor intuitive types (Dawson & Guy, 1994). Extroverted and intuitive students prefer to choose their writing topics, whereas introverted and sensing types prefer more instructor direction (Severino, 1989). Finally, occasional studies report that opposite MBTI matches can produce significant student growth (Donovan, 1994).

Attempts to arrange environments to enhance the learning of students with different cognitive preferences and learning styles have met with various results. It is difficult to create one learning environment suitable for all types. The flexibility inherent in contract grading acknowledges and capitalizes on learning style diversity. By providing a menu of learning options in conjunction with diverse classroom pedagogy, students can select assignments and experience instructional techniques that match with their learning styles, as well as being exposed to choices that may not match but may nonetheless promote their development.

Student Response to Contract Grading

One of the most compelling arguments for using contract grading is our own student feedback. We began experimenting separately with contract grading 4 years ago in various management classes. Over the past 4 years, we have used contract grading in introductory and upper-level undergraduate-

and graduate-level courses in organizational behavior; human resource management; change management; managerial skill development; group problem solving; strategic leadership; and trust, justice, and emotions in the workplace. A diverse cross-section of students and majors was enrolled in these classes, which included a mix of electives and required courses. Although the majority of our students were traditional undergraduates, we have used contract grading with nontraditional undergraduates, full- and part-time graduate students, executive students, and international students as well. The enrollment for each class ranged from a low of 7 students to a high of 57. Over a 4-year period, we collected data about student reactions to the contract grading systems used in our courses from 473 students in 22 classes at three universities. The data were collected anonymously at the end of the semester. Eighty-five percent of our students indicated that they had had no experience with contract grading prior to the courses for which they were completing the evaluation. Of the 15% who had had previous experience with contract grading, most students' experiences had come from taking prior courses we had taught.

We found contract grading to be effective with all levels and types of students. Despite their inexperience with contract grading, an overwhelming 94% of our students preferred it to traditional grading systems, and 96.5% recommended that we continue to use contract grading in future classes. We found it intriguing that 60% of the students who did not prefer contract grading to traditional grading still recommended that we continue to use contract grading. One student's comment may help to explain this finding:

> It stressed me out trying to determine my own contract. I'm so indecisive! Because of the stress, I didn't prefer the contract. But I thought it was a great exercise to take ownership of my own grade. I'm sure I learned more because of it. Keep making other people do this!

Other representative student comments, extracted from responses to open-ended questions on the contract grading evaluation forms, are displayed in Table 1. The vast majority of student comments were positive. Students appreciated the control over their learning that contract grading afforded them. They also felt that contract grading increased their motivation, learning, and satisfaction with the course and created a trusting learning environment. Furthermore, engaging in the contract grading process was itself a learning experience that taught them management concepts. Our students' enthusiasm for contract grading is consistent with that of other students who have experienced contract grading in a wide range of disciplines (Fraser, 1990; Hardigan, 1994; Harris, 1993).

TABLE 1
Anonymous Student Comments From
Contract Grading Evaluation Forms

Student Comments

1. Contract grading gave me freedom to learn!
2. [Contract grading] enabled us to really feel like this was "our" course, that we had control over our learning. It showed us that we were trusted to evaluate our own level of learning. I wish other professors would be able to break free of their normative systems and put more trust in us as students.
3. [Contract grading] gave us choice and control, something missing from our education.
4. [Contract grading] put more power in our hands.
5. Everything was fair because I actually had a say in my own fate.
6. [Contract grading] made me care more about what I was doing.
7. [Contract grading] makes me feel more of an obligation to do the work.
8. Since you put greater emphasis on things you could do better on or knew you were weak at, but wanted to improve on, it encouraged you to put more effort in.
9. The thing I most like about this grading system is that it allows me to put emphasis on projects/assignments that I feel are most important or that I learn the most from.
10. Every student has a different style of learning and [contract grading] takes this into consideration. For instance, one might do well taking tests, others writing think pieces and journals, while still others do their best work in groups.
11. Most times professors really don't take into account time spent and effort/quality. It is refreshing to see that we have a say in what we believe contributed most to our learning experience. It also makes you feel as if you had more ownership over what you were learning.
12. Sometimes things came up and it was difficult to put enough time into my work. The contract gave me some flexibility to make up for outside forces that influenced my work.
13. I could learn from my mistakes and not have a bad grade "haunt" me for the entire semester.
14. I felt that it was an extremely fair and flexible system of grading because you could renegotiate at any time during the semester.
15. The [contract] grading system . . . was a good way to start to interact with the other members of the team.
16. Choosing grade weights within a group can be hard, but that's part of this learning experience, isn't it!
17. I learned a lot about negotiation and collaboration through negotiating and renegotiating the team part of our [grading] contract.
18. [Contract grading] fit with a lot of the organizational behavior material we discussed in class—empowerment, autonomy, etc. It created a very different kind of course experience, which I appreciated.
19. I wish more professors used grading contracts because we do not all learn the same way.

For a few students, contract grading was an uncomfortable experience. As one student who disliked the system said, "Contract grading was too much pressure and too ambiguous. I would rather fulfill your expectations than

have the opportunity to set my own." In addition, many of our international students from high–power distance cultures were initially uncomfortable with contract grading because it was outside their cultural norms to share power with a professor. These students tended to be anxious about contract grading at the beginning of the course, but almost all became converts to the system as the course progressed.

Although some students may view the contract grading experience as painful, empowering them, within limits, develops their responsibility. Part of learning to be responsible may mean making poor choices (procrastination is a typical example) and facing those consequences. It may also mean stretching oneself to act outside the norms of one's culture to promote self-development. Choice engenders both ownership and responsibility for consequences; blame for earning poor grades is internalized. Most students ultimately become more committed to excelling at the choices they have made.

Like managers training new employees, our challenge in implementing contract grading is to give students enough freedom and control of the system to motivate their learning and improve their likelihood of performing successfully while providing enough direction so that they do not flounder or experience undue stress. Students' diverse cultural norms, levels of tolerance for ambiguity, and desire for self-directed learning make this challenge all the more difficult. However, individuals must increasingly perform in organizations undergoing rapid change, under conditions of ambiguity and turbulence, in empowered environments, or as members of self-directed teams. Individuals can learn to tolerate more complexity and flexibility in their information-processing abilities (Cameron & Whetton, 1998). Contract grading provides an opportunity for students to enhance their tolerance for ambiguity and to learn to function more effectively in empowered environments.

Implementation of Contract Grading

We have implemented contract grading differently in different courses as we have experimented over time. In all cases, however, we have shared learning and evaluation choices with students rather than giving students complete control over their learning. Although we concur with Mallinger's (1998) argument that students are capable of expanding their maturity levels to take on greater responsibility for their learning than many faculty members believe, we also agree with Ramsey and Couch (1994) that totally self-directed learning is an unrealistic and perhaps inappropriate target in academic settings. Because we presumably know more about our subject matter

than our students and have much more experience trying out a range of methods to generate learning relevant to our courses than they, we have a responsibility to build a structure within which our students can make their learning choices—"a structure that encourages independence yet also offers parameters to assure quality education" (Mallinger, 1998, p. 473).

CONTRACT COMPONENTS

In each of our courses, we create a menu of learning assignments customized to the course, from which students can build their individual course contracts. Appendix A includes sample excerpts from three syllabi that present different contract formats. Both classroom activities and assignments in our courses are highly experience based and interactive, as advocated by Kolb (1984) and Bilimoria and Wheeler (1995). Classroom activities include experiential exercises, role plays, organizational simulations, case study discussions, storytelling, small- and large-group discussions, group project work, and planned and extemporaneous student presentations. Among the assignment choices are personal journals, reflective papers, research papers, case analyses, and a wide range of individual and team projects. We have structured our assignments to encourage students to work collaboratively, to introspect, to reflect on both their in-class and out-of-class experiences, to apply course theories and concepts to those experiences, to think both critically and open mindedly, and to make connections among disparate information and viewpoints.

Some assignments are required of all students, with student choice coming only in how much weight to give the assignment. Other assignments are optional, such that students can choose both what to do and the assignments' weights. With some assignments, we provide minimally and/or maximally acceptable weights. For others, we do not. The limits imposed are based largely on our own experience over time of the learning value of different assignments to our students.

We recognize that empowerment is a matter of degree. We adapt contract parameters to the course content and student level, with less flexibility and choice in lower level, required courses. Choice and voice are fairly constrained in lower level courses; empowerment is increased and limits removed or reduced as students develop. In upper-level elective courses, with greater student experience and development, flexibility and empowerment are expanded considerably.

For example, the contract for the course on trust, justice, and emotions in the workplace, outlined in Excerpt #1 in Appendix A, gives students a high degree of control over how the course is structured and how they are evalu-

ated. The assignments and student responsibilities presented in the original syllabus are explicitly mere starting points for negotiation of a course contract. No assignment weightings are included in the syllabus. On the 1st day of class, the students and teacher discuss what each hopes to learn in the course. We then discuss the reasoning behind the suggested assignments and student responsibilities listed in the syllabus and brainstorm other possible assignments that might better help the group or individuals within the group reach our learning goals. The 2nd week of class, we negotiate a preliminary contract that includes some of the assignments originally listed in the syllabus and others that the students create. For example, in a recent semester, the students decided as a group to all put the same weight on class discussion, but they allowed variable weighting on other assignments and maximal flexibility in designing unique final projects. We also agreed that throughout the semester, students would have a good deal of input into deciding how course content would be presented and explored and in evaluating their own and one another's learning.

In contrast, the contracts for our organizational behavior and managing change courses, excerpted in Appendix A, are more restrictive. Most of the assignments are required, with student choice limited to deciding weightings and numbers of each type of assignment to do. However, a caveat that gives students greater control and flexibility over their learning is that we always give them the option to propose alternative assignments for at least some (and for one of us, all) of our planned assignments. Indeed, we strongly encourage our students to propose alternative assignments that they believe will better fulfill their own learning goals. Only a small percentage of students have taken us up on this offer, but for those who have, the learning experience has been excellent for both them and us. Our students tell us that the reason most of them do not propose alternative assignments is that at the beginning of the semester, when contracts are first negotiated, they do not understand enough about the course to come up with ideas for their own assignments. Most of the students who do propose alternative assignments do so at midsemester as part of a contract renegotiation rather than at the beginning of the semester, when contracts are first negotiated.

Our experience has been that working students (including nontraditional undergraduates, graduate students, and executives) are more likely than traditional undergraduate students to propose and complete alternative assignments. Most often, working students propose assignments that require them to use course theory and methods to complete projects that are relevant to their work. For example, one student in a graduate-level human resource management class developed a Web-based training program for his subordinates in lieu of the assignment to analyze a case dealing with training issues.

The student's work not only demonstrated excellent learning about training theory and design but also effectively filled a real need for improved training in his workplace. Thus, working students who take advantage of the opportunity to develop their own assignments can integrate their conceptual learning with their work while the course is still in progress.

CONTRACT NEGOTIATION

One approach to negotiating course contracts is described above in explaining the development of contract components for a seminar on trust, justice, and emotions in the workplace. In our larger classes, to create a collaborative class culture and to provide opportunity for student learning about teams, we typically include a team component in our grading contracts. Students must contract for both individual and team assignments. In the 1st or 2nd week of classes, students form small teams of three to five members who work together throughout the semester, typically creating team documents that outline team member responsibilities. The method of team formation varies by course, from random assignment to selection through a student-run interview process. By the 2nd or 3rd week of class, each team must negotiate the team portion of its grade contract. Teams put together customized packages of assignments from our menus, complete with proposed weightings and contingencies. Although each individual on a team has free rein to personalize the portion of his or her contract dealing with individual assignments, the team-level choices must be identical for members of a given team. To aid the teams in negotiating their contracts, we spend class time discussing and clarifying the assignment options, in some cases brainstorming new assignment options, and engaging in team-building exercises prior to beginning contract negotiations. The teams are given class time to begin their contract negotiations but often must complete the negotiations outside of class.

We encourage students to contract for contingencies that allow them to redo assignments or to do additional work, replacing lower and/or marginal grades. Because we want to provide our students with frequent assessment and feedback to stimulate their learning (Bilimoria, 1995), we usually require them to contract for a large number and wide range of assignments. We encourage them to discuss their work in progress with us and to share drafts of assignments for our feedback before turning them in for final grades. To encourage students to do their best work and to enable them to balance the workload for our course with their other responsibilities, we also allow flexibility in the timing of some assignments.

When students have developed their proposed contracts, they submit them to us for approval. Occasionally, a proposed contract falls outside our zone of

acceptance because it fails to include all required assignments, violates the required minimum or maximum percentages, or proposes an unclear or poorly conceived alternative assignment. In that case, we meet with the student to discuss our concerns and together negotiate a mutually acceptable contract. Once a mutually acceptable contract has been negotiated, the student and we sign and date it, and it goes into effect.

CONTRACT RENEGOTIATION

At least once during the semester, students are allowed to renegotiate their contracts on an individual and/or team basis. One of us sets aside 1 week at midsemester for contract renegotiation and revisions. The other of us is more flexible with renegotiations, allowing them at any point during the semester. Students are responsible for initiating the renegotiation process and must adhere to a set of ground rules for renegotiation, which vary by course. An example of renegotiation ground rules for one of our organizational behavior courses is included in a footnote to Excerpt #2 in Appendix A.

Our experience is that fewer than half of the students renegotiate their contracts. Having the option to renegotiate seems to be very important to them, however, even if they do not exercise the option. Their comments on end-of-course evaluations make clear that they consider renegotiation to be critical to the fairness of the system. Because contract grading is new and confusing to most of the students at the outset, they are unsure of how to design contracts that will best shape their learning experiences. The opportunity to renegotiate allows students to change in midstream, at a time when they better understand the potential learning available from the course. The chance to renegotiate also decreases students' stress levels associated with the increased responsibility of making their own learning choices.

STUDENT INVOLVEMENT IN EVALUATION

Students participate not only in designing the contracts against which they will be evaluated but also in evaluating their own and their peers' learning. They have evaluative input in several ways. Although we decide the evaluative criteria for the majority of assignments in most of our courses, our students have some say in defining evaluative criteria. In some cases, students jointly develop the criteria for evaluating a specific responsibility or assignment, without our input. For example, in one of our human resources management courses, students work as a class to develop 360° performance evaluation instruments that are used to evaluate their own and their peers' contributions to class discussions. In other cases, as with the common assignments and responsibilities in the course on trust, justice, and emotions in the

workplace, the students and we discuss an assignment together in class and mutually agree on the evaluative criteria to be used. In still other cases, as with students' projects and/or presentations in several courses, individuals or teams meet with us to jointly discuss and agree on learning objectives, deliverables, and evaluative criteria for the unique assignments that they have contracted.

Students also give evaluative feedback to their peers as well as their instructor and have a role in assessing the quality of their own work. They complete anonymous feedback forms for their peers and named ones for themselves for all in-class individual or team presentations. We also ask them to write qualitative evaluations of their own and others' contributions to in-class discussions. Team members are also encouraged to provide frequent feedback to one another on their team contributions, and they may choose to grade one another's contributions to the team effort. In the group problem-solving course, a formal class feedback session is set aside at midquarter for students in each team to provide constructive positive and negative feedback to one another as well as to the instructor. In deciding grades, we incorporate all student feedback we have gathered.

Because our pedagogy encourages emergent knowledge creation rather than regurgitation of known "facts," students are graded on how effectively they have used their own learning opportunities. All students who demonstrate high levels of learning can earn an A, which we clearly communicate to our students early in the course. Because students are not competing against one another for good grades, their feedback to one another is usually forthright, constructive, and developmentally oriented. Students often learn a great deal from their peers' feedback, as do we.

Limitations and Challenges of Contract Grading

Despite its many strengths, we recognize limitations of our contract grading system. In addition, we continue to face challenges in implementing the system efficiently.

Minimizing the potential for free ridership abuses. Our experience has been that contract grading has positively influenced the motivation to learn and the effort given to learning for the vast majority of our students. However, a small minority have been free riders in the system, using their control over the assignments they are held accountable for and the weightings of those assignments to minimize their efforts in the course. As one student explained, "At times I felt like it was too easy to do well because I put most of the weight

on things I was good at—it kind of took some of the challenge away." We have learned to set boundaries to minimize free ridership abuses. For instance, we make assignments that provide critical skill development mandatory, with tighter limits on weight variations than other assignments. Students must also engage in a wide range of assignments in most of our courses. Although we want students to be able to demonstrate their learning in ways with which they feel confident, we do not want to limit them solely to their strengths, choosing instead to encourage them to stretch and develop themselves. Peer input into evaluation and grade decisions helps overcome free ridership on team-based assignments. We have also experimented with renegotiation to try to prevent grade gamesmanship (playing with grade weightings on previously completed assignments without doing any additional work and without increased learning). For instance, with continuously permitted renegotiation, we disallow modifying percentages upward on previously completed assignments, with increases in grade weights only allowed on future assignments. Alternatively, in other instances, we have permitted renegotiation only halfway through the course, limiting the number of assignments available solely for gamesmanship attempts.

Striking a balance between structure and empowerment. Our efforts to avoid free ridership are tied to a bigger issue at the heart of contract grading: ensuring that students have a real voice in their own learning process and in how they are evaluated, while at the same time ensuring that student involvement in course design does not unintentionally degrade course content or evaluation standards. Our experience has shown us that providing structure in the contract grading process helps achieve both objectives simultaneously. We have found that most of our students need some structure to feel empowered; too little structure leaves them feeling not empowered but set adrift, consistent with Randolph's (1995) model for effective empowerment in organizations.

One of our biggest challenges in implementing contract grading has been in finding the optimal amount of structure for each course and group of students. We continue to experiment with different levels of structure in different courses. Certainly, students have had more control over their own evaluation in some of our courses than in others. However, in all of our courses in which we have used contract grading, the overwhelming majority of our students have perceived themselves to have a real voice in their evaluation process. What we have found to be consistently true, moreover, is that the quality of both our course content and our students' work has improved, not degraded, with their involvement in their own evaluation process. We attrib-

ute the increase in quality to our students' increased commitment to their own learning.

Handling an increased administrative burden. One drawback of using contract grading is that it creates a larger administrative burden than more traditional grading systems. Class time must be devoted to team building, contract negotiation, and collecting evaluative feedback from the students. It can be a challenge to carve out the class time needed to administer the system. We have dealt with this challenge in two ways. First, we expect our students to do a great deal of reading outside of class and to come prepared to discuss what they have read, which frees up time that might traditionally be used for lecturing to be used instead for interactive learning experiences, including contract negotiations. Second, wherever possible, we try to use the contract negotiation process as a way to teach experientially about management topics, which we discuss in more depth in a later section.

Implementing contract grading places high demands on instructors' out-of-class time as well. It is admittedly time consuming to develop complex grading alternatives, negotiate and renegotiate contracts, read multiple drafts and rewrites of assignments, and keep track of each individual's progress against his or her personalized grading contract. However, it can be done, even under the time constraints inherent in a quarter system. One of us currently teaches under a 10-week quarter calendar, and several years' worth of data were collected under the quarter system.

The time demands are more easily managed with increasing experience using contract grading; however, contract grading does require a greater commitment of time and energy devoted to teaching than a more traditional grading system. Anyone who wishes to experiment with contract grading must understand that. We have found that being generous with the in-class time we allow for discussing our students' learning objectives, explaining the negotiation process, and allowing teams to begin negotiating contracts pays dividends in minimizing the out-of-class time involved in negotiating and renegotiating contracts. Doing this work together in class helps clarify the process for all the students and significantly cuts down on the number who are confused and need to meet with us separately outside of class.

We have found it efficient to use computer spreadsheets to keep track of the personalized grading contracts for each student. Appendix B includes a sample Microsoft Excel grading spreadsheet. Although it takes more time to set up the grading file for a course using grading contracts than for a course in which all students are required to do identical assignments with identical weightings, once the grading spreadsheet is established, it is easy to maintain throughout the semester.

In addition to the increased administrative burden, because contract grading encourages students' commitment and motivation to learning, it creates more pleasurable time demands as well. Since adopting contract grading, we have found ourselves spending much more time with our students engaged in significant "teaching moments" outside the classroom. Individuals and teams meet with us frequently throughout the semester to get feedback on their ideas and work in progress, to continue stimulating discussions that were interrupted by class's ending, to get advice about how to deal with contentious team issues, and to share stories of their learning moments. We have also experienced high levels of class attendance, with most students missing no more than one or two classes and many achieving perfect attendance, even when class begins at 8:00 a.m. Although class attendance is certainly influenced by multiple factors, we believe that the learning ownership engendered by contract grading contributes to students' commitment to attending class regularly.

Minimizing the career risk associated with experiencing higher grade distributions. Most of our students have risen admirably to the learning challenges they contracted to undertake. They have validated our deep-seated faith in their eagerness both to learn and to share control over their learning through producing high-quality work in our classes. The majority of our students have demonstrated high levels of learning, which have translated into higher grade distributions than we experienced in classes we taught before using contract grading, although still generally within existing institutional ranges for the type and level of course. We have been fortunate to experience neither institutional concern over our higher grade distributions nor pressure to lower them. However, we recognize that many teachers face institutional pressures to maintain grade distributions that limit the number of students who earn high grades. In institutions where grade distributions are closely monitored and where high grade distributions are considered suspect, it may be risky to engage in contract grading.

To lower the risk of colleagues' and administrators' misinterpreting a high grade distribution as a leniency bias, we recommend that teachers employing contract grading maintain files of representative student work for each course that demonstrate A-level work, B-level work, and so on. Such files can be maintained as stand-alone files or as part of a teaching portfolio. Our biggest defense of our higher-than-average distributions is the quality of our students' work.

Another recommendation is to collect students' feedback about how contract grading affected their learning processes. Ask students how challenged they were by the work they did for the course, how committed they felt to the

course, how much effort they put into the course relative to other courses, and how much they learned. Most of our students report having been challenged by our classes, having felt deep commitment to doing the work, and having put more than their usual effort into doing the work. They also report—and demonstrate—a great deal of learning. Even more convincing than student feedback gathered during or at the end of the course is feedback solicited from alumni of the course after they have entered or returned to the workforce. In addition to formal collection of student feedback, our experience is that our students frequently talk informally among themselves and to other faculty members and administrators about how challenging and demanding our courses are, which helps belie a leniency bias in grading.

Finally, we recommend that teachers who decide to use contract grading educate their faculty colleagues and administrators about the theory underpinning such an evaluation system. We have done so through explanatory statements in teaching portfolios and review documents. We have also conducted contract grading workshops and symposia on our campuses and at national conferences. On our own campuses, we have conducted workshops for faculty members both within our departments and across all departments and colleges. One of us has also presented a contract grading workshop for the school's board of control. Interestingly, the board, composed of business executives, greatly supported the concept because they believed contract grading would develop student responsibility and initiative. Conducting such workshops on our campuses has helped our colleagues accept our higher-than-average grade distributions as what they are: evidence of the effectiveness of contract grading in motivating our students to learn. Happily, these workshops have also encouraged a few of our colleagues to experiment with contract grading.

Management Learning Inherent in the
Contract Grading Process

A significant benefit of using contract grading is that students learn fundamental management concepts and skills through the experience of engaging in the contract grading process. Student management of the contract grading process helps them learn experientially about negotiation processes; conflict management; managing diversity; procedural, distributive, and interactional justice; creating and managing performance evaluation systems; and relationships between empowerment, motivation, performance, and satisfaction. The students see culture change in action as their class moves away from the traditional, passive, instruction-centered learning environment experienced

in most of their classes to an interactive, active, learning-centered environment.

Using the organizational behavior course outlined in Appendix A, Excerpt #2, as an example, on the 2nd day of class, students are assigned to four-person teams that work together throughout the semester. The students' first readings are about critical team dynamics and influences on team effectiveness. Their second readings are about a wide range of individual difference variables that may potentially affect their team dynamics and performance, such as cognitive style, personality variables, birth order, values, and ethical frameworks. During the 2nd week of class, students begin to negotiate a team profile/agreement that outlines the similarities and differences that exist among team members and how the team plans to capitalize on them. The agreement articulates the team's goals, its rules for conducting business, the mechanisms for holding team members accountable for the rules, and the mechanisms for renegotiating rules. Only after that initial team development work has been done does the team begin to negotiate the grading contract. Working through this fairly complex and lengthy process of negotiation, students not only learn experientially about how to negotiate with peers but also begin to understand something about team dynamics and to think about how to effectively utilize their team's diversity.

As the semester progresses, both in their journal entries and in-class discussions, the students frequently relate course concepts such as conflict management and justice issues to the experiences they have in their teams' implementing their course contracts. At midsemester, each team writes a team assessment and plan for change that diagnoses both the strengths of the team and impediments to effective team interactions and develops a plan to improve how the team functions to carry out the final phases of the teams' work more effectively. Working through this assignment often results in students understanding connections between problems that their team is experiencing at midsemester and problems in the way they negotiated their original team profile/agreements and grading contracts.

According to Conger and Kanungo (1988), individuals feel more empowered in organizations when their managers use participative management techniques, allow them to set their own goals independently or collaboratively, provide frequent feedback to enhance self-efficacy beliefs, and remove contextual features that make them feel powerless. The process of contract grading that the students experience in this course helps make the classroom the kind of empowering organization that Conger and Kanungo

described. By the end of the class, most students learn, consistent with theory, that classroom empowerment, of which contract grading is a significant piece, has increased their motivation, satisfaction, and the quality of their work.

Importantly, by engaging in the contract grading process, students gain critical skills that enhance their marketability and potential for organizational effectiveness. Our students become more thoughtful and adept negotiators; learn how to critically evaluate their own and others' performance and to provide constructive feedback; and improve team skills, including agenda development and management, conflict management, and effective team decision making. They also gain skill in designing and structuring an empowering work team environment and in working more effectively with diverse people. The experience also builds students' self-confidence in managing their own learning—a skill that is critical to success in jobs and organizations that experience rapid change.

Conclusion

By giving our students some voice over what and how they are evaluated, contract grading helps us create a "classroom of respect" (Giampetro-Meyer & Holc, 1997) built on learning partnerships with our students and facilitates a postmodern learning environment. We think it is critical that students become less passive learners—that they take some responsibility for their own learning through having voice in the design of their individualized grading contracts. We need to prepare our students to succeed in today's organizations, which are characterized by frequent change and innovation, diverse employees, and greater emphasis on self-management and continual learning. Employees who wait for their managers to set their goals or to interpret organizational changes for them are less likely to succeed in such a diverse, dynamic environment. The experience of negotiating and being held accountable for fulfilling grading contracts sends students out into the work world better prepared to share responsibility for determining the roles they will play in their organizations. Contract grading pushes students to diagnose their own strengths and weaknesses in determining what they will contract to accomplish during the course and then makes them more committed to do the learning needed to deliver what they have promised. If we can teach students to take ownership of their learning now, it should make them better able to adapt to the changes and diversity they will face in their careers.

Appendix A
Syllabi Excerpts Demonstrating Different Contract Formats

Excerpt #1: From Trust, Justice & Emotions in the Workplace syllabus (used in an upper-level undergraduate and graduate elective seminar with 10 students, under a semester calendar).

Since this is such a small class, we have the luxury of designing together a course grading contract—an agreement about what assignments/responsibilities you will be held accountable for completing and how much weight to place on each one in calculating your final grades. This contract will allow you to have some voice in how you are evaluated. I have a set of assignments in mind that I think would be valuable for your learning. However, if you convince me that alternative assignments would be equally beneficial or superior for achieving your learning goals, we'll go with your ideas. To give us a starting point for negotiation, I have listed below the assignments/responsibilities that I think would benefit our joint learning:

1. Accountability for Contributing to Class Discussions on a Regular Basis

Our readings for this class will be original theoretical and empirical articles and books, rather than a textbook. That means that we, rather than a textbook author, will need to make sense of each individual article and how the various readings relate to each other. I think we will maximize our joint learning if we use our time together to talk with each other about our interpretations and understandings of the articles. Holding all of us accountable for contributing meaningfully to class discussions should help to ensure that everyone comes to class having read the assignments for that day. Since we are collaborating in a learning venture, it is imperative that we are all prepared for every class period. More important, holding everyone accountable for contributing to class discussions should help to ensure that everyone voices their ideas. My hope is that we will all engage in the following types of behaviors in class: voicing original ideas, challenging others' positions with which we disagree, defending our own views, clarifying points that others may have misunderstood, raising questions that need to be further explored, sharing relevant personal experiences and opinions, analyzing and synthesizing course material, and theorizing on the basis of our readings and experience.

2. Weekly Informal Reflective Writing Assignments

I envision two different weekly writing assignments—one written before class each week that reflects on/tries to make sense of the set of readings assigned for that class and the other written after class each week that discusses how your understanding has altered/what you have learned based on our class discussion. Such writing would serve multiple purposes. The pre-class writing should help to ensure that you have not only read, but also thought about, the assigned readings before class each

week. Organizing your thoughts well enough to put them in writing should help you to clarify your own understanding of (or confusion about) the readings, such that our in-class discussion is enriched. For those of you who are initially reluctant to speak up much in class, your writing will help me to gauge your level of understanding and to give you feedback about that. The post-class writing should help you to capture and be more likely to retain the key insights/learning you get out of each class. If we agree to share our post-class writings with one another, it should help us all to maximize our learning.

3. Shared Responsibility for Leading Class Discussions

I would like to see us share the responsibility for leading class discussions, such that sometimes I will lead class discussions and sometimes you will. It is common practice in graduate-level seminars for students or teams of students to take the responsibility for leading class discussions throughout the semester. From my own days as a grad student, I know that I learned the most about the topics for which I was responsible for leading class discussion. Although this is also an undergraduate-level course, given its seminar nature, I think we would all benefit from sharing the leadership of class discussions. There are several options for how we could share responsibility for leading class discussions. One or two of you could take responsibility for leading the discussion of an entire class (or classes). Alternatively, we could rotate the discussion leadership during each class session, such that each person in the class took leadership for discussing one or two articles each session.

4. Completion of a Course Project

Completing a course project would allow you to immerse yourself in whatever aspect of the course material you are most interested. I can envision many different types of course projects that you could choose to do. I see no reason for everyone to choose the same type of project. I'd be happy to let you each negotiate your own course project with me. On the other hand, you could do course projects in pairs or small groups if two or more of you share the same interest. Possible course projects include, but are not limited to, development of a research proposal, completion of a case study, or development of a theoretical model. Whatever you choose to do for your project, I would expect it to be well grounded in the literature on trust, justice, and/or emotions in the workplace. I would also expect you to present an oral version of your project to your classmates near the end of the semester.

Excerpt #2: From Organizational Behavior (OB) syllabus (used in an upper-level undergraduate class in which typically two thirds of the 20 to 30 students in the class are BSBA majors taking the course as a requirement and one third are BA students taking the course as an elective, under a semester calendar).

You will put together, in conjunction with your team, your personal grading contract . . . . You decide how much to weight each assignment, as a percentage of your total evaluation for the course. Your contract must conform to the required maximum

and minimum weightings listed below, and the team component of your contract must be identical for everyone in your team. You'll notice that some assignments have no weighting restriction. Individual assignments with no weighting restrictions are optional. You must complete all of the team assignments listed below, even if you elect not to have them graded, unless you propose an acceptable alternative assignment that better serves your personal or team learning goals. I strongly encourage you to propose alternative assignments for any of the course assignments—team or individual, if you have ideas for assignments that will better motivate you to learn in this course. Course contracts can be renegotiated with me, on an individual or team basis, any time during the semester. If you wish to renegotiate your contract, it is your responsibility to initiate the process.[a]

Individual Assignments: maximum of 50% of total course grade

1. Class Contribution
2. Learning Journal: 5 entries minimum. Min weighting = 1% / entry, Max weighting = 2% / entry.
3. Mid-semester Individual Team Analysis
4. Team Assessment Survey (not graded but required as an aid to your team assessment & plan for change)
5. Final Individual Team Analysis: minimum weight = 15%.

Team Assignments: minimum of 50% of total course grade

1. Team Profile/Agreement
2. Team Identity Skit: maximum weighting = 5%
3. Team Progress Report (not graded)
4. Team Assessment and Plan for Change: maximum weighting = 5%
5. Case Analyses: minimum of 2 cases
6. Original OB Case: minimum weight = 10%
7. Original OB Case Presentation: minimum weight = 10%
8. Original OB Case Analysis: minimum weight = 10%
9. You may also grade each other on team contribution if you desire.

Excerpt #3: From Managing Change syllabus (used with both upper-level undergraduate elective classes and graduate-level elective classes, with class sizes ranging from 12 to 40 students, under both quarter and semester calendars, as well as in 5-week intensive summer sessions for graduate engineering management students).

You will put together, in conjunction with your self-selected team, your own package of course deliverables as well as a team contract. Team membership is subject to negotiation for the duration of the term. Individuals may "fire" their groups and join another; teams may "fire" individuals. Individual grades earned on team case grades may be modified if warranted by feedback from team members regarding individual contribution to team cases. The team component and team peer evaluations must be identical for team members, while the remaining components may vary for each team

member. Your contract must conform to the required maximum and minimum weightings listed below while summing to 100%, and the team component of your contract must be identical for everyone in your team. Contract renegotiation opportunities are provided during a week mid-semester.

Individual Deliverables: Minimum of 25%, maximum of 65% of total course grade

1. Memos: 3 options. Minimum of 1 required, minimum weight = 5% per memo.
2. Thinkpieces: 6 options. Minimum of 1 required, minimum weight = 5% per thinkpiece.
3. (I)Search paper or (I)Search presentation: 1 required. Minimum weight = 15%.

Team Deliverables: Minimum of 20%, maximum of 60% of total course grade

4. Team Cases: 6 options. Minimum required = team size, minimum weight = 5% per case

Participation Deliverables: Minimum of 10%, maximum of 40% of total course grade

5. Instructor's Class Participation Evaluation: minimum of 5%.
   #5 must be = or > #6
6. Team Peer Evaluation: minimum of 5%. #6 must be = or < #5.

a. Ground rules for contract renegotiation: (1) You may not increase the weight of any assignment that has already been graded; (2) you may decrease the weight of an assignment that has already been graded, but not by more than half; and (3) you must stay within the original guidelines for minimum and maximum weightings.

Appendix B
Sample Excel Grading Spreadsheet

Contracted Assignment	Student Number 1			Student Number 2		
	Grade	Percentage	Total	Grade	Percentage	Total
Class contribution	80	8.0	6.40	95	15.0	14.25
Learning journal	96	17.0	16.32	88	5.0	4.40
Midsemester individual team analysis	90	10.0	9.00			0.00
Final individual team analysis	94	15.0	14.10	91	15.0	13.65
Individual total		**50.0**	**45.82**		**35.0**	**32.30**
Team profile/agreement			0.00	90	3.5	3.15
Team identity skit	93	5.0	4.65	84	4.5	3.78
Team assessment and plan for change	90	5.0	4.50	94	4.0	3.76
Case analysis #1	87	5.0	4.35	85	2.0	1.70
Case analysis #2	89	5.0	4.45	88	3.0	2.64
Case analysis #3			0.00	94	4.0	3.76

(continued)

Appendix B Continued

	Student Number 1			Student Number 2		
Contracted Assignment	Grade	Percentage	Total	Grade	Percentage	Total
Case Analysis #4			0.00	92	5.0	4.60
Original OB case	92	10.0	9.20	97	10.0	9.70
Original OB case presentation	90	10.0	9.00	98	14.0	13.72
Original OB case analysis	88	10.0	8.80	95	10.0	9.50
Team contribution			0.00	100	5.0	5.00
Team total		**50.0**	**44.95**		**65.0**	**61.31**
Final grade		**100.0**	**90.77**		**100.0**	**93.61**
Number of learning journal entries contracted		10			5	
Contingencies		If unsatisfied with grades on Case #1 and/or Case #2, will write more team cases and keep two best grades.			No contingencies contracted.	

NOTE: The two sample student files shown here are for students from two different teams. OB = organizational behavior.

References

Ames, R., & Ames, C. (1991). Motivation and effective teaching. In L. Idol & B. F. Jones (Eds.), *Educational values and cognitive instruction: Implications for reform* (pp. 247-271). New York: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Barr, R. H., & Tagg, J. (1995, November/December). From teaching to learning—A new paradigm for undergraduate education. *Change*, 13-25.

Bilimoria, D. (1995). Modernism, postmodernism, and contemporary grading practices. *Journal of Management Education*, *19*(4), 440-457.

Bilimoria, D., & Wheeler J. V. (1995). Learning-centered education: A guide to resources and implementation. *Journal of Management Education*, *19*(3), 409-428.

Boyatzis, R. E., Cowen, S. S., & Kolb, D. A. (1992). Implementing curriculum innovation in higher education: Year one of the new Weatherhead MBA program. *Selections*, *9*(1), 1-9.

Butler, R. (1992). What young people want to know when: Effects of mastery and ability goals on interest in different kinds of social comparisons. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *62*, 934-943.

Cameron, D. A., & Whetton, K. S., (1998). *Developing management skills*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Candy, P. C. (1991). *Self-direction for lifelong learning: A comprehensive guide to theory and practice*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Condray, J. (1977). Enemies of exploration: Self-initiated versus other-initiated learning. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *35*, 459-477.

Conger, J. A., & Kanungo, R. N. (1988). The empowerment process: Integrating theory and practice. *Academy of Management Review*, *13*(3), 471-482.

Dawson, B. G., & Guy, R. F. (1994). Personality type and grade performance in a TV-assisted course. *Journal of Psychological Type*, *29*, 38-42.

DiTiberio, J. K. (1996). Education, learning styles, and cognitive styles. In A. L. Hammer (Ed.), *MBTI applications: A decade of research on the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator* (pp. 123-166). Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologist Press.

Donovan, A. J. (1994). The interaction of personality traits in applied music teaching (Doctoral dissertation, University of Southern Mississippi, 1994). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, *55*(06-A), 1499.

Dweck, C. S. (1986). Motivational processes affecting learning. *American Psychologist*, *41*, 1040-1048.

Edwards, C. H., & Edwards, L. (1999). Let's end the grading game (grading and marking of students). *Clearing House*, *72*(5), 260-263.

Elmore, R. F. (1991). Foreword. In C. R. Christensen, D. A. Garvin, & A. Sweet (Eds.), *Education for judgment: The artistry of discussion leadership* (pp. ix-xix). Boston: Harvard Business School Press.

Fraser, J.A.H. (1990, November). *Student reaction to contract grading*. Paper presented at the Conference of Atlantic Educators, Halifax, Canada.

Giampetro-Meyer, A., & Holc, J. (1997). Encouraging students to demonstrate intellectual behavior that professors respect. *College Teaching*, *45*(3), 92-95.

Hardigan, P. (1994). Investigation of learning contracts in pharmaceutical education. *American Journal of Pharmaceutical Education*, *58*(4), 386-390.

Harris, J. C. (1993, November). *Elements of contracting, individualization, and cooperative learning in a community college history classroom*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Mid-South Educational Research Association, New Orleans, LA.

Janzow, F., & Eison, J. (1990). Grades: Their influence on students and faculty. In M. D. Svinicki (Ed.), *New directions for teaching and learning, Vol. 42: The changing face of college teaching* (pp. 93-102). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Knowles, M. S. (1975). *Self-directed learning: A guide for learners and teachers*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Kohn, A. (1993). *Punished by rewards: The trouble with gold stars, incentive plans, A's, praise, and other bribes*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Kolb, D. A. (1984). *Experiential learning: Experience as the source of learning and development*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Lepper, M. R., Greene, D., & Nisbett, R. E. (1973). Undermining children's intrinsic interest with extrinsic rewards: A test of the overjustification hypothesis. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *28*, 129-137.

Malehorn, H. (1994). Ten measures better than grading. *Clearing House*, *67*(6), 323-324.

Mallinger, M. (1998). Maintaining control in the classroom by giving up control. *Journal of Management Education*, *22*(4), 472-483.

Milton, O., Pollio, H. R., & Eison, J. A. (1986). *Making sense of college grades*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Pintrich, P. R., & Schunk, D. H. (1996). *Motivation in education: Theory, research, and applications*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Ramsey, V. J., & Couch, P. D. (1994). Beyond self-directed learning: A partnership model of teaching and learning. *Journal of Management Education*, *18*(2), 139-161.

Randolph, W. A. (1995). Navigating the journey to empowerment. *Organizational Dynamics*, *23*(4), 19-32.

Severino, C. J. (1989). Helping nontraditional students achieve college literacy: A context-based study of the uses of text and teacher-student interaction (Doctoral dissertation, University of Illinois at Chicago, 1989). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, *50*(06-A), 1585.

Svinicki, M. D. (1998). Helping students understand grades. *College Teaching*, *46*(3), 101-105.

Zerges, R. A. (1984). Instructor behaviors valued by continuing education business students related to students' personality type, sex and program major (Doctoral dissertation, Cornell University, 1984). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, *44*(12-A), 3578.

TEACHING FACILITATION:
A PLAY IN THREE ACTS

Suzanne C. de Janasz
James Madison University

The trend toward teams and teamwork continues to increase. Many organizations are replacing traditional, hierarchical structures in favor of diverse, autonomous teams (Cohen, 1993) that can develop new products, solve problems, and improve processes in ways more quick, innovative, and cost-effective than ever before.

Despite reports of the phenomenal successes enjoyed by some work teams (e.g., Pine & Tingley, 1993; Plumb, 1993; Schilder, 1992), other teams experience failure (e.g., Mulvey, Veiga, & Elsass, 1996). Taking their cues from exemplar organizations, some organizations foray into "teaming" without adequate knowledge or preparation. These organizations fail to realize that "simply bringing together a group of professionals does not ensure that this group will function effectively as a team or make appropriate decisions" (Cooley, 1994, p. 6).

Complicating this teaming trend is the increasing diversity of the workforce (Jackson, 1991; Johnston & Packer, 1987). The challenges faced by a group of individuals working together are often magnified under the influence of diversity (gender, ethnicity, and functional specialization). Such diversity is believed to increase the potential for innovation and creativity in team outcomes; however, much research shows that such gains are often offset by process losses (e.g., Watson, Kumar, & Michaelsen, 1993). When indi-

viduals work together on a task, they cannot help but see the world from their own perspectives (e.g., as a woman, an African American, an engineer), at the same time ignoring or misunderstanding viewpoints of other team members. Team members who possess stereotypical perceptions of others' competence and abilities, different languages and styles of communication, and diverse methods for problem solving often have difficulty in reaching agreement (Ancona & Caldwell, 1992; Cox, Lobel, & McLeod, 1991; Dougherty, 1992; Wall & Nolan, 1986). Even nondiverse or homogenous teams have the potential for miscommunication and misunderstanding; however, this potential becomes exponentially elevated as a team's diversity increases (Jackson, 1991). Differences in gender, ethnicity, functional specialization, and personality among team members, unless understood and managed, can negatively affect team processes and outcomes (O'Reilly & Flatt, 1989; Wall & Nolan, 1986). Because the benefits of diversity—the synergistic combination of multiple perspectives (Adler, 1991)—often come with a cost, it becomes essential for organizations to provide resources that can enable diverse teams to collaborate more effectively while minimizing related costs.

The Case for Facilitation

How can an organization ensure effective group functioning? One way is to provide teams with trained process consultants or facilitators. By focusing on a team's internal processes (e.g., communication, decision making, and problem solving), or how members collaborate to accomplish its goals, facilitators can assist the team in achieving stated outcomes. Research suggests that although not necessarily ends in themselves, effective processes are critical to achieving successful outcomes (Cooley, 1994). On diverse teams, communication and other processes are hindered because of demographic and functional differences. Members find it hard to actively and objectively listen to and search for agreement with their diverse counterparts.

To facilitate means "to make easier" (*Webster's*, 1984), and through their actions, facilitators work with teams to help them more effectively achieve their stated goals. Facilitators generally attend to such team processes as meeting management, decision making, problem solving, and conflict resolution (Sisco, 1993). Aside from "teaching the group how to collect data," facilitators "may intercede if the team tries to solve a problem before defining what it is or if someone's ideas aren't being heard" (Sisco, 1993, p. 63). Their roles may not be confined to what happens during meetings; many facilitators work outside meetings to further group cohesion (Sisco, 1993) or help gain sponsorship or support from key groups or individuals external to the team

(Ancona, 1990). Although facilitators' responsibilities may vary with respect to teams' expected outcomes, technical requirements, and employee makeup, they often do whatever it takes to help a team improve its processes (and outcomes). This might start with helping a team clarify and "buy in" to its goals and objectives and progress through coaching the team to present its recommendations to management and eventually implement these recommendations.

A key facet of facilitator expertise is communication. Skilled in both verbal and nonverbal communication, facilitators are able to decode important cues that team members, who are generally more concerned about outcomes than processes, often miss. Subtle indications that members do not understand or do not want to understand another's diverse point of view, feel threatened by other members, or see themselves as unattached to a team and its goals are usually ignored or overlooked by fellow team members. Such signals may be deemed unimportant or unrelated to the task at hand. The adept facilitator, however, can highlight and focus the group's attention on such cues and their implications. For example, a team member who participates infrequently or isolates himself or herself (physically and psychologically) at team meetings might not seem problematic; however, as an experienced facilitator knows, such behavior might indicate that team member's lack of ownership of the team and its goals. Unchecked, this behavior can resurface later, often in the implementation phase, in the form of uncooperativeness or sabotage, and it can possibly lead to the downfall of a team.

In addition to process expertise, some facilitators possess specific content or technical knowledge (e.g., an engineering background) that might potentially benefit a team. However, because their primary responsibility is to ensure open and objective discussion of diverse perspectives, facilitators typically will downplay content knowledge for fear of being perceived as nonobjective or vested in a particular outcome (Sisco, 1993).

Another potential benefit of facilitation involves the opportunity for team members to learn and use the process skills modeled by the facilitator. Consistent with Bandura's (1977) social learning theory, a facilitator who models critical team behaviors (e.g., active listening, honest and direct communication, and providing appropriate behavioral feedback) plays a key role in helping team members develop and use these process skills more effectively. A facilitator's actions, including the effective modeling of teaming behavior and reinforcing of team members' effective behaviors, can eventually serve to assist a team in becoming self-facilitating (Cummings & Worley, 1993).

In sum, facilitators can provide multiple benefits for both the team and the individuals who make up the team. Team processes are improved in the short term, and team members are better equipped to deal with team-related issues

downstream. Of course, the company receives the benefits in the form of the valued outcomes a well-functioning team typically produces.

Teaching Facilitation: The Prologue

Facilitation skills can be learned (Cummings & Worley, 1993). I have successfully used the facilitation simulation described below in industry (supervisory and nonsupervisory employees) and in academe (undergraduate and graduate students). Students taking part in this activity report an increase in their facilitative and teaming skills as a consequence of the highly experiential and realistic nature of the exercise.

Typically, the teaching of facilitation skills follows one or more sessions devoted to the use of and need for organizational teams and team building. Students need to have a good sense of the benefits and drawbacks of teaming (cf. Scholtes, 1988) and preferably have had some experience working on teams. This "grounding" could be obtained through a discussion or brainstorming session. The instructor would begin by asking students, "How many of you have worked or played on a team before? If your experience was positive, what made it positive?" The instructor should search for student answers describing such ideas as team members knowing their goals and having the skills to achieve them, collaborating instead of competing, having a good coach or manager, and feeling good about the team and its outcomes. The instructor might follow these questions with one such as "If your team experience was negative, what made it negative?" Student responses to this question might include references to infighting, a bad coach or manager, and unclear or unachieved goals. The instructor should solicit as many responses to these questions as necessary to facilitate students' ability to differentiate team processes (the "hows") from outcomes (the "whats"). This differentiation is crucial to understanding the roles and responsibilities of a facilitator.

If students lack experience in teams, an instructor might ask whether students have had unproductive meetings and, if so, what they perceived to be the causes. Student inputs to this discussion are likely to center on issues of meeting management (not having a purpose or agenda), lack of focus on the task, excessive squabbling over the issues, or other process impairments. Again, the need for facilitation should become apparent.

At this point, there should be some discussion of what facilitation is and what role facilitators play in improving the functioning of teams and their meetings. The following list presents a sampling of a facilitator's responsibilities:

- to help teams run effective meetings, solve problems, and resolve conflict;
- to model and teach teaming and facilitative skills;
- to encourage teams to be self-managing;
- to encourage teams to coordinate with and present to related stakeholders (e.g., management, customers, suppliers); and
- to work oneself out of a job (i.e., by teaching and modeling effective facilitative behaviors, the group should eventually become self-facilitating and no longer require the services of the facilitator).

One might then discuss the difference between group outcomes or content (reasons for the team's existence, what the team is talking about) and group processes (how the team is going about achieving its formal tasks, including who talks to whom and how decisions are made). Facilitators should focus primarily on assisting the team with its process (as opposed to the content) by intervening when necessary to refocus a divergent discussion, ensure balanced participation, and clarify whether all options have been objectively evaluated. To do this effectively, facilitators must first be keenly aware of their strengths, weaknesses, and biases. Without this self-awareness, a facilitator's ability to set aside his or her personal needs (e.g., power, being liked by group members) or goals for the good of the group and organization may be limited (Johnson & Johnson, 1997). Other skills of a facilitator include the needs to

- listen carefully to what is being said;
- be sensitive to nonverbal communications, including emotions and silence; and
- pay attention and be able to respond to stages of team growth (e.g., arguing may be a normal part of team development that may not require intervention), communication patterns (e.g., do some members monopolize the conversation while others remain silent?), decision-making processes (are decisions made by consensus or majority rule, and do members accept the outcome?), and role behaviors (Schein's [1988] task-related, maintenance-related, and dysfunctional behaviors).

Students receive several handouts that are designed to augment and reinforce facilitation concepts. One of these lists a sampling of role behaviors (Schein, 1988; see Appendix A); students should know what they are doing (e.g., harmonizing, consensus testing, dominating), how they might help or hinder a team, and as necessary, appropriate responses. Students also receive a compilation of "problem people" (e.g., the "eager beaver," the "stand pat"), which includes detailed descriptions and potential responses to these behaviors (see Appendix B). The last handout contains a sampling of facilitative interventions (see Appendix C). One example is the "play dumb" intervention. When a group has lost its focus or has become sidetracked on another

topic, a facilitator might say something such as "I'm confused. What were we supposed to be discussing now?"

Prior to the simulation, each student is assigned one of the couple dozen interventions from this handout and asked to present the intervention to the class. For this presentation (2 to 3 minutes total), each student will describe the intervention, discuss how and why it would be used, and demonstrate its use to the class (or small group). The student who presents the play dumb intervention would explain the technique (e.g., "To get a group back on track, a facilitator will act lost and confused and request the team's help in leading him or her back to the issue at hand."), why it is used (e.g., "When the group has gotten sidetracked, playing dumb can help get the group to focus on its own process and how to improve it. It has the dual benefit of regaining the group's focus while simultaneously improving their ability to be self-facilitating."), and demonstrates its use (e.g., "I'm not sure where we are; were we discussing new employee orientation?"). If time does not permit intervention presentations by all students, have students get into groups of five or six and take turns presenting to one another. Then, each group can present a single intervention to the class. By teaching others the interventions, students become "experts" at one or more interventions and build their confidence using these techniques prior to the more intense simulation.

Teaching Facilitation: Act I

The facilitation simulation is designed to provide adequate realism, time, and feedback for students to practice their facilitation skills. In terms of realism, there are several components in the simulations. First, students are separated into groups of five or six (a typical work team size) and given small breakout rooms (if available) to have their meetings. Second, the group members are given information to guide them in the meetings they are about to have. The content of the various meetings is dictated by the pages of a booklet, each of which describes a team situation or objective.[1] Each meeting or round, led by a different facilitator, provides a different set of challenges that are appropriate for the ability and experience levels of the students. Some situations appeal to and are realistic for undergraduates with limited work experience. One example of this is as follows:

> Parking at (your university) has always been something of an issue for students. Many students can't find parking near their classes, and fines for parking in the wrong place are exorbitant. What suggestions does your team have for improving this situation—to be implemented in the short term (within the next

year) and in the long term (within 1 and 3 years from today)? Mr. or Ms. (fill in name for added realism), manager of parking, would like your team's recommendations by the middle of next semester.

Other situations are geared toward students with more work experience. One example of this type of situation or meeting is as follows:

> Your team—an ethnically diverse group of male and female employees who range in age from 21 to 59, most high school graduates but some with 2 years of college—has been assembled by the vice president of operations of a large, Fortune 500 company that has just embraced "teaming." Customer complaints about your products and services have risen over the past few years, and it is the vice president of operations's hope that teaming can turn that trend around. Your team's task is to come up with recommendations for how to implement teaming in the customer service division, one of 10 divisions in this company.

The third element of realism is achieved by requiring all but one student (the facilitator) in the small group to augment their "group member" roles by displaying behaviors suggested by a role card picked at random before each meeting begins. Some of these roles are intended to create a challenge for the facilitator (e.g., the monopolizer, who dominates the conversation, or the complainer, the team's "wet blanket"), whereas other roles may be helpful (e.g., the gatekeeper, who helps balance participation) or neutral (e.g., be yourself). (See Appendix E for a complete list.) The instructions to student role players are as follows:

- Don't show anyone your role card.
- Really get into your role, but don't go overboard. (Remember, you will have your turn as facilitator soon!)
- Make any assumptions you need to make about the task at hand.
- Ad lib as appropriate.
- After establishing your role, *do* allow yourself to be facilitated, especially if the facilitator is effectively dealing with your behavior. If you feel the facilitator is not effectively dealing with your behavior, you may continue to "act up."

The timing of the simulation will vary depending on the size and duration of the class in which it is used. With 30 students in a 75-minute class, I split the class into six groups and rooms, each containing 5 students. Four 17-minute rounds are held one day, and the fifth and final 17-minute round is held during the subsequent class. The number of rounds is equal to the number of students in each room and group; it takes this many rounds for each student to have his or her turn as facilitator. The plan for each 17-minute round looks like this:

- Decide who will facilitate for that round; all other students are "group members" for that meeting and should each pick a role card. You might also consider appointing a timekeeper to ensure adherence to the schedule.
- Spend about 8 minutes holding the meeting. (Refer to your "book" of meeting assignments; there are six different meetings, one for each round plus an extra.)
- Spend about 4 minutes giving feedback to the facilitator. (The facilitator should begin by sharing things he or she said or did that worked well and things that could be improved. Then, each of the group members should take turns directing his or her feedback to the facilitator using specific examples of behaviors that were effective and those that could be improved.)
- Spend about 4 minutes to continue the meeting, getting right back into the meeting as if a freeze frame had just expired. This time allows the facilitator to utilize the group's feedback to improve his or her performance for the second segment of the meeting.
- As appropriate, spend about 1 minute giving additional feedback.

The timing of these rounds could easily be extended, particularly for more advanced students; however, shortening the time is not suggested. Each successive round requires a new meeting and a new facilitator; all other students in the breakout room are "team members" who will be role-playing specific roles while working together on the subject of the meeting. By rotating the facilitator role and changing the meeting content, each student practices and receives feedback on his or her facilitative skills, observes and gives feedback to others doing the same, and practices teaming behaviors in a variety of realistic situations. Students often remark how watching other facilitators in subsequent rounds gives them ideas for what might have worked when they facilitated during the simulation as well as a model for how to (or not to, as is sometimes the case) deal with similar situations in future team settings. Learning occurs not only by doing but also by observing (e.g., Bandura, 1977). The complete simulation process, repetitive in format but dynamic in content and process, serves to continually challenge students and reinforce desired learning objectives.

The final key element of this simulation is the feedback process. Presumably, students have had previous instruction on how to give effective feedback (e.g., be descriptive, not evaluative; be specific, not general; focus on the behavior, not the person). If not, reviewing the principles of giving and receiving feedback would be important. The 4-minute feedback process within the 17-minute round is structured to provide helpful information to the facilitator without overloading or improperly criticizing him or her. At the completion of the first 8 minutes, the facilitator should begin by reflecting on his or her performance and describing what he or she thought he or she did well in the facilitation. This should be followed by the facilitator's honest

assessment of what he or she could have done better in his or her facilitation effort. Then, the group members should respond in a similar manner. If the instructor is available to facilitate the feedback session, he or she should encourage those giving feedback to provide specific examples of things the facilitator said or did to increase the usefulness of the feedback. After the feedback session, students continue with their meetings for an additional 4 minutes. This step enables student facilitators to utilize the feedback in the second part of the meeting to improve both their skills and confidence in facilitating teams and meetings.

Teaching Facilitation: Act II

Following the completion of the simulation exercise, some time should be spent discussing the challenges students experienced in their facilitating simulations. After a general discussion of the simulation, the instructor might ask a volunteer to share a particularly challenging or difficult moment that did not go as well as planned. The instructor uses this experience as a learning tool, probing students for ways to deal with the particular situation that proved too difficult during the simulation.

After about 15 minutes of discussion, the instructor will inform students that more experience observing and facilitating work groups is needed to improve facilitative skills. Highlighting the need for keen observation skills, the instructor asks students to refer back to the facilitation handouts while viewing[2] Sidney Lumet's 1957 film *Twelve Angry Men*, which is shown in class. The instructor might ask the students to take notes relative to jury members' role behaviors and the foreman's quasi-facilitative behaviors. The video is stopped periodically, and the instructor asks students questions such as the following:

- What types of behaviors do you see displayed at this point? (Some behaviors may be functional, such as clarifying the group's task or purpose, whereas others may be dysfunctional, such as stereotyping and causing divisiveness in the group.)
- What impacts might these behaviors have on the group's processes and outcomes?
- If you were asked to facilitate this group at this point in their task, what specifically would you do or say? (A complete list of questions is in Appendix F.)

Following the viewing and discussion of the video, the instructor may ask a summary question such as "Are you seeing things in this video that you

would not have seen a few weeks ago?" Students are often impressed with how much they have learned in such a short time. Other questions about the application of facilitation skills may be asked as appropriate.

Teaching Facilitation: Act III

A final element of teaching facilitation is the process of reflection on students' performances and the challenges faced when they facilitated. Reflective observation, according to Kolb (1984), is a critical element of comprehensive learning. To achieve this reflection, I typically assign a self-assessment assignment that contains the following questions:

1. What (interpersonal, managerial, organizational behavior) skills covered in our class did you find yourself using when you played the role of facilitator during this activity? Name at least two skills, and share an example for each.
2. When you facilitated, what do you believe to be the things you did particularly well? Please describe at least two instances when you felt your facilitation was effective.
3. When you facilitated, what do you believe to be the things you did not do particularly well or for which the outcome was different from what you had anticipated? Please describe at least two instances when you felt your facilitation could have been improved.
4. What lessons did you learn about yourself and about the challenges of doing work in teams from this activity? What steps can you take to improve your skills as a facilitator and as a team member?

This required self-assessment serves two purposes: First, it helps reinforce and complete the cycle of experiential learning; second, it serves as an assessment of student learning. When students complete the set of facilitation activities, they should understand the role of facilitation in teams; identify the skills and responsibilities of a facilitator; and by practicing and receiving feedback, increase their facilitative skills and identify areas for further development. Question 1 of the self-assessment addresses students' understanding of the skills necessary for effective facilitation, and through their recall of specific examples, students can reinforce earlier class concepts and applications. Questions 2 and 3 allow students to recall specific examples during their facilitation, likely aided by the feedback session, in which they did well (reinforces facilitation concepts and builds confidence) and needed to improve (reinforces facilitation concepts and addresses areas of weakness). Question 4 offers students an opportunity to reflect on the role and importance of facilitation on work teams as well as to identify steps needed to improve their skills as both team members and facilitators.

The process of reflection and self-assessment can be significantly aided through the use of videotape. If it is possible to videotape students' facilitation simulations, it would be best to require students to view their videotapes prior to completing the self-assessment exercise. Although I have not used this learning tool for this exercise because of resource constraints, it has been used for similar activities such as negotiation simulations. Students are typically very honest and reflective in their self-assessments without this tool; however, given the added recall ability and opportunity to observe students' actions and others reactions post hoc, it is clear that the use of videotape can offer additional and important benefits to the facilitation simulation. The ability to review and critique one's actual behaviors cannot be overemphasized.

Teaching Facilitation: Epilogue

Although the activity can and does improve students' facilitative skills, it should be clear that a facilitator cannot be "created" in several hours' time. At best, instructors should expect an increase in students' facilitative skills that can be applied to their current work groups. However, should students appear to possess sufficient facilitation skills, one could expand the classroom experience described in this article by assigning students the responsibility to observe and facilitate an ongoing work group, either in another class or back in their workplaces. (This assignment is available in Appendix G.) Students would preferably observe and share their observations at the conclusion of the first (or first few) meetings they observe. Then, as their skills and confidence levels increase, students may choose to actively facilitate and intervene in subsequent meetings. Students might then be asked to write up summaries of their experiences in facilitating "real" groups or teams.

Given the current reliance on teams and teamwork in the contemporary workplace, as well as the additional challenges presented by changes in the demographic makeup in the workforce, it is clear that facilitative skills are necessary and valued. However, some limitations on facilitation are important to note. First, it can be costly in terms of the facilitator's temporary full-time status on one or more teams. As such, not all work teams will have the luxury of adding (even temporarily) outside members to facilitate their activities. More likely, individual team members will be called on to use facilitative skills as appropriate. In this case, objectivity, one of the benefits perceptually bestowed on an "outside" facilitator, is not present. When such is the case, some of the problems inherent in culturally and functionally

diverse teams (e.g., misunderstanding or devaluing others' opinions, fighting over scarce resources) are not likely to be overcome by an "inside" facilitator.

Even when outside facilitators or process consultants are offered to a team, other problems may exist. First, teams can see the job of process facilitation resting squarely and solely on the facilitator. Such dependence precludes team development toward self-management. Second, at the other extreme, team members may not trust the outsider or "allow" him or her to intervene. This is especially likely when a team has existed for a period of time and resists the presence and questions the value of this appointed outsider.[3] Third, when management appoints a facilitator to a team without communicating the reasons or objectives for this step, team members might become suspicious and choose to be less forthcoming in team meetings and discussions. Facilitators can only facilitate what they see and hear; if the team's work goes "underground," there is not much a facilitator can do to help, should his or her help be needed. Fourth, facilitators may meet resistance because of a lack of familiarity and/or credibility with a part of the organization (Sisco, 1993), despite the fact that such unfamiliarity may underlie valuable objectivity. Because facilitators often work between teams and their management, a facilitator who is seen as ineffective or not credible (or a deterrent to some "master plan") might be "blocked" from helping a team achieve its goals by other organizational stakeholders. Organizational politics can and do pose a challenge for facilitators as well as other employees; some of these issues, despite effective facilitation, can be intractable.

Although team facilitation is not a panacea for all organizational challenges, undeniable benefits can be gained through the use of a trained process facilitator. Anecdotal evidence clearly supports this notion. More to the point of this article, facilitative skills can be learned and should be taught.[4] Some of the materials described herein were developed and implemented in a corporate context. Professional and supervisory employees were handpicked to participate in a facilitation training program. Participants and their managers took part in an orientation to the program designed to ensure that both were aware of and prepared for the challenges ahead. For the facilitator, these challenges centered primarily on his or her ability to provide facilitative support to ongoing work groups; for the manager, these challenges included their support of their employees' "reassignments" and assurance that their jobs would remain intact. The program (composed of 24-hour training, monthly support meetings, and one-on-one coaching if desired) was deemed a resounding success as measured by the ability of numerous ongoing and newly formed work groups to meet and exceed management's expectations.

Several elements were tweaked, and additional exercises were added when the facilitation simulation was adapted for classroom use. Students

who have gone through the facilitation "module" have reported far fewer "group problems" in their work groups than those who did not have the training. Follow-on assignments, such as the facilitation self-assessment and an overall class self-assessment, have revealed that students find the exercise particularly rewarding and instrumental in improving essential workplace skills. Although only one of at least two dozen exercises in a highly experiential interpersonal skills course, this exercise is singled out by as many as half the students as being the most valuable exercise for improving their interpersonal skills.

Appendix A
Role Behaviors

Behavior	Explanation	Example	Pros (cons)
Task related			
Initiating	Proposes a task	"Why don't we start by . . . "	Gets the "ball" rolling
Giving/seeking information	Offers/asks for facts, ideas	"In our department, we were able to cut costs by . . . "	Improves decision making
Clarifying and elaborating	Clears up confusion	"So you're saying . . . "	Ensures members understand one another
Summarizing	Restates, offers conclusion	"We've covered all but the last item on the agenda"	Can reduce time spent rehashing discussions
Consensus testing	Checks on group position	"It sounds like we agree on Points 1 and 2, but not 3 . . . "	Saves time, ensures decision buy-in
Maintenance related			
Harmonizing and compromising	Reduces tension, looks for middle ground	"It doesn't have to be either X or Y. Why don't we use the best elements of both?"	Reduces tension in group (can reduce risk taking)
Gatekeeping	Facilitates balanced participation	(To silent member) "What's your opinion?"	Ensures that members participate
Diagnosing	Shares observations of group process	"It seems a few of us are unhappy with the decision. Shall we revisit . . . ?"	Ensures that hidden problems are surfaced and dealt with

(continued)

Appendix A Continued

Behavior	Explanation	Example	Pros (cons)
Standard setting	Helps set norms, test limits	"Let's agree to brainstorm, then evaluate"	Facilitates team self-management
Dysfunctional			
Blocking	Prevents consensus	"I'm not going to agree to a solution that . . . "	Could slow down a hasty decision process (and bog down an effective process)
Dominating	Talks more than his or her share	The dominator often talks the longest and loudest, overshadowing others' potential contributions	(Can stifle others' participation)
Withdrawing	Silent, distracted	(Check body language)	Decision making may be quicker (if his or her concerns are not aired, he or she might sabotage the outcome later)
Self-seeking	Oppresses with personal needs	"The only way I'll agree to this is if you'll do . . . for me"	(Others might emulate this behavior and/or be biased against future inputs from him or her)

Appendix B
Problem People

Problem Person	Problem	Effect	Solution
The Silent One	Withdrawn. May be bored, indifferent, timid or insecure.	You lose a portion of the group's power. May have a negative effect on others in the group.	Ask for his or her opinions. Draw out the person sitting next to him or her, then ask the quiet one what he or she thinks of the view just expressed. If you are near him or her, ask his or her view so he or she will feel he or she is talking to you, not the whole group. Compliment the silent one when he or she does speak. Give positive verbal and nonverbal reinforcement.
The Advice Seeker	Wants you to solve his or her problems or those of others. May try to put you on spot, trying to have you support one viewpoint.	Can put you in position of decision maker rather than the group.	Avoid solving other people's problems for them. Never take sides. Point out that your view is relatively unimportant compared with that of the group. Say, "Let me get some other opinions. Joe, what do you think of Sam's question?"
The Heckler	Combative individual who wants to play devil's advocate or may be normally good natured but is upset by personal or job problems.	Can trap you into a one-on-one fight. Can stimulate group infighting.	Stay calm. Don't lose your temper. Keep the group from getting excited. Try to find merit in one of his or her points, then move on. Toss his or her statements out to the group; let them handle it. Talk to him or her privately; try to find out what's bothering him or her. Appeal to him or her for cooperation.
The Fighters	Two or more people clash at the personality level.	Can divide the group into competitive factions.	Interrupt politely but firmly. Stress points of agreement, minimize points of disagreement. Ask direct questions on the topic. Request that personalities be set aside.

(continued)

Appendix B Continued

Problem Person	Problem	Effect	Solution
The Drifter	Talks about things not related to subject. Uses far-fetched examples. Gets lost.	Can cause confusion to self and the group.	1. Interrupt politely. Thank him or her. Refocus his or her attention by restating main points being discussed. 2. Smile. Indicate that you are having a problem relating his or her interesting comments to the subject at hand, or ask him or her directly to make this connection for the group.
The "Stand Pat"	Won't budge. Refuses to accept the group's decisions. Often prejudiced. Unable or unwilling to see your point or those of others.	Can turn group into competitive camps. Delays decision making.	Toss his or her view to the group: "Does anyone else feel as Pat does about this?" Tell him or her that time is short and ask him or her to accept the group's position for the moment. Offer to discuss the point with him or her later.
The Griper	Has some pet gripe. Has a legitimate complaint.	Can turn the meet-ing into a grievance session.	Point out, "We can't change policies, but we can do the best we can under the system." Indicate that you will bring the complaint (if legitimate) to the proper person's attention. Indicate time constraints. Offer to discuss the problem after the meeting or at a future point.
The Verbal Stumbler	Lacks ability to clearly express himself or herself. Has the ideas but finds it difficult to put into words.	Frustration, both to the person and to the group.	Help the person out. Rephrase his or her statements: "Let me see if I understand . . . (paraphrase his or her point)." Do not say, "What you mean is . . . " Keep the idea(s) intact and check for understanding.
The Sidetracker	No drifting, just off the subject or agenda.	Can cause confusion and waste group time.	Take the blame for sidetracking him or her: "Something I said must have led you off the subject. This is what we should be discussing: (restate point)."

Appendix B Continued

Problem Person	Problem	Effect	Solution
The Whisperer	Engages nearby people in side conversations while someone else has floor. May or may not be tangential.	Distracts you and other group members.	Do not embarrass him or her. Interrupt politely and ask if he or she could share information with the group. Ask his or her opinion of a remark (restate it for the person). Explain that you are having trouble hearing (or talking) when others are speaking at the same time.
The Eager Beaver	Overly talkative. Monopolizes the conversation. May be a show-off or just very well informed and anxious to show it.	Can shut out less aggressive members.	Do not be embarrassing or sarcastic. Interrupt politely with "That's an interesting point. What do the rest of you think about it?" (Look around group.) Might also use body language: Walk over to and stand behind the eager beaver and/or use your hands (like a traffic cop) to diminish his or her talking while encouraging others. Let the group take care of him or her as much as possible.
The Over-achiever	Although he or she is really trying to help, it makes it difficult to maintain control.	Shuts others out. May monopolize in genuine effort to be helpful.	Recognize the valuable traits of this person. Thank him or her. Suggest that "we put others to work . . . " Cut across tactfully by questioning others. Use this individual for summarizing.
The Mistaken	Member is obviously incorrect. Definitely in the wrong ballpark.	Can cause inaccurate information to spread. Causes confusion in the group.	Handle with care. Say, "I can see how you feel . . . " or "That's another way of looking at it . . . " To bring out correction tactfully, say "I see your point, but how can we reconcile that with (state correct point)?"

Appendix B Continued

Problem Person	Problem	Effect	Solution
The Know-It-All	Can dominate group with comments such as "I have worked on this project for 10 years . . . " or "I have a Ph.D. in . . . and . . . "	May inhibit creativity, causing others to feel inadequate or that their opinions are not valued.	Avoid theory or speculation by focusing the group on a review of the facts. Might suggest another opinion such as "another noted authority on this subject, (state name), has said . . . "
The Late-comer	Comes late and interrupts meeting.	Slows down group's progress, particularly if latecomer insists on being brought up to speed.	Announce an odd time (e.g., 8:17 a.m.) for the meeting to emphasize the necessity for promptness. Make it difficult for latecomers to find seats, and stop talking until they do. Create a "latecomer's kitty" for refreshments.
The Early Leaver	Announces, with regret, that he or she must leave for another important activity.	Interrupts meeting flow and can halt progress if he or she is critical to an upcoming discussion that now must be deferred.	Before the meeting begins, announce and confirm the ending time, and ask if anyone has a scheduling conflict. If this is a standing conflict, ask group if they would like to change meeting times.

SOURCE: Adapted and compiled from de Janasz et al. (1992, pp. 13-4–13-10) and Peoples (1988, pp. 147-155).

Appendix C
Facilitative Interventions

General Approach	Specific Things You Can Say or Do
Boomerang	Don't get backed into answering questions the group should be answering for themselves. Boomerang the question back to the group. Group member: "Facilitator, which problem should we deal with first?" Facilitator: "That's up to the group. Which do you think we should discuss first?" Group member addressing the facilitator: "What was the inflation rate for last year?" Facilitator: "Who can answer that question?" Group member: "I don't like the direction we're taking here." Facilitator: "What do you think we should do?" (See "Don't be defensive" below.)

Appendix C Continued

General Approach	Specific Things You Can Say or Do
Maintain/regain focus	"Wait a second. Let's keep a common focus here." "Just a moment, one person at a time. Joe, you were first and then Don." "I can't facilitate if we have two conversations going at once. Pleased try to stay focused." "Excuse me, Elizabeth. Are you addressing the issue of . . . ?" "Let's work on one thing at a time."
Play dumb	When the group has gotten off track, or the meeting has broken down in some way, playing dumb is a way of getting the group to focus on its own process by having to explain it to you. It's a form of boomeranging and is easy to do when you're really confused. "Can someone tell me what's going on now?" "I'm confused. What are we doing now?" "Where are we?" "I'm lost. I thought we were . . . "
Say what's going on	Sometimes, simply identifying and describing a destructive behavior to the group is enough to change that behavior. Be sure to "check for agreement" after your process observation. "You are not letting John finish his presentation." "I think you're trying to force a decision before you're ready." "It seems to me that . . . " "My sense is . . . "
Check for agreement	Almost any time you make a statement or propose a process, give the group an opportunity to respond. Don't assume they are with you. "Do you agree?" "All right?" "OK?" A powerful way of checking is to look for the negative. Make silence a sign of confirmation. Rather than saying, "Do you all agree?", ask any of the following: "Are there any objections?" "If there are no objections (pause), we'll move on to . . . " "Is there anyone who can't live with that decision?"
Avoid process battles	Don't let the group become locked into arguments about which is the "right" way to proceed. Point out that you can try a number of things, deal with more than one issue. The issue is which one to try first. (See "Preventions" below. Educate the group.) "We can try both approaches. Which one do you want to try first?" "Can we agree to cover both issues in the remaining time? OK, which do you want to start with?"
Enforce process agreements	Once the group has agreed to a procedure, your credibility and neutrality may be at stake if you don't enforce their agreement. "Wait a second, you agreed to brainstorm. Don't evaluate ideas . . . " "Harry, let John finish." "Sorry, Beth, I'm afraid your time is up."
Encourage	"Could you say more about that?" "Why don't you try?" "Keep going. I think this is useful."
Accept, legitimize, deal with, or defer	This is a general method of intervening that works well for dealing with problem people and emotional outbreaks of all kinds. "You're not convinced we're getting anywhere? That's OK, maybe you're right." "Are you willing to hang on for 10 more minutes and see what happens?"

(continued)

Appendix C Continued

General Approach	Specific Things You Can Say or Do
Don't be defensive	If you are challenged, don't argue or become defensive. Accept the criticism, thank the individual for the comment, and boomerang the issue back to the individual or group. "I cut you off? You weren't finished? I'm sorry. Please continue." "You think I'm pushing too hard? (Lots of nods.) Thank you for telling me. How should we proceed from here?"
Use your body language	Many of these interventions and preventions can be reinforced, and sometimes even made, by the movement of your body or hands, for example: Regaining focus by standing up and moving into the middle of the group. Enforcing a process agreement by holding up your hand to keep someone from interrupting. Encouraging someone by gesturing with your hands. Stopping a monopolizer's talking by walking over to him or her and standing next to or behind him or her.
Use justifying questions	When team members disagree on an issue, a facilitator can use justifying questions to help bring out discussions by uncovering facts and reasons behind team members' opinions. Group member: "Well, we tried it before, and it didn't work then." Facilitator: "What could you share about that experience . . . lessons learned . . . so we don't make the same mistake twice?"
Use leading questions	Use when the team has too narrow a focus, and you want to gently guide them into another direction or if the team needs a "jump start." "Have you ever thought about using . . . ?" "Are you sure that is your only option?" "What precludes you from trying . . . ?"
Use the group memory	The group memory (i.e., the easel or notepad on which minutes or key points are being recorded) can also be used to reinforce many of the interventions and preventions. For example: Walking up to the group memory can facilitate regaining focus by pointing to the agenda item the group should be dealing with. Getting agreement on content can be greatly supported by writing down or circling the subject to be discussed.
Don't talk too much	The better a facilitator you become, the fewer words you will have to use. When you have really done a good job, the group may leave thinking that the meeting went so well it could do without you next time. Use your hands, eye contact, and partial sentences to communicate economically. Examples include: "I'm sorry. You were saying that . . . " "Could you say that again?" "The point you were making was . . . "
Use hypothetical questions	When a team appears to be stagnant or more interested in maintaining the status quo, the facilitator could use hypothetical questions to spur creativity, innovation, and so forth. Group member: "I can't come up with any more ideas for change. We've already improved as much as we can." Facilitator: "What if money were no object?" or "If you change any one thing about your work or environment . . . "

Appendix C Continued

General Approach	Specific Things You Can Say or Do
Use a reality check	Use when a team needs to reexamine and/or modify its direction, progress, process agreements. "Time out for a reality check: Are we doing what we said we would do? Or should we be discussing this now? Or do we need to change our milestone chart? Or is this something we should talk to our sponsor about?"
Use the "round robin" method	If a team member is monopolizing the conversations while others are nearly silent, you might suggest, "Why don't we go once around the table? What do you think might be a way to improve . . . ?" Call on members in a clockwise direction, ensuring that no member is skipped and the direction is maintained.
"Talk to your neighbor"	Sometimes you'll ask a question and get no response. No one understands it, no one cares about it, or no one has had enough coffee. Rephrase the question, and ask team members to discuss their responses with the people sitting next to them. A lively discussion is sure to ensue.
Use a time-out	When team members are fighting, losing sight of the big picture, or are uncooperative for some reason, try calling time out. Ask that members take a 5-minute break, after which the meeting will resume.
Trust the process	A novice facilitator panics easily. When an intervention doesn't appear to work, he or she may conclude that the sky is falling and rush in with an alternative intervention, only to get caught in a vicious circle. Instead, practice patience and trust the process (and the team!). Presume that the situation is "still cooking," and wait until things fall in place and the activity flows smoothly. Sooner or later, the good things will swamp the bad things.
Call a team member's bluff	Use when a team member threatens to do something unless or until the team changes direction. (This intervention is risky; you must be willing to accept a team member's decision.) Team member: "Well, since my opinion isn't valued, I guess I'll leave." Facilitator: "I'm not asking you to leave. You can do what you want. You'll have to live with that decision."

SOURCE: Adapted and expanded from de Janasz et al. (1992, pp. 6-42–6-46).

Appendix D
Meetings

Round 1

Parking at (name of university) has always been something of an issue for students. What suggestions does your team have for improving this situation—to be

implemented in the short term (within the next year) and in the long term (within 1 and 3 years from today)? Mrs. Jones, manager of parking, would like your team's output by the end of next semester.

Round 2

Your team has been assembled by the dean for academic programs to come up with recommendations for improving the College of Business undergraduate curriculum. Dean Smith would like your recommendations by the beginning of next semester.

Round 3

Your team has been assembled by the director of residential life to enhance the quality of the undergraduate residential experience at (name of university). Ms. Brown expects your team's report and recommendations within 3 months.

Round 4

Your team—an ethnically diverse group of male and female employees who range in age from 21 to 59, most high school graduates but some with 2 years of college—has been assembled by the vice president of operations of a large, Fortune 500 company that has just embraced "teaming." Customer complaints about your products and services have risen over the past few years, and it is the vice president of operations's hope that teaming can turn that trend around. Your team's task is to come up with recommendations for how to implement teaming in the customer service division, one of 10 divisions in this company.

Round 5

The College of Business is considering requiring all incoming freshmen to purchase laptop computers. Other schools (e.g., the University of Virginia, Wake Forest University) have such requirements. Students can "plug in" to their classrooms and are able to instantly access the Internet, professors' lecture notes, and so forth. Recruiters also have a stake in seeing this implemented because it nearly guarantees the computing competency of all graduates. Dean Smith wants your team, representing various business majors and years in school, to evaluate the viability of implementing this requirement within 3 months and to develop strategies for implementing your recommendations no later than 6 months from today.

Round 6
(or an extra round as necessary)

Your team has been assembled by Dr. White, president of (name of university), to recommend how to improve both the quality and diversity of students who apply to (name of university). What strategies would you suggest and why? Dr. White expects your team's recommendations within 6 months.

Round 7
(or an extra round as necessary)

In the high-tech firm for which you work, three separate strategic business units (SBUs) manufacture a "black box" that is a subassembly for a larger electronic device. These operations were separated in the past because of government regulations. Recently, the regulations were lifted, and the president of your firm mandated that the production of the black box be centralized in an effort to streamline operations and reduce operating costs. Your team—employees representing the three SBUs and their various functional areas (e.g., electrical engineering, manufacturing operations, mechanical engineering)—is expected to present its plan for centralizing production of the black box by the end of the next quarter.

Appendix E
Role Cards to Be Used in the Facilitation Simulation

Be yourself

Be a **gatekeeper**: Help the facilitator ensure that participation is balanced (i.e., all members contribute)

Be a **whisperer**: Periodically engage nearby people in side conversations

Be an **advice seeker**: Solicit input and advice from the facilitator to help your team make decisions

Be a **sidetracker**: Discuss items not on the agenda

Be **silent**: Don't speak unless spoken to

Be an **interrupter**: Start talking before others are finished

Be a **talker/monopolizer**: Always have something to say

Be an "**expert**": Offer advice on any and all subjects

Be a **fighter**: Pick a "fight" and/or argue with another team member

Be a **complainer**: Tell everyone why what they're working on will never work

Appendix F
Potential Questions to Ask Concerning *Twelve Angry Men*

1. In the beginning of this clip, we see the foreman suggesting a process (i.e., "Why don't we take a straw vote?") and clarifying instructions related to this process. Using Schein's (1988) role behaviors as a guide, which behaviors did the foreman use and what effect did they have?
2. During this initial or straw vote, we see hesitation on the part of some members when casting their votes. What explains this hesitation, in your opinion, and if you were the foreperson, what might you have done differently?
3. After this vote, some members can be seen pressuring the single dissenting member. If this were to happen in a team you were facilitating, what intervention would you use and why?

4. Midway through the clip, the foreman suggests one process ("Let's all go around the table and convince this man why he's wrong"), and immediately thereafter, another jury member suggests a different process ("It seems to me that he—the dissenter—should be the one who tries to convince us"). Both processes have value. How would you help the group choose between the processes? What, specifically, would you say or do?

5. Periodically, throughout the clip, we see jury members treat one another harshly (e.g., remarks that are ethnically and/or age discriminatory). If you were to facilitate this group, would you intervene during these moments? Why or why not? If you would intervene, what would you say or do and why?

6. The foreman is actually one of the 12 jury members. At times, he plays a leader-like role; other times, he is facilitative. Cite examples of each. Should he play both leader and facilitator? Why or why not?

7. Different jury members have different personality styles. Such is also the case on most teams. What are some ways to point out these differences in a way that enables members to benefit from instead of being aggravated by these differences?

8. The jury member (played by Jack Klugman) who admits that he "grew up in a slum" and identifies with the defendant speaks infrequently and only when requested by others to do so. Even then, he seems to lack confidence in sharing his ideas and concerns. If you were to facilitate this "team," what techniques might use to help this character contribute? Identify at least two interventions, and describe how you would use them.

9. Another jury member (played by E. G. Marshall) is intelligent, articulate, and very confident in his opinions. You could see this when he tries to point out the defendant's guilt on the basis of the boy's inability to recall the name of the movie(s) he saw. These qualities can both benefit and hinder a team's process. What impact did his behavior have on you? If you were to facilitate the meeting, what might you have said or done to facilitate this member and why?

10. Which of the four stages of teaming did this "team" go through? Identify the stages, and cite evidence to support your answer.

Appendix G
Meeting Observation Assignment

A critical step to developing facilitative skills is knowing when and why to intervene. Knowing when takes practice, and one way to get this practice is to start by observing other teams and meetings in process. To do this assignment, you will need to observe a team or work group meeting from start to finish. It is preferred that you are not a member of this particular team or work group because it would be difficult to pay careful attention to the process while being expected to actively participate in the meeting. Answer the following questions completely yet concisely.

1. From what you observed, how clear are the goals for the team in general and for this meeting in particular? What evidence is there that members clearly understand what they're supposed to do? Explain.

2. Did the meeting start on time? End on time? Did people arrive late or leave early? What impact, if any, did this have on the meeting process?
3. Did the team use an agenda for the meeting? If yes, in what ways did it facilitate or hinder the meeting's goals? If not, in what ways would an agenda have been helpful? Explain.
4. Did team members play defined roles for the meeting, such as timekeeper, scribe, facilitator, and leader? Were these roles explicitly or implicitly determined?
5. What could you discern from communication patterns? Were there one or two members who monopolized the conversation, and what impact did that have on the meeting process? Were there any individuals who were mostly quiet (i.e., only speaking when spoken to)? Were there any side conversations or overtalking (people talking simultaneously)? If so, did anyone attempt to stop this? If not, what impact did this have on the process?
6. Were any decisions made during this particular meeting? How was the decision made? What process was followed (e.g., the leader made a suggestion and a debate ensued), and what decision rule (e.g., majority, consensus) was used? Did members appear to be satisfied with the outcome of the decision? Why or why not?
7. Did any of the members use facilitative behaviors in the meeting? Cite an example.
8. Were there any occasions in which you would like to have intervened? Describe the situation, what you would have done or said, and what you expect the outcome would have been had you been the facilitator.

Appendix H
Chronological Listing of Suggested
Activities for Teaching Facilitation

Activity	Suggested Time Allotment
Lecture and discussion: The need for facilitation, what facilitators do, why, what skills they need, what experiences students may have had that required facilitation.	About 30 minutes.
Discussion of facilitation techniques and interventions. In a previous session, each student is assigned a particular intervention and is instructed to prepare a short, 2- to 3-minute presentation on the intervention, including how and why it is used and what it might look and sound like. In small groups, students present their interventions. Then, each small group selects, prepares, and presents an intervention (usually in a short skit) to the class.	Between 30 and 60 minutes, depending on size of class and number of students and whether students' preparation is done outside of class.

(continued)

Appendix H Continued

Activity	Suggested Time Allotment
Five to six volunteers are selected to simulate a facilitated meeting in front of the class, using the format (meet, debrief, continue meeting, debrief) of the actual facilitation simulation. Extend debriefing, as appropriate, discussing students' and instructor's observations. Repeat if desired; a second session might also be done using an experienced facilitator.	A minimum of 20 to 30 minutes for one "preview" simulation; allow more time if a subsequent session is completed.
Facilitation simulation: Following a brief reiteration of instructions, students are moved to breakout rooms. Each round (including meeting and feedback) could take between 15 and 30 minutes, depending on number of students, time available, and so forth. As many facilitation simulation rounds will be held as the number of students in each group. These can occur in a single extended session or several shorter sessions.	Depending on number of students in each group (i.e., rounds) and the length of each round, the simulation could take between 75 and 150 minutes.
Students view *Twelve Angry Men* in its entirety (if time permits) or selected parts (see note 2). The instructor might facilitate a discussion using such questions as those discussed in "Teaching Facilitation: Act II" or contained in Appendix F.	A minimum of 2 hours if the video is shown in its entirety and followed by class discussion.
Assign the self-assessment reflection exercise (see "Teaching Facilitation: Act III") and, if appropriate, the meeting observation exercise (see Appendix G). Instructor might debrief assignments in a subsequent class session.	Varies depending on time available and exercises assigned.

Notes

1. A list of meetings is contained in Appendix D. Some of these are more student oriented, whereas others are intended to mimic the workplace. Notice that several of the latter variety include elements of demographic and functional diversity to increase the realism of the situation.

2. The entire video (approximately 90 minutes) should be shown. However, if time is at a premium, much of the educational effect of the video can be retained by viewing the first 20 minutes of the video and then fast forwarding to the segments depicting the jury members' discussions immediately preceding and following their voting processes.

3. Such "entry barriers" exist and can be addressed following the simulation. The instructor might ask students what these might look like and how to address them. A facilitator could introduce himself or herself at the first meeting and discuss with the group how he or she sees his or her role. This role can then be negotiated over time. For example,

Hi, I'm Jan Smith. Your manager asked me to come to help you map your manufacturing process to find ways to decrease defects and cycle time. My background is in (indicate background), and I see myself doing (list roles and/or responsibilities) for you. What

concerns do you have about me or my role? What can you tell me so far about what has been effective or ineffective since your team began its work?

4. A chronological listing of suggested activities and time allotments for teaching facilitation appears in Appendix H.

References

Adler, N. J. (1991). *International dimensions of organizational behavior* (2nd ed.). Boston: PWS-Kent.

Ancona, D. G. (1990). Outward bound: Strategies for team survival in an organization. *Academy of Management Journal*, *33*, 334-365.

Ancona, D. G., & Caldwell, D. F. (1992). Demography and design: Predictors of new product team performance. *Organization Science*, *3*, 321-341.

Bandura, A. (1977). Self efficacy: Toward a unifying theory of behavioral change. *Psychological Review*, *84*, 191-215.

Cohen, S. G. (1993). New approaches to teams and teamwork. In J. R. Galbraith, E. E. Lawler, III, & Associates (Eds.), *Organizing for the future: The new logic for managing complex organizations* (pp. 194-226). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Cooley, E. (1994). Training an interdisciplinary team in communication and decision-making skills. *Small Group Research*, *25*(1), 5-25.

Cox, T. H., Lobel, S. A., & McLeod, P. L. (1991). Effects of ethnic group cultural differences on cooperative and competitive behavior on a group task. *Academy of Management Journal*, *34*, 827-847.

Cummings, T. G., & Worley, C. G. (1993). *Organization development and change* (5th ed.). Los Angeles: West.

de Janasz, S., Johnson, L., McQuaid, M., Paulson, A., Roccia, D., Stubblefield, S., Wahl, P., & Wojick, C. (1992). *Fundamentals of facilitation*. Unpublished training manual created for Hughes Aircraft Company.

Dougherty, D. (1992). Interpretive barriers to successful product innovation in large firms. *Organization Science*, *3*, 179-202.

Jackson, S. E. (1991). Team composition in organizational settings: Issues in managing an increasingly diverse workforce. In S. Worchel, W. Wood, & J. Simpson (Eds.), *Group process and productivity* (pp. 138-173). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Johnson, D. W., & Johnson, F. P. (1997). *Joining together: Group theory and group skills* (6th ed.). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Johnston, W. B., & Packer, A. E. (1987). *Workforce 2000: Work and workers for the twenty-first century*. Indianapolis, IN: Hudson Institute.

Kolb, D. A. (1984). *Experiential learning: Experience as the source of learning and development*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Mulvey, P. W., Veiga, J. F., & Elsass, P. M. (1996). When teammates raise a white flag. *Academy of Management Executive*, *10*, 40-49.

O'Reilly, C. A., III, & Flatt, S. (1989). *Executive team demography, organizational innovation, and firm performance* (Working paper). University of California, Berkeley.

Peoples, D. A. (1988). *Presentations plus: David Peoples' proven techniques*. New York: John Wiley.

Pine, J., & Tingley, J. C. (1993, February). ROI of soft-skills training. *Training*, 55-60.

Plumb, S. E. (1993, September). Aurora team: New day dawning at Oldsmobile. *Ward's Auto World*, 77-80.

Schein, E. (1988). *Process consultation*. Menlo Park, CA: Addison-Wesley.

Schilder, J. (1992, February). Work teams boost productivity. *Personnel Journal*, 67-71.

Scholtes, P. (1988). *The team handbook: How to use teams to improve quality*. Madison, WI: Joiner Associates.

Sisco, R. (1993, February). What to train team leaders. *Training*, 62-63.

Wall, V. D., & Nolan, L. L. (1986). Perceptions of inequity, satisfaction, and conflict in task-oriented groups. *Human Relations*, *39*, 1033-1052.

Watson, W. E., Kumar, K., & Michaelsen, L. K. (1993). Cultural diversity's impact on interaction process and performance: Comparing homogeneous and diverse task groups. *Academy of Management Journal*, *36*, 590-602.

Webster's II new Riverside dictionary. (1984). New York: Berkley.

EXERCISES, ACTIVITIES, AND SIMULATIONS

UNDERSTANDING AND APPLYING AN INTEGRATIVE TAXONOMY OF MOTIVATION SOURCES TO PROFESSIONAL AND PERSONAL SETTINGS

John E. Barbuto, Jr.
University of Nebraska–Lincoln

The classroom exercise presented in this article is based on an integrative taxonomy of work motivation (Barbuto & Scholl, 1998; Leonard, Beauvais, & Scholl, 1999). The taxonomy was developed and validated to provide an integration of many perspectives in the motivation field (e.g., Alderfer, 1969; Ashforth & Mael, 1989; Bandura, 1986; Barnard, 1938; Brief & Aldag, 1981; Etzioni, 1961; Jung, 1923/1971; Katz & Kahn, 1978; Kegan, 1979; Locke & Latham, 1984; Loevinger, 1976; Maslow, 1954; McClelland, 1985; Sullivan, 1989; Vroom, 1964). Preliminary research has shown that the taxonomy of motivation sources is related to leader behavior, showing correlations with influence tactics and transformational leadership in work settings (Barbuto, Fritz, & Marx, 2000; Barbuto & Scholl, 1999). The five sources of

TABLE 1
Sources of Motivation

Motivation Source	Definition
Intrinsic process	Derived from fun or enjoyment of the task
Instrumental	Derived from expectations of tangible rewards
External self-concept	Derived from a desire to improve reputation and image
Internal self-concept	Derived from a need to meet personal standards of ideal self
Goal internalization	Derived from a deep-rooted belief in the cause or principle

motivation in the taxonomy include *intrinsic process*, *instrumental*, *external self-concept*, *internal self-concept*, and *goal internalization* (see Table 1).

Intrinsic process motivation. If people are motivated to perform work or to engage in behavior for the sheer fun of it, then intrinsic process motivation is the driving motivation. The work itself, not the task outcomes, acts as the incentive because individuals enjoy what they are doing (Barbuto & Scholl, 1998).

Instrumental motivation. Instrumental rewards motivate individuals when they perceive that their behaviors will lead to certain tangible extrinsic outcomes such as pay or promotions. These individuals engage in tangible exchange relationships (Barbuto & Scholl, 1998). This source of motivation integrates Barnard's (1938) material inducements, McClelland's (1985) need for power, Katz and Kahn's (1978) legal compliance, and Kegan's (1979) imperial stage of ego development.

External self-concept motivation. Individuals driven by external self-concept motivation attempt to meet the expectations of others by behaving in ways that elicit social feedback consistent with their self-concepts (Barbuto & Scholl, 1998; Leonard et al., 1999). Individuals behave in ways that satisfy reference group members to gain first acceptance and then status. This source of motivation is similar to Etzioni's (1961) social moral involvement, McClelland's (1985) need for affiliation, and Barnard's (1938) social inducements. It also incorporates referent influences such as social identification theory (Ashforth & Mael, 1989).

Internal self-concept motivation. Individuals driven by internal self-concept motivation set internal standards of traits, competencies, and values that become the basis for the ideal self. They are motivated to engage in

behaviors that reinforce these internal standards and later achieve higher competency (Barbuto & Scholl, 1998; Leonard et al., 1999). This source integrates McClelland's (1985) need for achievement, Kegan's (1979) institutional stage of ego development, and Bandura's (1986) personal standards and self-regulation.

Goal internalization motivation. Individuals driven by this source of motivation adopt attitudes and behaviors based entirely on their personal value systems (Barbuto & Scholl, 1998). This source integrates Etzioni's (1961) pure moral involvement, Katz and Kahn's (1978) internalized values, and Kegan's (1979) interindividual stage of ego development.

Purpose and Audience for the Exercise

This exercise (see the appendix) challenges students to learn and apply the integrative taxonomy of motivation. From this exercise, students will benefit in the following ways:

1. They will develop a strong understanding of the sources of motivation in each scenario and in the original student role plays.
2. They will enhance conceptual skills and apply the motivation theories to behaviors.

The exercise was developed for an undergraduate organization and management theory course and has been used extensively in organizational behavior, leadership, and psychology courses at several universities, generally at the undergraduate level. It has been used primarily in undergraduate organizational behavior and leadership classes ranging in size from 10 to 48 students. The exercise has been used in full or part for each of the past eight semesters. This exercise can be used for larger class sizes as well, but it may be difficult to facilitate for classes larger than 60 students because of the ensuing large number of role plays that would be performed.

Instructions

- Divide the class into groups of two to four students.
- Distribute a copy of the exercise handout to each student.
- Instruct students to read each miniscenario and individually identify the source(s) of motivation that seem(s) to be driving the behavior or decision.
- Once group members have made individual choices for a scenario, they should share their results and compare analyses. This will promote understanding of the five sources of motivation.

- The instructor should visit each of the groups during the next 5 to 10 minutes to answer students' questions regarding the material or the exercise and to make sure that students are engaging in the activity.
- After about 10 minutes, the instructor should process the first scenario. Call on one of the groups and ask for the group consensus answer with some rationale for why the source of motivation was selected.
- As you process the five scenarios over the remaining time, continually challenge students by asking for the reasons they chose the sources of motivation. For example, ask, "What was it that made your group choose internal self-concept motivation? What gave it away? If this person had been motivated by another source of motivation, how would the decision or behavior have been different?"
- It will usually take about 2 to 3 minutes for each group to complete each scenario, with another 3 to 5 minutes of discussion with the class, so approximately every 5 to 8 minutes, you can cover a new scenario. Usually, it will take approximately 25 to 40 minutes to complete the five scenarios. It is helpful to process these scenarios intermittently, as opposed to all at once, so that the students can learn to diagnose as they go. Students will usually get better at assessing the motives in the scenarios as the activity progresses. This learning also prepares the students for developing original role plays and assessing other groups' role plays.
- After completing and discussing the five scenarios, assign each group one of the five sources of motivation and instruct it to develop an original role play demonstrating that source of motivation. Depending on the size of your class, you will likely have several groups developing role plays for the same source of motivation. This is valuable because it allows for the sources of motivation to be presented in a variety of contexts.
- Give students 10 minutes or so to develop these role plays. It is particularly helpful for the instructor to visit with the groups while they are developing their ideas for their role plays. This gives the instructor a barometer of how well students understand the sources of motivation. It also gives the instructor the opportunity to clarify points and assist groups that struggle to generate role plays.

Processing Information and Role Plays

SCENARIO #1

Jim believes that the destruction of rain forests and other plant life will "suffocate" our society. He joins Greenpeace so that his efforts will support this belief. What source of motivation seems to be driving Jim's behavior?

This scenario features goal internalization motivation. Jim is motivated to join Greenpeace because goal internalization is driving his behavior. Most groups will correctly identify this as the source of motivation. Here, we have a pure moral involvement: Jim believes in the cause and is thus motivated to work for Greenpeace. Some students may argue for one of the other four

sources of motivation. If this happens, it will be helpful to ask the class what this scenario might have looked like had one of these other sources been driving Jim's behavior. For example, had Jim been motivated instrumentally, he would have required tangible extrinsic exchange for his services. Had he been motivated by intrinsic process, he would have needed only to enjoy the work he was doing to be motivated to do such work (no discussion of the actual work being performed is provided in the scenario). Had Jim been motivated by external self-concept, he would have sought public recognition from others. Had he been motivated by internal self-concept, he would have required a sense of personal achievement to reinforce his self-concept (the scenario does not provide information about his ideal self). By considering how scenarios would have changed if different motives had been driving the characters' behaviors and decisions, students will develop their understanding and ability to apply the theory to scenarios, role plays, and in their professional and personal lives.

SCENARIO #2

At the end of a major company sales presentation, Bostwitch Technologies and Chapentieri Travel Agency entered into a long-term vending agreement. Bostwitch Technologies successfully sold its computer services to Chapentieri Travel Agency. Mike Brown, the Bostwitch Technologies CEO, credited the outstanding sales presentation of Carolyn Mayer and Shawn Bonner for securing the business, saying that the long-term financial stability of the organization was ensured. Bobby Chapentieri, the manager of Chapentieri Travel Agency, credited himself for his outstanding decision making in selecting the right vendor to provide computer services to the company.

    a. What source of motivation does Mike Brown seem to be using to motivate his workers?
    b. What source of motivation seems to be motivating Bobby Chapentieri's behavior?

This scenario features external self-concept motivation. Because Mike Brown, the Bostwich Technologies CEO, is attributing the success of the organization's recent sales agreement to the abilities of his employees, he is tapping into their external self-concepts. Many students report some difficulty here, particularly because they are asked to consider the employees' motivational impacts resulting from the CEO's behavior.

Bobby Chapentieri, manager of Chapentieri Travel Agency, credits himself for all of the successes associated with the new sales agreement. He

attributes the success of this business deal to his own excellent decision-making ability rather than recognizing others' contributions. Because he emphasizes his role and his skills that contributed to this success, he exhibits external self-concept motivation.

SCENARIO #3

Ron works as an accountant in a large accounting firm, in the middle of tax season. He has just received tickets to a major league baseball game for this afternoon. He understands that he should probably stay at the office and continue working to get the client tax forms completed on time. He doesn't want dissatisfied clients because that could result in a loss of revenues. Ron also understands that his peers will see him as "unprofessional" if he leaves work during tax season for a baseball game. He also holds high personal standards that include being a responsible and professional accountant. Still, he is a huge baseball fan and would love to go to the game. What source of motivation is driving his behavior if

   a. he stays at work to avoid the risk of losing clients?
   b. he stays at work because he believes it is the most responsible thing to do?
   c. he stays at work to avoid getting a reputation for being unprofessional?
   d. he leaves work and goes to the game?

This scenario features instrumental, internal self-concept, external self-concept, and intrinsic process motivation. Ron demonstrates instrumental motivation because he is trying to avoid the negative consequences attributed to attending the game: late tax forms means loss of clients and revenues. By staying at work, he avoids the potential loss. Some students will argue that this scenario represents goal internalization because Ron has a goal of keeping clients. It may be valuable to remind students that goal internalization features little or no self-interest, so avoiding the negative consequences of lost clientele is generally not driven by goal internalization.

Ron is motivated by internal self-concept because his behavior reflects his personal standards. He is trying to be responsible and professional, so staying at work would be consistent with this standard.

Ron is motivated by external self-concept because he is concerned with his reputation and image. He doesn't want to be viewed as unprofessional. To be thought of negatively by peers is a motivating force for individuals high in external self-concept motivation.

Ron is motivated by intrinsic process motivation if he leaves work and goes to the game because this would be the most fun thing to do.

One of the biggest strengths of this scenario is that it demonstrates conflict between the sources of motivation that individuals are faced with when making behavioral decisions. Several competing motives are affecting Ron at the same time. His instrumental motive tells him to avoid the potential monetary losses. His external self-concept motive tells him to avoid a bad reputation. His internal self-concept motive tells him to be professional. Meanwhile, his intrinsic process motive tells him to go have fun at the game.

SCENARIO #4

Sharon is offered a promotion to a higher level position at work, but in her opinion, the raise commensurate with the vertical move isn't worth the added responsibility. She believes that her outstanding interpersonal and leadership skills are ideal for this new position, and her current job does not even begin to utilize her unique talents.

   a. What source of motivation is driving her behavior if she takes the promotion?
   b. What source of motivation is driving her behavior if she turns down the promotion?

This scenario features internal self-concept and instrumental motivation. If Sharon takes the promotion, her internal self-concept is driving her behavior because the promotion would allow her to use her skills. She believes that she has competencies for leading others, and this promotion would allow her to use these skills, thus reinforcing her self-concept.

If Sharon refuses the promotion, she is demonstrating instrumental motivation because her actions would be driven by the tangible rewards. Because the rewards (additional pay) are not worth the additional work and responsibility, she is not motivated to accept the new position.

SCENARIO #5

   a. Joanna views herself as an outstanding student, capable of learning and mastering any concept. Because of this, she studies extra hard so she can get all the answers right on the exams. What source of motivation is driving her behavior?
   b. Joanna is more concerned with being recognized as the best student by earning the highest grade on the exam. Because of this, she studies extra hard so that she can get the most answers right on the exam. What source of motivation is driving her behavior?

This scenario contrasts internal self-concept and external self-concept motivation. If Joanna is concerned with learning the material and getting the answers correct, internal self-concept motivates her because she would be

striving to be the best that she can be. She views herself as having intellectual competencies and skills and will work hard to reinforce this for herself.

If Joanna is concerned with getting the highest grade on the exam, she is motivated by external self-concept because her behavior is motivated to improve her image or reputation as "top student."

Role Plays

Most students will do an impressive job with their role plays. Below is a small sampling of student role plays developed in a recent organizational behavior section.

Intrinsic process motivation. Derek and Janene are busy writing annual reports for the company. The reports are due that day. Rich walks into the office with an ice cream cone in his hand and starts talking about how delicious it tastes. Derek and Janene both light up at the thought of having ice cream, and they both agree that "the work can wait" and leave the office (to get some ice cream).

Instrumental motivation. Karen, Paula, and Ray are professional salespeople. Mike is the general sales manager of the organization. Mike tells Karen, Paula, and Ray to generate more new business as opposed to relying on existing accounts. Karen, Paula, and Ray drag their heels and make excuses until Mike offers them a monetary incentive if they hit a certain number of new clients. Now, Karen, Paula, and Ray go out and create new accounts because they are motivated to do so.

Internal self-concept motivation. Jeff, Chris, and Doug are together in a strategic planning session. Jeff and Doug decide to embezzle funds from the company and try to persuade Chris to join them. Chris won't do it because he "doesn't steal from anyone!" Despite social pressures and some offers of exchanges, Chris won't give in, sticking to his personal standards.

External self-concept motivation. Barbara, Bernadette, and Ann are team members whose marketing campaign proposal has just been accepted by the company's largest and most important client. After learning of the successful proposal from their supervisor, each seek the majority of the credit for the group success. With several acts of bragging and boasting, each of the members make a case for themselves as the reason for the team success.

Goal internalization motivation. Ron and Mary are military personnel instructed to transport nuclear missiles to a destination as ordered. Don is a nuclear ban activist and tries to prevent the move by lying down in front of the missiles. The move cannot be completed because of this until authorities come and remove Don from the scene.

To insure that students get the most out of each role play, challenge the students evaluating the sources of motivation by asking them why they chose a specific source over another. Ask students to consider what the scenario would have looked like had other sources of motivation been driving the behavior or decision. Ask students why they believe it is important to accurately diagnose motivation sources. What happens if you diagnose someone's motivation incorrectly? You also may ask students to consider how they would manage in an environment with many people motivated in different ways.

Advancing the Applications of the Concept

After completing the exercise and processing the role plays, there is an opportunity for drawing strong inferences and generating a rich dialogue using the integrative taxonomy (Barbuto & Scholl, 1998). For example, instructors may explore individual differences in motivation by dividing students into small groups and asking them to generate motivational incentives and processes for each of the sources of motivation. The issues for students to address include the following: "How am I motivated? What does that mean for motivating me? From which sources are others motivated? How can we motivate individuals that are highest in each source of motivation?"

The integrative taxonomy may also be used to explore interpersonal issues such as working with people who have diverse motivation sources. Instructors may ask students to describe situations experienced with another person in which competing motives caused conflict. Students can be encouraged to develop strategies for working with others, particularly when others are motivated differently than themselves.

Students may be asked to consider the prevalence of these five sources of motivation at different stages in life. Instructors may ask students to recall times in their lives when they were motivated exclusively by intrinsic process motivation, instrumental motivation, external self-concept motivation, and so on. Some students will recount their childhoods and their tendencies to want to play games and have fun. Other students may admit that they still have intrinsic process tendencies today. Others may refer to grades in

courses, making links to instrumental motivation. Others will discuss scholastic awards and class rankings as external self-concept motives. Students can be asked to work through each of the sources of motivation and try to identify career stages or life circumstances that seem to favor certain sources of motivation. This line of discussion will reinforce the motivation taxonomy concept.

Instructors may encourage students to draw links between corporate cultures and individual motivation. Several issues can be raised and discussed along these lines using the taxonomy of motivation. It also provides an opportunity to combine a micro-organizational behavior concept such as individual motivation with a macro topic such as culture. For example, instructors may ask students if certain organizational cultures favor certain sources of motivation. In what ways do some organizations tend to cater to one source over another? You may ask students to think of some concrete examples of this. This discussion will reinforce the concept of motivation, and it will encourage some strong introspection both inside and outside of class.

Student Reactions

Students in class keep journals to reflect on exercises and class activities. In their journal entries, students summarize important concepts learned in class and apply what was learned to their professional and personal lives. It may be helpful to have students respond to some of the questions during the class exercise and discussions of motivation.

Students have demonstrated strong applications of motivation theory to their personal and professional lives in these journal entries. Many students have recounted social encounters with friends and have been able to use the theory to explain the behaviors of others. Several students currently working have applied this model to explain behaviors of their coworkers and bosses. It appears that the exercise offers students a great learning activity. As a follow-up activity, students are asked to discuss in class some of the learning that has taken place from the activity and journal assignment. This gives students the opportunity to learn from one another and discover common learning themes from the material and exercise.

The exercise is designed to stimulate and challenge students to apply motivation theory to understand organizational behavior in a variety of situations. Through the execution and processing of the scenarios, role plays, and follow-up suggestions, students should develop an appreciation of individuals' sources of motivation and their effects on behavior. Student reactions

suggest that the exercise is an effective tool for learning and applying this motivation concept.

Appendix
Sources of Motivation in the Workplace

Purpose: To apply sources of motivation in professional settings.
Group Size: 2 to 4 per group.
Time Required: Approximately 60 minutes.
Preparation Required: Review class notes on sources of motivation.

Part One: Identifying the sources of motivation. (15 to 20 minutes)

Read the following scenarios and identify which source of motivation seems to be driving behaviors. After answering each question individually, discuss with group members to arrive at a consensus. Instructor will lead class discussion of each scenario. Be prepared to support your choices with rationale.

1. Jim believes that the destruction of rain forests and other plant life will "suffocate" our society. He joins Greenpeace so that his efforts will support this belief. What source of motivation seems to be driving Jim's behavior?

2. At the end of a major company sales presentation, Bostwitch Technologies and Chapentieri Travel Agency entered into a long-term vendor agreement. Bostwitch Technologies successfully sold its services to Chapentieri Travel agency. Mike Brown, the Bostwitch Technologies CEO, credited the outstanding sales presentation of Carolyn Mayer and Shawn Bonner for securing the long-term financial stability of the organization. Bobby Chapentieri, the manager of Chapentieri Travel Agency, credited himself for his outstanding decision making in selecting the right vendors to provide services to the company.

   a. What source of motivation does Mike Brown seem to be using to motivate his workers?
   b. What source of motivation seems to be motivating Bobby Chapentieri's behavior?

3. Ron works as an accountant in a large accounting firm. It is tax season. He has just received tickets to a major league baseball game for this afternoon. He understands that he should probably stay at the office and continue working to get the client tax forms completed on time. He doesn't want dissatisfied clients because that could result in a loss of revenues. Ron also understands that his peers will see him as "unprofessional" if he leaves work during tax season for a baseball game. He also holds high personal standards that include being a responsible and professional accountant. Still, he is a huge baseball fan and would love to go to the game. What source of motivation is driving his behavior if

    a. he stays at work to avoid the risk of losing clients?
    b. he stays at work because he believes it is the most responsible thing to do?
    c. he stays at work to avoid getting a reputation for being "unprofessional?"
    d. he leaves work and goes to the game?

4. Sharon is offered a promotion to a higher level position at work, but in her opinion, the raise commensurate with the vertical move isn't worth the added responsibility. She believes that her outstanding interpersonal and leadership skills are ideal for this new position, and her current job does not even begin to utilize her unique talents.

    a. What source of motivation is driving her behavior if she takes the promotion?
    b. What source of motivation is driving her behavior if she turns down the promotion?

5a. Joanna views herself as an outstanding student, capable of learning and mastering any concept. Because of this, she studies extra hard so she can get all the answers right on the exams. What source of motivation is driving her behavior?

5b. Joanna is more concerned with being recognized as the best student by earning the highest grade on the exam. Because of this, she studies extra hard so that she can get the most answers right on the exam. What source of motivation is driving her behavior?

Part Two: Developing and performing role plays. (30-45 minutes)

- Your group will be assigned a single source of motivation for which you will develop an original role play to be performed for your classmates.
- Your role play should demonstrate the appropriate source of motivation because your classmates will be trying to assess your motivation source depicted in the scenario.
- You are encouraged to be creative when developing your scenario.
- Include each of your group members in the role play.

Each role play will be discussed immediately following the performance. For students observing the role plays,

- Which source of motivation is evident in the scenario?
- Why did you choose this source?

References

Alderfer, C. P. (1969). An empirical test of a new theory of human needs. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, *4*, 142-175.

Ashforth, B., & Mael, F. (1989). Social identity theory and the organization. *Academy of Management Review*, *14*(1), 20-39.

Bandura, A. (1986). *Social foundations of thought and action: A social cognitive theory.* Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Barbuto, J. E., Fritz, S. M., & Marx, D. (2000). A field study of two measures of work motivation for predicting leader's transformational behaviors. *Psychological Reports*, *86*, 295-300.

Barbuto, J. E., & Scholl, R. W. (1998). Motivation sources inventory: Development and validation of new scales to measure an integrative taxonomy of motivation. *Psychological Reports*, *82*, 1011-1022.

Barbuto, J. E., & Scholl, R. W. (1999). Leader's motivation and perception of follower's motivation as predictors of influence tactics used. *Psychological Reports*, *84*, 1087-1098.

Barnard, C. (1938). *The functions of the executive*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Brief, A., & Aldag, R. (1981). The self in organizations: A conceptual review. *Academy of Management Review*, *6*, 75-88.

Etzioni, A. (1961). *A comparative analysis of complex organizations: On power, involvement, and their correlates*. New York: Free Press.

Jung, C. G. (1971). *Psychological types*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press. (Original work published 1923)

Katz, D., & Kahn, R. L. (1978). *The social psychology of organizations*. New York: John Wiley.

Kegan, R. G. (1979). The evolving self. *The Counseling Psychologist*, *8*, 5-34.

Leonard, N., Beauvais, L., & Scholl, R. W. (1999). Work motivation: An incorporation of self-concept based process. *Human Relations*, *52*, 969-998.

Locke, E., & Latham, G. (1984). *Goal setting: A motivational technique that works*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Loevinger, J. (1976). *Ego development: Conceptions and theories*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Maslow, A. (1954). *Motivation and personality*. New York: Harper & Row.

McClelland, D. C. (1985). *Human motivation*. Glenview, IL: Scott, Foresman.

Sullivan, J. (1989). Self theories and employee motivation. *Journal of Management*, *15*, 345-363.

Vroom, V. H. (1964). *Work and motivation*. New York: John Wiley.

STRUCTURING-BY-THE-NUMBERS: A PROCESS FOR DISCOVERING AND UNDERSTANDING ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE

Paul R. Lyons
Frostburg State University

David M. Nicol
Ferris State University

The discussion of Structuring-by-the-Numbers will offer insight into a methodological approach that we have found extremely effective at promoting learning in relation to issues associated with organizational structure. This approach not only stimulates lively discussion regarding a topical area that is often greeted with yawns but fosters firsthand awareness of the integral relationship of structure to organizational pursuits, something not readily accomplished when more conventional instruction methods are invoked.

Few undergraduate or MBA students take courses in organizational theory; hence, it is likely that most of their exposure to the study of organizational structure occurs in an organizational behavior (OB) course. Generally, teachers of these courses indicate that the concepts of structure and organizational coordination are not popular topics with students nor, for that matter, with teachers. Furthermore, content reviews of the *Journal of Management Education* as well as recent proceedings of the Organizational Behavior Teaching Conference, the Academy of Management, and the Lilly Confer-

ence on College Teaching indicate that little attention has been accorded the teaching of organizational structure and coordination. A perusal of widely used OB textbooks reinforces this assessment, particularly because issues of interdependence and the impact of interacting variables on performance are accorded limited attention. In a way, the latter inadvertently reinforces the misconception that organizational structure and coordination are not serious or particularly complex topics of study.

In reality, no matter what the disciplinary focus, students need to learn about organizational structures and coordinating mechanisms. Developing an awareness and understanding of structure is increasingly important because of transformations currently taking place in the organizational environment (e.g., self-managed work teams; the use of contingent workers; telecommuting; network, cellular, and virtual organizational variations; and the like). These workforce alterations are influenced by and influence organizational structure. However, because they are perceived as being removed from formal structure, they tend to cause the structure to appear increasingly amorphous, further contributing to the likelihood that structural considerations will be overlooked.

Paradoxically, change in organizational structure is often embraced as a magic elixir, perceived to wield the capacity to alter organizational fortunes as if it were an end unto itself, even though such change may be of superficial quality. Reengineering, particularly in the form of downsizing or rightsizing, is something that increasingly confronts members of the workforce. An understanding of the implications and possibilities of such structural alterations is crucial if we are to foster successful outcomes. These realities highlight how critical it is that we truly understand the relationship of structure to organizational performance; that we possess some sense of the relationship of form and function. Yet, it often appears that we not only do not understand but are not aware that we should. Structuring-by-the-Numbers provides a means of diminishing that insensitivity.

Many if not most students have neither deliberately nor rigorously thought about organizational structures, particularly in the sense of the performance implications that given structures enable or impose. The linkage between structure and an organization's capacity to implement communications, authority, strategic movement, individual and group actions, and so forth has not been a focal point for students. Rather, most students take for granted the structures they have. They seldom question the rationale for the creation and maintenance of a given structure, whereas areas of coordination such as communication, written forms, rules, procedures, and the like seem to generate some critical appraisal, especially because students can refer to their own work experiences.

The Structuring-by-the-Numbers activity may be used with students of diverse orientations, including both undergraduate and graduate business students as well as students from other disciplines (e.g., educational administration or public administration). The activity may also be used in training endeavors. The effectiveness of the Structuring-by-the-Numbers exercise is in part dependent on the associated study of some fundamental organizational theory, specifically entailing the review of concepts and practices relevant to organizational structure. In brief, the activity should not be used in isolation from the study of appropriate material such as resource-dependence models, population-ecology models, formalization, complexity, hierarchy, power, and other material that is generally descriptive of organizations. Without access to such referents, the participants in Structuring-by-the-Numbers may experience justifiable frustration because of a sense of "flailing about" without foundation for their actions. On the basis of such preparation, the linkage between this experiential exercise and the conceptual material can be invoked and underlined.

An Overview of Structuring-by-the-Numbers

The directed activity that we call Structuring-by-the-Numbers asks individuals working in groups (or teams) to create, in a series of phases, organizational features in response to a stimulus or target scenario. The activity is grounded in the social science inquiry model, in which students form and reform hypotheses, create interpretations and definitions, identify evidence through experience, test hypotheses, and create generalizations. Some examples of possible stimuli include starting some form of business and expanding a business or product line. The activity, by design, is short on strategic issues relating to markets, competitors, regulators, customers, and the like. The activity has creative and heuristic value, and most important, it helps introduce concepts of prominence in the areas of organizational theory and design.

Objective. This experience will provide students with a forum to express what they know (from study and experience) about the structure of organizations. Using small groups, it will provide a vehicle for surfacing assumptions, conventional wisdom, ideas, and attitudes regarding the elements necessary for an organization to exist and survive. The experience will also prompt students to develop an integration of interpretations and information to define how an organization gets important work done within the context of customer focus and dedication to continuous improvement. It will help foster an

understanding of the issues and complexities facing managers who must reinvent organizations in the midst of uncertainty.

Implementation. Structuring-by-the-Numbers typically will entail 110 to 150 minutes of class time. The exercise requires the class to be divided into groups of four to six students. This group size is intended to facilitate the active involvement of all students, an expectation that should be verbally reinforced. It is our experience that the impact of this exercise is severely compromised if students are permitted to be spectators rather than participants. Implementation of the activity also necessitates that there be no fewer than three groups, as required to accommodate Phase 1 of the exercise. In the event of more than three groups, multiple groups (each working separately) will be assigned to one of the three projects. In preparation, the students are expected to have read materials discussing the fundamentals of organizational structure and design as well as a one-page handout that functions as the stimulus situation-incident for this activity (see Appendix B, The Frostberries Situation, as an example). The matter of stimulus situation-incident is one in which an instructor can use discretion in the choice of material. Other materials, such as an incident, a case, and so on may be substituted for the Frostberries Situation depending on the desired instructional objectives.

Preparation for instructors. Aside from the obvious preparation necessary to knowledgeably address the content of this activity, the instructor needs to be prepared for the frustration and confusion the students can face in this activity. The questions that students ask as they delve into this previously unexplored terrain and the frustration they express, especially in light of the apparent absence of absolute solutions, can be very challenging at times. It has proved helpful to prepare some responses to the segment questions and statements (see Appendix A) for potential use with students, for use in illustrative fashion, or as alternatives to prompt discussion. Questions posed in this format will generate all types of interpretations and ideas. The level of sophistication expressed will vary, but the opportunities for discovery, clarification, and understanding are manifold.

The process. The Structuring-by-the-Numbers activity is divided into three phases, each in turn composed of multiple components (the name is derived from this process). Each component is intended to provide the opportunity for the students to confront fundamental issues in organizational theory and design without getting into an extensive set of labels, definitions, and instructor-defined relationships. The statements should evoke responses that address such important issues and topics as purpose-aim-mission,

stakeholder identity and analysis, customer requirements, process focus, task analysis, coordination, communication needs, and continuous improvement. The statements, taken in phases, help identify the substantive features of organization, how they tend to interact, and, it is hoped, their implications for performance. (See Appendix A for more detail.)

Phase 1—Creating a Foundation

(Separate groups address Items 1, 2, or 3; all groups join to share, engage in dialogue, and seek consensus.)

What should be the primary focus (aim) of our business? What business are we in?

1. Identify the internal stakeholders of the business (i.e., who has a vested interest in what we do?).
2. Identify the external stakeholders of the business (i.e., who is affected by what we do?).
3. Identify the general and specific expectations of stakeholders and customers (i.e., what they value and what gratification they are seeking).

The class, having been provided a short written scenario or stimulus question (in advance), is divided into groups, each with a designation of 1, 2, or 3. Each group is assigned the corresponding Phase 1 questions to discuss. Using chalkboards, flip charts, newsprint, and so forth, each team posts a response to its assigned statement accompanied by drawings or charts as needed. Then, the class reconvenes and works with the instructor to reconcile the efforts offered by the groups associated with each of the tasks so that a fundamental image of the organization to be created takes shape. This large group discussion is very important and usually difficult. It is important because the instructor needs to moderate the confusion that the activity generates, at the same time not offering simple solutions to complex questions and concerns. Positive reinforcement of student effort is critical.

Phase 2—Defining the Organization's Tasks

(Work together on Step A; work separately in groups on Step B, Items 1 to 3; then, all share and engage in dialogue.)

A. Identify processes and functions that enable us to address our focus and the expectations of our stakeholders (i.e., what is necessary to carry out the basic work of the business?).

B. Each small team or group is assigned one process. Each meets and develops responses that

   1. describe the process in detail;
   2. describe subprocesses or tasks for each process; and
   3. identify the knowledge, skills, technology, materials, and so forth required for tasks within the process.

For Phase 2, building on the foci and expectations identified in Phase 1, the students as a group of the whole are confronted with the question of "how." What processes have to be in place for the organization to perform as expected? Of course, at this point, the responses tend to be fairly superficial, hence the reason for Step B of this phase, which provides for the "fleshing out" of these organizational tasks. Each of the previous groups is assigned one of the identified processes to assess in depth. Once this has been achieved, the group of the whole is reconvened and, as in Phase 1, integrates the results of their individual group efforts. As before, the integrative process is guided by the instructor, though in the guise of a coach rather than a dispenser of correct answers. This process will require substantial probing, focusing, and the like to preclude premature closure, which, though comforting, may lack realism or practicality.

Phase 3—Coordinating, Assessing, Improving

(Discussion as a group of the whole.)

1. How do we link or arrange the processes to be performed (if need be)?
2. What procedures, events, and so forth do we build in to check if expectations are being met?
3. How are we going to encourage and attain continuous improvements in our business and its processes?

Here, we have three new statements to address. They build on the preceding statements and questions, providing a perspective of the organization as an ongoing entity tasked to continue accomplishing its purpose. What do we need to do to structure the prospect of achieving that end? The discussion that constitutes this phase is conducted as a class. The group of the whole strives for reconciliation of information, intent, and the like, and, as in the real world, both succeeds and falls short.

Summary: Debriefing. Because the instructor is an integral part of the activity in the various phases, a debriefing in the traditional sense is somewhat moderated. In a sense, debriefing has occurred in intervals. However, a final debriefing of the work presents an opportunity not only for integrative perspective but for elaboration of key organizational theory and design issues. This may include such matters as centralization-decentralization, hierarchy, span of control, authority, delegation, kaizen, process-function issues, communication links, information management, and the like. Also, process issues regarding teamwork and the activity itself are fair game for discussion. The debriefing actually may extend far beyond the traditional debriefing efforts for activities such as this one. The dialogue may continue

into additional class sessions as the course material touches other domains of OB and management. Discussion could involve exploration of the challenges of implementation, involving issues of resource limitation, relative power, political considerations, reactions to change, and so on. In Appendix A, Phase 4, are some questions for students that provide for a rich debriefing activity. The questions address many important matters relating to individual student learning, understanding, and application of organizational structure concepts.

Results

We have been quite successful using three groups of three to six students as the basis for this activity. As previously noted, groups of this size provide the opportunity for all students to participate and moderate social loafing. Not surprisingly, given the dearth of obviously correct answers and their limited experience with such a task, the students engaged in this activity experience numerous questions, not to mention an appropriate level of confusion. Consequently, there is evidence of frustration and some resignation as students work in their small groups to make meaning out of their assignments and to identify information and interpretations in response to their charges.

Generally, students engaged in this activity ultimately complete the tasks and develop a consensus-based view or interpretation of an organization. It is possible, as with one class, that the process can break down when the students and instructor are unable to satisfactorily work through the phases. In the referenced situation, the differences in interpretations of organization functions and task processes could not be reconciled satisfactorily. Though atypical, even such an aborted effort can be valuable as a learning experience (there are, after all, organizations that fail because of an inability to focus their efforts).

As for the previously noted confusion among the students, we believe the experience to be entirely normal and usually desirable. Creating organization is a relatively abstract, open-ended activity and one that is buoyed by numerous assumptions. Many students would prefer not to have to confront such ill-defined problems and issues. Some, though, thrive on the opportunity to be creative and to fashion assumptions that fit their ideas, and vice versa. Once the activity is completed and the debriefing takes place, many students express the perception that they possess more knowledge about structure and greater comfort, if not understanding, regarding what is involved in decisions relating to structural arrangements in complex organizations. Finally, the activity as set forth provides many opportunities for the instructor to intro-

duce or reinforce important concepts of communication, coordination, values, work design, strategy, continuous improvement, and so on.

Appendix A
Details of the Activity

Title: Structuring-by-the-Numbers

Objective: This experience will provide students with a forum to express what they know (from study and experience) about the structure of organizations and expand their understanding and awareness of structural issues. Using small groups, it will provide a vehicle for surfacing assumptions, conventional wisdom, ideas, and attitudes regarding the elements necessary for an organization to exist and survive.

Time Required: Depending on such factors as target scenario used, sophistication of the student group, and the amount of study and preparation completed prior to entering the exercise, Structuring-by-the-Numbers requires from 110 to 150 minutes of class time.

Maximum and Minimum Number of Students Needed: The exercise requires the class to be divided into groups of 3 to 6 students. This group size is intended to facilitate the active involvement of all students, an expectation that should be verbally reinforced. The exercise can be completed with a class size as small as 9 to 10 individuals or with a class size as large as 100.

Step-by-Step Instructions (with time estimates)

Phase 1—Creating a Foundation
(plenary session, then small groups work independently)

Plenary Session: Decide what should be the primary focus (aim) of our business. What business are we in? (10 to 12 minutes) Note: To reduce time given to the entire activity, the instructor could inform the students that the aim of the business is

_____.

Small Group/Team Tasks: (about 15 minutes) Three teams, one (A, B, C) assignment each.
    A. Identify the relevant *internal* stakeholders of this business.
    B. Identify the relevant *external* stakeholders of this business.
    C. Identify the general and specific expectations of our stakeholders and our likely customers. What gratifications do they seek?

Reporting, Dialog, and Consensus-Seeking per A, B, and C responses. (about 15 minutes)

Phase 2—Defining the Organization's Tasks
(plenary session, then groups work independently)
Plenary Session: We must identify *n* processes and functions that address our organizational purpose and expectations. That is, we must answer the question, *What processes are needed to carry out the basic work of the organization?* (about 15 to 20 minutes)

Small Group/Team Tasks: (about 20 to 25 minutes) Each small group is assigned one process. The group then meets and develops responses to these three requests:

    A. Describe the process in detail.
    B. Describe subprocesses or tasks that are included in your process.
    C. Identify the knowledge, skills, technology, materials, and so forth needed or required for tasks within the process.

(*Note*: This is a complex assignment, even for the experienced. It may be desirable to tell the students that they need, as a minimum, to identify *some* of the elements contained in the categories in Item C.)

Reporting, Dialog, and Consensus-Seeking per the products of each small group. (10 minutes)

Phase 3—Coordinating, Assessing, Improving
(whole group discussion, 25 to 35 minutes)

The following three questions are to be addressed sequentially. Students may require considerable prompting and/or direction to make reasonable progress.

    A. How do we link or arrange processes (if need be)?
    B. What procedures, events, and so forth do we build in to check if expectations are being met?
    C. How do we promote and attain continuous improvement in our business and its processes?

Phase 4—Summary

The instructor may ask the students to reflect on the process just completed as well as on the content and quality of the students' efforts. One thing leads to another in such a discussion. Some potential discussion questions regarding the activity are

- What was particularly frustrating?
- What was useful for reinforcing some of what you had read and studied about organization design and structure?
- Do you believe you have a better understanding of organizational complexity?
- Reflect on the order and sequence of the questions, and so forth, we used. If left to your own devices, would you approach these questions in a different way? Explain.
- Which of the questions or statements that guided your discussions do you believe were most stimulating or seemed to help your group generate useful information? Explain.

- If you were about to engage in preparing a business plan for your own business, would the model we used help you? Why or why not?

References (for further student reading)

Drucker, P. F. (1999). *Management challenges for the 21st century.* New York: HarperBusiness.

Hall, R. H. (1999). *Organizations: Structures, processes, and outcomes* (7th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Morgan, G. (1997). *Images of organization* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Nadler, D. A., & Tushman, M. L. (1989). Organizational frame bending: Principles for managing reorientation. *Academy of Management Executive*, *3*(3), 194-204.

Nadler, D. A., & Tushman, M. L. (1999). The organization of the future: Strategic imperatives and core competencies for the 21st century. *Organizational Dynamics*, *Fall*, 45-60.

Rummler, G. A., & Brache, A. P. (1995). *Improving performance: How to manage the white space on the organization chart*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Whetten, D. A., & Cameron, K. S. (1994). Organizational effectiveness: Old models and new constructs. In J. Greenberg (Ed.), *Organizational behavior: The state of the science* (pp. 135-153). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Appendix B
The Frostberries Situation

To the Student: In the following few paragraphs are details of a situation. We use this information for the several phases of the "Structuring-by-the-Numbers" process. Your instructor will explain to you the various tasks for the completion of the process. At the end of the last paragraph of the material, below, are the three basic objectives (a, b, and c) for the entire process. Achieving the objectives will assist you in learning and understanding organizational structure.

You are a business development team just named by the CEO of the firm, D. Rod Mann. It seems that a new variety of fruit, frostberry, has been "discovered." Actually, it has been around for a long time, but its significance and value has only recently been recognized. Frostberries contain a substantial quantity of gudstuforu, a mineral-like substance that, among other things, prolongs cell life and retards hair loss, skin wrinkles, heart disease, and bad breath.

The potential applications for the frostberry, such as food, health care products, and so on, are practically limitless. Frostberries are indigenous to the eastern and northern areas of West Virginia, where soil quality and climate combine to create optimum growing conditions for the frostberry. In fact, it is nearly impossible to grow frostberries anywhere else. Fortunately, in 1963, the firm had purchased 3,800 acres of land in eastern West Virginia for timber, real estate, and mineral extraction. The total cost was $988,000, plus annual real estate taxes of $5,300.

The firm you work for is Regional Enterprises, Inc., which manages operations in real estate, timbering, recreation resorts, and warehousing. The firm has no experience in food or health products. These are businesses into which Mr. Mann and his

executive committee hope to expand. And, interestingly enough, they want to jump into these ventures with both feet; that is, they are not really interested in selling off land, nor are they interested in licensing or franchising the frostberry potential. They believe that the company has the talent to grow new ventures.

The task of your business development team is to propose the rudiments of a strategy and the details of an organization structure that will help spring the strategy to life. CEO Mann told you that he is depending on you, and you don't have much time. If the new venture is even moderately successful, he guarantees that career advancement, bonuses, and an attractive ESOP will be offered. He wants you to tell him, with appropriate reasoning, (a) what are the essential strategy elements for food and health products businesses (how does the business define itself), (b) what are the essential *processes* needed to operate the business, and (c) how will you arrange the processes (fundamental organizational structure)?

NOTE: This "frostberries" scenario is provided for illustrative purposes. Instructors may choose whatever scenarios, incidents, cases, and the like that meet with particular course objectives and student interests. ESOP = employee stock option plan.

MUSAVI-LARI: AN EXPERIENTIAL EXERCISE IN DIVERSITY AWARENESS

Natalie S. Berger
University of Colorado, Colorado Springs

The dynamics of the workplace are changing dramatically. The labor force of the next decade will be older and more culturally diverse, with a greater proportion of women and minorities than ever before in the history of the United States (U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, 1999). Additionally, corporations are becoming increasingly global, and mergers and acquisitions are commonplace. Employees must often work with coworkers of diverse ages, from different cultures, or in cross-functional teams or interorganizational alliances (Shaw & Barrett-Power, 1998). Companies that can effectively manage diversity will be able to recruit, train, and retain workers and maximize the benefits of this diverse workforce. An organization's success and competitive advantage can be linked to its ability to address multicultural issues (Cox & Blake, 1991). Therefore, diversity awareness is a critical skill in management education (Iannuzzi, 1997).

Successful diversity training requires that the thinking of the participants be actively challenged; they must be seriously moved to consider other perspectives (Stoner & Russell-Chapin, 1997). The Musavi-Lari exercise is an example of this kind of "activating experience." The activity provides an engaging way to bring into awareness prejudices and hidden assumptions that can color perceptions and impair judgment. The activity evokes discussion critical to such topics such as global human resource management, stereotyping, affirmative action, and group dynamics. If a group is large enough,

the exercise can also be effective for demonstrating the process of "groupthink" or the impact of diversity on group decision making.

Students consistently report the Musavi-Lari exercise to be an engaging activity, and it is not uncommon for intense emotions to arise during the discussions. Although activities such as this one run the risk of reinforcing rather than reducing stereotypes, with careful attention paid to debriefing and clarifying the key learning points in the activity, the results are worth the risks. Successful debriefing of this activity has typically resulted in insights and self-awareness, which are the hallmark of lasting learning.

Instructions for Conducting the Activity

To administer this exercise, I hand each student a copy of the Musavi-Lari exercise, which is provided below. I ask the students to first read the story and to then independently evaluate the 10 statements. They are to then determine if the statements are true or false, or if there is not enough information ("don't know"), and to circle the appropriate answer.

THE MUSAVI-LARI EXERCISE

The Story

Akilah Musavi-Lari has been killed. The authorities have rounded up 10 suspects, all of whom are known terrorists. All of the suspects are known to have been near the scene of the killing at the approximate time that it occurred. All had substantial motives for wanting Akilah killed. However, one of these suspected terrorists, Pat Flaherty, has positively been cleared of guilt.

BELOW ARE 10 STATEMENTS BASED ON THE ABOVE STORY. MARK EACH STATEMENT AS T (TRUE) F (FALSE) OR ? (DON'T KNOW; NOT ENOUGH INFORMATION).

The Statements

T F ?   1. Pat Flaherty is known to have been at the scene of the killing of Akilah Musavi-Lari.

T F ?   2. All 10 of the rounded up terrorists were known to have been near the scene of the murder.

T F ?   3. One man, Pat Flaherty, has been cleared of guilt.

T F ?   4. All 10 of the rounded up suspects were near the scene of Akilah's killing at the approximate time it took place.

T F ?   5. The police do not know who killed Akilah.

T F ?   6. All 10 of the suspects rounded up by the police are known to have been near the scene of the crime.

T F ?   7. Musavi-Lari's murderer did not confess of his own free will.

T   F   ?   8. It is known that the 10 suspects were in the vicinity of the murder.
T   F   ?   9. Pat Flaherty was not cleared of guilt.
T   F   ?   10. The following events were included in the story: a man was killed, police rounded up the 10 suspects near the scene of the murder, all suspects wanted Akilah Musavi-Lari killed, and one man has positively been cleared of guilt.

After the participants have completed their individual assessments, I divide the class into groups of four. I prefer to structure some groups as homogeneously as possible and to create other groups with as much diversity as possible. The diversity dimensions may include such variables as age, gender, marital status, birth order, ethnicity, socioeconomic class, religion, work experience, sexual orientation, or culture. I then ask the groups to come to group responses for each statement above. The groups are not allowed to ask questions of me or of any other group. They are to arrive at their collective answers without any additional input. They may use any means they choose to arrive at answer to each question: They could reach consensus, elect to accept a majority rule, or elect a spokesperson to determine the group's final answer. It usually takes about 20 minutes for the groups to determine their collective responses to the 10 statements.

While displaying an overhead that lists the 10 statements, I then ask how many groups selected "T" for the first statement, how many selected "F," and how many selected "?." I mark on the overhead the number of groups selecting each of the alternatives "T," "F," or "?." This will begin to demonstrate the disagreement within the class. I do not yet encourage dialogue on these differences.

The Debriefing

The debriefing of this activity is key for several reasons:

- It helps uncover the hidden biases or personal filters we each possess.
- It allows time to diffuse any intense emotions or misperceptions that may have arisen.
- It illustrates various group processes.
- It demonstrates the differences between homogeneous and diverse groups in decision-making processes and the quality of decisions made.

I allow at least 1 hour to conduct an effective debriefing. To begin, I ask the group members to raise their hands if they changed even one of their answers after participating in the group dialogue. Most people will affirm at least one change in their thinking as a result of discussion. In light of the fact that the

exercise is to both identify hidden assumptions and develop an appreciation for the value of diversity (i.e., there is no "right answer"), I avoid offering a right answer. This begins to illuminate the value of dialogue for uncovering hidden assumptions. For the debriefing, I address one statement at a time. A sample debrief for the second question is as follows: For the groups that responded "F" to this question, what was your reasoning? What lead you to that conclusion? What are the assumptions you had to make to reach that conclusion? How did your group arrive at any breakthrough thinking? What are some of the words or associations that might have colored your thinking on this statement?

I use a white board or flip chart to document the words that evoked the most associations or prejudices and then ask students to identify the associations to those words that influenced their perceptions. Typically, the words that evoke the most bias are *killing*, *terrorist*, *Musavi-Lari*, *Pat Flaherty*, and *authorities*. We discuss the erroneous notions we might have on these topics (such as "I assumed this happened in the Middle East because that's where most terrorism occurs").

Because normal discourse does require us to make some assumptions when processing information, the "best" answer depends on which assumptions one believes are most valid for the questions at hand. Below are some of the underlying assumptions and personal insights that were uncovered in a recent conduct of this exercise with my Internet-based human resource management course.

1. Pat Flaherty is known to have been at the scene of the killing of Akilah Musavi-Lari.
    True
2. All 10 of the rounded up terrorists were known to have been near the scene of the murder.
    The story says that Musavi-Lari was "killed." That does not necessarily mean "murdered." Akilah Musavi-Lari could have been killed in an auto accident. The fact that terrorists were implicated creates the assumption that violence was involved.
3. One man, Pat Flaherty, has been cleared of guilt.
    This assumes that Pat is a man because of the perception that men are more often associated with violence. It also assumes that Pat is an adult. The Irish name creates a connection with terrorists.
4. All 10 of the rounded up suspects were near the scene of Akilah's killing at the approximate time it took place.
    True
5. The police do not know who killed Akilah.
    This assumes that the authorities are the police. It also assumes "someone" killed Akilah Musavi-Lari.

6. All 10 of the suspects rounded up by the police are known to have been near the scene of the crime.

   This assumes there was a crime rather than an accident and that the authorities are the police.

7. Musavi-Lari's murderer did not confess of his own free will.

   This assumes that there was a murder and could also intimate that the police beat a confession out of someone.

8. It is known that the 10 suspects were in the vicinity of the murder.

   Again, this assumes it was a murder.

9. Pat Flaherty was not cleared of guilt.

   False

10. The following events were included in the story: a man was killed, police rounded up the 10 suspects near the scene of the murder, all suspects wanted Akilah Musavi-Lari killed, and one man has positively been cleared of guilt.

    This assumes that Akilah Musavi-Lari was a man, that the police rounded up all the suspects, that murder was the cause of death, and that Pat is a man. Additionally, the story does not state that all the suspects wanted Akilah killed, only that they had motives.

As the participants begin to identify the assumptions they were making, their unconscious biases start to come into awareness. Below are listed some of the biases students have provided on the topics of Pat Flaherty, the authorities, Musavi-Lari, terrorists, and the killing.

BIASES ABOUT PAT FLAHERTY

- Men are more typically involved in violence. Pat was accused of murder; therefore, Pat must be a man.
- Pat must be an adult, because the association with terrorism can only be an adult activity.
- Flaherty is an Irish name, and they have terrorist groups in Ireland, so Pat must be a terrorist.

BIASES ABOUT AKILAH MUSAVI-LARI

- Akilah must be from the Middle East. People from that country are always killing each other.
- Akilah must be an adult male, because women and children are not criminals or involved in violence.
- Lots of people had motives for wanting him dead, so he must not be a "nice guy."

BIASES ABOUT THE AUTHORITIES

- I took it for granted that the authorities were the "good guys" and the suspects were the "bad guys." Just because someone wears a badge, doesn't necessarily mean they are fair and serve with the common good in mind. There are dishonest law enforcement people, just like there are immoral politicians, business owners and health care providers.

- The police department must have been racist and corrupt because they cleared Pat Flaherty of all guilt.
- Since I believed the event occurred in the Middle East, I assumed the police must have beaten a confession out of someone when the story stated, "Akilah's murderer did not confess of his own free will," because authorities abuse all suspects in that part of the world.

BIASES ABOUT THE TERRORISTS

- Terrorists are bad and do bad things, when really one person's terrorism is another person's justice. Terrorists may, in fact, be overthrowing a corrupt or evil government.
- One assumption I made after reading the story for the first time, was that all the suspects must have had something to do with the killing of Akilah. I believe that is because they were all identified as terrorists, and that's what terrorists do—kill people.
- The terrorists were all male, because men commit most of the violent crimes.

Student Learning and Insights

The Musavi-Lari exercise can provide significant realizations in the areas of understanding perception, relating to individual differences, and being aware of group dynamics and decision making in organizations. It can tie directly into content areas in an organizational behavior curriculum, such as issues of influence, power and politics in organizations, interpersonal communication and understanding cooperation, and conflict in organizations. Thus, time spent debriefing this exercise can be of great benefit to creating lasting learning for the students who have developed a conceptual understanding on these topics. At the conclusion of the exercise, I ask students to identify what personal learning occurred for them as a result of this activity. My recent Web-based class offered the following insights.

Perceptions. We operate as though our perceptions are reality without really knowing all of the detail surrounding the case. As a species, this has survival value. It allows us not to create everything from the beginning but instead to draw on our enormous background of experiences to make calculated decisions. It is a way of dealing with information overload as well as missing information. We need to be able to draw the line, though, to determine when more concrete detail is needed to make good decisions. Certainly, some assumptions that people make about others are necessary because time does not permit one to thoroughly investigate or get to know everyone or everything.

Considerable research has been conducted on the process of stereotyping in organizational life (e.g., Jackson, Sullivan, & Hodge, 1993). This exercise illustrates, however, that even among enlightened individuals who are making a concerted effort to perceive facts accurately, we still may carry unconscious biases that color our perceptions.

Decision making. The exercise demonstrates how easy it is to make assumptions after a quick reading of a situation. You must check your own bias to be sure you have the facts straight. I think the story relates to equal employment opportunity when it comes to how we interpret problems and people without all the facts. Rational thought is a capability of the human species, but it can occur only when our ability to see a situation clearly is not clouded by these unconscious filters. It is not only important to know the facts but also to be able to interpret them properly when making judgments. Within our society, we are fed so much information that we have to be able to efficiently gather the data and then interpret it or analyze it correctly.

Another observation about decision making that often arises is that the more diverse groups in the exercise typically produce better decisions. They take about twice as long (often as much as 30 minutes vs. the typical 15) as the homogeneous groups to reach consensus, but more often than not, they are able to identify the perceptual distortions and prejudices underlying false conclusions. This finding is supported by research on group effectiveness conducted by Guzzo and Dickson (1996), who concluded that there "is evidence that team effectiveness is well served by diverse members when teams perform cognitive, creativity-demanding tasks" (p. 331).

Stereotyping. This exercise demonstrates numerous stereotypes (e.g., gender, ethnicity, cultural, and power stereotyping). For example, society and the media have implanted visions associated with terrorist acts by people from the Middle East, such as the 1998 bombing of the embassies in Africa and the events of September 11, 2001 in the United States. These images influence our perceptions about a given culture. We place labels on people when we don't really understand them. When we stereotype, it causes inaccuracies in retrieving information and obscures individual differences. Sometimes, wrong conclusions are drawn in response to a perceived threat and based on our defense mechanisms.

Importance of diversity awareness in a global economy. A lack of understanding will prevent us from getting to know our employees and customers and assessing their needs, preferences, and abilities accurately. In a competitive global marketplace, we can never draw the line on trying to improve our

understanding of people. Sustaining a global competitive advantage will depend on our ability to constantly and accurately assess our employees' and customers' needs. Each individual comes to work with certain preconceived notions or beliefs. It is crucial for managers to understand each individual situation and to make appropriate responses. The successful organization of the future will understand the value diversity can have on the organization. In a multicultural, competitive economy, an organization's success will be strongly influenced by its ability to constantly and accurately address the diverse needs of its employees and customers.

Conclusions

This exercise has been effectively used in graduate classes and fits easily within the typical time allotted to a single class session. I have also used this exercise in an extremely diverse undergraduate class with equally positive results. With a change of names and context, this exercise can be readily adapted to ferret out other types of biases or stereotypes, such as age differences, class biases, and career or lifestyle biases. It may also be rewritten from another cultural perspective, for instance, to unveil the view that other cultural groups have about Americans or even, within the United States, the differences between Northerners and Southerners. This type of activity could be particularly useful for training expatriate employees to be sensitive to cultural differences.

This brief exercise can produce a significant inroad into diversity awareness. It is relatively easy to administer and has resulted in positive experiences for students. The debriefing activities can be extremely powerful in forging attitudes that will be essential in our global village. Students consistently report insights and self-awareness that will make them more successful as community members and corporate citizens. This exercise can be a useful addition to any management class that addresses issues of globalization, decision making, perception, or workforce diversity.

References

Cox, T. H., & Blake, S. (1991). Managing cultural diversity: Implications for organizational competitives. *Academy of Management Executive*, *5* (3), 45-56.

Guzzo, R., & Dickson, M. W. (1996). Teams in organizations: Recent research on performance effectiveness. *Annual Review of Psychology*, *47*, 307-338.

Iannuzzi, J. M. (1997). Reaping diversity's competitive rewards (diversity in the workplace). *Business Forum*, *22*(2-3), 4-5.

Jackson, L. A, Sullivan, L. A., & Hodge, C. N. (1993). Stereotype effects on attributions, predictions, and evaluations: No two social judgments are quite alike. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *65*, 69-84.

Shaw, J. B., & Barrett-Power, E. (1998). The effects of diversity of small work group processes and performance. *Human Relations*, *51*(10), 1307-1325.

Stoner, C. R., & Russell-Chapin, L. A. (1997). Creating a culture of diversity management: Moving from awareness to action. *Business Forum*, *22*(2-3), 6-7.

U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, BLS Release New. (1996-2006). *Employment projections*. Available: http://www.bls.gov/new.release/ecopro.nr0.htm

INDEX

to

JOURNAL OF MANAGEMENT EDUCATION

Volume 25

Authors:

Articles:

Exercises, Activities, and Simulations:

Ideas, Observations, and Inquiry:

Review of Instructional Materials: