WHAT IS ORGANIZATIONAL BEHAVIOR?

It’s not what we don’t know that gives us trouble, it’s what we know that ain’t so.
—W. Rogers
LEARNING OBJECTIVES

After studying this chapter, you should be able to

1. Define organizational behavior (OB)
2. Describe what managers do
3. Explain the value of the systematic study of OB
4. List the major challenges and opportunities for managers to use OB concepts
5. Identify the contributions made by major behavioral science disciplines to OB
6. Describe why managers require a knowledge of OB
7. Explain the need for a contingency approach to the study of OB
8. Identify the three levels of analysis in this book’s OB model
Meet David Kwok, a 1987 graduate of the University of California at Los Angeles. With a major in cognitive science, David works for a company called The Princeton Review that prepares students to take college and graduate school admission tests. At the age of 31, David directs fifty to sixty instructors at Princeton Review’s Los Angeles office.

“My academic training in artificial intelligence didn’t really prepare me for my biggest job challenge—understanding and motivating people,” says David. “For instance, nothing at UCLA really emphasized how to get people psyched up. For me, people are the unknown part of the equation that determines how effective I am in my job. Other tasks, like scheduling or customer relations, give me very few headaches. What I’ve learned is that when things go wrong, it’s almost always a people problem. I’ve worked hard to make our teaching staff feel like a small family and to learn techniques for getting them motivated. But it’s been on-the-job training for me. I didn’t learn any of this in school.”

David Kwok has learned what most managers learn very quickly: A large part of the success in any management job is developing good interpersonal or people skills. Lawrence Weinbach, chief executive at the accounting firm of Arthur Andersen & Co., puts it this way: “Pure technical knowledge is only going to get you to a point. Beyond that, interpersonal skills become critical.”

Although practicing managers have long understood the importance of interpersonal skills to managerial effectiveness, business schools were
slower to get the message. Until the late-1980s, business school curricula focused almost singularly on the technical aspects of management, emphasizing courses in economics, accounting, finance, and quantitative techniques. Course work in human behavior and people skills received minimal attention relative to the technical aspects of management. Over the past decade, however, business faculty have come to realize the importance that an understanding of human behavior plays in determining a manager’s effectiveness, and required courses on people skills have been widely added to the curriculum.
Recognition of the importance of developing managers’ interpersonal skills is closely tied to the need for organizations to get and keep high-performing employees. For instance, the chief executive of Chrysler Corporation, Robert Eaton, sees his workforce as an asset that provides his company with a sustainable competitive advantage. “The only way we can beat the competition is with people,” say Eaton. “That’s the only thing anybody has. Your culture and how you motivate and empower and educate your people is what makes the difference.”

The head of Starbucks, the rapidly growing Seattle-based coffee retailer, concurs: “Our only sustainable competitive advantage is the quality of our workforce.”

A study of 191 top executives at six Fortune 500 companies sought an answer to the question Why do managers fail? The single biggest reason for failure, according to these executives, is poor interpersonal skills. The Center for Creative Leadership in Greensboro, North Carolina, estimates that half of all managers and thirty percent of all senior managers have some type of difficulty with people. Consistent with these findings are surveys that have sought to determine what skills college recruiters consider most important for the job effectiveness of MBA graduates. These surveys consistently identify interpersonal skills as most important.

We have come to understand that technical skills are necessary, but insufficient, for succeeding in management. In today’s increasingly competitive and demanding workplace, managers can’t suc-
ceed on their technical skills alone. They also have to have good people skills. This book has been written to help both managers and potential managers develop those people skills.

**What Managers Do**

Let’s begin by briefly defining the terms *manager* and the place where managers work—the *organization*. Then let’s look at the manager’s job; specifically, what do managers do?

Managers get things done through other people. They make decisions, allocate resources, and direct the activities of others to attain goals. Managers do their work in an *organization*. This is a consciously coordinated social unit, composed of two or more people, that functions on a relatively continuous basis to achieve a common goal or set of goals. On the basis of this definition, manufacturing and service firms are organizations and so are schools, hospitals, churches, military units, retail stores, police departments, and local, state, and federal government agencies. The people who oversee the activities of others and who are responsible for attaining goals in these organizations are managers (although they’re sometimes called *administrators*, especially in not-for-profit organizations).
Management Functions

In the early part of this century, a French industrialist by the name of Henri Fayol wrote that all managers perform five management functions: They plan, organize, command, coordinate, and control. Today, we have condensed those down to four: planning, organizing, leading, and controlling.

If you don’t know where you’re going, any road will get you there. Since organizations exist to achieve goals, someone has to define those goals and the means by which they can be achieved. Management is that someone. The planning function encompasses defining an organization’s goals, establishing an overall strategy for achieving those goals, and developing a comprehensive hierarchy of plans to integrate and coordinate activities.

Managers are also responsible for designing an organization’s structure. We call this function organizing. It includes the determination of what tasks are to be done, who is to do them, how the tasks are to be grouped, who reports to whom, and where decisions are to be made.

Every organization contains people, and it is management’s job to direct and coordinate those people. This is the leading function. When managers motivate subordinates, direct the activities of others, select the most effective communication channels, or resolve conflicts among members, they are engaging in leading.

- "The people who oversee the activities of others and who are responsible for attaining goals in organizations are managers."

**planning**
Includes defining goals, establishing strategy, and developing plans to coordinate activities.

**organizing**
Determining what tasks are to be done, who is to do them, how the tasks are to be grouped, who reports to whom, and where decisions are to be made.

**leading**
Includes motivating subordinates, directing others, selecting the most effective communication channels, and resolving conflicts.
The final function managers perform is **controlling**. After the goals are set, the plans formulated, the structural arrangements delineated, and the people hired, trained, and motivated, there is still the possibility that something may go amiss. To ensure that things are going as they should, management must monitor the organization’s performance. Actual performance must be compared with the previously set goals. If there are any significant deviations, it is management’s job to get the organization back on track. This monitoring, comparing, and potential correcting is what is meant by the controlling function.

So, using the functional approach, the answer to the question, What do managers do? is that they plan, organize, lead, and control.

**Management Roles**

In the late 1960s, a graduate student at MIT, Henry Mintzberg, undertook a careful study of five executives to determine what these managers did on their jobs. On the basis of his observations of these managers, Mintzberg concluded that managers perform ten different, highly interrelated roles, or sets of behaviors attributable to their jobs. As shown in Exhibit 1-1, these ten roles can be grouped as being primarily concerned with interpersonal relationships, the transfer of information, and decision making.
INTERPERSONAL ROLES  All managers are required to perform duties that are ceremonial and symbolic in nature. When the president of a college hands out diplomas at commencement or a factory supervisor gives a group of high school students a tour of the plant, he or she is acting in a figurehead role. All managers also have a leadership role. This role includes hiring, training, motivating, and disciplining employees. The third role within the interpersonal
grouping is the *liaison* role. Mintzberg described this activity as contacting outsiders who provide the manager with information. These may be individuals or groups inside or outside the organization. The sales manager who obtains information from the personnel manager in his or her own company has an internal liaison relationship. When that sales manager has contacts with other sales executives through a marketing trade association, he or she has an outside liaison relationship.

**INFORMATION ROLES** All managers, to some degree, collect information from organizations and institutions outside their own. Typically, they get information by reading magazines and talking with other people to learn of changes in the public’s tastes, what competitors may be planning, and the like. Mintzberg called this the *monitor* role. Managers also act as a conduit to transmit information to organizational members. This is the *disseminator* role. Managers additionally perform a *spokesperson* role when they represent the organization to outsiders.

**DECISIONAL ROLES** Finally, Mintzberg identified four roles that revolve around the making of choices. In the *entrepreneur* role, managers initiate and oversee new projects that will improve their organization’s performance. As *disturbance handlers*, managers take corrective action in response to unforeseen problems. As *resource
allocator, managers are responsible for allocating human, physical, and monetary resources. Last, managers perform a negotiator role, in which they discuss issues and bargain with other units to gain advantages for their own unit.

Management Skills

Still another way of considering what managers do is to look at the skills or competencies they need to successfully achieve their goals. Robert Katz has identified three essential management skills: technical, human, and conceptual.9

**TECHNICAL SKILLS** Technical skills encompass the ability to apply specialized knowledge or expertise. When you think of the skills held by professionals such as civil engineers, tax accountants, or oral surgeons, you typically focus on their technical skills. Through extensive formal education, they have learned the special knowledge and practices of their field. Of course, professionals don’t have a monopoly on technical skills, and not all technical skills have to be learned in schools or formal training programs. All jobs require some specialized expertise, and many people develop their technical skills on the job.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interpersonal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figurehead</td>
<td>Symbolic head; required to perform a number of routine duties of a legal or social nature</td>
<td>Ceremonies, status requests, solicitations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leader</td>
<td>Responsible for the motivation and direction of subordinates</td>
<td>Virtually all managerial activities involving subordinates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liaison</td>
<td>Maintains a network of outside contacts who provide favors and information</td>
<td>Acknowledgment of mail, external board work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Informational</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitor</td>
<td>Receives wide variety of information; serves as nerve center of internal and external information of the organization</td>
<td>Handling all mail and contacts categorized as concerned primarily with receiving information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Responsibilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disseminator</td>
<td>Transmits information received from outsiders or from other subordinates to members of the organization</td>
<td>Forwarding mail into organization for informational purposes; verbal contacts involving information flow to subordinates such as review sessions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spokesperson</td>
<td>Transmits information to outsiders on organization’s plans, policies, actions, and results; serves as expert on organization’s industry</td>
<td>Board meetings; handling contacts involving transmission of information to outsiders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Decisional</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entrepreneur</td>
<td>Searches organization and its environment for opportunities and initiates projects to bring about change</td>
<td>Strategy and review sessions involving initiation or design of improvement projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disturbance handler</td>
<td>Responsible for corrective action when organization faces important, unexpected disturbances</td>
<td>Strategy and review sessions involving disturbances and crises</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**HUMAN SKILLS**  The ability to work with, understand, and motivate other people, both individually and in groups, describes **human skills**. Many people are technically proficient but interpersonally incompetent. They might, for example, be poor listeners, unable to understand the needs of others, or have difficulty managing conflicts. Since managers get things done through other people, they must have good human skills to communicate, motivate, and delegate.

**CONCEPTUAL SKILLS**  Managers must have the mental ability to analyze and diagnose complex situations. These tasks require **conceptual skills**. Decision making, for instance, requires managers to analyze and diagnose complex situations.
to spot problems, identify alternatives that can correct them, evaluate those alternatives, and select the best one. Managers can be technically and interpersonally competent yet still fail because of an inability to rationally process and interpret information.

Effective vs. Successful Managerial Activities

Fred Luthans and his associates looked at the issue of what managers do from a somewhat different perspective. They asked the question, Do managers who move up most quickly in an organization do the same activities and with the same emphasis as managers who do the best job? You would tend to think that the managers who were the most effective in their jobs would also be the ones who were promoted fastest. But that’s not what appears to happen.

Luthans and his associates studied more than 450 managers. What they found was that these managers all engaged in four managerial activities:

1. *Traditional management*. Decision making, planning, and controlling
2. *Communication*. Exchanging routine information and processing paperwork
3. *Human resource management*. Motivating, disciplining, managing conflict, staffing, and training
4. Networking. Socializing, politicking, and interacting with outsiders

The “average” manager in the study spent thirty-two percent of his or her time in traditional management activities, twenty-nine percent communicating, twenty percent in human resource management activities, and nineteen percent networking. However, the amount of time and effort that different managers spent on those four activities varied a great deal. Specifically, as shown in Exhibit 1-2, managers who were successful (defined in terms of the speed of promotion within their organization) had a very different emphasis than managers who were effective (defined in terms of the quantity and quality of their performance and the satisfaction and commitment of their subordinates). Among successful managers, networking made the largest relative contribution to success, and human resource management activities made the least relative contribution. Among effective managers, communication made the largest relative contribution and networking the least.

This study adds important insights to our knowledge of what managers do. On average, managers spend approximately twenty to thirty percent of their time on each of the four activities: traditional management, communication, human resource management, and networking. However, successful managers don’t give the same emphasis to each of those activities as do effective managers. In fact, their emphases are almost the opposite. This finding chal-
Exhibit 1-2
Allocation of Activities by Time

lenges the historical assumption that promotions are based on performance, vividly illustrating the importance that social and political skills play in getting ahead in organizations.

**A Review of the Manager’s Job**

One common thread runs through the functions, roles, skills, and activities approaches to management: Each recognizes the paramount importance of managing people. As David Kwok found out when he became a manager at The Princeton Review, regardless of whether it’s called “the leading function,” “interpersonal roles,” “human skills,” or “human resource management and networking activities,” it’s clear that managers need to develop their people skills if they’re going to be effective and successful in their job.

**Enter Organizational Behavior**

We’ve made the case for the importance of people skills. But neither this book nor the discipline upon which it is based is called People Skills. The term that is widely used to describe the discipline is Organizational Behavior.

**Organizational behavior** (frequently abbreviated as OB) is a field of study that investigates the impact that individuals, groups, and structure have on behavior within organizations for the purpose of applying such knowledge toward improving an organization’s effectiveness.
Carolyn Piecherowski’s problems began soon after she was promoted to controller of the Rosan Aerospace Fastener Division of Fairchild Corporation. Piecherowski, 45, had previously run an accounting department with eight subordinates but was used to issuing orders with little explanation. “I’d tell them, ‘Do it the way I say. Don’t worry about the whys.’” That style didn’t work in her new job. After subordinates loudly complained, Piecherowski’s boss took action. Did he reprimand her or consider replacing her? No! He hired an executive coach to help her improve her people skills.

The use of executive coaches to help managers improve their people skills is on the rise.

Companies such as Texaco, AT&T, American Express, Coca-Cola, CitiBank, Sun Microsystems, and Northern Telecom are finding that these coaches can polish up the interpersonal skills of managers whose technical skills they don’t want to lose. “Years ago, if you were good, you could get away with being abrasive,” says one coach. “Nowadays people don’t want to work with you.” These coaches charge from $5,000 for a half-dozen 90-minute sessions to $100,000 for consultations that can last two years and involve fact-finding interviews with dozens of colleagues, customers, and even families.

Who are candidates for this type of coaching? Some are recently promoted managers, like Carolyn Piecherowski, with limited experience.
The bulk of candidates, however, tend to be older white male bosses. They often adhere to command-and-control leadership styles that hinder their effectiveness, and they have difficulty overseeing workers under age 45 who are more diverse in terms of race, gender, and national origin.


---

**Take It to the Net**

We invite you to visit the Robbins page on the Prentice Hall Web site at:

http://www.prenhall.com/robbinsorgbeh

for this chapter’s World Wide Web exercise.

---

* ing such knowledge toward improving an organization’s effectiveness. That’s a lot of words, so let’s break it down.

Organizational behavior is a field of study. That statement means that it is a distinct area of expertise with a common body of knowledge. What does it study? It studies three determinants of behavior in organizations: individuals, groups, and structure. In addition, OB applies the knowledge gained about individuals, groups, and the effect of structure on behavior in order to make organizations work more effectively.
To sum up our definition, OB is concerned with the study of what people do in an organization and how that behavior affects the performance of the organization. And because OB is specifically concerned with employment-related situations, you should not be surprised to find that it emphasizes behavior as related to jobs, work, absenteeism, employment turnover, productivity, human performance, and management.

There is increasing agreement as to the components or topics that constitute the subject area of OB. Although there is still considerable debate as to the relative importance of each, there appears to be general agreement that OB includes the core topics of motivation, leader behavior and power, interpersonal communication, group structure and processes, learning, attitude development and perception, change processes, conflict, work design, and work stress.\(^{11}\)

Replacing Intuition with Systematic Study

Each of us is a student of behavior. Since our earliest years, we have watched the actions of others and have attempted to interpret what we see. Whether or not you have explicitly thought about it before, you have been “reading” people almost all your life. You watch what others do and try to explain to yourself why they have
engaged in their behavior. In addition, you have attempted to predict what they might do under different sets of conditions.

**Generalizations about Behavior**

You have already developed some generalizations that you find helpful in explaining and predicting what people do and will do. But how did you arrive at those generalizations? You did so by observing, sensing, asking, listening, and reading. That is, your understanding comes either directly from your own experience with things in the environment, or secondhand, through the experience of others.

How accurate are the generalizations that you hold? Some may represent extremely sophisticated appraisals of behavior and may prove highly effective in explaining and predicting the behavior of others. However, most of us also carry with us a number of beliefs that frequently fail to explain why people do what they do. To illustrate, let’s consider the following statements about work-related behavior:

1. Happy workers are productive workers.
2. All individuals are most productive when their boss is friendly, trusting, and approachable.

- Most of us carry with us a number of beliefs that frequently fail to explain why people do what they do.
3. The best leaders are those that exhibit consistent behavior, regardless of the situations they face.

4. Interviews are effective selection devices for separating job applicants who would be high-performing employees from those who would be low performers.

5. Everyone wants a challenging job.

6. You have to scare people a little to get them to do their jobs.

7. Because specific goals intimidate people, individuals work harder when asked just to do their best.

8. Everyone is motivated by money.

9. Most people are much more concerned with the size of their own salaries than with the size of other people’s salaries.

10. The most effective work groups are devoid of conflict.

How many of these statements do you think are true? For the most part, they’re all false, and we shall touch on each later in this text. But whether these statements are true or false is not really important at this time. What is important is to be aware that many of the views you hold concerning human behavior are based on intuition rather than fact. As a result, a systematic approach to the study of behavior can improve your explanatory and predictive abilities.
Consistency vs. Individual Differences

Casual or commonsense approaches to obtaining knowledge about human behavior are inadequate. In reading this text, you will discover that a systematic approach will uncover important facts and relationships and will provide a base from which more-accurate predictions of behavior can be made. Underlying this systematic approach is the belief that behavior is not random. It stems from and is directed toward some end that the individual believes, rightly or wrongly, is in his or her best interest.

Behavior generally is predictable if we know how the person perceived the situation and what is important to him or her. While people’s behavior may not appear to be rational to an outsider, there is reason to believe it usually is intended to be rational and it is seen as rational by them. An observer often sees behavior as nonrational because the observer does not have access to the same information or does not perceive the environment in the same way.13

Certainly there are differences between individuals. Placed in similar situations, all people don’t act exactly alike. However, there are certain fundamental consistencies underlying the behavior of all individuals that can be identified and then modified to reflect individual differences.
These fundamental consistencies are very important. Why? Because they allow predictability. When you get into your car, you make some definite and usually highly accurate predictions about how other people will behave. In North America, for instance, you would predict that other drivers will stop at stop signs and red lights, drive on the right side of the road, pass on your left, and not cross the solid double line on mountain roads. Notice that your predictions about the behavior of people behind the wheels of their cars are almost always correct. Obviously, the rules of driving make predictions about driving behavior fairly easy.

What may be less obvious is that there are rules (written and unwritten) in almost every setting. Therefore, it can be argued that it’s possible to predict behavior (undoubtedly, not always with 100 percent accuracy) in supermarkets, classrooms, doctors’ offices, elevators, and in most structured situations. For instance, do you turn around and face the doors when you get into an elevator? Almost everyone does. But did you ever read that you’re supposed to do this? Probably not! Just as I make predictions about automobile drivers (where there are definite rules of the road), I can make predictions about the behavior of people in elevators (where there are few written rules). In a class of sixty students, if you wanted to ask a question of the instructor, I predict that you would raise your hand. Why don’t you clap, stand up, raise your leg, cough, or yell “Hey,
over here!”? The reason is that you have learned that raising your hand is appropriate behavior in school. These examples support a major contention in this text: Behavior is generally predictable, and the systematic study of behavior is a means to making reasonably accurate predictions.

When we use the phrase systematic study, we mean looking at relationships, attempting to attribute causes and effects, and basing our conclusions on scientific evidence—that is, on data gathered under controlled conditions and measured and interpreted in a reasonably rigorous manner. (See Appendix B in the back of the book for a basic review of research methods used in studies of organizational behavior.)

Systematic study replaces intuition, or those “gut feelings” about “why I do what I do” and “what makes others tick.” Of course, a systematic approach does not mean that those things you have come to believe in an unsystematic way are necessarily incorrect. Some of the conclusions we make in this text, based on reasonably substantive research findings, will only support what you always knew was true. But you’ll also be exposed to research evidence that runs counter to what you may have thought was common sense. In fact, one of the challenges to teaching a subject like organizational behavior is to overcome the notion, held by many, that “it’s all common sense.”\(^{14}\) You’ll find that many of the so-called commonsense views you hold about human behavior are, on
closer examination, wrong. Moreover, what one person considers common sense frequently runs counter to another’s version of common sense. Are leaders born or made? What is it that motivates people at work nowadays? You probably have answers to such questions, and individuals who have not reviewed the research are likely to differ on their answers. The point is that one of the objectives of this text is to encourage you to move away from your intuitive views of behavior toward a systematic analysis, in the belief that such analysis will improve your accuracy in explaining and predicting behavior.

Challenges and Opportunities for OB

Understanding organizational behavior has never been more important for managers. A quick look at a few of the dramatic changes now taking place in organizations supports this claim. For instance, the typical employee is getting older; more and more women and nonwhites are in the workplace; corporate downsizing and cost cutting are severing the bonds of loyalty that historically tied many employees to their employers; and global competition is requiring employees to become more flexible and to learn to cope with rapid change.

In short, there are a lot of challenges and opportunities today for managers to use OB concepts. In this section, we review some of
the more critical issues confronting managers for which OB offers solutions—or at least some meaningful insights toward solutions.

The Creation of a Global Village

Twenty or thirty years ago, national borders acted to insulate most firms from foreign competitive pressures. At least three factors contributed to this insulation. First, politicians imposed heavy tariffs on imports, so it was difficult for firms to competitively sell goods outside their own country. Second, communist countries such as the Soviet Union, Poland, Hungary, and Yugoslavia were managed economies. Burdened by poor management systems and primitive manufacturing processes, firms in the Eastern bloc couldn’t compete on price or quality against products manufactured by firms in capitalist countries. And third, the labor force in many countries—specifically places such as Japan, Korea, Taiwan, and Malaysia—lacked the skills to produce high-quality products that could compete against those manufactured by North American and European workers.

Organizations are no longer constrained by national borders. Trading blocks such as NAFTA and the European Union have significantly reduced tariffs and barriers to trade; capitalism is rapidly replacing government control in Eastern European companies; and North America and Europe no longer have a monopoly on high-skilled labor.
The world has truly become a global village. Burger King is owned by a British firm, and McDonald’s sells hamburgers in Moscow. Exxon, a so-called American company, receives almost 75 percent of its revenues from sales outside the United States. Toyota makes cars in Kentucky; General Motors makes cars in Brazil; and Ford (which owns part of Mazda) transfers executives from Detroit to Japan to help Mazda manage its operations. The message? As multinational corporations develop operations worldwide, as companies develop joint ventures with foreign partners, and as workers increasingly chase job opportunities across national borders, managers have to become capable of working with people from different cultures.

Globalization affects a manager’s people skills in at least two ways. First, if you’re a manager you’re increasingly likely to find yourself in a foreign assignment. You’ll be transferred to your employer’s operating division or subsidiary in another country. Once there, you’ll have to manage a workforce that is likely to be very different in needs, aspirations, and attitudes from the ones you were used to back home. Second, even in your own country, you’re going to find yourself working with bosses, peers, and subordinates who were born and raised in different cultures. What motivates you may not motivate them. Your style of communication may be straightforward and open; they may find that style uncomfortable and threatening. If you’re going to be able to work effectively with
these people, you’ll need to understand their culture and how it has shaped them and to learn to adapt your management style. As we discuss OB concepts throughout this book, we’ll repeatedly focus on how cultural differences might require managers to modify their practices.

Psychologists at the Center for Creative Leadership systematically study the behavior of managers in a controlled environment. Through one-way glass, they observe, videotape, and evaluate managers leadership skills. They also gather data by surveying the managers and their co-workers, bosses, and subordinates. The goal of this scientific study: to teach managers how to lead others in their organizations effectively.
From “Everyone’s the Same” to Workforce Diversity

One of the most important and broad-based challenges currently facing organizations is adapting to people who are different. The term we use for describing this challenge is workforce diversity. Whereas globalization focuses on differences between people from different countries, workforce diversity addresses differences among people within given countries.

Workforce diversity means that organizations are becoming more heterogeneous in terms of gender, race, and ethnicity. But the term encompasses anyone who varies from the so-called norm. In addition to the more obvious groups—women, African Americans, Hispanic Americans, Asian Americans—it also includes the physically disabled, gays and lesbians, and the elderly. Moreover, it’s an issue in Canada, Australia, South Africa, Japan, and Europe as well as the United States. Managers in Canada and Australia, for instance, are having to adjust to large influxes of Asian workers. The “new” South Africa will increasingly be characterized by blacks’ holding important technical and managerial jobs. Women, long confined to low-paying temporary jobs in Japan, are moving into managerial positions. And the creation of the European Union cooperative trade arrangement, which opened up borders through-
out much of western Europe, has increased workforce diversity in organizations that operate in countries such as Germany, Portugal, Italy, and France.

We used to take a melting pot approach to differences in organizations, assuming people who were different would somehow automatically want to assimilate. But we now recognize that employees don’t set aside their cultural values and lifestyle preferences when they come to work. The challenge for organizations, therefore, is to make themselves more accommodating to diverse groups of people by addressing their different lifestyles, family needs, and work styles. The melting pot assumption is being replaced by one that recognizes and values differences.15

Haven’t organizations always included members of diverse groups? Yes, but they were a small percentage of the workforce and were, for the most part, ignored by large organizations. Moreover, it was assumed that these minorities would seek to blend in and assimilate. For instance, the bulk of the pre-1980s U.S. workforce were male Caucasians working full-time to support a nonemployed wife and school-aged children. Now such employees are the true minority! Currently, 45 percent of the U.S. labor force are women. Minorities and immigrants make up 22 percent.16 As a case in point, Hewlett-Packard’s workforce is 19 percent minorities and 40 percent women.17 A Digital Equipment Corp. plant in Boston provides a partial preview of the future. The factory’s 350 employees
include men and women from 44 countries who speak 19 languages. When plant management issues written announcements, they are printed in English, Chinese, French, Spanish, Portuguese, Vietnamese, and Haitian Creole.

Workforce diversity has important implications for management practice. Managers will need to shift their philosophy from treating everyone alike to recognizing differences and responding to those differences in ways that will ensure employee retention and greater productivity while, at the same time, not discriminating. This shift includes, for instance, providing diversity training and revamping benefit programs to make them more “family-friendly.” Diversity, if positively managed, can increase creativity and innovation in organizations as well as improve decision making by providing different perspectives on problems. When diversity is not managed properly, there is potential for higher turnover, more-difficult communication, and more interpersonal conflicts.

Toward Improving Quality and Productivity

Tom Rossi manages in a tough business. He runs a light bulb plant in Mattoon, Illinois, for General Electric. His business has seen tough competition from manufacturers in the United States, Europe, Japan, and even China. To survive, he has had to cut fat, increase productivity, and improve quality. And he has succeeded.
Over a recent five-year period, the Mattoon plant has averaged annual cost productivity improvements of approximately 8 percent. By focusing on continuous improvement, streamlining processes, and cutting costs GE’s Mattoon plant has remained viable and profitable.\(^\text{19}\)

More and more managers are confronting the challenges that Tom Rossi is facing. They are having to improve their organization’s productivity and the quality of the products and services they offer. Toward improving quality and productivity, they are implementing programs such as total quality management and reengineering—programs that require extensive employee involvement.

We discuss \textit{total quality management (TQM)} throughout this book. As Exhibit 1-3 describes, TQM is a philosophy of management that is driven by the constant attainment of customer satisfaction through the continuous improvement of all organizational processes.\(^\text{20}\) TQM has implications for OB because it requires employees to rethink what they do and become more involved in workplace decisions.

In times of rapid and dramatic change, it’s sometimes necessary to approach improving quality and productivity from the perspective of “How would we do things around here if we were starting over from scratch?” That, in essence, is the approach of \textit{reengineering}. It asks managers to reconsider how work would be done and their organization structured if they were starting over.\(^\text{21}\) To
1. **Intense focus on the customer.** The customer includes not only outsiders who buy the organization’s products or services but also internal customers (such as shipping or accounts payable personnel) who interact with and serve others in the organization.

2. **Concern for continuous improvement.** TQM is a commitment to never being satisfied. “Very good” is not good enough. Quality can always be improved.

3. **Improvement in the quality of everything the organization does.** TQM uses a very broad definition of quality. It relates not only to the final product but also to how the organization handles deliveries, how rapidly it responds to complaints, how politely the phones are answered, and the like.

4. **Accurate measurement.** TQM uses statistical techniques to measure every critical performance variable in the organization’s operations. These performance variables are then compared against standards or benchmarks to identify problems, the problems are traced to their roots, and the causes are eliminated.

5. **Empowerment of employees.** TQM involves the people on the line in the improvement process. Teams are widely used in TQM programs as empowerment vehicles for finding and solving problems.

---

**Exhibit 1-3 What Is Total Quality Management?**
illustrate the concept of reengineering, consider a manufacturer of roller skates. His product is essentially a shoe with wheels beneath it. The typical roller skate was a leather boot with shoelaces, attached to a steel platform that held four wooden wheels. If our manufacturer took a continuous improvement approach to change, he would look for small incremental improvements that he could introduce in his product. For instance, he might consider adding hooks to the upper part of the boot for speed lacing; or changing the weight of leather used for improved comfort; or using different ballbearings to make the wheels spin more smoothly. Now most of us are familiar with in-line skates. They represent a reengineering approach to roller skates. The goals was to come up with a skating device that could improve skating speed, mobility, and control. Rollerblades fulfilled those goals in a completely different type of shoe. The upper was made of injected plastic, made popular in skiing. Laces were replaced by easy-close clamps. And the four wooden wheels, set in pairs of two, were replaced by four to six in-line plastic wheels. The reengineered result, which didn’t look much like the traditional roller skate, proved universally superior. The rest, of course, is history. In-line skates have revolutionized the roller skate business.

Contemporary managers understand that, for any effort to improve quality and productivity to succeed, it must include their employees. These employees will not only be a major force in carrying out changes but increasingly will participate actively in plan-
ning them. OB offers important insights into helping managers work through those changes.

**Improving People Skills**

We opened this chapter by demonstrating how important people skills are to managerial effectiveness. We said, “This book has been written to help both managers and potential managers develop those people skills.”

As you proceed through this text, we present relevant concepts and theories that can help you explain and predict the behavior of people at work. In addition, you’ll also gain insights into specific people skills that you can use on the job. For instance, you’ll learn how to be an effective listener, the proper way to give performance feedback, how to delegate authority, and how to create effective teams. Moreover, you’ll have the opportunity to complete exercises that will give you insights into your own behavior, the behavior of others, and practice at improving your interpersonal skills.

**From Management Control to Empowerment**

If you pick up any popular business periodical nowadays, you’ll read about the reshaping of the relationship between managers and the people they are supposedly responsible for managing. You’ll find managers’ being called coaches, advisers, sponsors, or facilita-
In many organizations, employees have become associates or teammates. And there’s a blurring between the roles of managers and workers. Decision making is being pushed down to the operating level, where workers are being given the freedom to make choices about schedules, procedures, and solving work-related problems. In the 1980s, managers were encouraged to get their employees to participate in work-related decisions. Now, managers are going considerably further by allowing employees full control of their work. Self-managed teams, in which workers operate largely without bosses, have become the rage of the 1990s.

What’s going on is that managers are empowering employees. They are putting employees in charge of what they do. And in so doing, managers are having to learn how to give up control and employees are having to learn how to take responsibility for their work and make appropriate decisions. In later chapters of this book we show how empowerment is changing leadership styles, power relationships, the way work is designed, and the way organizations are structured.

**From Stability to Flexibility**

Managers have always been concerned with change. What’s different nowadays is the length of time between changes. It used to be that managers needed to introduce major change programs once or...
twice a decade. Today, change is an ongoing activity for most managers. The concept of continuous improvement, for instance, implies constant change.

In the past, managing could be characterized by long periods of stability, interrupted occasionally by short periods of change. Managing today would be more accurately described as long periods of ongoing change, interrupted occasionally by short periods of stability! The world that most managers and employees face today is one of permanent temporariness. The actual jobs that workers perform are in a permanent state of flux. So workers need to continually update their knowledge and skills to perform new job requirements. For example, production employees at companies such as Caterpillar, Chrysler, and Reynolds Metals now need to know how to operate computerized production equipment. That was not part of their job description 15 years ago. Work groups are also increasingly in a state of flux. In the past, employees were assigned to a specific work group, and that assignment was relatively permanent. There was a considerable amount of security in working with the same people day in and day out. That predictability has been replaced by temporary work groups, teams that include members from different departments and whose members change all the time, and the increased use of employee rotation to fill constantly changing work assignments. Finally, organizations themselves are in a state of flux. They continually reorganize their various divisions,
sell off poor-performing businesses, downsize operations, subcontract noncritical services and operations to other organizations, and replace permanent employees with temporaries.27

Today's managers and employees must learn to cope with temporariness. They have to learn to live with flexibility, spontaneity, and unpredictability. The study of OB can provide important insights into helping you better understand a work world of continual change, how to overcome resistance to change, and how best to create an organizational culture that thrives on change.

**Improving Ethical Behavior**

In an organizational world characterized by cutbacks, expectations of increasing worker productivity, and tough competition in the marketplace, it’s not altogether surprising that many employees feel pressured to cut corners, break rules, and engage in other questionable practices.

Members of organizations are increasingly finding themselves facing **ethical dilemmas**, situations in which they are required to define right and wrong conduct.28 For example, should they blow the whistle if they uncover illegal activities taking place in their company? Should they follow orders they don’t personally agree with? Do they give an inflated performance evaluation to an employee they like, knowing that such an evaluation could save
that employee’s job? Do they allow themselves to play politics in the organization if it will help their career advancement?

What constitutes good ethical behavior has never been clearly defined. And in recent years the line differentiating right from wrong has become even more blurred. Employees see people all around them engaging in unethical practices: Elected officials are indicted for padding their expense accounts or taking bribes; high-powered lawyers, who know the rules, are found to be avoiding payment of Social Security taxes for their household help; successful executives use insider information for personal financial gain; employees in other companies participate in massive cover-ups of defective military weapons. They hear these people, when caught, giving excuses like, “Everyone does it,” or “You have to seize every advantage nowadays,” or “I never thought I’d get caught.”

Managers and their organizations are responding to this problem from several directions. They’re writing and distributing codes of ethics to guide employees through ethical dilemmas. They’re offering seminars, workshops, and similar training programs to try to improve ethical behaviors. They’re providing in-house advisers who can be contacted, in many cases anonymously, for assistance in dealing with ethical issues. And they’re creating protection mechanisms for employees who reveal internal unethical practices.

◆ Today’s manager needs to create an ethically healthy climate for his or her employees, where they can do their work productively and confront a minimal degree of ambiguity regarding what constitutes right and wrong behavior.
Today’s manager needs to create an ethically healthy climate for his or her employees, where they can do their work productively and confront a minimal degree of ambiguity regarding what constitutes right and wrong behavior. We discuss ethics in several places in this book—for example, as it relates to decision making and politics in organizations. To help you define and establish your personal ethical standards, we include ethical dilemma exercises at the end of many chapters. By confronting ethical issues you might not have thought about before, and sharing your ideas with classmates, you can gain insights into your own ethical viewpoints, those of others, and the implications of various choices.

**Contributing Disciplines to the OB Field**

Organizational behavior is an applied behavioral science that is built upon contributions from a number of behavioral disciplines. The predominant areas are psychology, sociology, social psychology, anthropology, and political science. As we shall learn, psychology’s contributions have been mainly at the individual or micro level of analysis; the other four disciplines have contributed to our understanding of macro concepts such as group processes and organization. Exhibit 1-4 presents an overview of the major contributions to the study of organizational behavior.
Psychology

Psychology is the science that seeks to measure, explain, and sometimes change the behavior of humans and other animals. Psychologists concern themselves with studying and attempting to understand individual behavior. Those who have contributed and continue to add to the knowledge of OB are learning theorists, personality theorists, counseling psychologists, and, most important, industrial and organizational psychologists.

Early industrial and organizational psychologists concerned themselves with problems of fatigue, boredom, and other factors relevant to working conditions that could impede efficient work performance. More recently, their contributions have been expanded to include learning, perception, personality, training, leadership effectiveness, needs and motivational forces, job satisfaction, decision-making processes, performance appraisals, attitude measurement, employee selection techniques, work design, and job stress.

Sociology

Whereas psychologists focus on the individual, sociologists study the social system in which individuals fill their roles; that is, sociology studies people in relation to their fellow human beings. Specifically, sociologists have made their greatest contribution to

psychology
The science that seeks to measure, explain, and sometimes change the behavior of humans and other animals.

sociology
The study of people in relation to their fellow human beings.
OB through their study of group behavior in organizations, particularly in formal and complex organizations. Some of the areas within OB that have received valuable input from sociologists are group dynamics, design of work teams, organizational culture, formal organization theory and structure, organizational technology, communications, power, conflict, and intergroup behavior.

**Social Psychology**

**Social psychology** is an area within psychology, but it blends concepts from psychology and sociology. It focuses on the influence of people on one another. One of the major areas receiving considerable investigation from social psychologists has been change—how to implement it and how to reduce barriers to its acceptance. In addition, social psychologists are making significant contributions in the areas of measuring, understanding, and changing attitudes; communication patterns; the ways in which group activities can satisfy individual needs; and group decision-making processes.

**Anthropology**

**Anthropology** is the study of societies to learn about human beings and their activities. Anthropologists’ work on cultures and environments, for instance, has helped us understand differences in
fundamental values, attitudes, and behavior between people in different countries and within different organizations. Much of our current understanding of organizational culture, organizational environments, and differences between national cultures is the result of the work of anthropologists or researchers using their methodologies.31

Political Science

Although frequently overlooked, the contributions of political scientists are significant to the understanding of behavior in organizations. Political science studies the behavior of individuals and groups within a political environment. Specific topics of concern include structuring of conflict, allocation of power, and how people manipulate power for individual self-interest.

Thirty years ago, little of what political scientists were studying was of interest to students of organizational behavior. But times have changed. We have become increasingly aware that organizations are political entities; if we are to be able to accurately explain and predict the behavior of people in organizations, we need to bring a political perspective to our analysis.
There Are Few Absolutes in OB

There are few, if any, simple and universal principles that explain organizational behavior. There are laws in the physical sciences—chemistry, astronomy, physics—that are consistent and apply in a wide range of situations. They allow scientists to generalize about the pull of gravity or to confidently send astronauts into space to repair satellites. But as one noted behavioral researcher aptly concluded, “God gave all the easy problems to the physicists.” Human beings are complex. Because they are not alike, our ability to make simple, accurate, and sweeping generalizations is limited. Two people often act very differently in the same situation, and the same person’s behavior changes in different situations. For instance, not everyone is motivated by money, and you behave differently at church on Sunday than you did at the beer party the night before.

That doesn’t mean, of course, that we can’t offer reasonably accurate explanations of human behavior or make valid predictions. It does mean, however, that OB concepts must reflect situational, or contingency, conditions. We can say that $x$ leads to $y$, but only under conditions specified in $z$ (the contingency variables). The science of OB was developed by using general concepts and then altering their application to the particular situation. So, for example, OB scholars would avoid stating that effective leaders should always

**contingency variables**

Situational factors; variables that moderate the relationship between the independent and dependent variables and improve the correlation.
seek the ideas of their subordinates before making a decision. Rather, we shall find that in some situations a participative style is clearly superior, but, in other situations, an autocratic decision style is more effective. In other words, the effectiveness of a particular leadership style is contingent upon the situation in which it is used.

As you proceed through this text, you’ll encounter a wealth of research-based theories about how people behave in organizations. But don’t expect to find a lot of straightforward cause-and-effect relationships. There aren’t many! Organizational behavior theories mirror the subject matter with which they deal. People are complex and complicated, and so too must be the theories developed to explain their actions.

Consistent with the contingency philosophy, point-counterpoint debates are provided at the conclusion of each chapter. These debates are included to reinforce the fact that within the OB field there are many issues over which there is significant disagreement. Directly addressing some of the more controversial issues using the point-counterpoint format gives you the opportunity to explore different points of view, discover how diverse perspectives complement and oppose each other, and gain insight into some of the debates currently taking place within the OB field.32

So at the end of one chapter, you’ll find the argument that leadership plays an important role in an organization’s attaining its goals, followed by the argument that there is little evidence to sup-
port that claim. Similarly, at the end of other chapters, you’ll read both sides of the debate on whether money is a motivator, clear communication is always desirable, and other controversial issues. These arguments are meant to demonstrate that OB, like many disciplines, has disagreements over specific findings, methods, and theories. Some of the point-counterpoint arguments are more provocative than others, but each makes some valid points that you should find thought-provoking. The key is to be able to decipher under what conditions each argument may be right or wrong.

**Coming Attractions: Developing an OB Model**

We conclude this chapter by presenting a general model that defines the field of OB, stakes out its parameters, and identifies its primary dependent and independent variables. The end result will be a “coming attraction” of the topics making up the remainder of this book.

**An Overview**

A **model** is an abstraction of reality, a simplified representation of some real-world phenomenon. A mannequin in a retail store is a

◆ “There are three levels of analysis in OB, and, as we move from the individual level to the group level to the organization systems level, we add systematically to our understanding of behavior in organizations.”
model. So, too, is the accountant’s formula: Assets = Liabilities + Owners’ Equity. Exhibit 1-7 presents the skeleton on which we will construct our OB model. It proposes that there are three levels of analysis in OB and that, as we move from the individual level to the organization systems level, we add systematically to our understanding of behavior in organizations. The three basic levels are analogous to building blocks; each level is constructed upon the previous level. Group concepts grow out of the foundation laid in the individual section; we overlay structural constraints on the individual and group in order to arrive at organizational behavior.
The Dependent Variables

**Dependent variables** are the key factors that you want to explain or predict and that are affected by some other factor. What are the primary dependent variables in OB? Scholars tend to emphasize productivity, absenteeism, turnover, and job satisfaction. Because of their wide acceptance, we shall use those four as the critical dependent variables in an organization’s human resources effectiveness. However, there is nothing magical about these dependent variables. They merely show that OB research has strongly reflected managerial interests over those of individuals or of society as a whole. Let’s review those terms to ensure that we understand what they mean and why they have achieved the distinction of being OB’s primary dependent variables.

**PRODUCTIVITY** An organization is productive if it achieves its goals and does so by transferring inputs to outputs at the lowest cost. As such, **productivity** implies a concern for both **effectiveness** and **efficiency**.

A hospital, for example, is **effective** when it successfully meets the needs of its clientele. It is **efficient** when it can do so at a low cost. If a hospital manages to achieve higher output from its present staff by reducing the average number of days a patient is confined to a bed or by increasing the number of staff-patient contacts per day, we say that the hospital has gained productive efficiency. A
business firm is effective when it attains its sales or market share goals, but its productivity also depends on achieving those goals efficiently. Measures of such efficiency may include return on investment, profit per dollar of sales, and output per hour of labor.

We can also look at productivity from the perspective of the individual employee. Take the cases of Mike and Al, who are both long-distance truckers. If Mike is supposed to haul his fully loaded rig from New York to its destination in Los Angeles in 75 hours or less, he is effective if he makes the 3,000-mile trip within that time period. But measures of productivity must take into account the costs incurred in reaching the goal. That’s where efficiency comes in. Let’s assume that Mike made the New York to Los Angeles run in 68 hours and averaged 7 miles per gallon. Al, on the other hand, made the trip in 68 hours also but averaged 9 miles per gallon (rigs and loads are identical). Both Mike and Al were effective—they accomplished their goal—but Al was more efficient than Mike because his rig consumed less gas and, therefore, he achieved his goal at a lower cost.

In summary, one of OB’s major concerns is productivity. We want to know what factors will influence the effectiveness and efficiency of individuals, of groups, and of the overall organization.

**ABSENTEEISM**  The annual cost of **absenteeism** has been estimated at over $40 billion for U.S. organizations and $12 billion for **absenteeism**  Failure to report to work.
Canadian firms. In Germany, absences cost industrial firms more than 60 billion Deutschmarks (U.S.$35.5 billion) each year. At the job level, a one-day absence by a clerical worker can cost a U.S. employer up to $100 in reduced efficiency and increased supervisory workload. These figures indicate the importance to an organization of keeping absenteeism low.

It is obviously difficult for an organization to operate smoothly and to attain its objectives if employees fail to report to their jobs. The work flow is disrupted, and often important decisions must be delayed. In organizations that rely heavily upon assembly-line production, absenteeism can be considerably more than a disruption; it can result in a drastic reduction in quality of output, and, in some cases, it can bring about a complete shutdown of the production facility. But levels of absenteeism beyond the normal range in any organization have a direct impact on that organization’s effectiveness and efficiency.

Are all absences bad? Probably not! Although most absences have a negative impact on the organization, we can conceive of situations in which the organization may benefit by an employee’s voluntarily choosing not to come to work. For instance, illness, fatigue, or excess stress can significantly decrease an employee’s productivity. In jobs in which an employee needs to be alert—surgeons and airline pilots are obvious examples—it may well be better for the organization if the employee does not report to work.
rather than show up and perform poorly. The cost of an accident in such jobs could be prohibitive. Even in managerial jobs, where mistakes are less spectacular, performance may be improved when managers absent themselves from work rather than make a poor decision under stress. But these examples are clearly atypical. For the most part, we can assume that organizations benefit when employee absenteeism is low.

**TURNOVER**  A high rate of **turnover** in an organization results in high recruiting, selection, and training costs. How high are those costs? A conservative estimate would be about $15,000 per employee. A high rate of turnover can also disrupt the efficient running of an organization when knowledgeable and experienced personnel leave and replacements must be found and prepared to assume positions of responsibility.

All organizations, of course, have some turnover. If the “right” people are leaving the organization—the marginal and submarginal employees—turnover can be positive. It may create the opportunity to replace an underperforming individual with someone who has higher skills or motivation, open up increased opportunities for promotions, and add new and fresh ideas to the organization. And in today’s changing world of work, reasonable levels of employee-initiated turnover facilitate organizational flexibility.
and employee independence, and they can lessen the need for management-initiated layoffs.

But turnover often involves the loss of people the organization doesn’t want to lose. For instance, one study covering 900 employees who had resigned their jobs found that ninety-two percent earned performance ratings of “satisfactory” or better from their superiors. So when turnover is excessive, or when it involves valuable performers, it can be a disruptive factor, hindering the organization’s effectiveness.

**JOB SATISFACTION** The final dependent variable we will look at is **job satisfaction**, which we define simply, at this point, as the difference between the amount of rewards workers receive and the amount they believe they should receive. (We expand considerably on that definition in Chapter 4.) Unlike the previous three variables, job satisfaction represents an attitude rather than a behavior. Why, then, has it become a primary dependent variable? For two reasons: its demonstrated relationship to performance factors and the value preferences held by many OB researchers.

The belief that satisfied employees are more productive than dissatisfied employees has been a basic tenet among managers for years. Although much evidence questions that assumed causal relationship, it can be argued that advanced societies should be concerned not only with the quantity of life—that is, concerns such as

**job satisfaction** A general attitude toward one's job; the difference between the amount of rewards workers receive and the amount they believe they should receive.
Companies are coming up with creative ways to increase job satisfaction. One way that Autodesk, a San Rafael, California-based software developer, keeps its employees satisfied is by allowing them to bring their dogs to work. The practice helps Autodesk maintain a loyal and motivated work force that rates high on job satisfaction and productivity and low on turnover. Autodesk’s dog lovers are shown here with their pets during lunchtime.

higher productivity and material acquisitions—but also with its quality. Those researchers with strong humanistic values argue that satisfaction is a legitimate objective of an organization. Not only is satisfaction negatively related to absenteeism and turnover, but, they argue, organizations have a responsibility to provide employees with jobs that are challenging and intrinsically rewarding. Therefore, although job satisfaction represents an attitude rather than a behavior, OB researchers typically consider it an important dependent variable.
The Independent Variables

What are the major determinants of productivity, absenteeism, turnover, and job satisfaction? Our answer to that question brings us to the **independent variables**. Consistent with our belief that organizational behavior can best be understood when viewed essentially as a set of increasingly complex building blocks, the base, or first level, of our model lies in understanding individual behavior.

**INDIVIDUAL-LEVEL VARIABLES**  It has been said that “managers, unlike parents, must work with used, not new, human beings—human beings whom others have gotten to first.” When individuals enter an organization, they are a bit like used cars. Each is different. Some are “low-mileage” — they have been treated carefully and have had only limited exposure to the realities of the elements. Others are “well-worn,” having been driven over some rough roads. This metaphor indicates that people enter organizations with certain characteristics that will influence their behavior at work. The more obvious of these are personal or biographical characteristics such as age, gender, and marital status; personality characteristics; values and attitudes; and basic ability levels. These characteristics are essentially intact when an individual enters the workforce, and, for the most part, there is little management can do to alter them. Yet they have a very real impact on employee behavior. Therefore, each of these factors—biographical characteristics, personality, val-
ues and attitudes, and ability—will be discussed as independent variables in chapters 2 and 4.

There are four other individual-level variables that have been shown to affect employee behavior: perception, individual decision making, learning, and motivation. Those topics will be introduced and discussed in chapters 2, 3, 5, and 6.

**GROUP-LEVEL VARIABLES**  The behavior of people in groups is more than the sum total of all the individuals acting in their own way. The complexity of our model is increased when we acknowledge that people’s behavior when they are in groups is different from their behavior when they are alone. Therefore, the next step in the development of an understanding of OB is the study of group behavior.

Chapter 7 lays the foundation for an understanding of the dynamics of group behavior. That chapter discusses how individuals in groups are influenced by the patterns of behavior they are expected to exhibit, what the group considers to be acceptable standards of behavior, and the degree to which group members are attracted to each other. Chapter 8 translates our understanding of groups to the design of effective work teams. Chapters 9 through 12 demonstrate how communication patterns, leadership styles, power and politics, intergroup relations, and levels of conflict affect group behavior.
Organizational behavior reaches its highest level of sophistication when we add formal structure to our previous knowledge of individual and group behavior. Just as groups are more than the sum of their individual members, so are organizations more than the sum of their member groups. The design of the formal organization, work processes, and jobs; the organization’s human resource policies and practices (that is, selection processes, training programs, performance appraisal methods); and the internal culture all have an impact on the dependent variables. These are discussed in detail in chapters 13 through 16.

**Toward a Contingency OB Model**

Our final model is shown in Exhibit 1-8. It shows the four key dependent variables and a large number of independent variables, organized by level of analysis, that research indicates have varying effects on the former. As complicated as this model is, it still does not do justice to the complexity of the OB subject matter, but it should help explain why the chapters in this book are arranged as they are and help you to explain and predict the behavior of people at work.

For the most part, our model does not explicitly identify the vast number of contingency variables because of the tremendous complexity that would be involved in such a diagram. Rather,
throughout this text we shall introduce important contingency variables that will improve the explanatory linkage between the independent and dependent variables in our OB model.

Note that we have included the concepts of change and stress in Exhibit 1-8, acknowledging the dynamics of behavior and the fact that work stress is an individual, group, and organizational issue. Specifically, in chapter 17 we will discuss the change process, ways to manage organizational change, key change issues for management in the 1990s, consequences of work stress, and techniques for managing stress.

Also note that Exhibit 1-8 includes linkages between the three levels of analysis. For instance, organization structure is linked to leadership. This link is meant to convey that authority and leadership are related; management exerts its influence on group behavior through leadership. Similarly, communication is the means by which individuals transmit information; thus, it is the link between individual and group behavior.

**Summary and Implications for Managers**

Managers need to develop their interpersonal, or people, skills if they are going to be effective in their jobs. Organizational behavior (OB) is a field of study that investigates the impact that individuals, groups, and structure have on behavior within an organization, and
then it applies that knowledge to make organizations work more effectively. Specifically, OB focuses on how to improve productivity, reduce absenteeism and turnover, and increase employee job satisfaction.

We all hold generalizations about the behavior of people. Some of our generalizations may provide valid insights into human behavior, but many are erroneous. Organizational behavior uses systematic study to improve predictions of behavior that would be made from intuition alone. But, because people are different, we need to look at OB in a contingency framework, using situational variables to moderate cause-effect relationships.

Organizational behavior offers both challenges and opportunities for managers. It recognizes differences and helps managers to see the value of workforce diversity and practices that may need to be changed when managing in different countries. It can help improve quality and employee productivity by showing managers how to empower their people as well as how to design and implement change programs. It offers specific insights to improve a manager’s people skills. In times of rapid and ongoing change—what most managers face today—OB can help managers learn to cope in a world of temporariness and to manage a workforce that has undergone the trauma of downsizing. Finally, OB can offer managers guidance in creating an ethically healthy work climate.
For Review

1. “Behavior generally is predictable.” Do you agree or disagree? Explain.

2. Define organizational behavior. Relate it to management.

3. What is an organization? Is the family unit an organization? Explain.

4. Identify and contrast the three general management roles.

5. What is TQM? How is it related to OB?

6. In what areas has psychology contributed to OB? Sociology? Social psychology? Anthropology? Political science? What other academic disciplines may have contributed to OB?

7. “Behavior is generally predictable, so there is no need to formally study OB.” Why is that statement wrong?

8. What are the three levels of analysis in our OB model? Are they related? If so, how?

9. If job satisfaction is not a behavior, why is it considered an important dependent variable?

10. What are effectiveness and efficiency, and how are they related to organizational behavior?
For Discussion

1. Contrast the research comparing effective managers with successful managers. What are the implications from the research for practicing managers?

2. “The best way to view OB is through a contingency approach.” Build an argument to support that statement.

3. Why do you think the subject of OB might be criticized as being “only common sense,” when one would rarely hear such a criticism of a course in physics or statistics?

4. Millions of workers have lost their jobs because of downsizing. At the same time, many organizations are complaining that they can’t find people to fill vacancies. How do you explain this apparent contradiction?

5. On a scale of 1 to 10 that measures the sophistication of a scientific discipline in predicting phenomena, mathematical physics would probably be a 10. Where do you think OB would fall on the scale? Why?
The Case for a Structural Explanation of Organizational Behavior

If you want to really understand the behavior of people at work, you need to focus on social structure. Why? As one noted scholar put it, “The fundamental fact of social life is precisely that it is social—that human beings do not live in isolation but associate with other human beings.”*

Far too much emphasis is placed on studying individual characteristics of people. We’re not saying here that values, attitudes, personalities, and similar personal characteristics are irrelevant to understanding organizational behavior. Rather, our position is that you gain considerably more insight if you look at the structured relationships between individuals in organizations and how those relationships constrain certain actions and enable others to occur.

Organizations come with a host of formal and informal control mechanisms that, in effect, largely shape, direct, and constrain members’ behavior. Let’s look at a few examples.

Almost all organizations have formal documentation that limits and shapes behavior. This includes things such as policies, procedures, rules, job descriptions, and job instructions. This formal documentation sets standards of acceptable and unacceptable behavior. If you know an organization’s major policies and have a copy of a specific employee’s job description, you have a major leg up in being able to predict a good deal of that specific employee’s on-the-job behavior.

Almost all organizations differentiate roles horizontally. By that I mean, they create unique jobs and departments. Toni is a sales representative for H.J. Heinz, calling on supermarkets. Frank also works for Heinz, but on an assembly line, where he monitors machines that fill pickle relish jars. The structure of these jobs alone allows me to predict that Toni will have a great deal more autonomy in deciding what she is going to do in her job and how she is going to do it than does Frank.

Organizations also differentiate roles vertically by creating levels of management. In so doing, they create boss-subordinate relation-
ships that constrain subordinate behavior. In our nonwork lives we don’t have “bosses” who can tell us what to do, evaluate us, and even fire us. But most of us do at work. And remember, bosses evaluate employee performance and typically control the allocation of rewards. So if I know what behaviors your boss prefers, I can gain insight into what behaviors you are most likely to exhibit.

When you join an organization, you are expected to adapt to its norms of acceptable behavior. The “rules” don’t have to be written down to be powerful and controlling. An organization, for instance, may not have a formal dress code, but employees are expected to “dress appropriately”—which means adapting to the implied dress code norms. Merrill Lynch expects its brokers to dress appropriately: Men wear coats and ties and women wear similarly professional attire. Along the same lines, Microsoft’s norms emphasize long work hours—60 to 70 hour workweeks are not unusual. These expectations are understood by employees, and employees modify their behavior accordingly.

The point is that you shouldn’t forget the organizational part of organizational behavior. It doesn’t sound very nice, but organizations are instruments of domination. They put people into job “boxes” that constrain what they can do and individuals with whom they can interact. To the degree that employees accept their boss’s authority and the limits the organization places on their role, then that authority and those limits become constraints on the behavioral choices of organization members.


The Case for a Psychological Explanation of Organizational Behavior

The concept of an “organization” is an artificial notion. Organizations have physical properties, such as buildings, offices, and equipment, that tend to obscure the obvious fact that organizations are really nothing other than aggregates of individuals. As such, organizational actions are just the combined actions of individuals. In this section, we will argue that much of organizational behavior can be viewed as the collection of efforts by a set of quasi-independent actors.

Let me begin by acknowledging that organizations place constraints on employee behavior. But, despite those constraints, every job possesses a degree of discretion—areas in which rules, procedures, job descriptions, supervisory directives, and other formal constraints do not apply. Generally speaking, the higher one moves in the organization, the more discretion he or she has. Lower-level jobs tend to be more programmed than middle-management jobs; and middle managers have less discretion than do senior managers. But every job comes with some autonomy. And it is that autonomy that allows different people to do different things in the same job.

Casual observation leads all of us to the obvious conclusion that no two people in the same job behave in exactly the same way. Even in highly programmed jobs, such as assembly-line work in an automobile factory or processing claims in an insurance company, employee behavior varies. Why? Individual differences! College students certainly understand and act on this reality when they choose classes. If three instructors are all teaching Accounting 101 at the same time of day, most students will question their friends to find out the differences between the instructors. Even though they teach the same course as described in the college catalog, the instructors enjoy a considerable degree of freedom in how they meet their course objectives. Students know that, and they try to acquire accurate information that will allow them to select among the three. So despite the fact that the instructors are teaching the same course and the
content of that course is explicitly defined in the organization’s formal documentation (the college catalog), the students (and all the rest of us) know that the behavior of the three instructors will vary widely.

People go about doing their jobs in different ways. They differ in their interactions with their bosses and coworkers. They vary in terms of work habits—promptness in completing tasks, conscientiousness in doing quality work, cooperation with coworkers, ability to handle stressful situations, and the like. They vary by level of motivation and the degree of effort they are willing to exert on their job. They vary in terms of the creativity they display in doing their work. And they vary in terms of the importance they place on factors such as security, recognition, advancement, social support, challenging work assignments, and willingness to work overtime. What explains the variations? Individual psychological characteristics such as values, attitudes, perceptions, motives, and personalities.

The end result is that, in the quest to understand employee productivity, absenteeism, turnover, and satisfaction, you have to recognize the overwhelming influence that individual psychological factors play.

Learning About Yourself Exercise

How Does Your Ethical Behavior Rate?

Below are 15 statements. Identify the frequency with which you do, have done, or would do these things in the future when employed full-time. Place the letter R, O, S, or N on the line before each statement.

R = regularly; O = occasionally; S = seldom; N = never

___ 1. I come to work late and get paid for it.
___ 2. I leave work early and get paid for it.
___ 3. I take long breaks/lunches and get paid for it.
___ 4. I call in sick to get a day off when I’m not sick.
___ 5. I use the company phone to make personal long-distance calls.
___ 6. I do personal work on company time.
___ 7. I use the company copier for personal use.
___ 8. I mail personal things through the company mail.
___ 9. I take home company supplies or merchandise.
___10. I give company supplies or merchandise to friends, or I allow friends to take them without saying anything.
___11. I put in for reimbursement for meals that I did not actually eat, or trips that I did not take, or other fabricated expenses.
12. I use the company car for personal business.
13. I take my spouse/friend out to eat and charge it to the company expense account.
14. I take my spouse/friend on business trips and charge the expense to the company.
15. I accept gifts from customers/suppliers in exchange for giving them business.

Turn to page 1477 for scoring directions and key.


---

**Working With Others Exercise**

**Workforce Diversity Exercise**

**Purpose** To learn about the different needs of a diverse workforce.

**Time required** Approximately 40 minutes.

**Participants and roles** Divide the class into six groups of approximately equal size. Each group is assigned one of the following roles:

- **Nancy** is 28 years old. She is a divorced mother of three children, aged 3, 5, and 7. She is the
department head. She earns $37,000 a year on her job and receives another $3,600 a year in child support from her ex-husband.

*Ethel* is a 72-year-old widow. She works twenty-five hours a week to supplement her $8,000 annual pension. Including her hourly wage of $7.50, she earns $17,750 a year.

*John* is a 34-year-old black male born in Trinidad who is now a U.S. resident. He is married and the father of two small children. John attends college at night and is within a year of earning his bachelor’s degree. His salary is $24,000 a year. His wife is an attorney and earns approximately $44,000 a year.

*Lu* is a 26-year-old physically impaired male Asian American. He is single and has a master’s degree in education. Lu is paralyzed and confined to a wheelchair as a result of an auto accident. He earns $29,000 a year.

*Maria* is a single 22-year-old Hispanic. Born and raised in Mexico, she came to the United States only three months ago. Maria’s English needs considerable improvement. She earns $18,000 a year.
Mike is a 16-year-old white male high school sophomore who works fifteen hours a week after school and during vacations. He earns $6.25 an hour, or approximately $4,875 a year.

The members of each group are to assume the character consistent with their assigned role.

Background

Our six participants work for a company that has recently installed a flexible benefits program. Instead of the traditional “one benefit package fits all,” the company is allocating an additional 25 percent of each employee’s annual pay to be used for discretionary benefits. Those benefits and their annual cost are listed below.

Supplementary health care for employee:
Plan A (No deductible and pays 90%) = $3,000
Plan B ($200 deductible and pays 80%) = $2,000
Plan C ($1,000 deductible and pays 70%) = $500

Supplementary health care for dependents (same deductibles and percentages as above):
Plan A = $2,000
Plan B = $1,500
Plan C = $500

Supplementary dental plan = $500
Life insurance:
Plan A ($25,000 coverage) = $500
Plan B ($50,000 coverage) = $1,000
Plan C ($100,000 coverage) = $2,000
Plan D ($250,000 coverage) = $3,000

Mental health plan = $500
Prepaid legal assistance = $300

Vacation = 2% of annual pay for each week, up to 6 weeks a year

Pension at retirement equal to approximately 50% of final annual earnings = $1,500

4-day workweek during the three summer months (available only to full-time employees) = 4% of annual pay

Day-care services (after company contribution) $2,000 for all of an employee’s children, regardless of number

Company-provided transportation to and from work = $750

College tuition reimbursement = $1,000
Language class tuition reimbursement = $500

**The Task 1.** Each group has 15 minutes to develop a flexible benefits package that consumes 25 percent (and no more!) of their character’s pay.
2. After completing step 1, each group appoints a spokesperson who describes to the entire class the benefits package they have arrived at for their character.

3. The entire class then discusses the results. How did the needs, concerns, and problems of each participant influence the group’s decision? What do the results suggest for trying to motivate a diverse workforce?

Special thanks to Professor Penny Wright (San Diego State University) for her suggestions during the development of this exercise.

**Thanks for 24-Years of Service. Now Here’s the Door!**

Russ McDonald graduated from the University of Michigan with his MBA in 1969. He had numerous job offers but chose General Motors for several reasons. The automobile industry offered terrific career opportunities, and GM was the world’s number one car manufacturer. Salaries at GM were among the highest in corporate America. And a job at GM provided unparalleled security. A white-collar job with GM was the closest anybody could come to permanent employment, outside of working for the federal government.

Russ began his career at GM as a cost analyst at the company’s Fisher Body division in Detroit. From there he proceeded through a
long sequence of increased job responsibilities. By his 20th anniversary with the company he had risen to the position of assistant vice president of finance in the corporate treasury department. His salary was $124,000 a year. And, in a good year, he could expect a bonus of anywhere from $10,000 to $25,000. But those bonuses had become increasingly rare, because GM’s profitability had declined throughout the 1980s. Increased foreign competition, aggressive action by Ford and Chrysler, and GM’s slow response to change had resulted in a serious erosion in the company’s market position. When Russ joined the company, nearly one out of every two new cars sold in the United States was a GM product. By the late 1980s, that number was down to one in four. As a result, GM’s management was taking drastic action to try to stop its decline in market share. It was closing inefficient plants, reorganizing divisions, introducing new production technologies, and making huge cuts in its staff. Tens of thousands of white-collar positions were eliminated. One of those was Russ McDonald’s job. In the summer of 1993, less than a year short of his 25th anniversary with GM, he was given the opportunity to take early retirement. Russ saw the handwriting on the wall. If he didn’t take early retirement, it would only be a matter of time—maybe a year or two at best—and he would be pushed out, and with a less attractive severance package. So he took the company’s offer: nine months’ pay plus lifetime health benefits for him and his family. Russ tried to put a positive
spin on the situation. Maybe this was a blessing in disguise. He was only 49 years old. He had 24 years of experience with one of the world’s foremost corporations. He would land on his feet with a company that was growing and offered opportunities that no longer existed at GM.

Russ’s optimism had pretty well faded by New Year’s Day of 1996. He had been out of work for nearly 30 months. He had responded to dozens of employment ads. He had sent out more than 200 résumés. He had talked with several executive recruiting firms. And he had spent more than $7,000 on employment counseling. All for naught. What he kept hearing was that his experience wasn’t relevant to today’s workplace; there were no opportunities in large companies; small companies wanted people who were flexible, and they considered corporate types like Russ as “mentally rigid”. Even if there was a job for which Russ was qualified, he would have to take at least a 50 percent cut in pay, and employers were very uncomfortable offering someone such a relatively low salary; they figured Russ would be demotivated and likely to “jump ship” at the first opportunity.

Questions

1. How valid do you think the comments are that Russ is hearing?
2. If you were a small business executive in need of someone with extensive financial experience, would you consider Russ? Explain your position.
3. What suggestions might you make to Russ to help him find suitable employment?

David Vincent’s New Career

Since 1990, 8,400 logging jobs have disappeared in Oregon. More efficient ways of tree cutting have pushed a lot of lumbermen out of the forest. One of those pushed out is 40-year-old David Vincent. Rather than seeking another logging job, David has decided to retrain for a completely new career. He’s enrolled in a nursing program at his local community college.

“I get teased some,” says David. “Nursing is a woman’s occupation—or perceived that way. And my old lumberjack friends ask me if I question my masculinity.” But David is a realist. He wants a future and he realizes there isn’t much of one for him in the logging business. “The reality of my situation is I have to survive. I have to adapt. The timber industry is on the skids; there’s no work there for me anymore. And what I have to do is I’m going to have to adapt. I have to figure out a way of making a living and get on with my life.”

One place where there does seem to be opportunity is in health care. Since 1990, there are more than 6,000 new jobs in the Oregon health care industry. And David is determined to get one of them.

David isn’t alone in his retraining efforts. Globalization, technology, and other forces are changing job structures and opportu-
nities. Millions of Americans are doing what David is doing—retraining for new careers. Young Americans face the possibility of five, six, or seven different careers in their lifetime. For David Vincent, nursing will be his fourth.

For those workers who are afraid of change, unable to demonstrate flexibility, or unwilling to participate in retraining, their future may indeed be bleak.

Questions

1. What does this case say about the changing workforce?
2. What kind of personal attributes do you think would be related to success in the job of a logger? How about in the job of a nurse?
3. To what degree do you think your responses to question 2 are stereotypical?
4. How flexible do you think most people are in retraining for new careers? Discuss.

Robert (Rob) Panco is 37 years old. He is now a management consultant. Along the way to his current position, Rob’s had some interesting work experiences, and he’s been kind enough to share some of them with us. Specifically, he reflects on his career path as well as the challenges and problems related to OB that he encountered in his career.

You should find this progressive case (which appears at the end of each section of this book), valuable for at least two reasons. First, it will help you integrate many of the OB concepts introduced in this book. Unfortunately, textbooks have to be linear—moving sequentially through an artificially created set of independent chapters. The real world, however, is a juggling act of overlapping and highly interdependent activities. This case will make this interdependence clearer and help demonstrate how individual, group, and organization-system factors overlap. Second, this progressive case will show you the applicability of OB concepts to actual management practice. Most textbook examples or cases are short and designed to illustrate only one or two points. As an integrated and progressive story, the Rob Panco case will show you how one real-life manager has dealt with dozens of OB issues.

Figure I-1 provides a brief description of Rob Panco’s background and career progression. But résumés leave a lot out. So let’s begin by learning a bit about Rob’s early life and career experiences.

If you had asked Rob during his senior year in high school what he planned on doing with his life, he’d have answered: “I’m going to be a professional musician.” Toward that end, he had trained as a string bass player. When he went off to college—Duquesne University in Pittsburgh—it was with the intention to pursue his music interests. But things don’t always work out as planned. During his first year, Rob came face to face with reality: There were lots of string bass players more talented than he was. If he pursued his passion, he could be a music teacher at best. Rob wanted more so he decided to change majors. He chose to work toward a degree in business, with specialization in marketing and management.
Why pursue a career in business? Rob wasn’t sure. It might have been the influence of his father, who opened a State Farm insurance agency after spending 22 years in the U.S. Navy. Or it might have been the positive experiences he’d had working part-time in high school. From the age of 14 to 18, Rob worked evenings, weekends, and summers at a weekly newspaper. “I took the job initially to make money. I wanted to buy a $1400 string bass.” He started by sweeping floors and washing presses. But, over time, he learned most of the jobs at the paper. For instance, he set type, pasted up ads, and perfected the skills of maintaining complex printing equipment. After graduating from high school, Rob continued working summers at the newspaper.

During his undergraduate college years, Rob gained experience selling shoes at Tom McAn, working in a Hallmark card store, and in similar jobs. It wasn’t unusual for him to carry 18 units and work...
30 hours a week during the school year. (He needed the money, but he also enjoyed working.) Rob also assumed leadership roles in campus activities. He was on the Student Activity Board (SAB) and single-handedly fought to bring jazz concerts to campus. These concerts eventually became one of the SAB’s few profit-making enterprises. But Rob’s heavy schedule had a price. “My grades were never as high as they should have been,” says Rob. “I was a B student when I should have been making A’s.”

After earning his undergraduate degree, and facing a weak job market, Rob entered graduate school to work on an MBA. Again, he combined studying with an outside job. In his first year, he spent 20 hours a week supervising students at the university’s Student Union. In his second year, he spent 30 hours a week working in the university’s Small Business Development Center. Both these jobs were valuable because they allowed Rob to apply what he was learning in his MBA program. Clearly, a pattern was emerging. This was a guy who wasn’t happy unless he was keeping very busy.

Rob stayed at the Small Business Development Center for two years after earning his MBA. Then he left for a job at AT&T in New Jersey. In his first job there, he did market research on new products. After six months, he got his first promotion. A year later, he was chosen to head a temporary market-research project team made up of five peers. “This was a very challenging job,” says Rob. “These people worked under my direction but reported to their departmental bosses. I had no real authority, yet I was responsible for the project. Ironically, it was a lot like my experience in running concerts in college. The people I oversaw were all volunteers. Managing peers and volunteers is very similar.”

Rob’s success in managing this project team led to his nomination and selection to AT&T’s Leadership Continuity Program. This is a select group of individuals who show promise for significantly higher managerial responsibilities. As part of this program, Rob linked up with a senior executive who would become an informal mentor, participated in two continuing education programs a year, and gained favored status on future job assignments. In May 1989, Rob was transferred to Maryland as a senior marketing manager. Eighteen months later he returned to New Jersey as a project manager.

In October 1992, Rob joined M.E. Aslett Corp. as the company’s business manager. Aslett is a small New Jersey-based packager of educational and professional reference books. It handles book projects
from conception all the way up to, but excluding, the printing stage. Aslett’s clients include Grolier Encyclopedia, World Book International, Prentice Hall, Harcourt Brace, and McGraw Hill. Seven months later, he took over as general manager where he oversaw the firm’s operations—the production manager, network administrator, copy editors, proofreaders, desktop publishers, and color separators all reported directly to him.

When asked about his philosophy toward managing people, Rob says “You can’t take honesty away. Don’t mislead people. Be open and tell the truth.” But he also mentions something that occasionally gets him into trouble: “I assume that other people love their work as much as I do. I like to learn, to keep moving forward. For instance, I set self-improvement goals for myself every quarter. I sometimes forget that other people aren’t like me.”

The comment that “other people aren’t like me” prompted questions about workforce diversity at Aslett. “We had more women working there than men.” Rob said, “and several of our people were single parents. In addition, we employed a couple of people from Great Britain, an African-American, and a Jamaican. For a company with only 20 people, I think we had a pretty diverse group.”

When asked about his career goals, Rob’s answer wasn’t totally surprising. “I want to grow. I want to learn new things. I like working hard, but as long as I’m learning, I enjoy it. I want to do things that are fun.” His current management consulting activities seem to fit well with his goal of continual learning.

Questions

1. How do you think Rob’s early life experiences have influenced his career choices and his philosophy toward managing people?
2. Review Rob’s last job at Aslett in terms of managerial functions, roles, and skills.
3. What challenges might Rob have faced with his diverse work force at Aslett that he might not have had to deal with if he had a homogeneous work force?
4. What do you think Rob meant when he said that “managing peers and volunteers is very similar”?

*Some facts, incidences, and quotes included in this progressive case have been slightly modified by the author to enhance student discussion and analysis.