

Leadership (MANAGEMENT 423)

Fuqua School of Business, Duke University
Fall, 2006 – Term 2

Instructor

Professor Allan Lind

Office: FSB Academic Building 209, voice 919-660-7849, fax 919-681-6244, allan.lind@duke.edu

Office Hours: By Appointment

Course Overview

This course addresses leadership as a topic separate from management. Effective leadership involves setting a tone, a focus, and a direction for an organization, its members, and other stakeholders. In contrast, effective management involves executing against the direction and tone set by the leadership. Individuals are not either leaders or managers, but a mixture of leadership and management, and the exact mix depends upon the situation, the role and the person.

The purpose of this course is to provide opportunities for reflection, study, debate, and practice that provide students with a context within which they can learn about leadership – both their own leadership and more general principles of effective leadership. Thus, this is a course for students who wish to take the time and exert the effort required to confront and reflect on their own leadership strengths and weaknesses.

Using a recently developed model of leadership (“The Pyramid Model of Leadership”) to examine issues from a variety of perspectives on leadership, the course will examine six core topics representing the model’s six domains of leadership (personal leadership, relational leadership, contextual leadership, inspirational leadership, supportive leadership, and Ethical leadership). The course will examine how the domains relate to each other, the effects of each domain on followers, and what actions individuals can take to assess leadership and to enhance their own awareness of what each domain involves and how to improve their skills with respect to it. The course will also examine how the effective application of different configurations of these domains is contingent upon the specific characteristics of different leadership situations (for example, we will look at leading in new organizations, leading in times of crisis, and leading M&A or other change processes). The course will conclude by examining how leadership teams can be most effectively formed to ensure that all six leadership domains are appropriately reflected within the team.

Teams

Some of the coursework will be team-based and some will be individual. Teams will not be assigned – students will be able to form their own, self-selected teams of 5-6 members. ***The first team assignment (see “Team Case Analyses” below) is due in Session 3, so you will need to form your teams quickly and register your team members electronically via the Internet. Note: Instructions and URLs for identifying your team and submitting your assignments are included in the coursepack.***

Course Requirements and Grading

Each class session will involve a combination of lecture and discussion, reading articles, preparing cases, and doing some experiential/skill-focused exercises. Reflection journals are an important part of the course and will be required; reflection assignments are described in the syllabus below. Some cases will not require advance preparation but will be based on in-class video-based material. All “required” assignments (including readings and cases) should be prepared before class. Cases and readings that are “required” will be included in the course pack. Other readings that are listed as “recommended” will be available on reserve in the library for those who are interested in pursuing the topic in more depth.

Grades will be computed based on ongoing preparation for and contribution to individual class sessions -- participation (10%), reflection journal assignments (5%), peer coaching (5%) and team case analyses (5%). There will also be two major assignments -- a team leadership case (35%) and an individual leadership action plan (40%).

These assignments are specifically designed to be cumulative – the reflection journals provide a basis for doing the individual leadership analysis paper, and the team case analyses will help the major team assignment. Lower weights are given to earlier assignments – so you can build up your understanding of the model and your ability to apply it over time and across a number of assignments and opportunities for feedback.

Participation. Courses are not only about your individual learning but also about how you contribute to the learning of your classmates. Participation grades will reflect your contribution to the overall class and to your team. I am not looking for “right” answers but expect you to grapple with the material in the class and its implications for your own leadership effectiveness. If you come to class, contribute to our discussions, pull your weight in teamwork, and try to seriously wrestle with the implications of the course material for yourself and your organization, then you have nothing to worry about concerning this portion of your grade.

Reflection Journals. For the first part of the course, where we introduce the domain of the model, each student will be required to turn in reflection journal notes on how each domain relates to his/her own strengths and weaknesses, lingering questions, plans for action, etc. Each student will receive 360 feedback data that can be analyzed and used in this assignment. The idea is to be able to take each piece of the leadership puzzle that we review in class and immediately apply it to understanding your own strengths and weaknesses, how you might try to improve – in other words to both gain personal insight and also to better understand the model in practical terms.

Reflection Journal Summaries: As we examine each domain in class, reflection journal summaries will be due according to the schedule listed below under “Reflection Journal Deadlines.” These will be turned in electronically. Although there are no length requirements or limitations, to reflect in sufficient depth, I would expect that the journal length will range from 1-3 pages for each of the six domains. I also expect that the 360 data will be analyzed and form part of the basis for reflection journal.

Grading: The reflection journals will be graded only in terms of whether they are submitted on time.

Reflection Journal Deadlines: Reflection Journals will be due electronically by 11:59pm on the date specified below. No late submissions (without prior approval) will be accepted.

Personal – due Sunday, November 5th

Relational – due Wednesday, November 8th

Contextual – due Sunday, November 12th

Inspirational – due Sunday, November 19th (extra time being given because of team paper due date)

Supportive – due Sunday, November 26th

Ethical – due Wednesday, November 29th

Electronic Submission of Reflection Journals: *Instructions and URLs for submitting your reflection journal assignments are included in your coursepack.*

Peer Coaching. As explained below, the most effective way to use the team 360 instrument in the course is to work with a classmate to interpret the results. You will receive an extra 5% for serving as a peer coach. This is an all-or-nothing grade; you either get this 5% or not, depending on whether you have served as a peer coach. (If you have trouble finding someone to coach, let the instructor know *early* in the class; alternative assignments can be made.) If the person you coach feels you made a real effort to help interpret the 360, he or she will submit a certification to that effect before the end of the term. No additional credit will be given for serving as a peer coach for more than one person. Peer coaching certifications are due by 11:59pm Thursday, November 30th—send your certification to me by e-mail.

Team Case Analyses. For a number of class sessions during the course there is a team case assignment. For these assignments, each team will prepare and turn in a brief analysis (the equivalent of 3-4 detailed power point slides) at the beginning of class when a case analysis is due. These analyses will be submitted in two ways -- electronically prior to class and a hard copy will be given to the instructor at the start of class. As described previously, electronic submission of the individual and team assignments will be accomplished via the Internet. *Instructions and URLs for identifying your team and submitting your assignments are included in your coursepack.* Team assignments should be submitted by only one team member (and should be submitted by the beginning of class)—however, all team members can access and review each submission by clicking on the submission link and then clicking on the

submitted file to download it. Each session, one team will be asked to present their analysis to the class. Like the reflection journals, these assignments are graded solely in terms of whether they are submitted on time.

Major Assignment 1 – Team Paper – Analyzing a Leadership Case. Each team will prepare a leadership case study (approx 3000 words) that describes a leader in terms of the domains of the model. This is an opportunity to explore in some depth a leader you particularly admire or dislike or just think may be interesting – and you wish to understand the leader more deeply. This assignment can take the form of a “teaching case” or be more purely analytical – but it must assess the leader’s strengths and weaknesses along the domains used in class and ground that analysis in facts. Specific guidelines for preparing the assignment and how it will be graded are included in the course pack. All team members will receive the same grade for the team assignment. Electronic copies of team papers and PowerPoint slides will be due by midnight (11:59pm to be precise) on Wednesday, November 15th. Electronic submission of this team assignment is accomplished in the same manner as Team Case Analyses.

Major Assignment 2 – Individual Paper – The Individual Action Plan (IAP). Individual action plans should typically be no more than 2500 words, but length can vary tremendously depending upon what you are planning. These assignments are not about famous leaders, but about applying what we have learned to your own leadership in an immediate and concrete way that meets a real need for you and/or your organization. Building on our analyses of various cases in class, your 360 feedback, your reflection journal, and your team’s analysis of a leader, the goal here is for you to apply the material from across the class to yourself. Focus on planning for a current or future leadership effort. Your paper will involve briefly explaining the situation and the leadership requirements. Then, using the material from the course, analyze what you might do and why, analyze what issues or problems you anticipate, how you plan to address them, and why those planned actions are the right course to take. Although this is an action plan, it must be clear how you have used the course material to do the planning. One piece of material you will be expected to use is your 360 feedback – thus, preparation of the reflection journals and using the coaching feedback along the way are intended to make this project assignment cumulative and very practically useful.

Although I specify a target length above, depending upon the nature of your project, this assignment can take quite varied forms. However, ideally it would involve an analysis of the situation, the leadership requirements of the situation, your strengths and weaknesses, and what you plan to do (this last part could include draft documents, speeches, notes for action, a memo to your boss, etc). This assignment is due Friday, December 8th at 9am. Electronic submission of the Individual Action Plan assignment is accomplished in a manner similar to that used for the Team assignments. Again, the URL for submitting this assignment is included in your coursepack.

Late assignments. You will be penalized 20% of the earned grade for each day a major assignment is late. The journal submission and team case analysis assignments will not receive credit (that is, your overall grade for this portion of the course will decline to a degree proportional to the number of such assignments) if submitted late. (If exceptional circumstances arise, let me know and we may be able to work out an alternative arrangement for you to avoid these penalties).

360 Feedback

General Description. The course includes a 360-survey (the team version of the Multiple Domain Leadership Instrument) that will allow you to assess your leadership skills. The MDLI allows presents assessments from the perspective of you yourself and from the perspective of your teammates. This survey allows you to assess your leadership in a way that is tied directly to the course. This makes the course more personally relevant and actionable. It will take a little time to coordinate survey respondents, so students should initiate this process as soon as you can—the survey is available from the first day of classes onwards. The instrument has been designed to map onto the Leadership Pyramid framework, and thus is intended to make the issues discussed in class more personally relevant in terms of personal insight and action implications.

A core focus of the course is helping you to use your own ideas, vision, and aptitudes to become a more effective leader. The “Leadership Pyramid 360 Instrument” is the beginning of this introspective process. The survey assesses your leadership style across six core domains and can be used to gain invaluable information about how you lead. Since it focuses on your leadership actions, not your personal traits, it raises issues you can work on.

The minimum requirement is that each student complete the instrument on themselves. Obtaining feedback from others (people with whom you have worked or are working on team projects) is not required but is **strongly** encouraged to gain the most from the feedback. *You should ask 3-5 people who have worked with you on team projects to complete the survey. You can ask people who worked with you in other contexts and who can evaluate your leadership skills to rate you using the “other rater” category.*

Using the Results. You can use results from this instrument to identify your strengths and weaknesses as a leader, develop a plan for working on your leadership, and apply these insights to specific issues of interest to you. This 360 instrument has been used very successfully with both seasoned senior executives and younger middle managers. Its success for you depends on how much you are willing to be reflective and to push yourself. The 360 instrument can be a key part of this process, so I hope you will utilize it fully.

Peer Coaching. A key element in working your way through the 360 results is finding someone in the course to serve as a guide, sounding board, and support person. Peer coaches are expected to spend several hours on their task.

Information About Confidentiality. You can assure your raters that you will never see their individual ratings, as we have worked hard to develop systems that truly assure individual confidentiality.

The Process of Collecting the Data

Step 1: Filling out the Survey. Web site information and technical instructions for the survey will be sent by CEBE (Fuqua’s Center for Effective Business Education) to all enrolled students in an e-mail. You will use the web site to: 1) evaluate yourself, 2) enter the names and e-mail addresses of your respondents so that they can access the site, and 3) view your results. *If you have not received an email about commencing the 360 process by the end of the first day of classes, contact the instructor and Kelly Umstead (our 360 technical guru for this course) immediately. Kelly can be contacted at <kku@mail.duke.edu>*

Step 2: Selecting Raters and Discussing the Deadline and Confidentiality with your Raters. As noted above, you should ask 3-5 persons to rate your team leadership—you should select people who have worked with you on team projects in the not-too-distant past. You do **not** need to select people from teams you have formally lead—the instrument is designed to assess informal, as well as formal, leadership actions in teams. I suggest contacting personally the people you would like to ask to provide evaluations in order to make sure they are willing and able to do the evaluations in the next few days. You might stress to them that responses are anonymous and confidential. We report to you only averages on the ratings by teammates, so you will not know who gave what rating. Also, any comments that your respondents make on the survey will be shown without telling you who entered the comment, but the comment will be reported exactly as they had been entered by the respondent. *You should not just select people you have had good working relationships with—select both people you got along with well and those you did not, so that you can get a good general picture of how you lead in teams.*

The MDLI also offers you an additional rater category, “other raters.” You can use the “Other Rater” category to ask for leadership ratings from people who have had an opportunity to observe your leadership but who were not your Fuqua teammates. If you want to get ratings of your leadership from people you work with outside of school or from people you worked with in the past in an employment setting, this is the category to use for them.

Once you have entered the name and address of a rater, he or she will be contacted directly by CEBE and asked to complete the MDLI on you.

Step 3: Accessing Results. An email from CEBE to each student in the course will provide detailed technical instructions for this entirely web-based survey. Its web-based design allows the survey to be filled out remotely, easily, and confidentially.

Additional Recommended Materials

Additional recommended materials – readings, videos, etc – will be on reserve in the library. If you have a favorite leadership reading or video to recommend, let me know and I will try to add it to our arsenal.

Honor Code

The Fuqua School of Business Honor Code and Learning Partnership apply to all course activities. All individual assignments must be completed by you yourself and all team assignments must be completed by the members of the team, without the aid of other individuals. You are encouraged to conduct research beyond course materials, but you must not use helpers or any write-ups prepared by current or previous students, or case notes prepared by other students or instructors at Fuqua or at other universities. In general you are expected to do your own work on individual projects and to do your share of the work on team projects. With the exception of the individual paper and team case assignments, all class assignments may be discussed with others freely. If you wish to consult with others about the written individual and team assignments and are unsure if it would be a violation of the Honor Code, consult with the instructor.

Answers to Questions and Discussion of Problems

You should feel free to contact me at the email, phone or fax numbers listed above if you have any questions about the course, readings, assignments, or any other course-related matter. (Email is probably the quickest way to reach me.) In particular, if you have a problem meeting an assignment deadline, it is always best to discuss this and explore options before the deadline, rather than after. Of course, if you have any questions about your grade or are concerned about any of these course requirements, please contact me.

Course Outline and Assignments

Session 1 (Monday, October 23): What is Leadership? The Pyramid Model of Leadership

Required Reading:

The six domains of leadership: An Overview of a New Model for Developing and Assessing Leadership Qualities. Sim Sitkin & Allan Lind. (Chapel Hill, NC: Delta Leadership Inc., 2006)

Management versus leadership. John Kotter. From Leading change (Boston: Harvard Business School Press, 1996, pp 25-31)

Case for Week 1:

Martin Luther King: The man and the dream. (Video to be viewed outside of class; available from the library. See the MLK viewing guide.)

Case Questions (MLK):

1. Can you classify Dr. King's leadership into the Six Domains model?
2. What effects of his leadership did you see?

Session 2 (Thursday, October 26): Personal Leadership Domain

Required Reading:

Why should anyone be led by you? Robert Goffee & Gareth Jones. Harvard Business Review, September-October, 2000, 63-70. Reprint 5890.

The personal domain of leadership. Allan Lind & Sim Sitkin. (Chapel Hill, NC: Delta Leadership Inc. 2006)

Case:

Peter Browning & Continental Whitecap (A) (HBSP 9-486-090)

Team Assignment:

Prepare a PowerPoint summary (approx 3-4 slides in length should be sufficient) of your analysis of the Peter Browning case questions (below). You will need to turn in one hard copy (or bring your slides on a flash drive) of the analyses in class on Thursday, October 26th (and one electronically by the beginning of class), so be sure you bring copies for each team member and one extra to turn in. One team may be asked to briefly present their results, so have yours ready and a team member identified to present.

Case Questions (Peter Browning):

1. What kind of personal attributes does Peter Browning bring to his difficult assignment? Which of these will help him and which may be an obstacle? How can he project his leadership qualities appropriately?
2. What does Browning see as the key problem(s)? What is his vision – and how can he develop his vision for Whitecap?
3. Projecting a leader's characteristics is an important part of the leader-follower relationship, but it depends upon actually understanding who you are projecting to and what they can and should feel from you as a leader. How well has Browning projected his leadership qualities in a way that is tailored to the various stakeholders he must deal with?
4. If you were in Browning's position, what would you do? Describe the resources you would draw on and the key actions you would take.

Case Questions (MLK):

3. Think specifically about Dr. King's personal leadership. What examples can you give of each of the three subdomains of personal leadership: Capacity building, authenticity, and dedication?

Session 3 (Monday, October 30): Relational Leadership Domain**Required Reading:**

Enlist others. James Kouzes and Barry Posner. From The Leadership Challenge (2002, Ch 6, pp 141-170)

Cases:

Negotiating Corporate Change (video case; shown in class)

Hoosiers (video case to be viewed outside of class; available in library)

Case Question (Hoosiers):

1. Coach Dale has a very different experience base than his kids do. He has been involved at the very top levels of college basketball whereas his kids are just simple farm boys. What does he do not only to try to understand and connect with these kids, but also to let them know that he has done so?
2. What are the key actions he takes to truly establish a relationship with them?

Session 4 (Thursday, November 2): Contextual Leadership**Required Reading:**

Building an innovation factory. Andrew Hargadon and Robert Sutton. Harvard Business Review, May-June, 2000, pp 157-166. Reprint R00304.

Cases:

Jack Welch at GE (video case shown in previous class)

IDEO: The Deep Dive (in class video case)

Team Assignment:

Prepare a PowerPoint summary (approx 3-4 slides in length should be sufficient) of your analysis of the Jack Welch video case. You will need to turn in one copy of the analyses (hard copy or flash drive and electronic submission), so be sure you bring copies for each team member and one extra to turn in. One team may be asked to briefly present their results, so have your analysis ready and a team member identified to present. Due Thursday, November 2nd.

Case Question (Hoosiers):

3. Contextual leadership is about focusing, prioritizing, and clarifying. How does Coach Dale do that for his team's members? How does he do it in first shaping the team, and then again how does he do late in the film when the team is preparing for the championship game?

Case Questions (Jack Welch):

1. What was most striking about Welch's leadership, when you examine his messages over a long period of time?
2. What stayed consistent?
3. What changed?
4. If contextual leadership is about providing a sense of coherent focus, what did Welch do well or poorly in terms of this criterion

Session 5 (Monday, November 6): Inspirational Leadership**Required Reading:**

Inspiring others: The language of leadership. Jay Conger. Academy of Management Executive, Vol. 5(1), 31-45.

Case:

Dead Poets Society (video case viewed outside of class)

Team Assignment:

Prepare a powerpoint summary (approx 2-4 pgs in length should be sufficient) of your analysis of the video case (case questions include the one below and those listed for 11/9). The slides should address both the question below and the questions for supportive leadership, but the assignment is due before the inspirational leadership class. You will need to turn in one copy of the analyses, so be sure you bring copies for each team member and one extra to turn in. One team per video case will be asked to briefly present their results, so have yours ready and a team member identified to present.

Case Questions (Dead Poets Society):

1. Clearly English teacher John Keating (the Robin Williams character) was a very inspiring individual. How exactly did he inspire his students?

Session 6 (Thursday, November 9): Supportive Leadership**Required Reading:**

The work of leadership. Ronald Heifetz, & Donald Laurie. Harvard Business Review, January-February, 1997, pp 124-134. Reprint 4150.

Case:

Dead Poets Society (video case viewed outside of class)

Case Questions (Dead Poets Society)

2. How would you assess Mr. Keating as a supportive leader for his students? What were his strengths and weaknesses as a supportive leader?
3. How did the students lead each other (be specific)? Was all the “supportive” feedback favorable or what those being led wanted or asked for?

Session 7 (Monday, November 13): Ethical Leadership

Readings:

Leaders learn to heed the voice within. Stratford Sherman. *Fortune*, August 22, 1994.

Leadership when there is no one to ask: An interview with ENI's Franco Bernabe. *Harvard Business Review*, July-August, 1998.

Cases:

Hotel Rwanda (video case to be viewed outside of class)

Meg Whitman at eBay Inc (A) (HBSP 9-401-024)

Team Assignment:

Prepare the equivalent of a detailed PowerPoint summary (approx 3-4 pages in length should be sufficient) of your analysis of the Meg Whitman case questions (below). You will need to turn in one hard copy of the analysis in class (or bring your slides on a flash drive)--(plus one electronically--so be sure you bring copies for each team member and one extra to turn in. One team will be asked to briefly present their results, so have yours on transparencies and a team member ready to present. Due Monday, November 13th.

Case Questions (Meg Whitman at eBay):

1. Whitman's challenge in the e-Bay case is to interpret what is the right thing for the company to do. How does she do this?
2. Different people describing e-Bay might have different views of the key element of its culture and purpose. What do you think of Whitman's view?
3. Effective stewardship involves planning for future leaders. How can one “grow” new leaders?
4. Sometimes company goals come in conflict with community goals. In cases like these, do good leaders always promote the company interest? Why or why not?

Case Questions (Hotel Rwanda):

1. Paul Rusesabagina finds himself in a leadership position with tremendous consequences for his family and his followers. What leadership actions did you see as he got his charges to the hotel and as he worked to keep them safe?
2. Rusesabagina uses bribery, ordinarily a violation of ethical business practices, and he had to decide whether this and other actions that seemed to favor those who were supporting the genocide were things that he could reconcile with his personal values. What do you think of his decisions?

Session 8 (Thursday, November 16): Leadership Decisions; Leading in the Middle

Required Reading:

We don't need another hero. Joseph L. Badaracco. *Harvard Business Review*, Sept. 2001. Reprint #R0108H.

Case:

Hotel Rwanda (video to be viewed outside of class)

Band of Brothers: Breaking Point (this video, an episode of the Band of Brothers HBO series, is optional, but it is a good example of the problems of leading when those above are incompetent)

Case questions (Hotel Rwanda):

3. What were the bases of Rusesabagina's decisions? Was he following proper decision analysis rules? Should he have been?
4. Rusesabagina is leading in the middle in a number of ways—he is positioned between his superiors in Sabrina in Belgium and the staff, and he is between the government and his charges. How effective is he in leading within the constraints he has? What strengths and weaknesses did he show?

Consideration questions (Breaking Point):

1. Sergeant Lipton was faced with a difficult task as he tried to lead his men while coping with Lt. Dike's incompetence. How well do you think he did? What did he do right? What did he do wrong? Which leadership domains did he excel in?
2. It's easy to dismiss Dike as just a bad leader, out of his depth in commanding Easy Company, but it is more instructive to think about why he failed. What do you think was the source of Lt. Dike's problems?
3. Capt. Winters was also trying to lead in the middle, in his case he was caught between his responsibilities to Easy Company and the demands of higher command that he keep Lt. Dike on the job. How did he resolve the dilemma? What did he do right and what did he do wrong as a leader?
4. There are two other leaders in the episode whose reactions to leadership are worth considering. What did you think of Lt. Compton (who broke under his leadership responsibilities) and Lt. Spiers (who advanced his leadership persona in interesting ways)? What lessons can we take from their leadership actions?

Session 9 (Monday, November 20): Crisis Leadership

Required Reading:

Leading through rough times: An interview with Novell's Eric Schmidt. Bronwyn Fryer. Harvard Business Review; May, 2001, 117-123. Reprint R0105H.

September 11, 2001. Rudolph Giuliani. In Leadership, New York: Miramax Books, 2002, pp 3-26

Case:

Apollo 13 (video case to be viewed outside of class)

Team Assignment:

Prepare the equivalent of a detailed PowerPoint summary (approx 3-4 pages in length should be sufficient) of your analysis of the *Apollo 13* case questions (below). You will need to turn in one hard copy of the analysis in class (plus one electronically), so be sure you bring copies for each team member and one extra to turn in. One team will be asked to briefly present their results. Due Monday, November 20th.

Case Questions:

1. For Gene Krantz, Jim Lovell and others, identify examples of leading down, leading laterally and leading up. Be specific both about what the behavior was. Try to identify at least two examples for each of the 6 leadership dimensions.
2. Which aspects of leadership were most important, in your view, to the success of the mission?
 - a. What aspects of the leadership context created before the crisis were most important?
 - b. What aspects of leading after the accident were most important?

Session 10 (Monday, November 27): Effective Leadership Teams – Co-Leadership

Individual Assignment to Complete Prior to Class:

Through news articles or personal contact, find a leadership team (two or more people) and try to determine the extent to which the strengths of the team's members complement each other to enhance functioning. Do they work effectively together? How?

Reading:

When two (or more) heads are better than one. James O'Toole, Jay Galbraith & Edward Lawler. California Management Review, Vol. 44 (4), Summer 2002, 65-83.
Co-leadership. David Sally. California Management Review, Vol. 44 (4), Summer 2002, 84-99.

Case:

Nervewire (in-class video case)

Session 11 (Thursday, November 30): Gender, Culture, and Leadership

Reading:

Ways Women Lead. Judy B. Rosener. Harvard Business Review, November-December, 1990. Reprint #90608.

Case: *Whale Rider* (video case to be viewed outside of class)

Team Assignment:

Prepare the equivalent of a detailed PowerPoint summary (approx 3-4 pages in length should be sufficient) of your analysis of the *Whale Rider* case questions (below). You will need to turn in one hard copy of the analysis in class (plus one electronically), so be sure you bring copies for each team member and one extra to turn in. One team will be asked to briefly present their results. Due Thursday, November 30th.

Case questions:

- 1) Gender differences in leadership styles are sometimes more evident in traditional societies like the Maori whanau shown in the movie. Obviously Pai is trying to break through the gender barrier and lead in a traditionally male role. What is her strategy? How would you contrast her approach to the more traditional female leadership behavior shown by Nanny Flowers?
- 2) As the film shows, it is hard to change traditional cultural definitions of what a leader needs to be. Put the gender issue aside for a moment and think of what Koro was looking for and what Pai was giving in terms of the leadership pyramid. What domains seem to be the key to understanding Maori leadership?
- 3) There is an undertone of spirituality in the film--the Maori believe that leadership comes from one's spiritual power or *mana*, which is linked to ancestry and courageous accomplishments, but which also involves being connected spiritually with the land and the sea. What did you see in the film that reflects this belief?

Session 12 (Monday, December 4): Change Leadership

Reading:

Right away and all at once: How we saved Continental. Greg Brenneman. Harvard Business Review, September-October, 1998, 2-12. Reprint X98503.

Case:

Glory (video case to be viewed outside of class)

Team Assignment:

Prepare the equivalent of a 2-4 page powerpoint summary of your analysis of the *Glory* case questions (below). You will need to turn in one copy of the analyses, so be sure you bring copies for each team member and one extra

to turn in. One team will be asked to briefly present their results, so have yours ready and a team member identified to present. Due Monday, December 4th.

1. What were the obstacles to change and how were they overcome? What was needed in the situation and what strengths and weaknesses did Col. Robert Gould Shaw bring to the situation?
2. For Shaw, Sgt. Maj. John Rawlins, and others, identify examples of leading down, leading laterally and leading up.
3. Be specific both about what the behavior was. Try to identify at least two examples for each of the 6 leadership dimensions.