

Case analysis: goodman company

[Business](#), [Leadership](#)



Case Analysis: Goodman Company Problem Statement - How did the sudden adoption of a newly conceived production process, aimed at increasing efficiency, affect the performance of workers at Goodman Company? How come some workers thrived while others buckled under the new system?

Analysis - The president of the company sought to hire a production analyst so as to increase efficiency at the plant. He viewed their future to be promising if they could keep up production to meet increased demands. - Ann Bennet, the new production analyst, chose to streamline the process, whereby work was broken down according to tasks, hoping to make it more efficient. - The shift supervisors were not involved in Ms. Bennett's and the president's plan. They were more or less given orders to implement the new plan effective immediately, thereby not taking into account problems on the floor, or issues workers or supervisors had with the plan. Had they been involved in the planning stages, they could have communicated the pros and cons of adopting the new plan. - As a result, each shift accepted and reacted to the change differently. - The new plan was poorly implemented within the 1st shift. They were resistant to adapt to change as most workers on this shift were long time employees in their 50s. Their supervisor had been with the company a very long time. He continued to approach his job the same way he did ever since he started there. He also seemed to be ready to wind down and spent a lot of time researching his ideal retirement location. There was considerable disappointment among workers over the company not sharing profits, as they believed they were more productive than the other shifts. The employees in the 1st shift did not enjoy camaraderie outside work. They went their separate ways after work. The new plan required

teamwork to be successful. These employees worked independently prior to the transition and did not understand sharing responsibilities. Additionally no training was given to facilitate this understanding. Employees clearly were not motivated prior to the adoption of the new process. After the implementation of the new plan, all of the above factors contributed to their decreased performance. - In the 2nd shift, the supervisor had no interaction with his employees and as a group leader it is necessary to interact continuously with group members. When he was appointed supervisor, the group did not readily accept him and he did not socialize but rather believed that they should do their work. Therefore they were reluctant to speak to him on any problems that they encountered. They preferred to speak with Jim Fask, who was a senior member of the group with a lot of experience, but had no formal authority on them. The supervisor attributed poor performance of his shift to the new plan and to Jim Fask's removal from the group. He did not think communicating with members would stimulate them. - Employees in the 3rd shift were well informed about the new process. They spent enough time familiarizing themselves with the changes. The supervisor was friendly and encouraged ideas. He enabled each person to be an operator and therefore tried to keep boredom at bay. They socialized outside work and got along well with each other. They understood teamwork and often chose to work in groups. The group realized that the more efficient they made the process the more time they had to enjoy a little free time. Therefore they were able to outperform the other shifts. - Lack of communication in the 1st and 2nd shifts led employees being less committed. Workers were not motivated towards goals. Goals were not

communicated to them in this case. - Therefore lack of communication, leadership skills, not involving supervisors in decision making all led to factors affecting productivity adversely. Conclusions - 1st shift workers seemed dissatisfied and lacked motivation before the new process was implemented. After the new plan was implemented they didn't welcome the change, the supervisor himself was not thrilled about it and didn't initiate any advise to them. This resulted in poor performance and increased job dissatisfaction. - 2nd shift workers lacked a good leader. Their supervisor was not disturbed by the fact that his employees did not communicate with him much and was comfortable with the fact that they spoke about all issues to a senior member of the team. - Workers in the 3rd shift seemed to survive the transition, as they were pro-active, flexible, and challenged one another. Their supervisor encouraged them and prepared them well for the changes that were to come. Recommendations - Goals must be clearly communicated to all members of the organization. This enables them understand what is expected of them and the importance of their involvement to accomplish them. - Prepare employees for change. Change is inevitable. Employees must be given enough training to familiarize themselves to the coming changes. - Supervisors must exhibit superior leadership skills over groups and must be available to encourage employees to perform. They must set goals, devise methods, and not shudder to incorporate ideas from employees to streamline the process. - Employee appreciation awards can lead to increased motivation.