The tough guy case study

This case study is about the management and leadership methods of the vice president of a middle market investment bank, Hudson Smith Gordon and how these methods affected the employees of this firm working directly with the UP. Management models and concepts introduced In BUILD 1308 will be used to analyses this case study. In this case study, Chip Maze, UP, uses a leadership style of forcing and opposing in order to encounter his anticipated requirements.

He tries to create a false impression of power and dominance both by using bullying and patronizing combined by situational abuse. Chip has been with the company for the last 10 years and he has made his way up to the senior management level by trying to be continually be submissive to upper management. Chip has a lot of hard skills and is a solid banker but his soft skills such as personal effectiveness, communication and influencing skills are not nowhere near his technical skills. Chip's negative characteristics and poor people skills create a lot of room for conflict. He puts down his employees and make fun of them.

He also uses his authority by making threats in order to achieve his desired outcomes.

Drive, honesty, emotional maturity and flexibility are the critical traits a leader should have in order to bring the best out of the subordinate team but he has not been able to put these traits In action and none of the employees Is willing to work with him proactively. Traits and skills must be transformed Into behavior In order to achieve an effective leadership. " People Behavior"

is the one that focuses on interactions such as being friendly and supportive or showing trust and confidence in team members.

All good managers do this but it seems like chip does not comprehend the importance of these qualities. He has created this environment where everyone fears him. He subscribes to a kiss- up and kick-down mantra of management.

Chip Is using strong forces, which results In no emotional motivation for his team. Without the emotional connection, the villous of the company moves further and further away. This company is in need of a face- to-face conversation involving the entire employee to tear down narrow thinking.

The teams and bosses are working together although it Is out of fear. Positional power which refers to legitimate, reward and coercive is not conducted appropriately. A leader's skilful use of power can produce positive outcomes.

It must be used carefully and thoughtfully. Chip goes out of his way to discredit others while never admitting objects at other employees conveys fear of one's personal security. Visible temper tantrums combined with dishonesty, distrust, verbal lashings breaks down communication opportunities, which exemplified his unwillingness to listen to others.

In order to identify criteria for an effective solution it is necessary to explore many Seibel scenarios some of which are on the far ends of the scale of positive outcome. Nonetheless, it is an experiment, which requires a scientific analysis and discovery coupled with hypotheses and conclusions

disclosed later. Like any experiment the results are not always conclusive or satisfying but often the mistakes made when resolving conflict with a specific method reveals useful information that leads closer to the underlying causes of the behavior.

Detailing the criteria for an effective solution means identifying the relevant information, which involves adhering and writing down the details, disclosing the findings to the group, deciding which method to use to confront the individual, and then put together an action plan. An effective solution should indicate the benefits and disadvantages of approaching Chip. The results of confrontation listed so that each outcome is acceptable under each scenario. The Tough Guy case team testimony must be a collective document before presentation and be absent of sensationalism, false reports, and disinformation.

This will require some element of proof entailing times, dates, places, ND situation staging.

Perhaps by finding out these details by using an effective solution, a better understanding of why Chip acts in this way becomes evident. It is possible that procedurally Jeremy Frazer should not be a sympathetic ear for their concerns. This may not be a problem at all but from all indicators there will be cause for concern. Identifying the root causes of why Chip uses a strong leadership mantra leads to answers needed for this investigation into conflict resolution.

Labeling Chip's behavior will require distinguishing between the facts and fiction in the data elected. There is a not a unified mindset in the company and the vision and future are not clear.

A weak emotional connection to the mission forms a powerless environment where a strong team voice should thrive. The lack of courage to break free of the bindings created by Chip's behavior is preventing the team from taking action right when the abuse occurs. Once the most likely causes for the behavior are detailed, it is now time to test each situation against the listed solutions and look for a fit.

The team should be ready for all the possible outcomes and move to a prepared action plan. Identifying the possible solutions will require analysis of the collected data and then surmising all the possible action paths of action. Seek out as many ideas as possible for creating changes in Chips' behavior.

Using past experiences, logical analysis of the report, brainstorming, and published peer reviewed documents for guidance are ways expand the list of solutions. Second-guessing the whole process is actually healthy because it explores all possible negative and positive aspects of the actions which are about to begin.

Select the right person for the Job and then ask the team if this is an issue worth the emotional discomfort. In this case, action is in order. Chip cannot continue on this track for various reasons most of which are his health and won the most merit in this case. This cannot end up as a lose-win scenario so

a shark like conflict style similar to the style Chip uses is prudent in order to fight fire with fire.

Identifying solutions based on criteria previously listed requires investigation into elements that can influence the effectiveness of the solution in the form of questions. What could derail the entire process?

What could go terribly wrong during the intervention? Could Chip change his behavior while this investigation is building or turn to worse behavior after the proceeding? Is the most obvious cause clearly visible by everyone but the team? The relationships between the actions the team will choose as a solution are dependent on the consistency of the situation. The choices are simple really and in the list below. 1 . Use Direct Confrontation 2. Base the issues on verifiable data collected from reliable sources 3.

Use an intervention style meeting 4. Involve upper management and adhere to their suggestions 5.

Realize if upper management decides to handle it you do not have all the details 6. Chip's reaction should be on the list of anticipated outcomes 7. Act accordingly to the preconceive response algorithms The prefigured outcomes are part of the criteria in determining if the outcomes are effective as solutions. Remember there may be a few moments when using improvisational solutions are prudent.

Be prepared for on the spot thinking and action so stay engaged in the moment should the need arise and always remain sensitive to other people's emotions both gentle and belligerent.

There is always two sided to every story. Selecting a solution and following through with it can be an emotional experience but conflict resolution, if planned carefully, should be a predictable process. Often there is no time to prepare or the data presents itself in the moment so fast calculative thinking and quick decision-making are paramount. Do your best and rely on training. Solution selection is a process of learning how to leave conventional ways of thinking while suspending Judgment.

There should be a bias reduction and high commitment to the truth.

Often, as in this case, using a group is one of the most effective ways to ensure that personal Judgment and bias are not a part of the equation. Jeremy and the team will confront Chip based on suggestions and permission from upper management to address the items of concern in a closed- or session free from public or media exposure. Implementing the solution is about following the prepared material. There should be no other alternative to the chosen procedure and the execution will follow the prescribed line items.

The teams should withhold impulsive responses, remain careful of erroneous data, stay on task, and proceed in a methodical manner.

Many decision is discovered during the preceding, then own up to it. Good preparation prevents hazy objectives and enhances the accuracy of internal and external influences to the case. The only thing left to do now is move on the plan and Judge its effectiveness. Evaluating the effectiveness of the solution occurs after the scheduled intervention. Before, during, and after the process records become a great resource.

These notes serve to evaluate the processes effectiveness at achieving the anticipated goal.

A comparison of the models created to the actual results determines how well the team's predictions are in alignment. Changes in Chip's behavior still need monitoring as well as continued follow up with those individuals affected. Conflict resolution is almost an oxymoron because conflict is only as resolved as the future actions of those involved. Many parties are interested in the results of a conflict resolution event. Any stakeholder involved will want a report on the activities, dialog, procedure, solution presented, solution agreement by the accused party, and the follow up tracking.

In this case Chip should be referred to the company appointed counselor who will determine professionally what he is dealing with on all fronts and if he is psychologically ready to return to the team as a leader in his department like before. Perhaps a control word is put in place in a common session with all employees that signal a STOP command for whatever the activity in order to provide a safe word that all will respect implicitly. An escalation procedure, if not already developed, put into policy so that if someone crosses over any safe command request employees already are aware of the consequences.

A database of conflict files should be created and referenced for future conflict solutions and in case of legal counsel requisition. The legality of intervention proceedings within a company can produce, more often than not, a sense of unfinished business and should be a part of the valuation process. Deciding whether or not a solution is the best solution involved

defining all the possible solutions, eliminating the enviable solutions, scrutinizing the chosen solutions, evaluating the risks of choosing a certain solution, and then making a decision to use the selected solution.

There is an obligation to involve higher levels of management in the process but they might want this to remain within the department, which Justifies the process and build respect for the manager or associate that resolves the issue. The minimum and maximum expectation for Chip's recordings sets a windows of parameters by which successful conflict resolution is measurable. In conclusion, Frazer sees in Chip many of the expected traits that a Vice President may need to remain effective. Often employees underrate and devalue their superiors in an effort to get the listener to buy into the common posturing of lower level employees.

Frazer needs to determine on his own whether the accusations merit investigation and if so then decide if it is an issue or non-issue. Sometimes a simple game of golf with the Vice President clears up all the stories presented or validates everything the team is trying to tell Frazer.

Either way when someone tells you that they feel threatened your attention should be focused on the immediate a long time and Chip has already worked on an effective solution matrix with a chosen shark type of management style because everything else has limited results.

Every story has two or more sides to the details and reasoning for behaviors. On the other side, Chip may have a substance abuse issue and it is getting out of hand. The only way to know what is eating at people and making them cause conflicts is to investigate using the described process mentioned.

While it is in our human indention to destroy one another, we rarely wake up in the morning, look in the mirror, and state that our mission today is to make everyone around us as uncomfortable as possible.

It is our Jobs and the stresses of the work that drive us into behaviors that may be unbecoming. Has anyone in upper management or lower employees stopped to ask Chip how he is doing today? A great deal of information is be left out of this solution search by not going to the source. This entire conflict would have resolution by a method this is not on the list. This is one of the satisfying and surprising elements of managing conflict resolution.