Kyle Mitchell at ABC investments

Tony Mento
Loyola University Maryland

Joe Farrell
Loyola University Maryland

Christy DeVader
Loyola University Maryland

Gabe Villani
Loyola University Maryland

Lynne Elkes
Loyola University Maryland

Alex Costos
Loyola University Maryland

Jon Kent
Loyola University Maryland

Abstract:

Kyle Mitchell was disillusioned with his experiences as a newly promoted junior manager at ABC Investment Corporation. Mitchell had succeeded for three and one-half years working as an investment writer focusing on retirement and retail customers at ABC. He had demonstrated significant management skills in his role and was recognized by upper management. Viewed as a potential star, Mitchell was offered a junior management role in the firm's retirement plan transaction processing team. Although these responsibilities were drastically different than his previous experience, he welcomed the challenge. Unfortunately, he never anticipated what it would be like working with Tracey Harris, his new manager, the group's lead manager. Harris had been with the retail client group for six years and seemed to offer a welcoming, laidback presence, maintaining what Mitchell initially perceived to be a familial work environment. Mitchell joined his new group with ideas and ambition work methods which were a marked contrast to Harris's more reserved, hands-off style of management. He was nonetheless confident that he could work well with Harris to make an impact on the team. After a year in the role, however, Mitchell found himself exhausted, constantly butting heads with Harris and receiving what he felt to be unjust feedback and criticism. He questioned his capacities for the position and whether he had the "right stuff" for management in general. More immediately, he had to decide whether to tough it out with Harris in his new position or to return to his previous position.

Keywords: Managerial work, job satisfaction, onboarding, supervisor-subordinate relationship, VABEs (values, assumptions, beliefs, expectations)

INTRODUCTION

Kyle Mitchell was disillusioned with his experiences as a newly promoted junior manager at ABC Investment Corporation. Mitchell had succeeded for three and one-half years working as an investment writer focusing on retirement and retail customers at ABC. He had demonstrated significant management skills in his role there and his performance was noted by upper management. Viewed as a potential shining star, Mitchell was offered a junior management role in the firm's retirement plan transaction processing team. Although the responsibilities of a junior manager were drastically different than his previous experience he welcomed the challenge. Unfortunately, he never anticipated what it would be like working with Tracey Harris, his new manager. Harris was the group's lead manager and Mitchell's new direct supervisor. Harris had been with the retail client group for six years. On the surface, she offered a welcoming, laidback presence and maintained what Kyle initially perceived to be a familial work environment. Mitchell came into his new group with a lot of ideas and ambition but his way of working was a marked contrast to Harris's more reserved, hands-off style of management. He was nonetheless confident that he could work well together with Harris to make an impact on the team.

After a year in the role, however, Mitchell found himself exhausted working with Harris, constantly butting heads with her and receiving what he felt to be unjust feedback and criticism. He questioned his capacities for the junior management position and whether he had the "right stuff" for management in general. More immediately, he had to decide whether to tough it out with Harris in his new position or to return to his previous position which was available to him.

Kyle Mitchell's early experience at ABC before Tracey Harris

ABC Investments is an asset management company that serves a wide range of retail and institutional clients. Mitchell graduated with a B.A. in English and obtained a position at ABC Investments directly upon graduating from college. Mitchell had no prior financial experience, but had a strong intellectual curiosity, and was hired on the strength of his writing and editing skills. Even without a financial background, Mitchell made impressive gains in his new job and was the first in his new hire class to obtain his FINRA Series 6 License, shortly followed by the Series 63 and Series 7 Licenses. These are certifications that allowed Mitchell to trade securities.

Mitchell had a strong interest in the financial markets and coupled with his strong communications skills, became a standout performer in the firm's writing group. His job involved corresponding with a wide range of ABC's customers on a one-on-one basis, including retirement, retail, brokerage, and high-net worth clients. Over time, he gradually gained more responsibilities, including training new hires and running one-off training sessions on proper communication techniques. It is important to be clear and concise in conveying their message to clients since ABC can be held to its written documentation.

As he continued being a coaching resource to his team, his manager began to encourage him to pursue coaching, training, team development and other managerial activities outside of the writing group. While he was reluctant at first, his manager assured him that these management skills were transferable to any scenario. Coupled with his friendly, humorous, and highly personable demeanor, Mitchell became more confident that he could succeed in a management role outside of his comfort zone.

Tracey Harris's Background

Tracey Harris was a self-made success. After graduating high school, Harris rose through the various positions at a competing investment firm. She started at ABC Investment Corporation 25 years ago as the junior manager of the mailroom. For the last 15 years she had held management positions at ABC and she was appreciated for her warm demeanor, supportive nature, and her hands-off, conservative management style. Harris maintained a strong relationship with the plan administrators of ABC's employer-sponsored savings plan and was adept at managing upward – keeping her bosses well-informed of her group's performance and maintaining a level of respect for them and from them for a job well done.

Mitchell's Experience as a Junior Manager in the College Savings Division

Mitchell previously had no reports and was responsible for correspondence to various customers primarily through email. While there were supplemental duties that Mitchell assumed in that role (training, coaching, and team development), he had no official management responsibilities.

In his new role, Mitchell would be responsible, along with Harris, for his team's performance, and would be in a position of authority over his reports. Mitchell would be responsible for coaching, tracking performance, finding ways to continuously improve his team's performance, and completing appraisals of team member performance. Mitchell was to be a junior partner with Harris in managing the team while reporting directly to Harris. The team consisted of nine entry-level associates and one specialist. Mitchell believed this was what expected of him in his new job: familiarize himself with the group's transaction processes, be able to execute each process, and increase the productivity and quality of his team's work.

Mitchell believed these to be key performance indicators for getting an outstanding evaluation from Harris in his new job: find creative ways to increase his team's metrics and find ways to further develop his team, such as expanding their product/investment knowledge and helping them network.

Within his first three months in the group, Mitchell felt like he had a good strategy for how he could make an impact. Holding individual meet-and-greets and a series of sit-ins with each associate, Mitchell gained an excellent perspective on each team member's strengths and areas for improvement. Mark Williams, for instance, was a smart and ambitious young employee whose demonstrated competence in his present role seemed to be a key factor in his desire to move up in the organization. Olivia Spencer on the other hand, had been with the team for five years and, while skilled in her position, had no expressed upwardly mobile ambitions to advance in the long term.

Jon Linton presented a unique challenge to Kyle. As the team's specialist, Linton had been the longest tenured associate in the group and was responsible for important reporting and communications to the plan administrators. Linton had systems in place to support his role and was highly possessive of his duties. He was very close to Harris and the two regularly ate lunch and chatted together. Mitchell perceived slight condescension in Linton's voice when talking with him, as Linton described his role and the retirement plan rules in general. Mitchell knew when he took the promotion that he was considered to be an outsider being put in a position of authority and recognized that he might be the target of resentment from members of the team. He was relatively certain he had detected that resentment from Linton. Further, Kyle immediately

noted several inefficiencies in Jon's processes and knew it would be an uphill battle to try and manage changes for improvement in Linton's duties.

Mitchell's general impression of the team was that they operated just fine within the silo of their business line. However, he had the sense that they lacked perspective of the firm's other lines of business as well as the financial acumen in general (more than one employee expressed a desire for formalized investment training). As he familiarized himself more with the group's products, systems, and processes, Mitchell began to put together action plans for each associate and ideas for department-wide investment training, leveraging his training experience and contacts in the firm's Corporate Education Department.

Mitchell found himself becoming concerned very quickly with his interactions with Harris. While the two held regular biweekly one-on-one meetings, Mitchell recognized that nothing of substance was ever discussed. Harris was happy to see that Mitchell had ideas about improving the team but seemed to be more concerned with how he was progressing in familiarizing himself with the group's technical processes and system utilization. Further, Harris was not overly concerned with Linton's attitude or with the inefficiencies Mitchell had noted, saying, "Oh, that's just how he is." When Mitchell mentioned the risks in having only one person handling such delicate critical responsibilities, Harris mentioned that Spencer had been trained as a back-up and that she wasn't overly concerned with Spencer's ability to step in, if need be.

Mitchell asked to speak with Harris after his third month with the team. In Harris's office, Mitchell said, "I want to be crystal clear regarding your expectations of me in this job, now that I've been here for a short while." Harris assured Mitchell that he was doing great in his role and that her peers thought the same, yet she offered no specific feedback. One can infer that Harris was mostly concerned with the team's progress in reducing the workload of processing payments, but this issue was never raised. Mitchell was thirsting for some positive feedback about his first few months as junior manager and assumed that she approved of his actions and his vision for the team's direction. Unexpressed, but clear in Mitchell's mind was his vision for the team: to weed out inefficiencies, to make the team more well-rounded, more investment savvy, and more aware of the retirement plan team's place in the broader scope of ABC.

After the First Quarterly Review

Over the next month, Mitchell implemented his plans for each associate on the team with Harris's implied blessing. He worked with Williams on improving his productivity and quality of work, while setting up appointments for Williams to meet with other groups at the firm to gain a better understanding of ABC's business lines and areas of potential interest. Mitchell likewise worked with Spencer to expand her role on the team. While she expressed no immediate desire to advance, Mitchell still wanted to help her be a better resource to the team given her experience. Mitchell even held regular sit-ins with Linton and recommended they both explore options to streamline Linton's reporting duties, which sometimes amounted to half of Linton's day. In addition to his tailored plans for each team member, Mitchell began to put together his investment training proposal. He emailed this plan to Harris for her review prior to their next one-on-one, which had been pared back to one meeting per month.

During the meeting in month four, Mitchell's optimism and enthusiasm were suddenly dealt a harsh blow and he was absolutely stunned by Harris's feedback. Harris initiated their meeting by saying, "I wanted to talk with you about how much we seem to be butting heads. I had really expected you to be making more of an impact on our workload at this point, and I'm

especially surprised with the amount of extracurricular activities you've been taking part in." Mitchell was completely caught off guard. He expressed that he was under the impression transaction processing was incidental to his role, and that he perceived the "extracurricular activities" she mentioned to be pivotal to his responsibilities. He also expressed confusion at the idea they were butting heads and that this feedback seemed to be coming out of nowhere. While he assumed that he was being transparent enough in their last meeting (and during his implementation over the past month), Harris made it clear that he had not been, nor was he currently meeting her expectations. She mentioned that other managers had asked her why Williams had expressed interest in their groups and she was caught off guard and was unaware of William's desire to move on. (Both Mitchell and Williams maintained that this had been previously communicated to Harris.) In addition, Harris reported that she received a complaint from the team that Mitchell was overstepping his role and making a member feel uncomfortable. Mitchell did not ask Harris to explain what "to feel uncomfortable" meant. While she wouldn't divulge who that member was (even though Mitchell thought she should, as his manager), Mitchell assumed it to be either Spencer or, more likely, Linton. Finally, Harris said that she had disagreed with Mitchell's department-wide investment training proposal and that her peers and the site manager agreed with her assessment. Going forward, Mitchell was to focus on the group's own work, and on making a bigger impact on the team's workload, which Harris indicated would help Mitchell be a better manager to the team.

Mitchell walked away from the meeting shocked and upset. He was concerned at the direction provided by Harris and felt that it set a precedent for how his role would look going forward. Mitchell thought he was to be a junior manager and look out for the total vision and excellence of the team not simply be a member of the team processing disbursements. He had been working as an individual contributor for the past three and one-half years as an investment writer focusing on retirement and retail customers at ABC and now was working to manage other employees in the College Savings Department; he presumed that he wouldn't need to be an expert in all technical aspects of another business unit, but rather be able to use his outsider's perspective to work behind the scenes to manage and develop his team. Mostly, though, Mitchell was confused at the apparent 180-degree turn Harris had made, believing her feedback to come out of left field without prior notice of apparent issues she had with Mitchell's performance. Regardless, Mitchell still wanted to make things work.

After the Upsetting Feedback

Over the next few months, as Mitchell began to improve his knowledge of the team's processing practices, Harris experienced a series of health and family issues that caused her to frequently take time off, leaving Mitchell as the sole manager of the team. Concurrently, a new site manager had joined the firm, replacing the outgoing manager to whom Harris reported over the past 10 years. During this time as well, Linton had been interviewed by and was offered a position with the firm's control group. Both Mitchell and Harris had assumed that Spencer was up to the task of picking up Linton's reporting duties, but after a shaky start with several minor errors, Harris let Mitchell know that she wanted him to take over these duties instead. While Mitchell was annoyed at Harris's previous insistence of Spencer being a viable back-up option for this role, he was eager to be able to own the process on his terms and to implement the changes he thought would benefit the team.

On one particular week-long stretch of Harris's absence, Mitchell was informed that a member of his team had incorrectly processed an identical retirement savings distribution twice. These distributions had been performed days apart, so they didn't show up on Mitchell's report on the same day and he therefore reported them separately to the plan sponsor, who handled disbursements to employees independently. Mitchell contacted ABC's electronic distribution group in the finance department and asked if they could retrieve the errant distribution from the sponsor account. He was told that that could be performed without a problem, so Mitchell requested retrieval of the funds and assumed all was well.

A month later during his next one-on-one with Harris, Mitchell was informed that he was receiving a verbal warning for his handling of the distribution error. Mitchell was shocked, indicating that he was assured from the finance department that there were no issues. He likewise maintained that his handling of the situation without Harris there was the best solution possible. Harris explained that in previous instances of this event occurring, Linton would adjust subsequent reports to the distribution group and to the plan administrator to reconcile any discrepancies (he would essentially reduce the amount of a subsequent distribution file by the amount of any previous errant distribution). This was the first Mitchell heard of this practice, as it hadn't been explained by Linton or maintained in his instructions. Harris told Mitchell that he should have escalated the situation to the site manager given Harris's absence, and used the situation as another example of Mitchell's failure to communicate upward. While Mitchell felt the new site manager would offer little in the way of a technical solution given his drastically different responsibilities in his prior role, Mitchell instead expressed his frustration that this feedback had been withheld from him for almost a month. Harris explained that she had dealt with the plan directly upon returning to the office three days after the initial incident. Mitchell was furious, as Harris detailed an action plan for Mitchell that would drastically reduce his projects and have him focus on coaching the team and increasing his transaction efforts. Mitchell insisted that he and Harris revert back to biweekly check-ins, and that Harris be more up front with him with her feedback.

Over the next month, Mitchell reluctantly dialed back his time working on other projects. Still, Mitchell felt almost instinctively inclined to pursue efforts that would better his team and the firm outside of transaction processing responsibilities and coaching. He gradually found opportunities to work outside of Harris's defined boundaries. He spent a day creating an Excel macro that his team could use to quickly and accurately process pro rata rollover purchases from multiple accounts. After a customer complaint raised a red flag about transaction processes, he spearheaded a written communications outreach to all potentially affected customers by collaborating with his old writing group. Mitchell was most proud, however, of his month-long endeavor of completely revising and partially automating Jon's old reporting process, saving hours of time each day and mitigating virtually all of the risk inherent in the previously manual process.

Nevertheless, Harris continued to communicate her dissatisfaction with Mitchell's processing output, despite the steadily increasing quality and quantity of their team's output. Likewise, Harris continued to express what she felt was a deliberate withholding of information on Mitchell's part, as well as a failure to overtly communicate his activities. Mitchell acknowledged his tendency to operate independently but reminded Harris of his own insistence on more frequent meetings and check-ins. Harris was still dismissive and in a particularly heated meeting said that she should never have to guess what Mitchell was doing. Frustrated, Mitchell asked, "Then when are YOU going to start asking ME?" Tracy said, "I'm your boss. I don't ask

you what you are doing. I tell you what you are supposed to be doing. That's your problem Mitchell. You don't know who is the boss."

Mitchell's attitude at work had begun to change. He was less social with his peers and was visibly less enthusiastic and outgoing. While he still enjoyed engaging with his reports and helping them develop (Williams had been promoted under Mitchell's career path guidance), he found himself less motivated day by day to develop himself, while being increasingly resentful of Harris's role in the group, as well as her influence on her superiors and, by extension, their impression of Mitchell.

Given Mitchell's problems on the team, he had been offered his previous position back in the investment writer group at the same salary as his current position. Mitchell thought this was a potentially beneficial option and entertained the thought of starting fresh in a more familiar setting. However, a previous manager and mentor had advised Mitchell to make things work in his current group, impressing upon Mitchell the negative perception that could be formed about him should he revert to a previous comfort zone.

Still, Mitchell was finding it more and more difficult to go in to the office every day, let alone attempt to reconcile his working style and vision with those of Harris's.

The issue for Mitchell

Mitchell had a dilemma. In his present job, his attempts and successes to improve the team's functioning were ignored or dismissed by Harris. Good work was never acknowledged and shortcomings were magnified. Essential and valuable feedback for development was never received in a timely fashion. In addition, Mitchell was developing somewhat of a reputation communicated by Harris to higher level management of being an under performer as well as a somewhat loose cannon. Mitchell firmly believed that Harris's feedback to him was definitely known by the team and the broader group. Some sympathized with Mitchell and his predicament with an outlook that Harris was an ineffective manager, while some thought Mitchell was the problem. It is important to note that up to this point, Mitchell has not attempted to actively develop a network of support from lateral managers through the use of reciprocity (Cialdini, 2001) or by exchanging favors (currencies) (Cohen and Bradford, 1991).

Mitchell needed to make the decision whether to learn how to work better and to grow on the job under Harris's supervision or to return to his previous job and comfort zone where he excelled which would limit his management and leadership potential.

TEACHING NOTE

Case Synopsis

After a successful three and a half years working as an investment writer for ABC Investment Corporation during which he had demonstrated significant leadership and coaching skills, Mitchell was offered a junior management role in the firm's college savings transaction processing team. While the responsibilities and expectations of a junior manager were drastically different, he welcomed the challenge. Mitchell never anticipated operating under Harris, however.

Harris had managed the group for six years offering a welcoming, laidback, presence and a familial environment. Mitchell arrived with many ideas and drive to succeed, thereby being a

slight foil to Harris's more reserved, hands-off style of management. He was very confident that he and Harris could work together to benefit the team's productivity and impact.

After a year in the role, however, Mitchell found himself exhausted working with Harris, constantly at odds with her and receiving what he felt to be unjust feedback and criticism. He began to wonder not only if he was a good fit for the position but why he pursued a leadership role. He was conflicted as to his future in the organization.

INTRODUCTION

What DO managers manage? The answer is to manage self, team, and network, all major responsibilities (Hill & Lineback, 2011). New and first time managers are often overwhelmed and clueless when confronted with understanding what managers do. This case provides an excellent opportunity to utilize multiple frameworks to understand the manager's job and to assess what is happening in order to understand and improve the outcomes and the likelihood of success for the manager and his/her team.

LEARNING OBJECTIVES

After discussion and analysis, students should be able to:
1. Assess an employee's level of job satisfaction using specific job facets and identify links between job satisfaction and behavior.
2. Explain and apply the EVLN (exit, voice, loyalty, neglect) framework.
3. Understand the manager's role in onboarding a new manager.
4. Identify misconceptions managers have about their role and responsibilities.
5. Understand and identify the VABEs (values, assumptions, beliefs, and expectations) used by others in the workplace and predict the effect different VABEs may have on workplace relationships.

RESEARCH METHOD

This case is disguised and based on a real company where one of the authors was the case protagonist.

PRE-ASSIGNMENTS AND READINGS/CHAPTERS

Students should read introductory chapter(s) from an organizational behavior textbook (Colquitt, LePine, & Wesson, (2013) on the following: EVLN (Exit, Voice, Loyalty, and Neglect) Framework describing employee responses to dissatisfaction, the onboarding process for new employees and managers, and Realistic Job Preview (RJP): (from Colquitt et al Ch. 16 – Organizational culture – realistic job preview and onboarding; Chps. 3 and 4 – EVLN framework – Organizational commitment and job satisfaction. Alternatively, this material might be covered by the professor in a lecture/discussion before the case is assigned for analysis.

Recommended pre-readings for MBA students

Badaracco, J. L, Jr. (2004). Personal values and professional responsibilities. Industry and Background Note 304070. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Publishing. Describes some

of the classic conflicts managers face in trying to live and work by their personal values and uses Hirschman's "exit, loyalty, and voice" framework to suggest ways for resolving these conflicts.

Watkins, M. D. (2009). The onboarding challenge: A leader's guide to navigating important career transition – Ch. 4 from Your Next Move: The leader's guide to navigating major career transitions. 5339BC. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Publishing. In this chapter, transition acceleration expert Michael Watkins outlines the steps onboarding leaders must take in order to adapt to the culture, make political connections, and align expectations in their new organization.

Recommended pre-readings for undergraduate and graduate students:

Clawson, J. G. (2001). Note: A leader's guide to why people behave the way they do. UVA-
        OB-0744, Darden Business Publishing.

Other readings to consider:

Recommended general readings about what managers do include:
- Hill, L. (2007). Becoming the boss. R07016. Boston, MA.: Harvard Business School Publishing
- Hill, L. (2000). What it really means to manage: exercising power and influence. 9-400-041. Boston, MA.: Harvard Business School Publishing
- Simpson, L. (2004). Why managing up matters. U0208A. Boston, MA.: Harvard Business School Publishing

DISCUSSION QUESTIONS

1. What were Mitchell's stated and unstated expectations about the job and his role? What were Harris's stated and unstated expectations about the job and his role? (Learning Objective 4)

2. What are the facets that contributed to Mitchell's job satisfaction before and after his promotion to a junior manager? Apply the 5-facet model (Hulin and Judge, 2003; Spector, 1997) to describe the specific changes and how they affected his behavior pre and post promotion. (Learning Objective 1)

3. How did Mitchell respond to his increasing level of job dissatisfaction? Which of the 4 EVLN responses ((Farrell, 1983; Nyberg & Ployhart, 2013) did he employ? Provide specific examples. (Learning Objective 1 & 2)

4. What gaps did Mitchell have between his current capabilities and the requirements of his junior manager position? What key management responsibilities did Mitchell neglect? (Learning Objective 4)

5. Explain how Mitchell could have improved his results when working with the associates. What could he have done to improve the associates' buy-in and Harris's acceptance? (Learning Objective 4)

6. Evaluate how Harris managed Mitchell's performance. Were there any opportunities for improvement? What were Harris's main complaints about Mitchell's performance? (Learning Objective 3)

7. Develop an onboarding process that Harris could have used for Mitchell. Identify what she did do and what she overlooked. (Learning Objective 3)

8. How might an analytical approach like Clawson's (2001) VABEs model help us to understand the dynamics of the situation? (Learning Objective 5)

9. What should Mitchell be doing to become a more effective manager, and in what areas might he benefit from mentoring or training? Why? (Learning Objective 4)

ANSWERS TO DISCUSSION QUESTIONS

1. What were Mitchell's stated and unstated expectations about the job and his role? What were Harris's stated and unstated expectations about the job and his role?

Mitchell's attitude towards ABC Investments and towards his new position was very favorable. He saw the move as a step up in the organization and thought he could add value to the new group after learning the ins and outs of the new department. He thought he had a solid foundation of knowledge and skills and he was willing to learn and build on those experiences. His previous success helped bolster his belief that he could perform the job. He was optimistic and excited about the job and he was willing to put in the time and effort and work hard to be successful. He felt good about the company and wanted to contribute to the organization's success through a rigorous evaluation of the department's processes as well as implementing more efficient practices. After he was on the job for several months his attitude was far less positive. The shift occurred slowly but it affected how he thought and felt about the job and his willingness to continue along the same path.

There are three components to an attitude: cognitive, affective and behavioral (Breckler, 1984). The cognitive component is how an employee thinks about their job. The affective component describes how the employee feels about the job and the emotions it elicits. The affective component is often closely linked to the third, behavioral, component of an attitude. The case provides a wealth of information about Mitchell's attitude towards his work and how it changed over time with respect to the three components. As indicated in Table 1 (Appendix), an analysis of Mitchell's behavior includes a synopsis of initial and subsequent behaviors.
Cognitive

How Mitchell thought about and perceived his job and his own ability to perform that job changed over time. There are two cognitive changes that can be pointed out. 1) Mitchell perceived himself as competent and capable as a new manager and he was initially confident. Later he describes how he started to "second guess" himself and it created indecision but the cognition that he wasn't sure he was making the right decision also affected how he felt about his ability to do the job and he reports feeling less confident. 2) Mitchell entered the position with an ability to look at his position from a broader, systems perspective. He describes meeting with team members and learning how each person's job impacted other team members' jobs and also how they connected to work done in other departments and divisions. He was focused on improving processes at different levels (within an individual's job, within the team and across

departments and units). Harris later refers to these as "extra-curricular activities" and she puts him on a shorter leash so that his task is to focus on his own "processing output" doing a specific job and tasks that other team members did and not "managerial" activities. He struggles with the change that his co-manager wants from him to be less of a systems/process/team developer to more of a technical expert in processing the day to day work of the college savings group. The changes in the way Mitchell thought about his job decreased his satisfaction in the work he was doing.

Affective

There are also 4 affective changes that occurred which affected Mitchell's attitude about his job. At the beginning he describes himself as excited at the opportunity to assume a junior manager position and further develop the coaching skills he had used in his previous position and he also was excited at the prospect of making significant performance improvements in the team increasing productivity and customer satisfaction. Once he begins to realize that Harris expects him to be more of a team member than a team leader and she says he isn't meeting her expectations he reports feeling less enthusiastic and less outgoing.

At the beginning he was confident that he could succeed even though he knew he had things to learn about the job and about working as a co-team leader with Harris, whom he initially respected for her years of experience and her managerial roles within the company. After months of setbacks and Harris continuing to express her dissatisfaction with his performance, and learning that she was letting others know what she thought of his performance, his feelings changed from respecting Harris to feeling resentful of her role and her influence on her superiors.

How Mitchell felt about his successes also changed. He took pride in and felt satisfaction in helping others grow and develop in his first job with ABC Investments and also devoted time and effort into helping members of his current team develop. However, when Williams was promoted under Mitchell's guidance he found he didn't feel his normal burst of motivation but instead felt less motivated to develop himself.

After a few months, despite some setbacks, Mitchell still reported feeling optimistic that with communication he and Harris could work thing out. Over time, even that optimism vanished and was replaced with disillusionment.

Behavioral

There is a close link between how an employee feels about their job and the behavioral choices they make. There are 5 specific changes in Mitchell's behavior that are observed throughout the case.

1) In the beginning he was outgoing. He sought team members and others in the organization out to learn about what was going on with them and also to discuss their goals and jobs. Over time, Mitchell is less social with his peers and seeks others out less.

2) When Mitchell was in his first job he often sought out new assignments and responsibilities, he took initiative. He continued to do this when he was promoted into the managerial position. He was an employee who did more than just what was required for the job. After months of working with Harris and not being able to meet her expectations Mitchell put in less time at work and he was less interested in doing the work, it felt routine. He went through the motions and did what he was supposed to be but his "heart" wasn't in it.

3) Mitchell felt ambitious when he was promoted; he wanted to prove himself and also to improve his skills and knowledge and he sought out activities and opportunities to increase his

knowledge of the business. As the crisis point approaches Mitchell reports seeking out fewer opportunities to improve and develop himself.

4) At the outset, Mitchell communicated freely with team members, peers, and his boss. As time went on he was unable to decipher what Harris wanted or how she would perceive and respond to a situation. Mitchell then began to withhold information, ideas, and feedback in part because he no longer felt like it was worth the effort and frustration.

5) Finally, whether it was actively or inactively, Mitchell is also testing the waters for a new position near the end of the case.

Harris's attitude towards the firm was that of a long time employee who rose through the ranks by dint of her scrappiness, hard work, and ability to get along with others. Her management skills appear to be a bit shaky, however. While not evident initially, Harris seemed adept at reporting to supervisors, but not necessarily managing an enthusiastic junior manager, nor pushing her direct reports to achieve. Her understanding of Mitchell's role seemed to place his in the same league as the lower level employees, leading to a severe misunderstanding of expectations on both sides.

2. What are the facets that contributed to Mitchell's level of job satisfaction before and after his promotion to a junior manager? Use the 5-facet model ((Hulin & Judge, 2003; Spector, 1997) to describe the specific changes and how it affected his behavior pre and post promotion.

Mitchell had a high to moderate level of job satisfaction prior to his promotion. His job satisfaction started to decline a few months after his promotion and then accelerated. Prior to his promotion and immediately after assuming the new responsibilities Mitchell is very satisfied with his job. To assess Mitchell's job satisfaction the student should identify the discrete elements/facets (Hulin & Judge, 2003; Spector, 1997) that contribute to Mitchell's summative evaluation of his satisfaction. The five job facets commonly used to understand and measure job satisfaction are: the work itself, pay, promotion, supervision, and co-workers.

During the pre-promotion period Mitchell expressed satisfaction with the work itself. He enjoyed becoming an expert in the technical and financial aspects of the business.
Pay wasn't discussed as either a positive or a negative factor. However, if intrinsic rewards are considered as part of the "pay package" then Mitchell was getting quite a bit of positive reward. He had positive feelings about his job and took pride in helping others grow, he was competitive and being the first in his class to obtain licenses could be considered a source of "psychic dollars."

Mitchell was encouraged in his first job to look for managerial opportunities, thereby securing a promotion. This resulted in his being hired as a co-team manager within a different department. It is clear that after receiving the promotion and for at least a few months afterward he was satisfied with the future promotion opportunities.

Mitchell's first supervisor was supportive of him, supporting and encouraging him to seek out additional opportunities. He was told that he had the overall skill set to be a successful manager. Mitchell perceived his first manager as a supportive and encouraging manager and Mitchell was perceived by his boss as capable. Mitchell's satisfaction with supervision is high. Mitchell appears to be respected by his peers/co-workers. Mitchell respected and cared enough about them and their career opportunities that he has assumed increasing responsibilities of providing one-off training on communication skills and coaching to new employees on the team. He was perceived as friendly, humorous and personable. Mitchell's relationships with co-workers inside and outside his department are favorable resulting in moderate to high satisfaction.

Mitchell's overall satisfaction was high. There was no indication that Mitchell had any intention of leaving the company and he did not express dissatisfaction with any of the 5 job facets. It is clear that how Mitchell felt about the job affected his job behavior.

After the promotion, Mitchell did not express any dissatisfaction at the time he assumed the promotion within ABC Investments. The situation changed in several respects. Initially, Mitchell was satisfied with the work itself until it started to become clear that Harris had different expectations. Over a period of time Mitchell's satisfaction with the work itself became less favorable, mostly due to differing expectations between Harris and Mitchell about what the actual day-to-day duties were of the junior manager position. She wanted him engaged in the technical, day-to-day, routine matters and to be able to fill in for other employees. His expectations (perhaps somewhat shaped by his first manager's encouragement that management skills were transferable) were that he would be actively engaged in shaping the direction of the team and the larger organizational/team processes. The unclear reporting structure (both Mitchell and Harris in charge of the team but Mitchell reports to Harris) made the nature of the work more difficult. Before the case ends, Mitchell is dissatisfied with the work itself. The work Mitchell considered the most important was work that Harris did not value and labeled "extra-curricular activity".

It is stated that Mitchell received a raise when he first assumed the new co-manager position. He was at least somewhat satisfied with the pay. He was not dissatisfied with pay. The intrinsic rewards have been reduced because Mitchell is not engaged in activities he considers valuable.

Mitchell was satisfied with his future prospects of promotion immediately after assuming the new position. However, after the relationship with Harris diminished and she kept saying he wasn't meeting her performance expectations, his satisfaction with promotion opportunities decreased. Mitchell started to become concerned about poor performance and being "demoted" either forcibly or voluntarily removed. He was dissatisfied with the possibility of future promotion opportunities.

In terms of supervision, Mitchell experienced stress because he didn't know what Harris's performance expectations were and that affected his ability to meet those expectations. Mitchell felt as though he made significant effort to communicate with Harris but not did perceive the effort to be reciprocated. There was a significant lack of communication and that contributed to his growing dissatisfaction with supervision. Mitchell also did not feel supported when Harris revealed a complaint from a team member and did not share who made the complaint. Harris withheld timely feedback for almost a month. Harris did not ask what Mitchell was doing when she had questions. She labeled work he was doing to improve processes and team performance as "extra-curricular activities" without appearing to understand 1) his development of a spreadsheet to quickly and accurately process pro rata rollover purchases, 2) a method to improve client communications, 3) his ability to improve Linton's process, saving several hours per day and reducing the risk in the manual process. The weekly meetings were changed to every other month. Mitchell felt and thought the feedback and criticism were unfair. Mitchell was very dissatisfied with supervision.

Mitchell doesn't speak of the relationships with all of his co-workers. Of the 10 people on the team Mitchell discusses working with three team members. He enjoyed helping them develop, at least early on. But when Williams got promoted Mitchell doesn't take much satisfaction from it and Mitchell also acknowledges he isn't as motivated to develop himself. He says after a year in the new position he was "exhausted." Mitchell feels that Harris treated him

unfairly and that Harris had undue influence over superiors and she used it to cast him in an unfavorable light. He started to act less social and he was less enthusiastic and outgoing. Mitchell felt that one team member acted as though he was superior to him; one co-worker even complained to Harris about him. Other team members were very close to Harris and Mitchell wasn't which contributed to perceptions of an in-group. He was perceived as an outsider. His satisfaction with co-workers had been high in his old team and he was optimistic when he started as the co-manager of the new team, but over time his satisfaction with his co-workers decreased significantly. So much so, that by the end co-workers were a source of dissatisfaction.

Mitchell's overall job satisfaction was high before he assumed the new position. His satisfaction with each of the 5 facets was also high. After he assumed the new junior manager position his job satisfaction began to decline prior to the 3-month review and the downward spiral continued and it affected his work behavior, motivation, and his interactions with co-workers. He was so dissatisfied that he began looking for other job opportunities.

To sum up, Mitchell experienced stress, shock and upset. His interactions with Harris became more adversarial and non-supportive and they communicated with each other less frequently. Mitchell offered fewer suggestions and demonstrated less initiative. He went through the motions of doing what Harris asked. He became less social, enthusiastic and outgoing. He spent less time developing himself. He considered other job options and thought about leaving his junior manager position.

3. How did Mitchell respond to his increasing level of job dissatisfaction? Which of the 4 exit-voice-loyalty-neglect responses did he employ? Provide specific examples.

Employees can respond to job dissatisfaction in several ways. One model suggests that employees have four responses based on two different dimensions (Farrell, 1983) (Withey & Cooper, 1989). The two dimensions are Active/Passive and Constructive/Destructive. As indicated in Table 2 (Appendix), employees can respond to job dissatisfaction in many ways. As an example, employees may take steps or engage in behaviors to try to improve the situation, such as speaking to his/her boss (active/constructive/voice). The four general responses are voice (e.g. speaking up), loyalty (being supportive of the organization and doing what is generally expected), neglect (going through the motions of doing a job, meeting minimum expectations, disengaging from the job) and exit (making plans to leave, quitting a job). Sometimes an employee will engage in one type of response. Other times multiple responses may be observed as the employee's dissatisfaction deepens or as it improves based on the reaction(s) from the "employer."

Mitchell engaged in multiple behaviors, many of them expected. At first, Mitchell was satisfied with his job and his promotion. But when he started to encounter obstacles he tried to find solutions and adjusted his behavior. It is predictable that he would search for active and constructive actions to take to improve his feelings of satisfaction. And in fact, this is what Mitchell did. He first used his "voice" and took the initiative to speak with his boss in a positive and constructive way. He asked for 1) more frequent meetings with his boss, 2) he provided her with action plans, 3) he floated his ideas to her in advance of implementation, and 4) he tried to clarify his understanding of her expectations. When those efforts did not get the results he wanted, he engaged in a couple of projects that he thought would improve processes and systems (things he liked). However, he selected ones that were likely to get results with outcomes he thought Harris valued (individual and department productivity). He still helped other team

members achieve their career goals and thus added something positive for the overall organization. He hoped these behaviors, all of which fall into the "loyalty" response category, would change things and that his boss would recognize and value these contributions (Farrell, 1983. They did not. His work dissatisfaction continued to increase.

    As months passed, Mitchell began going through the motions of doing his job. He did not maintain the level of contribution he had before to team morale and interacted less frequently with co-workers. Their success provided him little sense of accomplishment or pride, he expended minimal to no effort on continuing to develop his professional skill set, and he communicated less frequently with peers and with his supervisor. All of these behaviors are considered "neglect" responses. Mitchell showed up to work and did what he was told but he no longer actively tried to improve the situation. His was less engaged with work and put in less effort than when he was first promoted. Finally, Mitchell asked himself if he was cut out to be a manager, whether he wanted to transfer back to his former position as well as contemplating a move of another sort. He also asked another colleague for advice about his next move. These behaviors and thoughts are all "exit" responses when an employee starts thinking about resigning or seeking other employment.

    Mitchell went through the full range of responses. At first he was fully engaged. When his expectations weren't met he started experiencing dissatisfaction. His first responses were constructive and active, followed by constructive and passive. Next he started withdrawing and going through the motions and he has pretty much given up on developing a good working relationship with Harris (passive and destructive) and at the end of the case Mitchell is contemplating resigning from his position or perhaps resuming his former positive (active/destructive.)

4. What gaps did Mitchell have between his current capabilities and the requirements of his junior manager position? What key management responsibilities did Mitchell neglect?

    He didn't know how to get his ideas implemented. He had the mindset that he had tacit approval and could go forward. He had the trust of his previous manager and didn't know he needed to earn Harris's trust. He had misconceptions about his role and this created false expectations for Mitchell.

    New managers often enter the position with misconceptions about what it means to be a manager. Hill (2007) identified 5 myths new managers often bring to the job. Mitchell and Harris were at opposite ends of each dimension. He was essentially believing the "myth" and acted accordingly. Harris had more experience and behaved more as a seasoned manager.

    Here are categories for the 5 myths/realities:
1. Defining characteristics of new role
2. Sources of power
3. Desired outcome
4. Managerial Focus
5. Key challenge

Myth 1: Defining characteristic of new role: Authority and the Freedom to implement one's own ideas vs. acting interdependently.

    Mitchell thought he had the approval to make his changes and autonomy to do so. Harris saw them as a team but he was a junior manager. She was the senior manager and higher

authority. Mitchell did not adequately manage upwards. Harris wanted to be included and given details. Harris needed to manage upwards, a key skill of which Mitchell was unaware. Mitchell didn't value Harris's knowledge and success; he didn't ask for her input or think he had to prove himself. Harris didn't understand how Mitchell saw his role. To her, he was a maverick and an independent operator who wasn't supporting the team. His emphasis on appearing competent and making a contribution undermined the development of trust. Harris had a well-developed network of other managers.

Mitchell didn't realize the value and importance of good relationships to get buy-in and support and for keeping others in the loop. As one example, when he "fixed" the duplicate transaction he didn't think about possible interconnections and what might happen at other points in the transaction, and he fixed it himself and then Harris had to clean it up. He pushed his ideas for improvement upon the employees in his new department even when they expressed disinterest (Spenser), resentment (Linton), lack of support (Harris and his training proposal). He thought he had all the authority he needed to make changes he thought best. He was surprised that members of the team would complain about him and his actions.

Myth 2: Sources of power: Formal Authority vs "everything but" have to earn trust.

Mitchell thought he and Harris shared managerial responsibilities and she would automatically trust him. Harris was wary, as it's not clear that she initiated hiring him. He may have been thrust upon her. Mitchell thought he could do what he thought was best for the team (develop others, cross train, change processes) regardless of the input and thoughts of others. Harris thought the team was running smoothly and that Mitchell would keep her informed of what he was doing. Mitchell didn't have the "functional/process" knowledge when he joined the team. So he needed to build trust and demonstrate his competence (technical and character/intentions). He needed to listen to others before trying to solve problems. Harris didn't have the information to know what Mitchell was doing specifically and that eroded trust. Harris had good relationships with the individuals on the team (family). Mitchell was forming relationships (boss/subordinate).

Mitchell did not adequately assess his sources of power and influence, nor did he understand Harris's. Mitchell did not have as many well-developed and long-term relationships throughout the organization as Harris. Mitchell had a good relationship with his previous boss and a couple of his former peers and at least one current departmental employee. Mitchell assumed that others saw him as he saw himself and that they would recognize his good intentions and desire to improve and that they valued these as much as he did and in the same way. He worked on "his' plans for improvement after the one on ones; there is no mention of him listening to or considering others ideas. He came in with an agenda and assumed he'd get others' buy-in and could implement his ideas using solely his formal authority.   There is little evidence that he worked to build good relationships and trust.

Myth 3: Desired outcome: Compliance v commitment

Mitchell thought when Harris didn't object to his ideas and plans for improvement that she was committed. Harris thought Mitchell would communicate more while Mitchell thought that Harris would communicate directly with him if she disapproved. Mitchell did not gain commitment from Spencer or Linton and neither one changed or took initiative to improve

Myth 4: Managerial Focus: Managing one-on-one vs leading the team

The team had established close bonds with Harris, and she was respected by her peers throughout the organization. Mitchell was the outsider. It is possible that Harris did not make it clear to the team exactly what Mitchell's role was and the extent of his authority and responsibility. At least one team member complained to Harris about Mitchell's behavior which suggests that the person saw Harris as the team leader and not Mitchell. When Harris told Mitchell of the complaint she did not reveal the person's name. This also suggests that Harris did not view Mitchell as a co-manager and this would make it harder for him to gain the respect and trust needed from department members. He did not get buy-in to his changes during his one-on-one meetings He thought if he made the changes people would see their advantages and come around. There is no information about team or department meetings led by either Mitchell or Harris or by both of them. Mitchell didn't manage his relationship with Harris one on one. He didn't talk with Harris about team performance. His actions could easily have been interpreted as undermining her and fault finding of her team and the individuals in it. Mitchell didn't work with Harris to manage the team but instead went right to the individuals on the team. Mitchell tried to use his formal authority and he didn't have a network of interdependent relationships within his team or the organization. Harris did have those things.

Mitchell never once talked about the team's performance, just individuals on the team. He did not have a sense of team culture, norms, and values.

Mitchell needed to be perceived as a part of the team. His role was not only unclear to him but it was unclear to the individuals he was supposed to be co-leading. He built at least one good relationship with Williams but their goals seemed to align from the beginning. Mitchell tried to build individual relationships failing to account for the larger context of the team.

Myth 5: Key Challenge: Keeping the operation in working order v changes to make the team better

Harris thought that her job was to keep the operation running smoothly. Mitchell thought he needed to help the team perform better. Maintaining the status quo and keeping things running smoothly can be complex and takes time. Harris thought Mitchell was going to be a producer of work like the others and not "above" their tasks. Mitchell thought his job was to manage other's work, not do it.

Harris was tied into the organizational network and engaged in upward influence. Mitchell neglected this. Mitchell didn't try to get Harris on board to use her influence to effect positive change.

Mitchell had different goals than Harris. Harris wanted to hit production targets and maintain the status quo. Mitchell wanted to improve the overall system. He was interested in production targets and quality but wanted his contribution to come from making improvements in the processes, not from being another "individual producer." Mitchell didn't ask for help in his new role from peers or Harris. Mitchell and Harris both valued production but they never reached an understanding of what that meant and how it could be achieved. Harris wanted to achieve by having Mitchell produce work and lessen the team's work load by doing the same job as other team members. Mitchell wanted to contribute to the team's production and success by reviewing and changing methods and procedures.

5. Explain how Mitchell could have improved his results when working with the associates. What could he have done to improve the associates' buy-in and Harris's acceptance?

Many of the problems in the case come from a lack of communication. One way to overcome this problem would be Before Actions Reviews (BARs) and After Action Reviews (AARs.) Darling, Parry, & Moore (2005) explain how BARs gather all participating parties and outline their roles in upcoming missions and activities. During BAR meetings, each party will state what actions they will take during a mission. If this had been done by Mitchell and Harris, this may have resolved all problems before they occurred. If Mitchell clearly stated his intentions, Harris may have stopped him before he even got started. If she agreed to the actions or didn't comment, there would be no excuses for not understanding his intentions. Likewise, if the entire team participated in the BAR, it would be unlikely that anyone (Linton or Spencer) would have complained to Harris later. They may have brought the issue up before the projects even took place. If Harris agreed to Mitchell's plans, an AAR would have been an excellent way to determine what actions were taken, what worked well, and what still needed improvement.

Mitchell could take several steps to better manage himself (Hill & Lineback, 2011: Kets de Vries, 2016). For example, Mitchell could have practiced empathy towards Harris and tried to put himself in her shoes. He could have reflected on his behavior and the feedback he was provided and considered whether Harris might consider his behavior problematic and get advice from others who do work well with Harris.

Simpson (2002) explains the importance of managing your manager. This doesn't necessarily mean that Mitchell would impose upon Harris his intentions and management style; rather, it would imply that he would learn to adapt to her management style while influencing her decisions for the team. Harris is conservative and seems to be a bit change resistant, so all of Mitchell's plans being put into motion in such a short period of time probably threw her off balance. By taking a slower approach and gaining her trust first, she may have been more receptive to additional plans later. Another important exercise mentioned by Simpson about managing up is the discussion of goals and expectations; having this conversation upfront would have helped to avoid "butting heads," as Harris describes later.

If Mitchell made it to the point of implementing his plans, one method he could have used to improve the buy-in from the team would have been to connect with the team beforehand and more clearly communicate his vision. Cuddy (2013) stresses the importance of developing warmth with your subordinates before displaying competency or asserting power. By demonstrating competency before warmth the best Mitchell could hope for would be passive support. Depending on how the team felt towards him, they may have even tried to do active harm, which may be why Linton or Spencer went back to Harris and spoke against Mitchell. You can see a clear difference by the way Williams responded to Mitchell's plans; he embraced the plans because Mitchell had discussed Mark's goals with him. Displaying warmth worked with Williams towards both his goals as well as Mitchell's.

6. Evaluate how Harris managed Mitchell's performance. Were there any opportunities for improvement? What were Harris's main complaints about Mitchell's performance?

Harris did not really manage Mitchell's performance, at least not in the beginning. There was little discussion of his responsibilities or expectations. In order to manage Mitchell's performance, Harris could have employed steps such as (1) evaluating performance and diagnosing performance problems, (2) providing feedback on performance, and (3) coaching and

counseling to improve performance. Since Mitchell was new to the team, step one would need to be preceded by setting expectations of Mitchell.

However, after Mitchell was in the role for a period of time, Harris should have been able to evaluate his performance. A good time to evaluate performance would have been before Mitchell started implementing his plans for each member of the team. It does not appear that Mitchell showed Harris the action plans he developed for the team members and the performance measures that would be used to assess whether they had the desired effect on team performance. Mitchell tried to carry out his plans and he was under the belief that Harris understood his intentions. Perhaps Harris (or even Mitchell) could have written out what the goals were for each team member and how performance or productivity would be assessed. A meeting to discuss these action plans would have provided and opportunity for Harris to provide specific input and feedback about what performance measures she wanted and valued that tied into her goals for the team

When it comes to delivering feedback, Harris also has room for improvement. In the beginning, all of her feedback to Mitchell was positive. This may be because she hadn't fully evaluated his performance, to begin with. Later on, she expresses concern about his "extracurricular activities" as a form of feedback, but again, this may have been avoided if proper feedback was given when Mitchell suggested his plans. Another big misstep is after Mitchell's distribution error, Harris waits a full month before providing feedback to Mitchell. In order for any feedback to be effective, it must be timely. Given the amount of time and her response of a verbal warning, this feedback seems to be more punitive than constructive. See Michaelsen and Schultheiss (1989) for concise guidance for giving helpful feedback.

Finally, due to her shortcomings in evaluating performance and providing feedback, Tracy doesn't have much of a foundation to coach Mitchell on. There were several opportunities when she could have coached Mitchell. In the beginning, she could have expressed the importance of Mitchell learning the technical processing skills before moving onto improving the process. Later on, the distribution error could have been a coaching opportunity to further Mitchell's understanding of reporting. As the case is written there is only minor mention of Mitchell receiving coaching on how to handle the problem in the future. Afterward, Mitchell is the one that insists they meet on a weekly basis hoping to receive regular feedback. Latham (2018) offers a 10-step guide to coaching employees to change their behavior

7. Develop an onboarding process that Harris could have used for Mitchell. Identify what she did do and what she overlooked.

Becoming a first-time manager is tough. Just like new non-managerial employees, new managers need to be socialized and integrated into their new role. (Feldman, 1976; Maurer, 2018) The short answer to this question is that in reality there was no onboarding process for Mitchell.

There are several stages included in the onboarding process.

Stage 1: Getting In

This stage typically happens during the recruiting process. Even when internal candidates are recruited and hired it is important to pay attention to key issues. Harris should have been focused on the following during this phase: Is there a formal position description and was it

provided? Is this a new position? What impressions did Mitchell get from Harris? His former boss? New team members? How was the person selected and who was involved in the hiring decision? Were the candidates given a realistic-job preview (RJP) to introduce them to the various characteristics of the job such as the work environment, the challenges, skills used, what the day to day demands are? (Feldman, 1976; Maurer, 2018) It is helpful for Harris to learn Mitchell's expectations and for Mitchell to identify what expectations he has developed as part of this stage. Unrealistic or conflicting expectations can negatively affect an employee's experience, performance, satisfaction and result in early turnover. (Feldman, 1976; Maurer, 2018) Ideally, a new hire should receive an RJP and the job description before being hired. But if it is not done then the boss should provide them on the employee's first day in addition to a clear explanation of how the manager's performance will be assessed. There is no evidence that a job description, nor any kind of RJP was developed for the junior manager job.

The First Day

        Harris should set the tone for what the job will be like on the first day by setting goals, building relationships and expressing trust in Mitchell. She should identify why she thinks Mitchell should be successful as a junior and co-manager of the team and the importance of the position. She should also help Mitchell learn about not only his job but how his job supports the senior manager position and the attributes of a good working relationship. She should set up the expectations that he must take initiative in getting to know her and in communicating well.
        Harris should onboard Mitchell by introducing Mitchell to the team and to key individuals she interacts with outside the team as well as informal one on one visits during the first week. This would show that she trusts Mitchell and wants him to get to know the team and its members.

The Initial Assignment

        It is not clear that Harris gave Mitchell a list of assignments/tasks. Some common goals that could be outlined here are for Mitchell to make a contribution to the team, increasing his likelihood for success and a reduction in politics within the team. It would have been helpful if they had developed a mutual and clear understanding of the position either before hire or shortly thereafter. This was not done. At a minimum if she had given him a clear explanation or framework for how he could go about learning the technical aspects of the job and what duties team members perform and a timeframe it may have helped him see how she expected him to allocate his time and why she believes this is necessary if he is to be successful in the position. Also, she would have learned what parts of the position most excited him and where he thought he could make a significant contribution. Then they could have developed a plan and timeframe for him to get started on one of those projects. The plan would have been one that was technically challenging and used his skills and not one with a potential for high conflict early on when he is integrating into the team. The lack of clarity is partially responsible for her dissatisfaction with how he allocated his time.

Stage 2: Breaking In

This stage can take several weeks or months for new managers. The goal is that at the end of the stage new managers are making positive contributions and they have learned the critical technical aspects of the job In addition, they have been able to gain acceptance within the team. Mitchell held one on one meetings and tried to get know team members. He was successful to some degree but he also ruffled feathers and wasn't able to acquire trust from all team members and didn't build trust with Harris. Harris had strong relationships with her team members and Mitchell was an outsider. Harris did not appear to take any actions to help Mitchell become accepted. In fact, when team members complained about him, she did not share who it was and protected them, thus reinforcing Mitchell as an outsider. Ideally, Harris would have shared her years of experience with the company and as a manager to help Mitchell navigate some of the pitfalls. The lack of clear goals and job duties was a factor in Mitchell's difficulty gaining team acceptance and getting Harris's understanding of his proposed improvements to the team's production. Both made assumptions about the position and what was valued. Harris had a well-developed network within the organization and she kept that for herself and didn't seem to take any actions to introduce or integrate Mitchell as a junior manager to the larger organization. Mitchell didn't seem to take any actions to seek out a mentor or person who could be a sounding board to help him navigate becoming a manager.

Social Adjustment

Despite Mitchell's outgoing, friendly and likable personality he didn't have an easy time being accepted by the team. Again it comes back to a lack of a clear role for the junior co-manager position. It wasn't clear to Mitchell what his role was and his role wasn't clear to other team members. They were also wary of how his role would impact their job duties and relationship with the senior manager. Despite his success with Williams and members of his previous department, such as his supervisor, he never fully integrated with the team. The team didn't see him as a co-leader, they didn't see the need to change how they did their job, or the benefit of more financial experience. The key problem area in Mitchell's social adjustment was that he and Harris never managed to develop a working relationship. Neither one knew what was expected of them by the other. Trust was never built and it affected their willingness to interact and communicate with each other, thus reducing the likelihood of ever working it out.

Stage 3: Staying In

Building and Maintaining Relationships across the organization

Mitchell stayed in contact with people in his previous department but he didn't actively build a broader network or take steps to learn who had influence. He appeared to neglect building an effective internal organizational network for himself. If he had a network of peers and managers, he failed to use it effectively. Harris seemed to have a network and considerable influence. She did not share that with Mitchell. When Mitchell developed a few proposals that needed buy-in from others outside his team Harris didn't support them and may have used her own relationships/network to derail it by expressing her own lack of support before others adequately considered the proposal. A few months into the job Mitchell is feeling stress, emotional exhaustion, reduced confidence, and he is not as excited or satisfied with his job.

8. How might an analytical approach like Clawson's (2001) VABEs model help us to understand the dynamics of the situation? (Learning Objective 5)

Clawson (2001) presents a compelling approach for understanding the behavior/perspectives of multiple stakeholders in any situation. In "A Leader's Guide to Why People Behave the Way They Do," Clawson (2001) stresses that to better motivate and lead, one needs to understand the values, assumptions, beliefs, and expectations, (VABEs) of various stakeholders in a given situation. In order for managers or people in general to interact more effectively with each other, it is crucial to consider factors other than just previous observable behaviors. Effective managers must be skilled at identifying and acting on the hidden VABEs of others. VABEs are one's idiosyncratic internalization about the "way the world is" or "should be." VABEs provide the mental building blocks upon which behavior is based. One can develop this framework by documenting observed behavior and then inferring the VABEs.

Based on facts presented in the critical incident, a set of what the proposed VABEs of Mitchell his team and the organization (ABC's Investment's culture) might look like is indicated in Table 3 (Appendix). Note Clawson (2001) suggests that it is not necessary to break down the analysis into values, assumptions, beliefs, and expectations, but to rather generate a global impression about each stakeholder based on reasonable inferences from case facts.

We observe from the VABEs analysis that Mitchell needs to do a better job of managing and representing his employees to top management rather than just banking on his reputation from his previous position. He needs to learn how to more effectively manage upwardly and laterally so that he might learn from his colleagues. He needs to be more proactive about clarifying explicit expectations of Mitchell re: her immediate and long term needs for him. Mitchell also needs to do a better job of networking both within and outside the organization. It would be helpful for Mitchell to acquire a mentor and/or career adviser to help him navigate the rocky shoals of working with Harris in the college savings department.

9. What should Mitchell be doing to become a more effective manager, and in what areas might he benefit from mentoring or training? Why? (Learning Objective 4)

Some excellent ideas on transitioning from a sole performer to a manager can be found in the leadership mindset BusinessWeek article (Welch & Welch, 2006). Promotion to a managerial position means reorienting one's focus from individual performance to that of group performance. This is the art of getting work done through others. Success as a manager is in large measure about the manager's ability to provide the team with resources and to oversee the team's actualization of the task at hand. This requires a deliberate shift in mindset because much of the recognition managers earn is based on effective mentoring of the team and management of the team's project outcomes. The manager's role is to help employees learn and excel and contribute successfully to the overall mission of the organization. As a manager, one becomes more of a coach and mentor rather than individual star player. Managers need to be concerned with new responsibilities that involve infusing energy and enthusiasm into the team, by knowing their own strengths and weaknesses as well as those of the team members, and by providing honest developmental feedback. It is no longer about individual achievement, but about the achievement of the team.

Hill (1994) describes a process for easing the transition from star individual performer to a managerial position. The new manager needs to be concerned about two key primary responsibilities: agenda setting and network building. In Mitchell's role as manager, he needs a combination of expertise (technical skills), analytical skills, and interpersonal and group dynamics skills. The latter set is now more important as the new manager must effectively represent the team in relationship above and across in the organization. This entails effective network building with a complex set of people both inside and outside the organization. One of the major trials faced by Mitchell has been his experience working with his team. It has not been very rewarding up to this point. Gabarro (1987) notes that most experienced managers soon come to realize that their success is largely dependent on how effectively they can build a well-functioning team. As indicated in Figure 1 (Appendix), Hill (1994b) provides a framework for understanding the components required to manage an effective team. She notes that managers have two primary responsibilities with respect to effective team management: (1) managing the team's boundary, i.e., scanning the competitive environment and managing relationships with those on whom the team is interdependent and (2) managing the team itself, i.e., designing the team and facilitating the team process. Hill (1994b) scopes out the components and processes required for effective team management.

The organization is well-served if new managers are routinely provided opportunities to promote successful transition into management positions. Mitchell could use training in team building and team development (Dyer, Dyer, & Dyer, 2007), assessing performance and providing effective feedback (Latham, 2018), and developing power and influence (Pfeffer, 2010).

KEY TAKEAWAYS

After thoroughly working through the case, students might be expected to generate a set of key takeaways gleaned from their thoughtful analysis. The instructor should give students about two minutes to generate one or two key takeaways. They might look something like this:

- When beginning a new job, one should be crystal-clear exactly what their role, goals, and expectations are in the eyes of their immediate manager.
- Learn as quickly as possible what outstanding job performance looks like from their boss' perspective.
- To be successful one needs to consider managing their boss to be an important component of their job. This involves determining through observation or discussion with the boss and/or colleagues what needs to be done to make help their boss achieve success.
- No one is an island. One needs to actively work on developing a network of relationships by identifying appropriate currencies (Hill, 2000) to exchange as well as applying different principles of persuasion (Cialdini, 2001).
- In order to motivate employees, it is a boss' job to identify the unique set of VABEs of his/her employees and to do their best to satisfy the VABEs that are in alignment with the organization's short term and long term goals.

EPILOGUE

Mitchell chose to remain on the college savings team and attempted to work through his and Harris's different managerial styles and visions. Mitchell took his former manager's advice

to heart, realizing that if he returned to his old group, future managers may have a negative perception of him should he pursue subsequent promotion opportunities. Instead, he introduced to Harris the idea of starting from scratch and establishing a new plan to close out the year. He introduced the goals that he wanted to accomplish for the team, and he identified measurable opportunities for himself that he knew Harris wanted him to improve upon. Mitchell still did not like Harris as a manager and didn't agree with her direction, but finally realized that his career was more important than his short-term ideas and process improvements. By working with – and not against – Harris and by abiding by a written, self-composed action plan, Mitchell showed his dedication to improving while also holding Harris accountable for his development needs.

Mitchell also recognized that Harris might not have a favorable year-end evaluation for him, regardless of his success with his development plan. Having a poor YE review would severely hinder his potential mobility from the group for the year, and so he decided to meet with other managers at ABC. Mitchell had a hunch that Harris had been attempting to manage him out regardless (the writing group's return offer, he believed, had been orchestrated by Harris), and he predictably had her blessing to pursue other options, despite having spent less than a year on the college savings team. After an extensive interview process, Mitchell was able to secure another, non-management position in the firm's marketing department, right before receiving the less than stellar year-end appraisal he had anticipated.

REFERENCES

Badaracco, J. L, Jr. (2004). Personal values and professional responsibilities. *Industry and Background Note 304070*. Harvard Business School Publishing: Boston, MA.

Breckler, S. J. (1984). Empirical Validation of Affect, Behavior, and Cognition as Distinct Components of Attitude. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 47* (6), 1191-1205.

Cialdini, R. (2001). Harnessing the science of persuasion. *Harvard Business Review*, 79(9), 72-78.

Clawson, J. G. (2001). *Note: A leader's guide to why people behave the way they do*. UVA OB-0744, Darden Business Publishing, 141-146.

Colquitt, J. A., LePine, J. A., & Wesson, M. J. (2013). *Organizational Behavior*. McGraw Hill 4th edition. McGraw-Hill: New York, NY.

Cuddy, A. J., Kohut, M., & Neffinger, J. (2013). Connect, Then Lead. *Harvard Business Review, 91* (7/8), 54-61.

Darling, M., Parry, C., & Moore, J. (2005). Learning in the Thick of It. *Harvard Business Review. 83* (7/8), 84-92.

Dyer, W. G., Dyer, W. G. Jr., and Dyer, J. H. (2007) *Team building: Proven strategies for improving team performance* (4th ed.). Jossey-Bass: San Francisco, CA.

Farrell, D. (1983). Exit, Voice, Loyalty and Neglect as Responses to Job Dissatisfaction: A Multidimensional Scaling Study. *Academy of Management Journal*, *26* (4), 596-607.

Feldman, D. (1976). A Practical Program for Employee Socialization. *Organizational Dynamics*. *5*, (2), 64-80.

Feldman, D. (1976). A Contingency Theory of Socialization. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, *21* (3) 433-452.

Gabarro, J. J. (1987). *The dynamics of taking charge*. Harvard Business School Press: Boston, MA.

Gabarro, J., & Hill, L. (1995) Managing Performance (Revised 2002). *Harvard Business School Background Note,* 496-022.

Gabarro, J., & Kotter, J. (1980) Managing Your Boss. *Harvard Business Review, 58* (1), 92-100.

Hill, L. (2007). *Becoming the boss*. R07016. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Publishing.

Hill, L. (2000). *What it really means to manage: exercising power and influence*. 9-400-041. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Publishing.

Hill, L. A. (1994). *Exercising influence*. 9-494-080. Boston: MA: Harvard Business School Publishing.

Hulin, C. L., & Judge, T. A. (2003). Job attitudes. In W. C. Borman, D.R. Ilgem, R. J. Klimoski (Eds.), *Handbook of psychology: Industrial and organizational psychology*, 255- 276. Wiley: Hoboken, NJ.

Kets de Vries, Manford F.R. (2016). Managing Yourself: Do You Hate Your Boss? *Harvard Business Review*, *94* (12), 98-101.

Latham, G. P. (2018). *Becoming the evidence-based manager: Making the science of management work for you*. 2nd edition. Nicholas Brealey Publishing: London, UK

Maurer, R. (2018). New Employee Onboarding Guide. *Society for Human Resource Management* Retrieved from https://www.shrm.org/resourcesandtools/hr-topics/talent-acquisition/pages/new-employee-onboarding-guide.aspx

Michaelsen, L. K., & Schultheiss, E. E. (1988). Making feedback helpful. *Organizational Behavior Teaching Review*, 13(1), 109-113.

Nyberg, A. J. & Ployhart, R. E. (2013). "Context-Emergent Turnover (CET) Theory: A Theory of Collective Turnover," *Academy of Management Review*, 38, 109-131.

Pfeffer, J. (2010). Power play. *Harvard Business Review*, *88*(7/8), 84-92.

Simpson, L. (2002). Why Managing Up Matters. *Harvard Management Update 7* (8), 3-5.

Spector, E. (1997). *Job satisfaction: Application, assessment, causes, and consequences.* Sage: Thousand Oaks, CA.

Watkins, M. D. (2009). "The onboarding challenge: A leader's guide to navigating important career transition – ch. 4" from *Your next move: The leader's guide to Navigating major career transitions.* 5339BC. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Publishing.

Welch J., & Welch, S. (2006). The leadership mindset. *BusinessWeek. 3969*, 120.

Withey, M.J., & Cooper, W.H. (1989). Predicting Exit, Voice, Loyalty, and Neglect. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 34* (4), 521-539.

APPENDIX

Table 1 – Changes in Mitchell's Job Satisfaction Over Time

Three Attitude Components	Initial	Subsequent
Cognitive	Competent, capable. Ability to see broader systems perspective and impact on various levels	Second guessing, indecision, a decline in confidence. Decreased job satisfaction when directed to focus on non-managerial activities.
Affective	Excited, Respectful of supervisor. Pride & satisfaction in teammates' growth. Optimism for future.	Less enthusiastic & outgoing. Resentful of supervisor's role and influence. Less motivated to improve himself. Disillusionment.
Behavioral	Outgoing. Taking initiative. Ambitious. Engaged in active communication with coworkers.	Less social. Less time/interest in work. Less motivation to improve. Withholding information, ideas, and feedback

Table 2 – ELVN Construct

	Constructive	Destructive
Active	Voice	Exit
Passive	Loyalty	Neglect

Table 3

Suggested VABEs of Mitchell, His Team and the ABC Investments Organization

Stakeholder	Observed Behavior	VABEs
Mitchell	Harris keeps important information away From Mitchell or releases it in an untimely fashion	My manager should let me know when my performance causes her problems in the organization in a timely fashion
	Harris dwells on the negatives and her Disappointments with Kyle's performance never providing recognition or praise for good work	Recognition for good performance should be recognized
	Harris tells Mitchell his performance is fine and does not give explicit helpful feedback	Feedback should be provided on a regular basis that focuses on behavior and that is actionable. Recognition should be provided for accomplishing good work
	Mitchell makes recommendations to his team to improve their performance and overall contribution to ABC Investments	A manager's job is to help their team succeed by aligning team performance with the organization's strategic intent.
	Some team members seem to resent Mitchell's joining the team as a newcomer	Team members should give me the benefit of the doubt when I arrive instead of prejudging my contribution to their performance
	Harris' seems to take pleasure in letting Mitchell's shortcoming become known throughout ABC Investments	One's supervision should help one to succeed and develop an action plan for improvement instead of broadcasting shortcoming to the organization
	Expectations are never clearly explained with respective to long term and short term goals	One's manager should clearly explicate long term and short term expectations clearly and as soon as one begins the new job
	Mitchell meets one-on-one with reach associate to learn about their developmental needs	Good managers should understand individual employee Values, assumptions, beliefs, and expectations (VABEs).
His work team	Mitchell is moving us out of our comfort zone	We like the status quo as it was with just Harris as manager
	Team does not seem to have confidence in, nor respect for Mitchell.	We trust and respect someone only after they have earned it over time.
	Mitchell the newcomer wants us to be trained and to learn about different aspects of the organization	It would be useful if Harris supported Mitchell's plans for our team development
	Mitchell and Harris seems to be at odds with each other on a regular basis	We are getting unclear messages from Mitchell and about how we should most productively utilize our time.

ABC Investments– the corporation	High performing individual performers are given an opportunity to move up into managerial positions	Managers once promoted for technical skills should be able to hit the ground running.
	Mitchell does not seem to be learning and growing from his experience with Harris	We expect managers to work cooperatively with their managers when promoted into a new role
	Mitchell is cross training his associates to take on broader roles with ABC Investments	Employees should stay in their silos unless developmental plans are known and approved at higher levels.

Figure 1

Management Responsibilities for Team Management and Team Effectiveness after Hill (1994).

Managing the Team's Boundaries:

- Scanning the competitive environment
- Managing external relationships

Managing the Team Itself:

- Designing the team
  -Setting the agenda
  -What type of team is needed?
  -Team composition and structure

- Facilitating the team process
  -Shaping the team's culture
  -Coaching the team

Team Effectiveness:

- The team's output meets the standards of both internal and external customers who use it
- The team experience contributes to the members' personal well-being and development
- The team experience enhances the capability of members to work and learn together in the future.