

adapt to keep up. IBM and Xerox are good examples of this due to changing technology. Häagen-Dazs is another great example of a company that needed to adapt when environmental challenges threatened its business. Dweck's (2006) research on mindset also offers useful examples for this activity.

While not necessary for participants to read, it might be helpful for the facilitator to learn more about TOMS shoes and criticisms in case participants need more context. There are many articles online, but this one by Joshua Keating (2013) gives a balanced perspective: www.slate.me/1jHrlRu.

Activity Six: Personalized vs. Socialized Vision and Decisions³

Time: 30 to 40 minutes

Learning Outcomes Participants will

- Analyze past group actions to understand how decisions are made in the group.

Detailed Instructions Remind the group of the difference between personalized and socialized decisions (Drechsler Sharp & Teh, 2016; Howell, 1988):

- *Personalized*—when a person in charge comes up with the vision, plan, or idea, and then passes it on to others in the group.
- *Socialized*—when group members contribute to setting the broader direction for the group.

Have the group as a whole brainstorm the last 10 decisions that were made regarding the group. (This is left purposely broad to avoid tipping the balance to decisions made by the *group*, versus decisions made by the *positional leaders* of the group.) Using the list of ways that decisions are made in a group, ask the group to place each decision under a category.

³ Adapted from Teh, A., & Ostick, D. T. (2010). Common purpose. In W. Wagner, D. T. Ostick, S. R. Komives, & Associates (Eds.). *Leadership for a better world: Instructor manual* (pp. 105–117). A publication of the National Clearinghouse for Leadership Programs. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Categories include the following (Drechsler Sharp & Teh, 2016; Johnson & Johnson, 2013):

- *Decision by authority without discussion:* A single positional leader makes a final decision without consulting group members.
- *Decision by authority after discussion:* The positional leader consults group members for their perspectives and ideas, but ultimately makes the final decision.
- *Expert member:* The final decision is made by the group member who has the most knowledge or experience related to the issue or problem.
- *Average member's opinions:* The decision is based on what is presumed to be the opinion of the most typical member.
- *Majority control:* The decision is based on the opinion held by the majority of the group's members.
- *Minority control:* The decision is made by a few key members, often when the group is dealing with time pressures.
- *Consensus:* Group members continue to discuss and persuade each other until everyone agrees (or those who do not agree are willing to commit to the decision).

Discuss with the group why one category is more common or less common than others. Are individuals comfortable with how decisions are being made in the group? Why or why not? Discuss what decision-making process group members would prefer. How can the group accomplish this?

Discussion Questions The following discussion questions can be used to guide a debrief of the activity:

- How do you contribute to how decisions are made in the group? Is this helpful or harmful to the group? Do you abdicate visioning and decision-making to others, or control decision-making in the group at the expense of others?

- Ideally, how would you like decisions to be made in your organization? What challenges might be associated with that approach? What would the value of that approach be?

Facilitator Notes This activity works best for an intact group, but can be modified if the group is still forming or random. To adapt this activity, you might consider using a common social movement or historical movement to categorize decisions made over time.

➤ Supplemental Readings

Astin, A. W., & Astin, H. S. (2000). *Leadership reconsidered: Engaging higher education in social change*. Battle Creek, MI: W.K Kellogg Foundation.

Crosby, B., & Bryson, J. (2005). *Leadership for the common good: Tackling public problems in a shared-power world*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Kurtzman, J. (2010). *Common purpose: How great leaders get organizations to achieve the extraordinary*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Haber, P., & Komives, S.R. (2009) Predicting the individual values of the social change model of leadership development: The role of college students' leadership and involvement experiences. *Journal of Leadership Education*, 7(3), 133–166. doi: 10.12806/v7/i3/rf4

➤ Media

This American Life (Producer). (2016, March 11). *When the beasts come marching in* [Audio podcast]. Retrieved from: www.thisamericanlife.org/radio-archives/episode/582/when-the-beasts-come-marching-in

Ed Muzio (2009, March 10). *Group decision-making that works* [video file]. CBS News. Retrieved from: www.bnet.com/2422-13731_23-265796.html

Charlie Harayz (2010, April 1). TEDEd Talk: Drive: The surprising truth about what motivates us. Retrieved from: <http://ed.ted.com/featured/LT8oQQTo>

Larry Kesslin (2014, February 21). TEDx Talk: Shared common purpose. Retrieved from: www.youtube.com/watch?v=yC3inLuWoyQ