CHAPTER 2

Measure of Participative Leadership


1. My supervisor consults with subordinates when facing a problem.
2. My supervisor listens receptively to subordinates’ ideas and suggestions.
3. My supervisor acts without consulting his or her subordinates. (reverse-coded)
4. My supervisor asks for suggestions from subordinates concerning how to carry out assignments.

Measure of Directive Leadership


1. My supervisor lets subordinates know what is expected of them.
2. My supervisor informs subordinates about what needs to be done and how it needs to be done.
3. My supervisor explains the level of performance that is expected of subordinates.
4. My supervisor asks subordinates to follow standard rules and regulations.
Measure of Team Performance

Five items adapted from the Team Productivity Scale (Kirkman & Rosen, 1999). The response format ranged from 1 (“completely disagree”) to 7 (“completely agree”).

1. This team completes its tasks on time.
2. This team makes sure that products and services meet or exceed production standards.
3. This team responds quickly when problems come up.
4. This team is a productive team.
5. This team successfully overcomes problems that slow down work.

Measure of Task Interdependence

Three items adapted from Van der Vegt and Janssen (2003). The response format ranged from 1 (“completely disagree”) to 5 (“completely agree”).

1. I need information and advice from my colleagues to perform my job well.
2. I need to collaborate with my colleagues to perform my job well.
3. I regularly have to communicate with colleagues about work-related issues.
CHAPTER 3

Measure of Individual-focused Intellectual Stimulation

Three items from a German version (Heinitz & Rowold, 2007) of the Transformational Leadership Inventory by Podsakoff et al. (1990). The response format ranged from 1 (“never”) to 5 (“always”).

1. My supervisor stimulates me to rethink the way I do things.
2. My supervisor has ideas that have challenged me to reexamine some of basic assumptions about my work.
3. My supervisor challenges me to think about old problems in new ways.

Measure of Individual-focused Individualized Support

Four items from a German version (Heinitz & Rowold, 2007) of the Transformational Leadership Inventory by Podsakoff et al. (1990). The response format ranged from 1 (“never”) to 5 (“always”).

1. My supervisor acts without considering my feelings. (reverse-coded)
2. My supervisor shows respect for my personal feelings.
3. My supervisor behaves in a manner thoughtful of my personal needs.
4. My supervisor treats me without considering my personal feelings. (reverse-coded)
Unlocking the Potential of Teams

Measure of Group-focused Transformational Leadership

Six items from a German version (Heinitz & Rowold, 2007) of the Transformational Leadership Inventory by Podsakoff et al. (1990). The response format ranged from 1 (“never”) to 5 (“always”).

Articulating an inspiring vision

1. My supervisor paints an interesting picture of the future for our group.
2. My supervisor has a clear understanding of where we are going.
3. My supervisor inspires others with his/her plans for the future.

Fostering the acceptance of group goals

1. My supervisor encourages employees to be “team players”.
2. My supervisor gets the group to work together for the same goal.
3. My supervisor develops a team attitude and spirit among employees.

Measure of Job Autonomy

Three items from a scale by Morgeson and Humphrey (2006). The response format ranged from 1 (“completely disagree”) to 5 (“completely agree”).

1. The job provides me with significant autonomy in making decisions.
2. The job allows me to make a lot of decisions on my own.
3. The job gives me a chance to use my personal initiative or judgment in carrying out the work.
Measure of Satisfaction with the Leader

Three items adapted from a measure of job dissatisfaction by Zhou and George (2001). The response format ranged from 1 (“completely disagree”) to 5 (“completely agree”).

1. In general, I am satisfied with my supervisor.
2. All in all, I like working for my supervisor.
3. In general, I don’t like my supervisor. (reverse-coded)

Measure of Knowledge Sharing

Three items suggested by Faraj and Sproull (2000). The response format ranged from 1 (“completely disagree”) to 5 (“completely agree”).

1. If someone in our team has some special knowledge about how to perform the team task, he or she is not likely to tell the other members about it. (reverse-coded)
2. There is virtually no exchange of information, knowledge, or sharing of skills among members. (reverse-coded)
3. More knowledgeable team members freely provide other members with hard-to-find knowledge or specialized skills.
**Measure of Individual Performance**

Three performance criteria adapted from Van der Vegt and Bunderson (2005). The response format ranged from 1 (“far below average”) to 7 (“far above average”).

1. Effectiveness
2. Productivity
3. Quality of work

**Measure of Group Performance**

Three performance criteria adapted from Van der Vegt and Bunderson (2005). The response format ranged from 1 (“far below average”) to 7 (“far above average”).

1. Effectiveness
2. Productivity
3. Quality of work
CHAPTER 4

Measure of Trait Learning Goal Orientation

Eight items from a scale by Button et al. (1996). The response format ranged from 1 (“completely disagree”) to 5 (“completely agree”).

1. The opportunity to do challenging work is important to me.
2. When I fail to complete a difficult task, I plan to try harder the next time I work on it.
3. I prefer to work on tasks that force me to learn new things.
4. The opportunity to learn new things is important to me.
5. I do my best when I’m working on a fairly difficult task.
6. I try hard to improve on my past performance.
7. The opportunity to extend the range of my abilities is important to me.
8. When I have difficulty solving a problem, I enjoy trying different approaches to see which one will work.

Measure of Salience of Intrateam Differences

Three items suggested by Greer et al. (2012). The response format ranged from 1 (“completely disagree”) to 7 (“completely agree”).

1. I perceive different categories of people within our team.
2. While our team was working on the task, I divided the team members into smaller subgroups.
3. When I would have to describe my team members, I would do that based on salient categories.
Measure of Utilization of Intrateam Differences

One item suggested by Schmidt and Wegge (2009). The response format ranged from 1 (“completely disagree”) to 7 (“completely agree”).

1. Different knowledge resources, based on (educational) expertise of certain individuals, have been openly addressed in our team.
CASE STUDY - Online Dating HMYY

Introduction

Your team is part of the Bremen Consulting Group (BCG). One of your team’s first projects is to consult HMYY. Since HMYY has a very entrepreneurial spirit, they want to find a solution that improves the online dating as it is today by avoiding the discovered pitfalls and by making it applicable not only to one culture or one academic group, but possibly all over the world and in many different cultures. In order to do this, of course, many social and technical issues within the described stages below have to be addressed.

Background

Due to globalization and advances in information technology, today’s workforce is supposed to be always ready to move to another city for a new job. Finding a partner in a new environment has become difficult, especially for educated, mobile working singles above 25.

For this reason, in many countries all over the world, online dating websites have double-digit growth rates. More and more people, among them a large number of academics, do not want to wait until possibly meeting Mr. or Ms. Right in the supermarket. Instead, at such dating-websites, singles can search systematically for potential partners that are indicated as matching their own profile. For instance, singles at chemistry.com are matched based on their personality, attitudes or interests and with regard to their comparative finger length, which is supposed to be related to testosterone and estrogen levels in the human body. However, singles can only get into contact with a potential match when paying a monthly membership fee.

“Haven’t Met You Yet” (HMYY) is a young entrepreneurial start-up company that wants to enter the global online dating market such as Asia, Africa and Europe. In order to be really successful worldwide, HMYY has conducted a cross-cultural survey to find out about the experiences of online dating users worldwide. In the following, the main stages and pitfalls in online dating are described:
Stage 1 – creating a profile

After entering the website, clients fill in questions regarding personality, attitudes and interests. Based on the answers, each user can see a list of potential partners that match his/her profile which is usually based on their similarity. The user can click on the profiles and get more information about his/her match, whom s/he may contact after becoming a paying members (fee of about 40$/30€ per month). HMYY intends to provide a reasonable price for the service that is feasible/adequate for different cultural or educational backgrounds.

Stage 2 – getting in touch

Sometimes, but not often enough, participants reported that they usually found something in the profile of their proposed match that seemed interesting. Then, the e-mail exchange started and continued, because when writing to each other they found out about many more things they would have in common.

Stage 3 – the picture

After having written to each other repeatedly, participants usually want to see each other’s pictures. This often was a reason they would stop to communicate, because even though their personalities matched quite well, their looks did not and they could not imagine dating each other after having seen the picture.

Stage 4 – first real date

In rare cases, seeing a picture got them even more interested in each other until one of the two finally proposed to meet. When they met, some people reported that the date was bad or unworthy, because the real appearance differed from the very old or too professional or photo-shopped picture or the real person suddenly seemed a whole lot different than expected. Sally, one of the focus group members, didn’t like how the guy smelled, while Peter was complaining about how his date lacked charisma and esprit. The potential partners simply didn’t have the “chemistry” which is very difficult to find out online.

HMYY intends to resolve one of the main problems of conventional dating services: to successfully match couples. Until now, no online dating concept provides automatic matches that take physical appearance, i.e. pictures into account. This leads to another required improvement: a better experience of online dating all together, for instance avoiding cases in which clients
spend a lot of time and effort on online interactions (e.g. writing or even calling each other), just to find out at the first face to face date that they do not have chemistry.

**Stage 5 - relationship**

In rare cases, users liked each other and began a relationship, sometimes even leading to marriages. HMYY would like to increase the number of successful matchings.

**Your Task**

Please help HMYY in their efforts to expand globally. Identify ways in which HMYY can improve the conventional business models and overcome the problems that are still inherent in each stage of online dating (i.e. overcome the obstacles that are currently inherent in each stage by either fixing the problems within the current business model or by developing a new and better approach).

Failing to solve those pitfalls will most likely lead to bankruptcy, while solving these problems, will enable HMYY to set the standard for online dating and become market leader.

- Your team has 20 minutes from now to accomplish the task (including reading the case study above 30 minutes).
- Please start with working on the task immediately after having finished the reading.
- Please write down each idea as a team immediately, already DURING the discussion on the provided worksheet (experience shows that it is best to appoint one team member to write down ideas. S/he also actively contributes to the task).
- You may provide a short description in case you think the idea needs further explanation to be understood by HMYY
- Please number your ideas (1 indicates your first idea, 2 the second etc.)
- Do only pay attention to details if absolutely necessary. Try to keep an overview over the whole project and the overall task!
- The team leader is moderating the discussion and making sure that the task is finished in time (within 20 minutes). S/he also actively contributes to the task.
CHAPTER 5

Measure of Contingent Reward Leadership

Four items from a German version (Heinitz & Rowold, 2007) of the Transformational Leadership Inventory by Podsakoff et al. (1990). The response format ranged from 1 (“never”) to 5 (“always”).

1. My supervisor always gives me positive feedback when I perform well.
2. My supervisor gives me special recognition when my work is very good.
3. My supervisor frequently does not acknowledge my good performance. (reverse-coded)
4. My supervisor commends me when I do a better than average job.

Measure of Participative Leadership


1. My supervisor consults with subordinates when facing a problem.
2. My supervisor listens receptively to subordinates’ ideas and suggestions.
3. My supervisor acts without consulting his or her subordinates. (reverse-coded)
4. My supervisor asks for suggestions from subordinates concerning how to carry out assignments.

Measure of Task Interdependence

Three items adapted from Van der Vegt and Janssen (2003). The response format ranged from 1 (“completely disagree”) to 5 (“completely agree”).

1. I need information and advice from my colleagues to perform my job well.
2. I need to collaborate with my colleagues to perform my job well.
3. I regularly have to communicate with colleagues about work-related issues.