

- Be honest with yourself about your motives are you really gathering information to help you make a small choice or are you just looking for evidence confirming what you think you'd like to do?
- In seeking the evidence of others, don't ask leading questions that invite confirming evidence and if you find that an advisor always seems to support your point of view, find a new advisor. Don't surround yourself with yes-mans

The framing-trap

The first step in making a decision is to frame the question. It's also one of the most dangerous steps. The way a problem is framed, can profoundly influenced the choice you make.

The framing shop can take many forms of frame can establish the status quo introduced and then curl it can highlight sunk-cost or lead you towards confirming evidence.

We can have frames as gains versus losses or frames with different reference points.

What can we do about it? A poorly frame problem can undermine even the best considered decision but any adverse effect of framing can be limited by taking the following precautions:

- Don't automatically accept the initial frame, whether it was formulated by you or by someone else. Always try to improve the problem in various ways, look for distortion caused by the frames
- Try posing problems in a natural redundant way that combines gains and losses or embraces different reference points
- Think hard throughout your decision-making process about the framing of the problem. At point throughout the process particularly near the end ask yourself how you're thinking my change of the framing changed
- When others recommend decision examine the way they find the problem and challenge them with different themes

The estimating and fore-casting traps

This trap consists of basing future predictions on personal events from your past. Traumatic events can leave such an impression in our minds that we often exaggerate the chances of something happening when really there's little chance that it could happen.

The overconfidence trap: The overconfidence trap makes us overestimate the accuracy of our forecasts

The prudence trap: When faced with high-stakes decisions, we tend to adjust our estimates or forecasts "just to be on the safe side."

The recallability trap: Even if we are neither overly confident nor unduly prudent, we can still fall into a trap when making estimates or forecasts. Because we frequently base our predictions about future events on our memory of past events, we can be overly influenced by dramatic events, those that leave a strong impression on our memory.

What can you do about it? The best way to avoid the estimating and forecasting traps is to take a very disciplined approach to making forecasts and judging probability for each of the three tooth traps some additional precautions can be taken:

- To reduce the effects of overconfidence in making estimates, always start by considering the extremes, the low and high ends of the possible range of values. This will help you avoid being anchored by an initial estimate. Then challenge your estimates of the extremes. Try to imagine circumstances where the actual figure would fall below your low or above your high, and adjust your range accordingly. Challenge the estimates of your subordinates and advisers in a similar fashion. They're also susceptible to overconfidence.
- To avoid the prudence trap, always state your estimates honestly and explain to anyone who will be using them that they have not been adjusted. Emphasize the need for honest input to anyone who will be supplying you with estimates. Test estimates over a reasonable range to assess their impact. Take a second look at the more sensitive estimates.

What's crucial about a vision is not its originality but how well it serves the interests of important constituencies—customers, stockholders, employees—and how easily it can be translated into a realistic competitive strategy. Bad visions tend to ignore the legitimate needs and rights of important constituencies—favoring, say, employees over customers or stockholders.

Aligning people versus organizing and staffing

A central feature of modern organizations is interdependence, where no one has complete autonomy, where most employees are tied to many others by their work, technology, management systems, and hierarchy. These linkages present a special challenge when organizations attempt to change. Unless many individuals line up and move together in the same direction, people will tend to fall all over one another.

Managers “organize” to create human systems that can implement plans as precisely and efficiently as possible. Typically, this requires a number of potentially complex decisions. A company must choose a structure of jobs and reporting relationships, staff it with individuals suited to the jobs, provide training for those who need it, communicate plans to the workforce, and decide how much authority to delegate and to whom. Economic incentives also need to be constructed to accomplish the plan, as well as systems to monitor its implementation. These organizational judgments are much like architectural decisions. It's a question of fit within a particular context.

Aligning is different. It is more of a communications challenge than a design problem. Aligning invariably involves talking to many more individuals than organizing does. The target population can involve not only a manager's subordinates but also bosses, peers, staff in other parts of the organization, as well as suppliers, government officials, and even customers. Anyone who can help implement the vision and strategies or who can block implementation is relevant.

A big challenge in leadership efforts is credibility—getting people to believe the message. Many things contribute to credibility: the track record of the person delivering the message, the content of the message itself, the communicator's reputation for integrity and trustworthiness, and the consistency between words and deeds.

Motivating people versus controlling and problem solving

Since change is the function of leadership, being able to generate highly energized behavior is important for coping with the inevitable barriers to change. Just as direction setting identifies an appropriate path for movement and just as effective alignment gets people moving down that path, successful motivation ensures that they will have the energy to overcome obstacles.

Good leaders motivate people in a variety of ways. First, they always articulate the organization's vision in a manner that stresses the values of the audience they are addressing. This makes the work important to those individuals. Leaders also regularly involve people in deciding how to achieve the organization's vision (or the part most relevant to a particular individual). This gives people a sense of control. Another important motivational technique is to support employee efforts to realize the vision by providing coaching, feedback, and role modeling, thereby helping people grow professionally and enhancing their self-esteem. Finally, good leaders recognize and reward success, which not only gives people a sense of accomplishment but also makes them feel like they belong to an organization that cares about them. When all this is done, the work itself becomes intrinsically motivating.

Of course, leadership from many sources does not necessarily converge. To the contrary, it can easily conflict. For multiple leadership roles to work together, people's actions must be carefully coordinated by mechanisms that differ from those coordinating traditional management roles.

Organizational behavior Session 9

Article: the structure of culture

The three levels of analysis

Artifacts

- Visible and feelable structures and processes
- Observed behavior
- difficult to decipher

Espoused beliefs and values

- Ideals, goals, values, aspirations
- Ideologies
- Rationalizations
- may or may not be congruent with behavior and other artifacts

Basic underlying assumptions

- Unconscious, taken-for granted beliefs and values
- determined behavior, perception, thought, and feeling

1- Artifacts – visible and feelable phenomena

We think of artefacts as the phenomena that you would see here and feel when you encounter a new group with an unfamiliar culture. Artefacts include visible products of the group such as the architecture of its physical environment, its language, its technology and products, its artistic creation, its style as embodied in clothing, manners of address, and emotion displays, its myths and stories told about the organization, its published list of values, and its observable rituals and ceremonies

The most important point to be made about this level of the culture is that it is both observable and very difficult to decipher.

If you live in a group long enough, the meaning of artefacts gradually becomes clear and people explain to you why we do it in that way. If, however you want to achieve this level of understanding more quickly, you must ask insiders why they do what they do. You will then get what we call the espoused beliefs and values

2- Espoused beliefs and values

Espoused values are the values that an organization or a person states that it believes in and is desired. Espoused values are often seen in mission statements, presentations, taglines, etc., of organizations. They are not meant to direct how the workers in the organization work but to inspire them to work and behave

All group learning ultimately reflects someone's original beliefs and values— his or her sense of what ought to be, as distinct from what is. When a group is first created or when it faces a new task, issue, or problem, the first solution proposed to deal with it reflects some individual's own assumptions about what is right or wrong, what will work or will not work. Those individuals who prevail, who can influence the group to adopt a certain approach to the problem, will later be identified as leaders or founders, but the group does not yet have any shared knowledge as a group because it has not yet taken a common action in reference to whatever it is supposed to do. Whatever is proposed will be perceived only as what the leader wants. Until the group has taken some joint action and together observed the outcome of that action, there is not as yet a shared basis for determining whether what the leader wants will turn out to be valid.