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The Senior Project was to have been a project that would make a difference in the community or in an organization within the community and at the same time be something relevant and important to the student. After discussing our mutual interest in the area of leadership training, Kristine Sweet and I decided to get involved in a Human Resources or Training and Development segment of a local business. After sending out numerous letters of inquiry, we were finally offered a project at Ukrop's Supermarkets, Inc. that suited our desires and also fit the class requirements. The project appealed to us because it offered practical experience in a type of profession that we were interested in pursuing upon graduation and because we knew it would call upon us to put into use all of our Jepson School learning in such a way that it would benefit another organization. It was the best opportunity to bridge the gap between classroom theory and actual field practice, and it became an exciting challenge to us to both sharpen our leadership skills and to help others develop their own.

The task was for us, equipped with all the knowledge and expertise on leadership issues, to review and revise their Leadership Development Program. The Program was several years old and had typically been offered to store managers, department managers, or emerging leaders in other aspects of the company. It was
based on Ukrop's shared values, and it included the following modules, spread out over an eight week period: "Leadership in a Value Driven Organization," "Coaching for Superior Customer Service," "Building Excitement for Food," "Maintaining a Healthy and Safe Work Environment," "Performance Management," "Diversity in the Workplace," "Improving Profitability," and "Developing Superior Work Teams." We were given free reign over editing the content of the classes, suggesting additional modules, eliminating other modules, and recommending new instructing methods and tools, such as readings and videos.

In a sense we became leadership consultants to Ukrop's Human Resources function. We worked closely with two personnel assistants, the Human Resources Director, and the Vice President for Human Resources, who oversees all training for almost four thousand associates. As a tool for evaluating all of their training and personal development programs, known as the Center for Retail Food Studies, Ukrop's distributed surveys to all associates and managers who had participated in classes last year and to all faculty who had instructed them. We were asked to evaluate the surveys in terms of what general improvements could be made to the Center for Retail Food Studies and more specifically what their needs were regarding leadership training. We discovered that in general associates were satisfied with their training opportunities, but they felt like input was needed, both instructors and materials, from sources other than within the company, as typically people from various aspects of Ukrop's served as their training staff. In addition, we noted that managers and associates alike seemed to want an emphasis on issues more personally relevant to them, with less focus on specific Ukrop's topics, such as the shared values. We
compiled the data from the surveys, returned them to Ukrop’s for further analysis, and began our attempt to critically review the program.

With the major factors that turned up in the survey results in mind, Kristine and I began to brainstorm ways of implementing successful change. We determined that we should merely focus on the current Leadership Development Program, offering our ideas for enhancement and expansion of Ukrop’s own modules. First, we read all the materials and literature with which they provided us. We tested ourselves using the instruments they use, and we reviewed the mandatory readings from authors like Kouzes and Posner and Kenneth Blanchard. Immediately we began flagging what was useful and relevant to our overall understanding of what a leadership program should be. In other words, we initially sensed that the program contained elements that coincided with our perception of leadership development (based on our learning in the Jepson School curriculum), but it also contained a lot of "excess baggage," material that we found irrelevant to leadership or better suited to another course all together. Such material included the entire module of "Superior Customer Service" and "Building Excitement for Food."

Instead of using classes like these, we agreed to maintain the program’s eight-week length by adding in new material, combining several old modules into one new one, and splitting other old ones into several new ones. The material that was useful we felt was so useful that we could just tack on some of our own ideas and the project would be complete. So, we divided up the "Leadership in a Value Driven Organization" module into two: "Leadership and Values" and "Leadership Styles and Theories." We recommended adding in an ethics component to the Values section.
We then added Food and Customer Service components to a class we designed on Motivation, striving to keep their original themes intact. We also recommended that Ukrop's consider addressing leader/follower interaction and communication techniques for effective leaders.

All of these ideas made it seem like we were really on target. However, we were having a little difficulty fitting the materials we wanted into the constraints of what Ukrop's wanted to offer. For instance, we felt like all of the examples for the new material needed to include specific reference to Ukrop's practices or situations. A class on motivation therefore would involve case studies about how a store manager might motivate his/her cashiers. We sensed that our hands were tied because much of the material offered in the current Leadership Development Program was very Ukrop's-specific, regarding company policy or code of behavior, for example. Being "outsiders" to the company, Kristine and I were unable to relate specific Ukrop's information to the general leadership information we wished to present.

Obviously this problem kept occurring everywhere we turned, and we became extremely burdened by a general lack of information--about the company in general and then specifically about the instructors' original lesson plans and ideas behind the modules. Ukrop's had simply not provided us with enough detail about how the modules had been taught in the past. The materials and the manual they presented us for our review was merely the students' manual, not the instructors'. We felt that we needed to know exactly what had been offered previously and how it was presented (medium) before we could really change it.

At that point, we decided not to proceed. We called a meeting with the Human
Resources Director and the two personnel assistants to present our ideas on the first three modules. Before we continued reviewing and revising the other five modules, we wanted to get some feedback on our ideas for the first ones, and we wanted to clear up some of the ambiguity and uncertainty about the project. Kristine and I discovered at the meeting that our ideas indeed were on track with Ukrop’s own vision for leadership development. They all commented on how coincidental it was that some of the things we suggested, such as a self-analysis of leadership style, were the same type of things that Jim and Bob Ukrop had discussed with them at a recent executive leadership retreat. That was very reassuring news, and their pat on our backs was enough to motivate us to examine the remaining modules. Before we left, we were assured that appointments would be arranged between us and the various instructors, in order to ascertain their clarifications and feedback. The first of these meetings would be with the Vice President of Human Resources, second in command to the Ukrops brothers, and the designated instructor for the first module, Mr. Bob Kelley.

The meeting with Bob Kelley turned out to be the end of our brief feeling of satisfaction and progress. We wanted to ask him some specific questions about "Leadership in a Value Driven Organization," such as what video clip is this or what questionnaire is that?, but first he wanted to hear our recommendations. So, we told him the same thing we had told the others, expecting to get the same positive reinforcement from him that we had from them. We were wrong, and suddenly we realized that we had assumed too much about the company. We had assumed, based on their interest in leadership training and their general quality reputation, that they
lived and worked by high standards of leader/follower interaction and multidirectional communication.

Mr. Kelley didn’t recognize the brilliance of our ideas as had his subordinates. In fact, he seemed to have never even talked with them about it. Apparently they never talk with him at all, much less share input on things like this. Not only did he seem to not have time to bother with them, he just didn’t seem to be interested in his followers’ opinions. I was disappointed to see this, particularly because the result was that he did not like our new ideas. This meeting, nearly half way through the semester, became a major turning point in the project. It opened our eyes to a variety of other problems involved with working for Ukrop’s.

First, we learned to not assume anything. After that time we knew that we could discuss minor issues, such as survey results, with the other three people, but we would have to go directly to Mr. Kelley, the leader, for approval of further work. We noted the lack of communication from there on out. For example, one of the personnel assistants consistently quizzed Kristine and I about Mr. Kelley’s responses. "Did he like this or that? Oh, I was afraid he wouldn’t" was a typical comment from her which indicated her non-communication with the leader.

Another problem that resulted from assumptions and lack of communication involved the initial surveys. We assumed that they provided us with the associate and faculty surveys for our own benefit, to gauge how much and the type of change the Leadership Program needed. Later we discovered that they had assumed we would analyze the surveys statistically and technically, providing them feedback on the entire Center for Retail Food Studies. The end result was that we returned them for their
people to further analyze. Our project was enough work without having to learn how to interpret statistical data.

Finally, Kristine and I encountered another ambiguity about the assignment which slowed down our progress. We were never certain to whom we should report. We knew that we were ultimately accountable to Bob Kelley, but we didn’t know who we should contact with minor questions or to whom we should present our findings and suggestions. Too many people at Ukrop’s acted as if they were in charge, yet no one seemed to want to take real responsibility for supervising our project. We often felt like we were being pushed off onto the one personnel assistant who knew the least and had the least authority.

The turning point that the meeting with Bob Kelley represented was not only an enlightenment of all the negatives, it was at the same time the best thing that happened to us. It was very stressful at first because Mr. Kelley was honest and upfront with us, admitting that he didn’t see our new ideas as more important than his old ones. He said that he liked the suggestions, but he was unwilling to scrap the "Customer Service" and "Food" modules. Kristine and I stood firm on our ideas, justifying the need for leadership development over supermarket operations, and so a discussion ensued about the fundamental problem with this project: What was the goal or objective for the Leadership Development Program? We hadn’t thought of it; they hadn’t thought of it, but all of us needed to know that answer before the program could be revised. After much tension and uneasiness, Bob Kelley, Kristine, and I reached a mutual decision. We concluded that each person participating in the modules should gain knowledge of themselves as leaders and how to be better
leaders. By the conclusion of the entire program participants should also have gained in depth knowledge of company policy and operations information relevant to its leadership. Though the process of deciding the program’s objective was a stressful event, the resolution of the issue (which none of us had even identified as an issue) became the best thing that could have happened to us. The whole focus of our assignment had changed, but it made the revision much easier for us. The Leadership Development Program would now be a series of modules about general leadership issues, and it would be followed by a supermarket operations program centered around Ukrop’s-specific and technical information. See the appendix for the final layout of the courses and their integration into the Leadership Program as a whole.

As noted previously, our being "outsiders" to the company had really hindered our progress. With the turn of events, we were now free from the constraint of making the leadership modules Ukrop’s-specific. In addition, some general leadership courses would provide Ukrop’s associates with one of their needs, as indicated by the surveys: more personal development offerings, less "job-only" courses. Finally, the change was for the better because it relieved us of some of the scarcity of information we were experiencing. For example, we no longer needed to meet with the other instructors and be debriefed on their lesson plans. We had freedom to create our own, totally new leadership modules. We chose to use the Jepson School curriculum as a model for the Leadership Development Program. Based on that we developed five basic modules, for the second time. See the appendix of module outlines for further detail.

We left intact for the most part "Leadership in a Value Driven Organization"
since the shared values are such an important part of Ukrop’s philosophy of business and leadership. We did, however, add an ethics emphasis to it. All the class originally had on ethics was a book entitled *The Power of Ethical Management*, which we both read and thoroughly recommended keeping, but it failed to focus on self-reflection as a leader. In order to evoke some self-reflection from the participants, we opted to add “The Parable of the Sadhu,” which is an ethics case study that calls on the reader to really put him/herself into a situation that could mean life or death for another human being. Furthermore, we suggested that the program participants take time to establish goals for themselves, their department, and their store in regard to how they should attempt to exemplify the shared corporate values.

The second of the five modules is one that we salvaged from our first attempt. It had originally stemmed from the "Value" module, but now constituted its own two and a half hour class. Taking its cue from "History and Theories of Leadership," "Leadership Styles and Characteristics" addresses definitions of leadership and the fact that there isn’t an agreed upon one, the characteristics of effective leaders through video medium, and an assessment of each individual’s own leadership style through a questionnaire. Kristine and I wanted the class to be not only educational but fun and memorable, so we selected some activities to demonstrate directive vs. participative leadership, transactional vs. transformational leadership, and management vs. leadership. For example, we devised a paper airplane folding exercise that exemplifies the stereotypes of managers and of leaders while clarifying the point that both are necessary for a successful business. See the instructions to the group heads (one leader, one manager) included in the appendix. The result of the
role play should be that the groups headed by a leader have a variety of creative paper airplanes and have had fun folding them while the "managed" groups have a high volume of similar planes and have felt their input was unappreciated, their individualism ignored. It turns out to be fun, with everyone flying their airplanes, but it makes clear the point that Ukrop’s needs good management and good leadership.

The third module proposed for Ukrop’s Leadership Development Program is a combination of various materials from the Jepson School courses. "Decision Making and Critical Thinking for Leaders" involves several simulations that again are illustrative of important leadership issues while at the same time are fun to participate in. For example, we recommend the familiar Desert Survival Simulation in which groups must decide whether to stay and wait for a rescue or to go and find help. Either way, items for survival must be chosen, and the participants must be prepared to explain their reasoning behind choosing items, a process that, in our plans, is accompanied by the "steps to decision making." Additionally, we wished to have their instructor discuss some typical fallacies of arguments (i.e. the false dilemma: the mistake of thinking that there are only two solutions to every decision when in reality there exist a variety of options and creative decisions.) as the prelude to a final decision making simulation. The goal is that by the end of the module, participants will be able to utilize new decision-making techniques and avoid certain fallacies in their simulation.

"Motivation and Empowerment" is the title of the fourth module we recommend. It is centered around the book Zapp! The Lightning of Empowerment, which we suggest as homework for the participants from the previous week. Kristine
and I intend to include a video clip of a real-life example of the principles of Zapp vs. Sapp (motivation/empowerment vs. de-motivation/discouragement). One idea for such a video was the now famous Pat Carrigan segment, as she exemplifies empowerment through walk-around management. Other plans for this module include a game to demonstrate the importance of communication between leaders and followers in motivating a group to complete a task and case studies of groups or individuals who are suffering from a lack of motivation. Class participants should evaluate the cases and utilize motivational techniques to act out role plays of potential solutions. This module provides a brief overview of motivation to help individuals discover how they personally are motivated and then in turn to help motivate others.

The fifth and final module for this program is "Group Dynamics." Here Kristine and I employed cases from an old textbook entitled *Groups that Work and Those That Don’t*. We wanted to introduce the generalities of both a group that functions well together and one that does not. Then we scheduled a group communication exercise that depicts the poor interaction of individuals in a meeting situation, each of them acting as different animals. (See appendix) For example, one individual in the meeting is a mule, extremely stubborn and refusing to compromise, while another is a mouse, timid and afraid to offer any opinions. The aim is to break down those stereotypical communication barriers and foster better group cohesion and interaction. Next, the participants take part in any group task, the point of which is to observe one another and oneself and note patterns of leader emergence and group interaction. Finally, the instructor should present them with several groupthink avoidance techniques and discuss the very negative implications of the phenomenon called groupthink. This
would conclude the modules for the Leadership Development Program, and at that
time its graduates would proceed to the modules that compose the proposed
Supermarket Operations Program.

Kristine and I are in the process of presenting these materials to Bob Kelley at
Ukrop's and getting his final approval. We feel like our recommendations were very
carefully thought out and researched. Based on our own experiences, our course
learning, and the results of the Ukrop's survey, we feel that the modules we proposed
should meet the needs of Ukrop's management in being introduced to the
fundamentals of leadership. We selected exercises, activities, and literature from a
variety of sources. For the most part, we chose to highlight what we felt were the
most important and most teachable aspects of the courses we have had over the past
two years, and we researched using old textbooks, articles, so-called "pop" leadership
books, and other training manuals. We feel that the courses are put together in such
a way that they will provide maximum learning about leadership in a brief period of
time (2.5 hrs. X 5 modules).

By the very nature of our Senior Project, Kristine and I were compelled to
integrate our previous course work in the Jepson School curriculum. Not only at the
surface level, where we recalled prior learning for the purpose of including it in our
own program, but at a higher level as well, we utilized our leadership education.
What I mean is that the overall education we have received not only equipped us with
the tools to replicate it for another organization, it helped us to be personally prepared
as the actual leaders of the project. We attacked the problem with the knowledge and
skills behind us from Conflict Resolution, The Leader as A Change Agent, Critical
Thinking, Decision-Making, Motivation, and Leadership in Formal Organizations.

The "Value Driven Organization" class required us to draw from the course on ethics, a component of leadership which is strongly emphasized in all the Jepson School curriculum, not just in one class. We extracted from the syllabus some ideas about readings and case studies to be used in our Leadership Program, but more importantly the education in ethics we both share helped guide us through the project. While we did not face any real ethical dilemmas, we did recognize our moral obligations as the leaders of this project. We established goals and a vision for it that entailed an effort to benefit others, to make a difference in an organization. Clearly we were at least a little self-interested in this topic, but we also felt a moral obligation to share our knowledge and educate others in the community about leadership.

"History and Theories of Leadership" provided us with a wide base of knowledge from which to draw for the entire Leadership Development Program. Specifically we utilized the texts and syllabus in structuring the module on styles and characteristics, including transformational leadership and the leader versus the manager. It helped us to not only introduce the concept of leadership to class participants, but also to recognize differences in the way people lead, including one another and the leaders with whom we were working at Ukrop’s. A general awareness of leadership styles made us much more appreciative of and empathetic to the inconsistencies among our leaders. Along those same lines, although we didn’t choose much material from it, "Leadership in Formal Organizations" proved to be a tremendous asset to Kristine and I in working with Ukrop’s. Just the general understanding of how effective leadership can impact an organization’s vision,
mission, climate, and culture inspired us to provide quality leadership training in hopes that we could have a positive impact on the company. Course material also helped equip us with a comprehension of organizational structure and where we were situated in that vision and an excellent culture, but Kristine and I wished to maintain that feeling in the materials we prepared for them. Therefore, a thorough review of visionary leadership and good leader-follower interactions was a major asset to us in carrying out this project.

"Critical Thinking" was extremely beneficial to us in completing the project. We were at times left with very little direction or guidance, and so we were forced to be very analytical, deciphering what the current Leadership Program was all about, and interpreting the survey results to determine where we needed to go. Our critical thinking skills were frequently called upon in evaluating our own decisions. We looked back on our ideas and plans, analyzing why we chose what we did, carefully thinking through the results, and anticipating any problems. We felt that the ability to use logic and reasoning, as we were doing at the time, is so critical that it should be included in their leadership curriculum. We picked some highlights from Dr. Ciulla’s Critical Thinking course and combined them with decision-making for one of the five modules. Naturally some material from the Jepson Decision Making for Leaders course was utilized, including the "steps to decision making" and a simulation, but more than in that respect, Kristine and I consistently practiced decision-making skills. As noted previously, we were often at a disadvantage, without enough information to make appropriate decisions, but we did it anyway. We just called forth our best judgement and moved onward due to the time constraints under which we worked.
Our module on Motivation and Empowerment was supplemented by the Leadership and Motivation course in Jepson. We took advantage of some of the class readings, implementing them in our own lesson plans, but the real integration of motivation for us was maintaining our own level of drive throughout the project. Again the frustration caused by our consistent lack of information and communication and the ambiguity of not knowing who was our "boss" served as a big de-motivator. We constantly had to try to get excited about what we were doing, the content of the project, in order to get motivated over the negative process of the project. Another test of our motivation skills will be getting Mr. Kelley and the others at Ukrop's to buy into our proposal.

"Leading Groups" was the model for our module, "Group Dynamics." Again we used the text and some research from the class to develop our own version of it, including cases and sociogram drawings of group behavior. Pretty much the entire module was based on our exposure to group theory through the Jepson School, and through our familiarity with group processes, Kristine and I were able to avoid the negatives of group decision making and benefit from its advantages. For example, we saw to it that we checked one another’s ideas, playing devil’s advocate, to make sure they were on track with our goals, not just "good enough" to be done with the project.

Finally Kristine and I were able to integrate two other courses into our Senior Project. First, "Conflict Resolution" came into use at the midpoint of the semester. A conflict arose when Bob Kelley rejected our plans, and we were forced, in the course of only one two hour meeting, to resolve it. Without resolving our differences
of opinion the project would have ceased. Instead, we combined our creative thinking with negotiation skills to create a "win-win" situation. Called integrative bargaining, this type of conflict resolution resulted in Bob Kelley maintaining his original input, satisfying Ukrop's, and us maintaining our ideas, thus satisfying our own desires for the program. The ability to tactfully and creatively solve conflicts is a skill I never anticipated using in the course of this project, but fortunately the leadership education had prepared me for it.

Then, though we did not address the subject in our proposed modules, Kristine and I actually served as change agents. Although the change she and I attempted to implement was fairly small overall, in terms of Ukrop's Center for Retail Food Studies, it was significant. The need for change was handed to us, and there was little resistance to change, but we did encounter difficulty in gaining acceptance for the type of change we proposed. Even though we haven't presented the final product or gained approval for it, we hope that we have been able to guarantee acceptance of the changes by seeking input and feedback from Ukrop's and by establishing a clear, shared vision for the project. Clearly, every bit of course work we experienced in the Jepson School was put to use in this project, at two different levels. We personally benefitted from the knowledge, and we were able to pass that knowledge onto others so that they too might benefit.

In addition to our utilizing prior leadership knowledge for this project, the project itself taught us more about leadership in the "real world." There are several important factors that stand as disappointments for Kristine and I, and I think we learned that leaders must often face imperfect situations. For example, ideally we would have
liked to have taught or collaborated with another instructor in teaching these modules. We had high hopes that we would be asked to do so, but based on the limited time, we would now be unable to, even if asked. We really don’t even know if our plans will ever materialize and be implemented into Ukrop’s Center for Retail Food Studies. Again that is disappointing to think we put so much time and effort into it, and we don’t even know if it will truly work as we had planned. Dealing with disappointment and allowing others to take the credit (by leaving a leadership post in our case) are two important lessons I think Kristine and I learned from this experience.

Other important areas of leadership that became very clear to us during the course of the Senior Project include communication and vision. We certainly learned that clear lines of communication, going both top-down and bottom-up, need to be introduced from the outset. A leader, no matter how powerful, cannot successfully lead change or supervise a project without open and clear communication. Furthermore, a vision and goals for the task need to be established at the beginning of a project, not half way through it. Leaders need to envision the project’s objective even before methods of completion are contemplated. Otherwise, problems such as those we encountered will inevitably occur. The vision for a project or task should be the guiding force that sees it through to completion, and adequate information flow between leader and follower is key to the project’s success.

An education for and about leadership could not be complete without learning valuable leadership lessons from real practice as Kristine and I did during our project with Ukrop’s. We provided them with our leadership insights, and likewise, although unbeknownst to them, they provided us with some leadership insights. I felt like the
project, as the capstone to the leadership education, was an excellent means of integrating all of the course work from the past two years into a meaningful conclusion. Actually, I hope that it is not a conclusion, but rather a springboard of opportunity for us to continue to put into use our knowledge of leadership while at the same time continuously learning more. I feel that if the proposed modules are implemented, the purpose of the project, to make a difference, will be achieved. We will have enhanced our leadership education while helping to enhance that of others, and that, to me, is the sign of a worthwhile Senior Project.
APPENDIX
For the questions that follow, circle the one response that best fits your answer.

1. Based upon feedback I receive or overhear, the Center for Retail Food Studies is viewed by associates as:
   A Superior
   B Very good
   C Average
   D Below average
   E Poor

2. In classes you have attended, the faculty's knowledge of the subject matter is:
   A Superior
   B Very good
   C Average
   D Below average
   E Poor

3. In classes you have attended, the quality of materials distributed is:
   A Superior
   B Very good
   C Average
   D Below average
   E Poor

Comments:
Listed below is a series of statements concerning the Center for Retail Food Studies. Indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with the statements by circling the appropriate letter.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4. The Center for Retail Food Studies courses meet the needs of <strong>all</strong> (store, manufacturing and support center) associates.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Classes offered in the Center should meet the <strong>basic business education</strong> needs (e.g., writing, math, statistics, etc.) of all associates.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. The Center for Retail Food Studies should offer more classes on the <strong>personal development</strong> needs (e.g., time management, English as a second language, etc.) of associates.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. The Center for Retail Food Studies should offer more classes to teach <strong>on-the-job skills</strong> (e.g., proper bagging skills, how to make a party tray, etc.) to associates.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Our associates understand the importance of required core classes (<strong>Values, The Game Plan, Food for Thought, Working Together</strong>) and how these courses relate to their jobs.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. I understand the importance of the core classes.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. It is difficult to schedule associates to be off to attend classes.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Electives (<strong>Business Math, Writing, etc.</strong>) are valuable enhancements to our associates' job knowledge.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Classes have positively affected our associates' job performance and knowledge of our industry.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
13. For various reasons, our associates find it difficult to attend classes offered by the Center. A  B  C  D  E

14. We should discipline associates who habitually do not show up for core classes and electives. A  B  C  D  E

15. For the most part, our associates just do not want to attend Center classes. A  B  C  D  E

16. The Center for Retail Food Studies is important to the success of our company. A  B  C  D  E

The following questions require a different response. Indicate your degree of satisfaction or dissatisfaction with the issues raised by these questions by circling the appropriate letter.

17. How do you rate your level of satisfaction with the Center for Retail Food Studies at this time? A  B  C  D  E

18. How would you rate the core classes' relevance to job performance? A  B  C  D  E

19. How would you rate the elective classes' relevance to job performance? A  B  C  D  E

20. How would you rate timeliness of the paperwork (confirmations; notification of cancelled classes)? A  B  C  D  E
Comments on the preceding questions:

Please offer below any suggestions you have for making the Center for Retail Food Studies a more valuable program for our associates.

*Return this survey to Ginny Schmitz by Friday, January 14, 1994. Thank you for your participation.*
Faculty Survey
Ukrop's Center for Retail Food Studies

For the questions that follow, circle the one response that best fits your answer.

1. Based upon feedback you receive (or overhear), the Center for Retail Food Studies is viewed as:
   A Superior
   B Very good
   C Average
   D Below average
   E Poor

2. What is your perception of the courses offered?
   A Superior
   B Very good
   C Average
   D Below average
   E Poor

3. The catalogue describing courses offered by the Center is:
   A Superior
   B Very good
   C Average
   D Below average
   E Poor

Comments:
Listed below is a series of statements concerning the Center for Retail Food Studies. Indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with the statements by circling the appropriate letter.

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4. The Center for Retail Food Studies should offer more <em>basic business education</em> (math, writing, statistics, etc.) courses.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. The Center should offer more <em>personal development</em> (time management, parenting skills, etc.) courses.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. The Center should offer more <em>skills-based</em> classes (perfecting bagging techniques, how to make a produce party tray, fine points of cashiering, etc.).</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Associates understand how the core curriculum is structured.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. I believe my course should be taken only by those associates recommended by managers.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. The Center offers too many core classes.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. The timing of the core classes, that is, one class every three months over a period of two years, is ambitious and difficult for me to meet.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. I believe the elective class I teach should be mandatory (answer only if applicable).</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. The format (core classes, electives) of the Center for Retail Food Studies is appropriate for our workforce.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. I think we should take steps to discipline associates who habitually do not show up for classes.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

15. I think we should discontinue offering my class; associates can get the information I present from another source (ExecuTrain, community college, etc.).

16. My course content is appropriate for the type of associate that attends my class.

17. The evaluation form gives me adequate feedback.

18. I receive my class roster and other paperwork on a timely basis.

19. The associates I know take classes because:

20. List at least one thing we can do to make your role as a faculty member more enjoyable and effective.

Comments:

On the back of this form, please give us your suggestions for making the Center a more valuable resource for our associates.
Please offer below any suggestions you have for making the Center for Retail Food Studies a more valuable program for our associates.

Return this survey to Ginny Schmitz by Friday, January 14, 1994.
Thank you for your participation.
For the questions that follow, circle the one response that best fits your answer.

1. Based upon my overall experience, the Center for Retail Food Studies is:
   A  Superior
   B  Very good
   C  Average
   D  Below average
   E  Poor

2. Overall, the quality of instruction is:
   A  Superior
   B  Very good
   C  Average
   D  Below average
   E  Poor

3. Overall, the material presented in the courses is:
   A  Superior
   B  Very good
   C  Average
   D  Below average
   E  Poor

4. Overall, how would you evaluate the communication of the schedule of courses:
   A  Superior
   B  Very good
   C  Average
   D  Below average
   E  Poor

Comments:
Listed below is a series of statements concerning the Center for Retail Food Studies. Indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with the statements by circling the appropriate letter.

5. My job performance has been positively affected by the classes offered by the Center for Retail Food Studies. A B C D E

6. The Center should offer more basic business education (math, writing, statistics etc.) courses. A B C D E

7. For the most part, classes meet at times that are convenient for me. A B C D E

8. The Center should offer more skills-based classes (perfecting bagging techniques, how to make a produce tray, etc.). A B C D E

9. The instructors are knowledgeable about their topic areas. A B C D E

10. The Center elective classes (Business Math, Moving from Criticism to Feedback, Attitude Opportunities, etc.) are informative and help me better perform my job. A B C D E

11. I understand how the core curriculum is structured. A B C D E

12. Overall, the Center core classes (Values, The Game Plan, Kaizen, Food for Thought, etc.) are informative and help me better perform my job. A B C D E

13. The Center should offer more personal development classes (time management, parenting skills, how to handle personal finances, etc.). A B C D E
14. The course would be more interesting if the instructor lectured less and used more visual aids. A B C D E

15. The Center offers too few electives. A B C D E

16. The evaluation form allows me to give the instructor adequate feedback. A B C D E

17. I am always informed of an upcoming class on a timely basis. A B C D E

18. My manager encourages me to attend classes. A B C D E

19. Most associates I know are not really very motivated to attend Center classes. A B C D E

20. If you were in charge, what one change would you make to the Center to make it a more valuable program for our associates?

Comments (please attach an additional sheet of paper if necessary):

Please answer some brief questions about yourself on the back
Please answer the following questions about yourself:

I work at the:  □ store retail  □ manufacturing  □ support center

My current employment status at Ukrop's is:  □ part-time  □ full-time

During the next 3 years, I see myself:  □ working part-time at Ukrop's  
□ working full-time at Ukrop's  □ working as a manager at Ukrop's  
□ no longer working at Ukrop's

The highest level of education I have completed is:  □ high school  
□ college graduate  □ graduate student

I have been working at Ukrop's for:  □ 3 months or fewer  □ 3-6 months  
□ 6 mos. to 1 yr  □ 1-2 years  □ 3 years or more  □ 5 years or more

Return this survey to Ginny Schmitz by Friday, January 14, 1994.  
Thank you for your participation.
Leadership Curriculum

**Core Modules (2.5 hrs. each)**

1. Coaching for Commitment (performance mgmt.)
2. Leading A Diverse Work Team
3. Writing and Speaking for Leadership Effectiveness
4. Technology and Change for the 21st Century
5. Supermarket Economics

**Leadership Development Program (2.5 hrs. each)**

1. Leadership in a Value Driven Organization
2. Leadership Styles and Characteristics
3. Decision Making and Critical Thinking
4. Motivation and Empowerment for Leaders
5. Group Dynamics

**Supermarket Operations Program (2.5 hrs. each)**

1. Creative Food Merchandising
2. Maximizing Profitability
3. Superior Customer Service
4. Maintaining a Safe and Secure Work Environment
5. Scheduling and Productivity

**Advanced Leadership Lab (3 days)**

1. Advanced Leadership and Communication
2. Organization Effectiveness
3. Change Management
Leadership in a Value Driven Organization
Module 1

1. Introduction to the Leadership Development Program and the concept of a value-driven organization

   • Introductions
   • Overview of objectives of program and module
   • Explanation of manuals
   • Distribution and completion of personality assessment test
   • Case study--video of Walt Disney World
   • Discussion questions
     1. Why is it important to have a mission and values?
     2. What are the corporate values of Disney?
     3. What strategies are in place to instill their values?
   • Characteristics of a value-driven organization

2. Ethics and values

   • Living the shared values
   • Discussion questions
     1. As a leader within Ukrop’s Super Markets, what gives you the greatest satisfaction?
     2. As we grow, what should we (leadership) keep in focus in terms of our customers, our associates, our suppliers, and our community?
   • The Power of Ethical Management
   • Ethics case study--"Parable of the Sadhu"

3. Goal setting

   • Establish personal goals
   • Ukrop’s vision for the future
   • How is your department performing?
   • Establish work group goals, department goals, and goals for Ukrop’s
   • Summary of the day’s ideas
   • Conclusion
Leadership Styles and Characteristics
Module 2

1. Definitions and characteristics
   - Leadership questionnaire
   - Discussion of personal definitions of leadership
   - Presentation scholars’ definitions
   - Characteristics of effective leaders
   - The five practices of effective leaders

2. Leadership styles
   - Review of questionnaire
   - Presentation of leadership styles: supportive, directive, participative, and achievement-oriented
   - Leader-follower communication
   - Leader vs. manager paper airplane exercise
   - Transactional leadership vs. transformational leadership
   - Summary of the day’s ideas
Leadership Questionnaire

1. What is your definition of leadership?

2. Think of the best leader for whom you have ever worked or with whom you have been associated. What personal and professional characteristics made that individual the best leader?

3. Now think of a group or a situation in which you are/were the leader. What were your strengths, positive leadership characteristics?

4. Think of the worst leader with whom you have been associated. Why, what characteristics made that individual the worst leader?

5. Again think of a situation in which you are/were the leader. What were your weaknesses, negative characteristics?

6. Which of the following do you think best describes your leadership style? Circle one.

   A) Give consideration to the needs of subordinates; display concern for their welfare; and create a friendly climate at work.

   B) Let subordinates know what they are expected to do; give specific guidance; ask subordinates to follow rules and procedures; schedule and coordinate work.

   C) Consult with subordinates and take their opinions and suggestions into account.

   D) Set challenging goals; getting performance
improvements; emphasizing excellence; and showing confidence that subordinates can perform up to those standards.

7. Are you typically more interested in getting the job done or in creating a pleasant work environment?

8. Think of the best team experience you have ever had, including work and non-work-related situations. Why was the team so effective and what compelled you to be an active team member?
LEADERS

You are to act as the leader for your group during the paper airplane folding exercise. You will not be allowed to actually fold the airplanes. Instead, as the leader of the group, you must encourage group members to work, stress collaboration among members, and shared goals.

Some other guidelines and buzz words about leadership:

- be supportive
- take risks
- take charge
- set priorities
- mobilize energies, share decision making
- be relationship-oriented, more so than task-oriented

In essence, try to use those characteristics and a style of leadership you have learned that would be most effective in the airplane building exercise.

As a reminder, your group will gain the most points by making the most number of similar airplanes that have a creative design, and they must FLY!

It is MOST IMPORTANT to follow the general role of a leader and not a manager. However, use your discretion about how you exactly define the role.
MANAGERS

You are to act as the manager for your group during the paper airplane folding exercise. You will not be allowed to fold airplanes. Instead, as the manager of the group (organization), you are responsible for directing/supervising the building of the airplanes.

Some guidelines and buzz words about management which you should keep in mind:

• be task-oriented rather than relationship oriented
• establish clear objectives
• be directive; delegate responsibilities to each member
• be controlling, making lone decisions

As a reminder, your group will gain the most points by making the most number of airplanes with an original style, and they must FLY!

It is MOST IMPORTANT to follow the general role of a manager and not of a leader. However, use your own discretion about how you exactly define the role. Remember, good management is not bad! Have fun!
1. The decision-making process
   - Desert survival simulation
   - Discussion of decision making in simulation
   - The steps to effective decision making

2. Critical thinking
   - The concept of the false dilemma
   - Presentation of fallacies of arguments
   - Interview video
   - Lifeboat case role play
   - Discussion of role play using valid arguments
   - Summary of day’s ideas
   - Homework assignment distributed
GROUP EXERCISE

LOST IN THE DESERT

It is 10:00 AM and you have just crash-landed in the Sonora Desert in the southwest of the U.S. The twin-engine plane, containing the bodies of the pilot and the co-pilot, has completely burned. Only the frame remains. None of the rest of you have been injured.

The pilot was unable to notify anyone of your position before the crash. However, she indicated before impact that you were 70 miles south-south-west from a mining camp which is the nearest known habitation and that you were approximately 65 miles off the course that was filed with your flight plan. The immediate area is quite flat and except for occasional cacti appears to be rather barren. The weather report indicated the temperature would reach 110 degrees. You are all dressed in light-weight clothes - short sleeves shirts, pants, and shoes. Everyone has a handkerchief. Collectively, your pockets contain $2.83 in change, $85.00 in bills, a pack of cigarettes, and a ballpoint pen.

Before the plane caught fire your group was able to salvage the 15 items listed below. Your task is to rank these items according to their importance to your survival, starting with "1" for the most important, to "15" for the least important. You may assume that you all have agreed to stay together and that all items are in good condition.

1. flashlight (4-battery size)
2. jack knife
3. air map of the area
4. plastic rain coat
5. magnetic compass
6. compress kit & gaze
7. .45 caliber pistol
8. parachute (red/white)
9. bottle of salt tablets
10. A book titled Edible Animals of the desert
11. A pair of sunglasses per person
12. 2 quarts of 180 proof vodka
13. One jacket per person
14. Cosmetic mirror
15. One quart of water per person
Steps to Effective Decision Making

1. Set the objective
2. Generate alternatives
3. Compare and evaluate alternatives
4. Make a decision
5. Implement the decision
6. Follow up and control
7. Evaluate
WHO SHOULD DIE WHEN NOT ALL CAN LIVE?*

You are among thirty survivors of a shipwreck, crowded into a lifeboat designed for no more than two dozen adults. In the boat with you are two others from the ship's crew, three married couples (one with a baby), three children whose parents went down with the ship, three elderly men and women, six other women, and the rest men, three of whom were very severely injured during the wreck. Already many of the thirty are seasick and most are terrified. It is a dark night, and the weather continues to worsen.

The boat is already shipping water at the gunwales; if the sea gets any higher the boat is sure to swamp and sink. It looks as if the only hope for any to survive is for five or six persons to get out of the boat, leaving the rest to bail and row in the hope that dawn will bring a slackening wind and chance of rescue.

As senior surviving ship's officer, and an experienced seaman, you are looked to for leadership. Having decided that the boat must lighten its human load, you ask for volunteers to jump overboard and take their chances in the icy waves. No one responds, even though all sense the danger to the overcrowded boat. You are not surprised at their selfishness, and you quickly review the alternative methods of deciding who shall be the unlucky half dozen.

Voting or a contest of some sort, which might do well enough in another situation, you immediately discard as unworkable here. One method that occurs to you is drawing straws — that seems fair enough — except that it, too, may be unfeasible in the situation. Then you think of a different sort of random selection process, such as designating every fifth person as the unlucky ones. You also consider throwing out the last six people who got into the boat, whoever they turn out to be (you are not among them). The thought crosses your mind to calculate the utilities of all possible combinations of twenty-four survivors, and throw overboard the six whose utility is the lowest; but this seems too time-consuming and conjectural under the circumstances. Yet another thought suddenly occurs to you. Perhaps you and the other crewmen have a duty to the passengers to give them safe voyage, and so the three of you must be among the six to abandon the boat however the other three are determined! You are also tempted to dismiss all these vexing ethical considerations and simply grab the weakest and nearest to you and with the help of other able-bodied men throw them overboard as quickly as possible and get it over with. You do not have much time to weigh these alternative methods of decision making — perhaps no more than a few minutes, to judge by the waves and wind, before panic or disaster overtakes all of you.

What method of decision should you choose and why? What result does this method yield, i.e., who goes overboard and who stays?
Motivation and Empowerment
Module 4

1. Principles of Empowerment

- Introduction--Zapping and Sapping
- Discussion of Zapp! The Lightning of Empowerment
- Examples of the zapp principles
- Video--Pat Carrigan
- Broken Squares game

2. Motivation

- Motivation case studies
- Presentation of cases, theories, and solutions
- Personal motivators
- Assignment of homework
'Broken Squares'

Obtain some thick cardboard (we have cut our puzzle pieces out of wood and painted them in lots of bright colours. If you are going to use this game a lot, we suggest that you do the same). Draw the outlines of the pieces, measuring their dimensions carefully with a ruler. Cut out the pieces and put them together in five little packages as described in the Appendix on pp. 156-7. If your group consists of about seven to ten people you need only one set, ie five packages (which will contain a total of 15 pieces in all) for five players; the rest of the group can be observers. If you have a lot of players — over 30, for example — you will need six sets, and so on. Do not worry too much if you do not have any observers in large groups because one set of five players is sure to finish before the others and then you can ask them to observe the struggles of the remaining players.

The only rules are: no talking at all, and no taking of or asking for other people's pieces, by force or non-verbal persuasion. If you like, you can supply the information that all of the completed squares will be approximately six inches in diameter, but you may not want to provide any clues at all, in which case the game will take longer — anything from ten minutes to half an hour.

Each of the five players in any given set begins with a few odd pieces of a puzzle, and each must end with a complete square identical in size with those of the others, that is, five squares in all. It looks impossible at first; the only way it can be done is for the players to stop thinking as individuals and operate as members of a team.

We saw this demonstrated in an amazing way once, when we played 'Broken Squares' with a group of teachers. As soon as the pieces are distributed, it becomes obvious that some players cannot make a square with what they have, but one of these teachers took this observation to its logical conclusion faster than we have ever seen anybody do it. He threw his brightly coloured wooden pieces with a clatter into the middle of the table and indicated so forcefully in pantomime that the others should do so too that they did, though uncomprehendingly at first. He soon made it clear by his actions that the five squares were to be built out of the common supply, and they were completed very quickly. This was an unusually neat demonstration of what happens when you get a confident, authoritative leader imposing a sense of direction and purpose on team-members, who can then take over and complete the task in record time.

Other patterns emerge from building 'Broken Squares'. What commonly happens is that one player completes what looks like a good square; in fact, the player has used too many pieces and the other four squares cannot be made out of what is left. Often the owner does not realize this for a while and neither do the other four players, who continue to move their own and eventually other people's pieces around without getting anywhere. Meanwhile, the
square-holder sits there, an interested and sympathetic outsider, observing the team. Sooner or later it dawns on the players that the original square will have to be broken up and the whole thing started again; but how are they to communicate this to its owner? Sometimes the owner becomes aware of this quite quickly, and willingly breaks up the square. Others take much longer to grasp the situation and are much more reluctant to give up their personal possessions. This happens with all age groups, as far as we have observed. Young children can be very possessive of their toys but so can grown ups. A colleague of ours reports having seen a bank manager hang on to his square, oblivious to the needs of his team, until the frustration level was so high — not only in his group but in our colleague — that she was literally sitting on her hands to stop herself leaning over the man’s shoulder and breaking up his square by force.

What players can learn experientially from this game is that there are restrictions imposed on people who want to be part of a team. They have to give up some of their personal power in order to complete a task for which they need the help of the group. So long as tasks continue to be accomplished and comradeship is strong, leaders will be prepared to surrender autonomy and to puce themselves to the needs of the group, and followers will refrain from mutiny.

Another short game that illustrates this need to put group needs before one’s own is ‘To Be Or Not . . .’

‘Broken Squares’

Objectives:
(1) To study group behaviour.
(2) To promote group dynamics.

Duration: About half an hour.

Number of players: Minimum of five, to any number.

Materials: A set of squares for each team of five players, as illustrated in Figure 1: Broken Squares. A set consists of five envelopes with pieces of cardboard cut into different patterns. When all the pieces are arranged, from all the envelopes, the players will find they have between them five squares of equal size.

To prepare a set, cut out five cardboard squares, each side exactly 6 inches long. Place the squares in a row and mark them as in Figure 1, pencilling the letters lightly so they can be erased. Then cut them out. Label the envelopes from 1 to 5 and fill them with the puzzle pieces as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Envelope</th>
<th>Pieces</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>I, H, E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>A, A, A, C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>A, J</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>D, F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>G, B, F, C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Erase the pencilled letter from each piece as you put it into its envelope and mark it instead with the number of the appropriate envelope. This makes it easy to sort the pieces out again after the game.

Summary: In groups of five, players have to build squares out of the puzzle pieces.
Case Study

Jane Doe, 35, is one of six department managers in the Ukrop’s store #X:

Am I getting what I deserve at this company? Yes and no. Yes, for my education and experience I’m getting a better than average salary in this business. The benefits package is good, and we have a bonus plan that adds a significant amount to my retirement plan each year.

But no, I’m not getting what I deserve when it comes to this specific store and some of the things that have been happening here. Last month, for example, all six of us in the department manager level found out about our raises: a five percent raise for each of us across the board.

I went home stunned that day. Any objective observer of the company would have seen that, over the past year, four of us have been working like dogs and the other two—I’ll call them Mike and Mary—have been absolutely loafing.

Last year my immediate boss, the store manager, gave us all a sermon about merit raises—how we would individually be rewarded for our effort. Like fools, four of us took that message seriously. We came in early, left late, often skipped lunches, and even spent days off on the job.

Mike and Mary, however, found every excuse in the book to be away from their departments. They each took their maximum number of sick leave days, left during work hours for frequent training, and generally treated their jobs as a hobby. On several occasions, Mary’s people went to the store manager for information and decisions that she was responsible for.

The four of us have agreed that, if the company won’t reward our effort, we won’t give it. Mike and Mary have apparently set the standard of what it takes to get a 5% raise here, and that’s the standard that the four of us are going to follow as well.

I’m not coming in a minute before seven and I’m leaving promptly at four, no matter what needs doing. If the store manager asks me about my change in work habits, I’ll be more than happy to explain and I’ll have three other managers there to back me up.

Either Mike and Mary have to start pulling their weight around here, or the company should reward those of us who do.
Equity Theory

Jane Doe is suffering from what she feels is a lack of equity. In other words the following equation is out of balance:

\[
\frac{\text{my reward}}{\text{my input}} = \frac{\text{your reward}}{\text{your input}}
\]

Options: (to balance the equation)
- quit and wipe the slate clean
- change the level of my input
- try to change the level of your input or your reward
- don’t compare oneself to that person any more
Group Dynamics
Module 5

1. Factors of successful groups

- Discussion of case studies from *Groups that Work and Those that Don’t*
- Listing of characteristics of effective and ineffective groups
- Animal exercise
- Examination of characteristics of group dynamics and roles

2. Personal assessment

- Videotaped group activity
- Viewing of videotape--introduction to the IPA
- Presentation of sociograms
- Discussion about reactions
- Reflections on Ukrop’s work groups

3. Circle diagram wrap-up of entire Leadership Development Program
MONKEY
THE MONKEY FOOLS AROUND AND CANNOT BE SERIOUS. IT TRIES TO DISTRACT OTHERS WITH ITS ANTICS.

PARROT
THE PARROT NEVER HAS ITS OWN IDEAS. IT ALWAYS REPEATS OTHERS' IDEAS AS IF THEY WERE ITS OWN.

MOUSE
THE MOUSE IS TIMID AND QUIET. IT ONLY OFFERS ITS OPINIONS DURING THE FEW MOMENTS THAT IT THINKS IT IS SAFE TO DO SO.
CHAMELEON
THE CHAMELEON CHANGES COLORS AND VIEWPOINTS FREQUENTLY. IT PRETENDS TO BE LOYAL TO WHOEVER SUITS ITS NEEDS BEST AT THE TIME.

LION
THE LION IS A TYRANT. IT IS LOUD AND HEADSTRONG. THE LION THINKS THAT IT CAN USE ITS SIZE TO THREATEN OTHERS INTO SUPPORTING ITS IDEAS.

HYENA
THE HYENA LAUGHS AT OTHERS’ IDEAS, NO MATTER HOW GOOD THEY ARE. IT POKES FUN AT THEIR OPINIONS, BUT HAS NO SUGGESTIONS OF ITS OWN.
MULE
THE MULE IS EXTREMELY Stubborn. IT REFUSES TO COMPROMISE OR MOVE FROM ITS ORIGINAL STANCE.

ELEPHANT
THE ELEPHANT NEVER FORGETS WHAT IT HAS LEARNED OR WHAT OTHERS HAVE SAID. IT REMINDS OTHERS OF PAST EXPERIENCES AND INTERACTIONS.

TURTLE
THE TURTLE HAS GOOD IDEAS, BUT IT TAKES A VERY LONG TIME FOR IT TO ARTICULATE THEM.
KANGAROO
THE KANGAROO JUMPS FROM IDEA TO IDEA. IT IS A LITTLE FLIGHTY, BUT USUALLY HAS A GENERAL COURSE OF ACTION IN MIND.

FISH
THE FISH HAS A BLANK STARE ON ITS FACE. IT HAS NOTHING TO SAY, AND DOES NOT RESPOND TO ANYTHING.