

Developing leadership skills in a virtual simulation: coaching the affiliative style leader

Kathy Gurley
Fayetteville State University

Dawn Wilson
Fayetteville State University

This study looked at the use of a business simulation that focused on improving the leadership skills of students in an MBA class at an HBCU in North Carolina. The students were asked to complete a questionnaire that identified their dominant leadership style. The study then compared the students who had an affiliative style of management against students with other leadership styles noting differences in how they performed in the leadership simulation. The results indicated that the affiliative style was less effective in developing and utilizing power and spoke significantly less to people than students with the other managerial styles. Further results stated that students with an affiliative managerial style scored significantly lower on both the financial and customer goals and that there was a significant difference in the number of times students opposed another character's ideas with the affiliative style. The results also showed that students had a significant improvement in their leadership, business results and total scores after playing scenario one multiple times. The multiple attempts at playing the scenarios allow students to adopt their styles to improve their scores and experiment with behaviors that are more typical of other managerial styles. Finally, the study noted that simulations provide an excellent opportunity to couple both conceptual learning with practice that is a self paced, in safe environment.

Keywords: Leadership, affiliative style, simulation, MBA

INTRODUCTION

MBA programs have been criticized for not developing real world competencies. One of the competencies that is rated as important by incumbent managers and is underrepresented in the curriculum is managing the decision making process (Rubin and Dierdorff, 2009). To help strengthen the curriculum in this competency, Fayetteville State University adopted the Virtual Leader simulation. This simulation is a self-paced, e-learning platform that allows the user to role-play with intelligent avatars to learn and practice leadership skills. The Virtual Leader by Simulearn was named the best online training product of the year in 2004 by Training & Development Journal (Jan. 2004). Although students have found this simulation very challenging, the goal was to increase the ability to coach students and to better understand how different managerial styles interacted with the simulation. This study compares the performance of MBA students with the affiliative style of leadership with other styles of leadership on the simulation's first three scenarios. This style was chosen because it was found that the majority of the students in the study had little or no management experience and therefore faced many of the same challenges as newly promoted managers.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Issues with MBA education

In recent years there has been much criticism of the relevancy of the MBA curricula across different universities and, specifically, how effectively it addresses the actual issues that graduates will face in the real world. Pfeffer and Fong (2002) note that one of the issues with the relevance of the MBA degree is the method of instruction and “relatively few instances... of learning by doing” (pg.85). Butler et al (2008) note that leadership is important for MBA graduates and that it is a skill that can be taught effectively in the classroom setting. Eitan (2009) suggest that leadership will be a critical skill for successful job seekers stating that “it is more crucial than ever for students to obtain the qualifications and skills that add value to companies” (p. 14) and Butler (2007) states that employers are looking for students with soft-skills such as leadership and empathy. Unfortunately, there are few opportunities for students to actually practice this skill in the classroom and be provided with immediate and relevant feedback.

Leadership Theories

There have been many theories of leadership over the last several decades. Some of the more recognizable theories include the Trait Theory, which states that leaders share specific attributes such as emotional intelligence and motivation, or the Behavioral Theory which states that leaders exhibit one of two types of behavior, either focusing on tasks or people. (Kreitner and Kinicki, 2008, McShane and Von Glinow, 2005, Shortell and Kaluzny, 2000) However, the prevailing wisdom, according to most research, seems to be utilizing different styles of leadership for different situations known as Situational Theory. There are several different situational models including the Path-Goal Model and the LEAD Model. One of the most widely accepted situational theories is the Contingency Theory based on the work of Fred Fiedler. This theory states that leadership effectiveness is contingent upon the variables of

different situations, the leader's style and amount of situational control. Fiedler noted that leaders have two different styles described as either relationship-oriented or task-oriented and that depending on the amount of control a leader has over a given situation different leadership styles are appropriate (Kreitner and Kinicki, 2008). Another situational leadership theory, the Path-Goal Model developed by Robert House, is based on the expectancy theory that leader behavior influences the expectations of employees and subsequently that leader influences subordinate behavior by tying the satisfaction of a need to employee performance. McShane and Von Glinow (2005) note that the Path-Goal Model can be likened to the concept of servant leadership in which leaders take on the role of coach, mentor or facilitator providing employees with support and encouragement, thus facilitating high performance work. The LEAD Model of situational leadership was developed by Hershey and Blanchard in the late 70's and notes four different styles of leadership based the level of relationship and task-oriented behavior. They state that the leadership style must be based on the motivation, level of responsibility and competency of the follower and that a leader must adjust his style in accordance with these variables (Shortell & Kaluzny, 2000). Vroom & Jago (2007) describe the roles that situational variables play in leadership, noting that different situations will shape how leaders behave. They state that "actions must be tailored to fit the demands of each situation" (p. 23) and also indicate that while one leadership style may be effective in a certain situation, it may be totally ineffective under different circumstances.

Leadership Styles

One of the challenges of effective leadership training is being able to agree what leadership is. According to Kreitner & Kinicki (2008), leadership is "the process of influencing others to achieve a common goal" (pg. 463). Kreitner and Kinicki (2008) combine several descriptions of leadership to arrive at this definition including that leadership is a process involving social influence, that it occurs at many levels of organizations from the front lines to the upper management, and that it focuses on goal attainment. Secretan (2004) defines leadership in terms of service to others and states that it should inspire the growth of subordinates and improve the world. He notes, however, that this definition is not all-inclusive as it does not include such leaders as Hitler or Stalin, who did not make the world a better place. These are all very general definitions for leadership that could apply to many situations in which leadership is required such as politics, military, parenting, teaching or civic groups. In terms of great leaders in business, many turn to Jim Collins, who penned *Good to Great* in 2001 and defines exceptional leadership as "Level 5 leadership". He notes that Level 5 leaders are not interested in fame or boosting their own egos, but in doing what is best for their company. He also writes that these leaders do not lack ambition or a strong will, but channel their ambition to the betterment of their institutions rather than their own self-interests. Sims Jr. et al (2009) also note that there are many definitions of leadership. For their purposes, they define it simply as influencing behavior. They also state that specific leadership behaviors can be grouped to form a style of leadership. Goleman (2000) defined six styles of leadership as coercive, authoritative, affiliative, pacesetter, coaching and democratic. He describes coercive as demanding immediate compliance; authoritative as mobilizing people toward a vision; affiliative as creating harmony and building emotional bonds; pacesetter as setting high standards for performance; coaching as developing people for the future and democratic as forging consensus through participation. The Hay Group Consulting Company used these definitions of leadership in several studies that they

conducted, as well as for their Managerial Style Questionnaire. In one study they tested the leadership effectiveness of partners in a law firm noting that the most effective style in motivating junior lawyers was affiliative and that pacesettering the least effective (Paterson, 2005). In another study conducted by the Hay Group using ward managers at an acute care hospital, it was noted that the best leaders used a variety of styles and were able to change their style to handle different situations (Parish, 2006).

Business Simulation

There are many different types of business simulations available for use in classrooms and they are being used in a variety of ways in order to give students practical, hands-on experience. Some focus on running a business while other focus specifically on leadership and behavior. At Fayetteville State University, two faculty members are using a business simulation to link two related classes of Operations Management and Strategic Management. They note that the business simulation allows students to experience decision-making while employing a specific strategy. The simulation is valuable in that students' decisions have a direct impact on the performance of their business and that it helps students to integrate the knowledge that they have learned throughout all of their business courses into applicable decisions. D. Truong (Personal Communication, October 12, 2009) In order for students to become effective leaders they need to learn what their dominant leadership style is and then be able to practice that and other styles in different situations. This is where simulations can be very helpful. A study from England created a business simulation to engage students in product development. The simulation gave the students the opportunity to develop "real" products and receive feedback. Within the simulation they were able to practice and have the freedom to make mistakes without the fear of reprisal or serious business consequences while still experiencing the consequences of their mistakes or the elation of their success (Goffin & Mitchell, 2006). Ahn (2008) notes in her doctoral dissertation that business simulations can be good examples of experiential learning utilizing all four elements that Kolb (1984) asserted, in his learning model, as essential: concrete experience, reflective observation, abstract conceptualization and active experimentation. She states that the process of experiencing the consequences of one's actions, reflecting on those actions, evaluating the significance of the actions and finally experimenting with new strategies are the essential variables provided to students by business simulations. Svoboda & Whalen (2005) used a business simulation to teach sustainability, noting that it allowed students to utilize cross-group collaboration as well as providing a consequence-free environment allowing students to try new behaviors and techniques and receive immediate feedback. Virtual leader provides this kind of practice to MBA students, giving them the opportunity to practice leadership skills outside of the dominant style without the issue of real-world consequences.

This study adds value to the previous research by using a new leadership simulation and investigating how the use of this simulation helps students increase their leadership skills. The study specifically investigates the challenges that students with an affiliative managerial style faced in learning the leadership skills required to play the simulation successfully. The affiliative managerial style is described by the HayGroup as follows:

The affiliative style can create a warm and friendly atmosphere. It can make team members feel valued as individuals – not just as workers. It recognizes each team member's emotional needs.

When using this style a manager:

- Promotes friendly interactions among co-workers
- Places less emphasis on task directions, goals and standards than on meeting team members' emotional needs
- Pays attention and cares for 'the whole person' and stresses things that keep people happy
- Identifies opportunities for positive feedback and avoids performance related confrontations
- Rewards personal characteristics as much as job performance" (Hay Group, 2007)

Based on this description of the affiliative managerial style the following propositions were developed on how students with this style would interact with the simulation.

Proposition 1: Students with an affiliative managerial style will place less emphasis on the financial and customer goals and therefore score lower in these areas than students with others styles.

Proposition 2: Students with an affiliative managerial style will place more emphasis on whole person and keeping team members happy and therefore should score higher on employee morale than students with other styles.

In the Virtual Leader simulation, the student or participant gains power through formal authority, informal authority and political influence. Formal authority is the power that results from one's position in the hierarchy. Informal authority comes from the group's perception of the leader, does the group respect and like the leader. Political influence is the power that results from building coalitions and partnering with leaders with greater formal authority. In this simulation Corey's power increases when she/he is able to get the right work or ideas passed. Getting the right work completed, at times, requires arguing against poor ideas and confronting others who are not focused on the right work. Since the affiliative managerial style "avoids performance related confrontations" it was anticipated that their power scores would be lower.

Proposition 3: Students with an affiliative managerial style will score lower on the use of power than students with other styles.

Proposition 4: Students with an affiliative managerial style will give more positive feedback and less negative feedback to team members than students with other styles.

The Virtual Leader simulation is designed to help student learn leadership skills that balance financial, customer and employee goals. The simulation provides a safe environment where students can practice the scenarios several times. Although there is a conceptual element to understanding different leadership styles, improving one's own leadership skills requires practice and feedback. Like emotional intelligence these skills are primarily behavioral skills that are internalized through repetition. In adopting this simulation, it was expected that students would improve their skills through practice and the goal was to validate this assumption with this study.

Proposition 5: Students will see a significant improvement in their total score, business score and leadership score after playing the scenarios multiple times.

METHODOLOGY

The Virtual Leader simulation was introduced as part of the Organizational Behavior class in the MBA program. Prior to starting the simulation, students were asked to complete the HayGroup Managerial Style Assessment questionnaire and then determine their dominant managerial style. Students reported their raw scores from the questionnaire and their dominant style. The raw scores were checked against the normed percentile chart in the HayGroup workbook to ensure the students had accurately read the chart. The HayGroup Managerial Style Assessment or Inventory has a high level of internal consistency and reliability. There have been a number of both construct and criterion validity studies that have been done, the largest of which was a study of 3871 managers that compared the results with the organizational climate survey, OCSII. These studies have shown substantial validity (Anderson and Zhu, 2002).

The students participated in the Virtual Leader Simulation for six weeks out of the courses. The first week involved going through the orientation and completing the “Learning the Principles” section that explains the dynamics of the simulation. During the next five weeks the students completed one of the scenarios every week. Only the first three scenarios are used in this study because these three scenarios focus on managing subordinates and peers. The last two scenarios involve managing upwards and decision making in a crisis.

In all of the scenarios, the student is Corey, a new manager, at Nordic company who has been hired to run the Call Center. In Scenario One, “One-on-One”, Corey meets with Oli who works in the Call Center. Corey wants Oli’s help to get her computer set up and to order business cards. Oli already has his own work and personal priorities which Corey has to influence and gain Oli’s commitment to carry out the work she needs done. In Scenario Two, “New Person”, Corey is meeting with two of her subordinates, Rosa and Oli. Rosa and Oli are both competing for the new boss’ attention and are in disagreement at the beginning of the meeting. Corey has to introduce topics that will build common ground between Rosa and Oli so that she can build positive momentum to tackle the tougher goals that she wants to establish for the Call Center. In Scenario Three, “Status Quo”, Corey is in a meeting with Will, her boss, Rosa, Oli and another senior manager is Finance. The scenario involves determining which project will receive the limited funds available. Corey’s objective is to obtain funding for upgrading the Call Center.

When students play the scenarios they log onto Simulearn’s server and their scores on several dimensions are recorded. The two main dimensions are leadership and business results. Each of these two dimensions is composed on sub-scores as indicated in table 1 (Appendix). The two dimensions go into the calculation of the student’s total score.

In addition data is collected on how students played the scenario. When students play the scenarios they can support or oppose another character in the meeting and they can support or oppose ideas that are introduced in the meeting. Data is collected on the number of times students took each of these four actions while playing the scenario.

This study includes thirty seven students collected over three sections of the Organizational Behavior class. The composition of the managerial styles of this group is indicated in table 2 (Appendix).

Because the affiliative style was the predominant style it was decided that this style would be the focus. It was found that the majority of these students had no or little management experience and the desire was to understand the challenges these students faced in taking on the role of a new manager. A database was compiled with the students' managerial style and the simulations scores for every time the students played the scenarios. The number of times students played the scenario ranged from 3 to over 50 times. Any record with a total score below 60 (maximum of 100) was eliminated because students can stop their play or abort the simulation for a number of reasons which ends up with a low score. Any play above 60 was considered as a serious attempt at the scenario. It was decided that the multiple times students played the scenarios would be analyzed because it was assumed that their early trials would be more representative of their dominant managerial style. All of the students were attempting to improve their scores since their class grade was affected by their total scores on the scenarios. A t-test was run first on the components of the leadership and business score dimensions. Further analysis was run on scores related to how the students played the scenario to better understand the difference found in the leadership and business scores.

To test Proposition 5 each student's average score was calculated over all serious attempts at playing the scenario for the business, leadership and total scores. A serious attempt was defined as any attempt with a total score equal to or greater than 60. This average score was compared to each student's best play; best play is the attempt where they scored the highest total score. A paired t-test was used to see if the difference in scores was significant.

RESULTS

As indicated in table 3 (Appendix), the results are shown of the t-test run on two independent samples, the affiliative style students versus all other students. The results are shown by scenarios.

Scenario 1

These results in table 3 (Appendix), indicate that the affiliative style was less effective in developing and utilizing power in scenario one supporting proposition 3. The other two subcomponents of the leadership dimension were not significantly different for the affiliative style versus the other styles. Affiliative style students scored significantly lower on financial and customer goals, but did score significantly higher on employee morale. These results support the first two propositions.

The results, as noted in table 4 (Appendix), indicate that students with the affiliative style spoke significantly less to people than students with the other managerial styles. They also opposed ideas significantly less than other students. These results partially support proposition three in that affiliative style students gave less negative feedback but the first part of the proposition was not supported in that they did not give more positive feedback.

Scenario Two

By scenario two, students tend to be more comfortable with the mechanics of the simulation and therefore, will require fewer attempts to get their scores in an acceptable range. The total number of plays for scenario two was 339 compared to 678 for scenario one as

indicated in table 5 (Appendix). The results for scenario two were similar to those for scenario one. Students with an affiliative managerial style scored significantly lower on both the financial and customer goals supporting proposition one. They also scored significantly higher on employee morale supporting proposition two. Proposition 3 was supported in that the affiliative style students scored lower on Power as indicated in table 6 (Appendix).

The results for scenario two in how students played the simulation were different than scenario one in that there was no significant difference in how many times the affiliative style students spoke to people, either supporting or opposing. There was a significant difference in the number of times students opposed another character's ideas with the affiliative style scoring lower similar to scenario one. These results only partially supported proposition four in that the affiliative style did give less negative feedback, but did not give more positive feedback as indicated in table 7 (Appendix).

Scenario Three

The pattern of results for scenario three is very similar to the first two scenarios in the financial, customer, and power scores were lower for students with an affiliative style. The main difference in scenario three is that the employee morale score is now significantly lower for affiliative style students as indicated in table 8 (Appendix). Scenario three again shows that students with affiliative managerial style tended to give less negative feedback but did not give more positive feedback.

Student Learning

To determine if all the students had increased their leadership skills after multiple plays of scenario one, the students' average scores on leadership, business results and total score was compared to their best scores in all three categories. The total score is a combination of the leadership and business result scores. The results are as indicated in table 9 (Appendix). The results shown about support Proposition Five that students had a significant improvement in their leadership, business results and total scores after playing scenario one multiple times.

DISCUSSION

The results for the three scenarios definitely supported Proposition One in that the affiliative managerial style focused less on organizational goals than the other styles. Achieving organizational goals required the use of power or personal influence and this is a second area that the affiliative style scored lower. The affiliative style also consistently gave less negative feedback than other styles. Being comfortable with giving negative feedback is often a challenge for new managers, and since many of the students who reported this style had no or little management experience, confrontation may be a skill they need to learn. During the six weeks that students worked with the simulation they were required to turn in papers on each scenario. The professors posed questions that the students answered in these papers. One of the questions asked was:

Did you give negative feedback to any of the characters? If not go back, and try giving negative feedback. How did it feel and what happened as a result of the negative feedback?

Students often reported that they are not comfortable making negative comments to another person. They were disturbed by the avatar's response who received the negative feedback. Students reported that the avatar appeared hurt, or became withdrawn or got more tense which made the students uncomfortable. The students' responses to the question were a good starting point to discuss how and in what situations leaders should use negative feedback. Students had the opportunity to hear different perspectives from other students as the more task oriented styles tended to have less concern over giving negative feedback. But more importantly students have an opportunity to experience their own discomfort in this safe environment.

This research has pointed out the need for additional coaching techniques to help students become more cognizant of their own style and to increase their skills in giving feedback. Next semester the intent is to spend more time working with the HayGroup Managerial Styles so that students conceptually understand when each style is used most effectively. Another goal is to have students experience the differences in styles so there is a plan to partner students with different styles to first role play a situation and later partner to discuss their strategies for playing a certain scenario. To improve their feedback skills an interpersonal feedback model will be introduced after the first or second scenario. The model will help students understand when, where, and how to give negative feedback. Students will be asked to apply this model to analyze their interaction with the characters in one of the scenarios. The intent is to provide a conceptual model for students to integrate and reinforce their experiences in the simulation.

The results on student learning are a clear indication that students improved how they played the scenario by playing it multiple times. Each time a student played the scenario the behavior of the avatars changed in response to Corey's (the student) actions. Students were encouraged to try different styles of leadership and learn from how the scenario played out and how the avatars responded. Learning new leadership skills requires a behavioral change which requires practice, feedback and a desire to change. The Virtual Leader simulation provides the feedback in terms of the scores the students receive on the various dimensions as well as additional feedback screens that follow the flow of the scenario. Because the scenario total score was a factor in the course grade, the MBA students had an incentive to keep playing until they achieved a score in the 90's. It was recognized that students played the scenarios multiple times to improve their grade in the course, but it was less clear whether that motivation translated into wanting to improve their leadership skills. Most behavior models of change require an individual to move out of a denial phase where they choose to ignore the need for change into a contemplation phase where the individual begins to weigh the cost/benefits of changing their behavior. These two phases proceed the preparation and action phases. The preparation phase involves experimenting with small changes and the action phase is a commitment to a definitive action or change of behaviors. The simulation is an excellent tool to help students move into the preparation phase. It was noted that a better job could be done of working with students prior to the simulation to get them to recognize their leadership strengths and weaknesses so that they experience the first two phases. The plan is to implement a short paper that asks students to recall situations where they effectively influenced others and a time when their voice didn't get heard or they could not convince others. The goal is for students not to see the simulation as a game to win or lose, but as an opportunity to learn.

CONCLUSION

This study has shown that the affiliative managerial style interacts with the avatars in the Virtual Leader simulation differently than the other styles. In particular the affiliative style students tend to put less emphasis on financial and customers goals than the other styles. In addition they are less likely to give negative feedback. The multiple attempts at playing the scenarios allow students to adopt their styles to improve their scores and experiment with behaviors that are more typical of other managerial styles.

The results of the study have led to suggestions for improving the course design so that students are more cognizant of their managerial style and when it is effective and not effective. In addition the results point to a need to help students understand when and how to give both positive and negative feedback.

With any leadership training the goal is to affect the leader's behavior back on the job. Too frequently conceptually based classroom training is used to bring about this behavior change and often the results are disappointing. Simulations provide an excellent opportunity to couple both conceptual learning with practice, practice that is a self paced, in safe environment. Since facilitating decision making is a skill that managers have reported in essential, MBA programs should experiment with new tools and techniques that are effective in bringing about behavioral change.

REFERENCES

- Ahimor, E. (2009, January 13). "For MBAs, A Brave New World". *BusinessWeek Online*, pp.14.
- Ahn, J. (2008) Application of experiential learning cycle in learning with a business simulation game. Proquest Dissertations and Theses. Section 0055, Part 0710 230 pages; [Ed.D. dissertation]. United States – New York: Teachers College, Columbia University; 2008. Publication Number: AAT 3314573.
- Anderson, K. and Zhu, G. (2002). *Managerial Style Inventory Technical Manual*. Boston, MA: Hay Group, McClelland Center for Research & Innovation.
- Butler, C. (2007). The soft side of the M.B.A. *U.S. News & World Report*, 142, (12), 74-78.
- Butler, D., Benjamin F., Johnson, L. (2008). "An Examination of a Skills Based Leadership Coaching Course in an MBA Program". *Journal of Education for Business*. 83, (4), 227-232.
- Collins, Jim (2001). *Good to Great*. New York, NY: HarperCollins Publishers Inc.
- Goffin, K., Mitchell, R. (2006). *Driving Innovation*. Biz Ed. 5(2), 42-45.
- Goleman, Dl (2000). "Leadership that gets results". *Harvard Business Review*. 78(2), 78-90.
- Kolb, D. (1984). *Experiential Learning. Experience as the source of learning and development*. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall Inc.

Kreitner, R., Kinicki, A. (2008). *Organizational Behavior*. Boston: McGraw-Hill Irwin.

Managerial Style Questionnaire Workbook. Boston, MA: Hay Group Transforming Learning.

McShane, S., Von Glinow, M. (2005). *Organizational Behavior*. Boston: McGraw Hill Irwin.

Parish, C. (2006). “Being nice is not enough for good leadership on the wards”. *Nursing Standard*, 20(41), 6.

Paterson, N. (2005). “Nice guys are the right guys”. *Lawyer*, 19(43), 59.

Pfeffer, J., Fong, C. (2002). “The End of Business Schools? Less Success Than Meets the Eye”. *Academy of Management Learning and Education*. 1(1),78-95

Rubin, R., Dierdorff, E. (2009). “How relevant is the MBA? Assessing the alignment of required curricula and required managerial competencies”. *Academy of Management Learning and Education*, 8(2), 208-224.

Secretan, L. (2004). *Inspire! What Great Leaders Do*. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons.

Shortell, S., Kaluzny, A. (2000). *Healthcare Management*. Albany: Delmar Thompson Learning.

Sims, Jr., H., Faraj, S., Seohkwa, Y. (2009). “When should a leader be directive or empowering? How to develop your own situational theory of leadership”. *Business Horizons*, 52(2), 149-158.

Svoboda, S., Whalen, J. (2004). “Using experiential simulation to teach sustainability”. *Greener Management International*, 48 (Winter), 57-65.

Vroom, V., Jago, A. (2007). “The Role of the Situation in Leadership”. *American Psychologist*, 62, 17-24.

APPENDIX

Table One

Dimension	Description	Tactics
Leadership	Getting people to complete the right work productively	
Gaining Power	Influencing others through formal authority, informal authority and political alignment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supporting ideas that pass • Preventing the wrong ideas from passing • Increase the group’s opinion of you • Partnering with higher authority
Moderating Tension	Productive level of tension is the state in between people being	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lowering tension by praising others and reducing conflict

	too relaxed or bored and being too tense that they are distracted.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Raise tension by challenging others or introducing controversial ideas
Generating New Ideas	Ideas represent the work that will get done in the meeting. Leaders must actively listen and get others to share their ideas.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Uncover hidden ideas • Moderate tension • Bring in the disengaged
Business Results	Completing the right work (ideas)	
Financial Customer Employee Morale	The simulation gives each idea a numerical score that it contributes to financial, customer and employee morale goals. Leaders must pass the right ideas and avoid the wrong ideas from passing.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assertively argue for ideas that support company's goals • Bring in others that support the right ideas • Argue against the wrong ideas • Reiterate the goals of the company • Confront others who are not focusing on the right work

Table Two

Managerial Style	Number of Students	Percentage of the Students
Affiliative	20	54%
Coercive	5	13.5
Pacesetter	5	13.5
Authoritarian	3	8
Democratic	1	3
Coaching	3	8

Table Three

Dimension	Style	No. of Plays	Mean	Std. Dev.	t	df	Sig.
Leadership	Affiliative	422	76.07	8.754	2.79	676	.005**
	Other	256	78.07	9.414			
Power	Affiliative	422	61.48	14.08	3.58	470	.000***
	Other	256	65.95	16.66			
Tension	Affiliative	422	90.59	7.916	-.536	480	.592
	Other	256	90.22	9.129			
Ideas	Affiliative	422	76.18	19.28	1.256	676	.210
	Other	256	78.06	18.12			

Business score	Affiliative Other	422 256					
Financial	Affiliative Other	422 256	83.59 93.77	26.34 19.12	5.81	655	.000***
Customer	Affiliative Other	422 256	83.79 92.09	22.18 19.12	5.15	599	.000***
Employee Morale	Affiliative Other	422 256	70.75 67.42	21.90 21.09	-1.94	676	.052*

Table Four

Dimension	Style	No. of Plays	Mean	Std. Dev.	t	df	p
Positive comments to people	Affiliative Other	422 256	5.66 8.47	5.40 7.15	5.43	431	.000***
Negative comments to people	Affiliative Other	422 256	.68 1.80	2.90 3.65	4.17	447	.000***
Supporting ideas	Affiliative Other	422 256	13.33 13.71	7.37 6.78	.662	676	.508
Opposing ideas	Affiliative Other	422 256	1.63 2.77	3.46 3.78	3.92	502	.000***

Table Five

Dimension	Style	No. of Plays	Mean	Std. Dev.	t	df	Sig.
Leadership	Affiliative Other	229 110	80.53 85.78	7.013 8.154	5.80	189	.000***
Power	Affiliative Other	229 110	65.25 77.09	14.97 17.29	6.16	190	.000***
Tension	Affiliative Other	229 110	91.78 90.70	8.633 9.216	-1.06	337	.290
Ideas	Affiliative Other	229 110	84.55 89.54	13.33 13.50	3.22	337	.001***
Business score	Affiliative Other	229 110					
Financial	Affiliative Other	229 110	83.52 88.93	17.50 10.80	3.49	317	.001***
Customer	Affiliative Other	229 110	90.77 94.94	13.18 10.41	3.16	266	.002**
Employee Morale	Affiliative Other	229 110	84.46 87.48	6.576 6.024	4.07	337	.000***

Table Six

Dimension	Style	No. of Plays	Mean	Std. Dev.	t	df	Sig.
Positive comments to people	Affiliative	229	14.64	12.32	-.217	337	.829
	Other	110	14.95	11.35			
Negative comments to people	Affiliative	229	3.47	7.93	.730	337	.466
	Other	110	4.10	6.40			
Supporting ideas	Affiliative	229	29.88	17.29	1.029	283	.305
	Other	110	31.59	12.65			
Opposing ideas	Affiliative	229	3.72	6.94	4.746	337	.000***
	Other	110	7.47	6.57			

Table Seven

Dimension	Style	No. of Plays	Mean	Std. Dev.	t	df	Sig.
Leadership	Affiliative	270	80.59	7.748	3.844	479	.000***
	Other	211	83.36				
Power	Affiliative	270	81.44	13.66	3.063	479	.002**
	Other	211	85.21	13.06			
Tension	Affiliative	270	88.96	10.34	1.750	479	.081
	Other	211	90.59	9.895			
Ideas	Affiliative	270	71.38	15.16	2.073	479	.039*
	Other	211	74.27	15.26			
Business score	Affiliative	270	72.93	13.84	5.542	470	.000***
	Other	211	79.56	12.36			
Financial	Affiliative	270	76.68	17.09	6.445	479	.000***
	Other	211	85.62	13.30			
Customer	Affiliative	270	73.87	16.04	5.084	469	.000***
	Other	211	80.97	14.51			
Employee Morale	Affiliative	270	68.24	13.50	3.166	479	.002**
	Other	211	72.11	13.03			

Table Eight

Dimension	Style	No. of Plays	Mean	Std. Dev.	t	df	Sig.
Positive comments to people	Affiliative	270	13.00	11.77	.649	479	.516
	Other	211	13.85	16.99			
Negative comments to people	Affiliative	270	2.26	5.78	2.039	256	.042*
	Other	211	4.54	15.49			
Supporting ideas	Affiliative	270	28.11	15.66	.807	479	.420
	Other	211	29.24	14.53			

Opposing ideas	Affiliative Other	270 211	6.13 8.11	10.47 12.56	1.881	479	.061
----------------	----------------------	------------	--------------	----------------	-------	-----	------

Table Nine

Dimension	No. of Students	Mean	Std. Dev.	t	df	Sig.
Average Leadership Score	37	76.74	4.072	-16.85	36	.000***
Best Leadership score	37	88.80	5.998			
Average Business Results	37	82.28	7.535	-8.317	36	.000***
Best Business Results	37	92.03	3.195			
Average Total Score	37	79.51	5.380	-14.20	36	.000***
Best Total Score	37	90.42	4.099			

