Assignment:
Common MGT 360 Management Analysis Report

wayne.smith@csun.edu

[updated: Monday, May 21, 2018]

Course: *MGT 360*
Title: *Management and Organizational Behavior* (3 units)

"Theory is about the connections among phenomena, a story about why acts, events, structure, and thoughts occur. Theory emphasizes the nature of causal relationships, identifying what comes first as well as the timing of such events." --*R. Sutton and B. Staw*

Goal:
The Department of Management strives to ensure that all students enrolled in MGT 360 are critical thinkers and strong writers. In essence, the Department wants all students to be able to demonstrate competency and efficacy in applying the principles of management and organizational behavior to the issues of a contemporary organization and its broader environment.

Objective:
In narrative essay format, I want you to address a business/organization case study using multiple concepts from class. The case question and case text begin on page 5 of this document.

Building upon your knowledge from MGT 360, students should demonstrate their best understanding of management and organizational behavior theory, and the application of those ideas to improve the understanding of various issues. You need to clearly identify at least *three* distinct, substantive issues. For each issue you need to 1), identify evidence from the case text that shows why this issue is important, 2), use theory from our textbook as a base for your analysis, and 3), draw an analogy from library materials other than the textbook to strengthen your argument. You also need to use appropriate in-text citations and provide a "Works Cited" (Reference) page.

Additionally, building upon your skills from general education and lower-division core courses, students should demonstrate their best composition and technical writing skills.

Length:
This essay is to be no less than three full pages and in length and no more than four full pages in length. Other relevant formatting requirements ("style guide") are

linked from the course web page. The "Works Cited" page is *in addition to* the required page length (i.e., the "Works Cited" page *doesn't count* as one of the 3-4 pages).

Deliverable:
This assignment is due on the date specified on the course outline.

Performance Measurement:
There will be two different scores for this assignment. The *first* score will be for content, and the maximum numbers of points for content will be 20. The scoring rubric for the content portion of this assignment is as follows:

1	-	clearly identifying at least three key issues to be addressed
3	-	appropriate and rigorous use of evidence from the case text(s)
6	-	appropriate and rigorous use of relevant theory from our Textbook
6	-	appropriate and rigorous use of the class Library materials
3	-	correct and proper use of In-Text Citations
1	-	correct and proper use of a Works Cited ("References") page

The details for earning strong scores are enumerated below.

Requirements Rationale:

- *You must* clearly identify at least three key issues. Readers, especially important readers whose time is valuable and decision-making you want to influence (which eventually will be *you*, at some point after graduation), can't be guessing as to what you are writing about. Four techniques can help immensely to improve clarity in this regard. The first is to identify the three issues by the end of the first paragraph, probably in the last line of the paragraph. This first step is crucial because it sets the expectations for the reader. The second is to use sub-headings liberally (think of sub-headings as "signposts"). The third is to repeat the issue in the first or second sentence of the paragraph that will address the issue. You might use slightly different words, but the issue, in essence, is the topic sentence of the paragraph. The fourth and final technique is to repeat the three issues (summarized, of course)—along with recommendations, if any—somewhere in the final, concluding paragraph.

- *You must* use evidence from the case text(s). The evidence must be at least one direct quote. Without some supporting evidence, there is no way to demonstrate that the issue you wish to discuss is even an issue, much less a distinct and substantive issue that key, senior decision-makers should consider. There might even be more than one piece of evidence, even from a single, journalistic article.

- *You must* lead the reader through the process of inference. That is, apply the general principles (theories, models, and frameworks) from this course to explain a phenomenon that occurred in the past or predict what phenomenon is likely to occur in the future. Both explanations and predictions require a deep understanding of "why". Support for "why" is demonstrated primarily by the rigorous use of appropriate theories, models, and frameworks. For this assignment those theories must originate from the course textbook readings. The theory must be at least one direct quote. There are many theories in a textbook; choosing the best one requires diligent focus, a comprehensive understanding of course approach and detail, and fervent review of technical subject matter. There are no "shortcuts" to using the best theory, models, or frameworks in an objective, purposeful manner.

- *You must* make a strong argument in your analysis. Convincing another smart person that your thinking is right or best is some of the most difficult work you'll do after you graduate. In addition to evidence and theory, another critical piece of a strong argument is the elegant use of an analogy. You offer additional support for your analysis of an issue by the use of a relevant analogy between a fact from the case text and a fact from a class *Library* materials listed on the course outline. You must use at least one direct quote from the *library* materials. As with evidence and theory, each issue will use analogies from different *library* materials. *Library* materials are labeled on the course outline as such; they are *not* materials from the textbook, supplementals, lectures, or video clips.

- *You must* cite your references, including specific page numbers (or from WileyPlus, the Section number or name), in-text (i.e., "in-line") in the sentence in the narrative. You cannot make crass, unsubstantiated arguments or use ambiguous references. You need to provide tangible support for your reasoning. You build authority and credibility by acknowledging and referring to the work of others. Put another way anything you write that isn't cited is assumed to be your own work. If you intentionally or unintentionally let the reader assume that the work of other individuals is your own work, you are plagiarizing. You cannot do this…ever…in either academic or professional work. I prefer APA format, but you may use MLA format as well. For the textbook, the citation must contain the Author's name, year of publication, and page number (or WileyPlus Section number or name). For other materials, the citation must contain the Author's name and year of publication. There are examples of in-text citations in the APA Style Guide summarized nicely by the CSUN Library:

  `http://library.csun.edu/egarcia/documents/apacitation_quickguide.pdf`

- *You must* use a "Works Cited" page (sometimes called a "References" page). Someone else must be able to locate and use each reference on the "Works Cited" page. Multiple, In-text citations from the narrative that refer to the same reference in the "Works Cited" page are listed only once in the "Works Cited" page (even if different elements are used in the In-Text citation). Again, I prefer APA format, but you may use MLA format as well. There are examples of how references are to be formatted on "Works Cited" pages in the APA Style Guide summarized nicely by the CSUN Library:

  http://library.csun.edu/egarcia/documents/apacitation_quickguide.pdf

Other Tips:

- *Don't* write haphazardly. *Do* balance breadth (broad coverage of multiple issues) with depth (sufficient, detailed analysis of each distinct issue). These issues emerge from your reading of the article, your education and experience, and your understanding of what the firm needs to succeed. You'll write a better paper if you identify issues that resonate with you viscerally because you'll have more acumen and concomitant passion for those issues.

- *Don't* focus on principles, concepts, and materials from *other* business classes (lower-division or upper-division). *Do* focus on principles, concepts, and materials covered in *this* course—MGT 360. Take the perspective that the materials from this class on "Management and Organization Behavior" are unique and distinctive from other upper-division business courses. Here are two tips: 1), review the titles of the textbook chapters, HBR and supplemental readings, and 2), review the organizational structure and details of the course outline.

- *Don't* just use concepts from the current part of the course, or materials just after the mid-term exam. *Do* use materials from the entire course, including from materials on leadership and change near the end of the course. Therefore, you need to review prior materials and you need to read ahead. This class doesn't have a cumulative final exam. However, this assignment is indeed a cumulative assignment.

- *Don't* arbitrarily ignore General Education courses. *Do* incorporate materials from one or more of G.E. courses if you feel those materials strengthen your thinking.

- *Don't* write like you speak. *Do* organize your thoughts well. The main body of the report are the issues. Additionally, the first paragraph of the report should be an introduction, and the last paragraph should be a conclusion.

The last sentence of the introduction might be a summary of what is to come in the main body, while the conclusion might be a summary of what was said and final recommendations.

The *second* score will be for writing, and the maximum numbers of points for content will be 10. The scoring criteria for the writing portion of this assignment will be similar to the writing scoring criteria used previously in this class.

Although the *raw* scores differ for Content (20 points) and for Writing (10 points), both scores are *weighted* equally (i.e., half of 10% overall is 5% for Content and 5% for Writing).

Case Question:

Assume that you are the Director of Management Operations at a U.S. manufacturing plant owned by a major Japanese automobile manufacturer. You report directly to the Chief Operating Officer (COO) of the firm. Your boss has asked you to identify issues that have surfaced at some of the Japanese manufacturing plants. Naturally, you want to ensure that these issues, to the extent they may occur at your U.S. plant, are identified and addressed. Ideally, you would want to make sure that issues that have arisen in the Japanese manufacturing plants don't arise in your U.S. plant. Your new boss has asked you for assistance in this matter.

Write a brief management analysis report to your boss that informs the COO and the top management team about the existing situation at the Japanese plants, and what might be done about it at your plant to address those issues, or better, what might be done to avoid the issues proactively. That is, using the language of our class, describe (explain or predict) specific examples of weak management skills or abilities along with possible suggestions for future interventions. Be certain to touch upon how new opportunities can be leveraged and new threats can be overcome.

(If you need to make any assumptions or background regarding anything you might have read in the case text, simply state them as needed.)

Case Citation:

Gale, A., and McLain, S. (2018, February 5). Japan's Famed Manufacturing Model is Facing a Crisis. *Wall Street Journal*.

Case Text:

Full text: Japan's reputation for flawless manufacturing quality and efficiency transformed the country's postwar economy, changed business practices world-wide and spawned a library's worth of management manuals and business advice books. Now, the model is cracking.

Kobe Steel Ltd., Mitsubishi Materials Corp. and Subaru Corp. have all admitted in recent months to manipulating quality inspections, though all say no safety problems emerged. Takata Corp. declared bankruptcy last year after admitting to supplying more than 50 million defective vehicle air bags in the U.S. Mitsubishi Motors Corp. has admitted covering up vehicle faults and falsifying fuel-economy data.

Nissan Motor Co. the world's fifth-largest auto maker, disclosed in September that its Japanese factories let unqualified employees perform final quality inspections on some cars, a practice that might date back to the 1990s. During audits, foremen routinely provided trainees with badges from certified inspectors, the company said.

Because results from new-car inspections are recorded on paper and stored in binders, it was nearly impossible to determine how many cars were affected, according to one person familiar with the process. Nissan recalled 1.2 million vehicles in Japan -- nearly every one it produced in the three years through September. It says safety was never compromised.

Corporate wrongdoing occurs the world over, but Japan's scandals cut to the core of what has kept Japanese brands popular, as well as the country's perception of itself. Japanese brands, once a byword for quality, score well on many quality surveys, but American car makers have bested them in the past two years in J.D. Power's Initial Quality Study, and makers of other products are also catching up.

The scandals threaten to accelerate an erosion of Japan's global market share for manufactured goods, handing main rival China further momentum in its march toward becoming the world's largest economy. They also call into question one of the world's most influential theories of management and manufacturing.

Japan's model, celebrated in publications such as Harvard Business Review, hinges largely on the concept of kaizen, often translated as "continuous improvement." In practice, it means eliminating unnecessary activity, reducing excess inventory and using teamwork to fix problems when they arise.

It places enormous responsibility on line workers at the factory-floor level, known as the genba, to manage daily operations and generate innovation. Those workers, viewed by many Japanese as craftsmen, have traditionally been guaranteed jobs for life in return for dedication to their company's goals.

The problem today is that many Japanese companies can no longer afford the luxury of guaranteed lifetime employment for craftsmen on factory floors. And delegating so much authority to line workers has left companies exposed to fraud and corner-cutting, while giving executives room to shirk responsibility, according to management consultants and corporate lawyers knowledgeable about the problems.

"The genba has been broken," says Hideaki Kubori, a Tokyo lawyer experienced in handling corporate scandals. The inability of companies to fully control it has resulted in a "kind of crisis" for Japanese industry, he says.

Kobe Steel, based near Osaka, makes high-end steel products for trains, cars and rockets. It recently admitted to faking quality-certification documents for hundreds of thousands of products for more than 500 clients.

An internal company report completed in October found that line workers were overworked as the company tried to maintain profitability, and executives were out of touch with the factory floor.

Problems intensified during busy periods, says Takashi Ueda, a 24-year-old who works for a Kobe Steel subcontractor and makes final quality checks on wire used in car engine springs. When delivery pressure was tight, he says, Kobe Steel employees approved products he told them might fail to meet required standards. "There are occasions when we are forced to prioritize a quick shipment over quality," he says.

One Kobe Steel employee who has worked for the company for three decades, as a factory manager and at headquarters, says pressure started to build on the genba after Japan's bubble economy burst in the early 1990s.

Quality-checking staffers became some of the first targets of layoffs because they didn't appear as busy as production-line workers, he says. Line workers were told to make quality checks themselves, he says, and some checks were outsourced after the company suspended hiring.

Workers involved in data falsification felt they had no choice because they needed to keep production moving, he says, and customers with urgent orders sometimes accepted products that didn't meet specifications.

Kobe Steel said in a written statement that pressure from management to achieve profits and meet production deadlines was one of the root causes of misconduct. It said it has commissioned an independent investigation to provide recommendations for reform.

Kobe Steel acknowledged in a November report that a "closed culture" -- one in which factory workers dealt with problems themselves, often without senior executives in the loop --

contributed to its scandal. Its leaders denied having knowledge of the issues before they became public.

"It's beyond my imagination how broad this problem has become," Chief Executive Officer Hiroya Kawasaki said in an October press conference.

On Dec. 21, Kobe Steel demoted three heads of business segments it said were aware of data falsification as far back as 2009. Kobe says it hasn't found safety problems in most products it shipped, but is still investigating.

Japan remains a manufacturing powerhouse. It ranks No. 3 in manufacturing output, behind China and the U.S. and just ahead of Germany, according to United Nations data.

Some $700 billion of Japanese goods are exported annually, mostly machinery, cars and parts such as screens and memory chips for iPhones and aircraft fuselages for Boeing Co. Japanese-owned factories are also a force in the U.S., making products for brands such as Nissan and Toyota in Kentucky, Texas and elsewhere.

Powering Japan's industrial might was a manufacturing model forged after World War II, when its companies sought to rebound by improving products for global buyers. Executives relied on an American management consultant, W. Edwards Deming, who advised companies to boost quality by empowering factory-floor workers to constantly focus on fixing problems.

The approach married well with Japan's ethics of hard work and attention to detail, and was widely adopted. Exports grew in value more than 130-fold between 1950 and 1990. American companies obsessed over Japan's success.

Studies of how Japanese companies outfoxed U.S. rivals considered the impact of Zen Buddhism and martial arts, as well as Japan's culture of building consensus. Ford Motor Co. and others tried to copy parts of the Japanese model.

There were also hints of shortcomings with the Japanese model. In a 1981 Harvard Business Review column, management consultant Peter Drucker wrote that Japanese executives spent little time involved in operational issues, focusing instead on managing relations with customers, bankers and government officials. Even today, manufacturing issues are rarely raised to the executive level, says Atsushi Osanai, a management professor at Waseda University in Tokyo.

Other countries, including South Korea and China, have gobbled up Japanese market share for exports such as ships and electronics. A strong yen after Japan's economic bubble burst reduced income from products sold overseas.

Japanese manufacturers began replacing permanent genba workers, who receive benefits including holiday pay and a retirement salary, with temporary staff. Panasonic Corp. says that less than one-third of genba workers at its appliance division are now permanent staff, a trend it says it hopes to reverse because it may be hurting its long-term business prospects.

Takuya Shimamura, CEO of Asahi Glass Co., said his company has conducted a survey every year for about the past decade that asks workers whether they would follow orders from a boss to cover up product defects. A surprising number say yes, he said.

"We're now paying the price for reducing new [permanent] hires," he said. Weeks after his comment, Asahi Glass said a subsidiary had issued quality certificates for a scientific tube without conducting the proper test. It apologized and said it would fix the issue.

Some Japanese manufacturers have shifted to more technologically advanced products to cope with the loss of business to foreign rivals. Toray Industries Inc., a maker of plastics and other industrial goods, has posted record profits from high-end products such as fiber used in auto tires.

Demand for such specialty products puts strain on thegenbato accelerate innovation and boost quality control, says Hiroshi Osada, a Japanese manufacturing expert at Bunkyo University near Tokyo.

In late November, Toray said a subsidiary rewrote product-quality data on shipments of its fiber for auto tires and other products, with data manipulation as far back as 2008. The company said its actions didn't violate any laws or raise safety issues. It declined to comment further.

After a subsidiary of Mitsubishi Materials rewrote test data on some products for more than 15 years, the company said in a report that employees had struggled to meet official quality targets for new products for electrical systems for cars. "Taking on impossible business caused many products to fail to meet standards, and this may have led to the inappropriate actions in this case," the report found. The company declined further comment.

Nicholas Benes, co-head of the Board Director Training Institute of Japan, who helped write Japan's corporate-governance code, believes the solution isn't to throw out Japan's manufacturing model. He says the answer lies in tougher corporate governance.

In recent admissions of quality-inspection faking, Japanese executives have repeatedly claimed they had no knowledge of problems. Subaru executives and plant managers said they had no idea workers had created an unofficial training regimen for quality inspectors, including purposely sending cars with defects down the line to see if newcomers could detect them.

A 2004 whistleblower law that guarantees protection for anyone reporting improper workplace activity has had limited success, corporate lawyers say. Japan's genba culture emphasizes dealing with problems within the employee's work team rather than raising them higher.

A corporate-governance code introduced in 2015 -- Japan's first -- called for companies listed on Japan's main stock market to have at least two outside directors. Most companies have done so. The code says outside directors should satisfy Tokyo Stock Exchange rules for independence, but in some cases, the new directors have connections to the companies.

Some experts on Japanese industry see the recent string of scandals as a positive sign that problems are surfacing and being addressed. Others note that some Japanese quality standards may be unrealistically high. Employees of manufacturers, confident their products are of sufficiently high quality, may feel it is OK to ship some that don't meet full specifications, says Mr. Osanai, the Waseda University professor.

Sadayuki Sakakibara, head of the Japanese business federation known as Keidanren, has urged companies to improve governance and ethics, but recently apologized himself after Toray revealed its quality faking scandal.

Mr. Sakakibara was president of Toray at the time of that company's wrongdoing. He said he had no idea about problems on the factory floor.