**Final Paper**

**Personal Case Analysis\***

**Overview**

The final paper asks you to do a four-frame analysis of your personal case situation.

The purposes of the paper are to:

* Provide opportunities to work with and integrate the four frames as a useful tool for diagnosis and action
* Demonstrate your ability to apply the four frames and other concepts from the literature to a real-life situation from your work

Although it is hard to predict how long your paper should be, you should probably expect to need 20 pages (double-spaced) to convey all of the required elements. The maximum length allowed is 25 pages.

**Assignment**

* Introduce the paper by summarizing your Personal Case in three to four paragraphs.
* Analyze, in narrative form, what happened in the case using each of the four frames.  Answer the following questions from the perspective of each frame:
	+ What’s going on?
	+ What options are available?

Devote approximately equal attention to each of the four frames.

* Summarize your narrative analysis using a table like the one found on page 429 of Bolman and Deal (2008).
* Analyze the ethical, leadership, and change issues from a four-frame perspective.
* Rethink the entire case in light of the four-frame analysis. Match a frame(s) (page 317) to the situation and answer the following questions:
	+ What should management have done differently?  Why?
	+ What can management do now to address the issue (if applicable)?  Why?
	+ Summarize and conclude the paper.
	+ Attach references in APA format. A minimum of 10 references, not including the textbook, are required.

**Criteria for Grading Final Paper**

Papers will be graded on the following:

* Quality and thoroughness of analysis
* Clear focus, organization, writing, and presentation
* Internal consistency of the arguments
* Accurate and effective use of theory, using all four frames and other relevant concepts, to reflect on and provide new insights into personal case experiences.

See the Final Case Analysis Paper grading rubric for details.

**Cautions**

Common errors in previous students’ papers have included the following:

* Providing descriptions of case events (what happened) rather than analysis of the events. Good analysis tells *why* things happened.
* Trying to discuss every single aspect of the case.  It is better to write thoroughly about the critical issues than superficially about many.
* Making inferences and generalizations without providing data from the case to support the generalizations, examples to help define them, or theory references to ground them.  For example, you might say that everyone in the case wanted “involvement” and “participation.”  How do you know that?  What evidence do you have?  What do you mean by involvement and participation?
* Ignoring theory and writing only opinions.  Good papers take a set of theoretical ideas and show how those ideas can be applied to some specific aspect(s) of the case.
* Choosing only one frame to address the situation. Complex situations typically require multi-faceted solutions.
* Ignoring one’s own interpretations and restating theory after theory from the readings.  Good papers use theory to support insights and to cast a new light on personal experiences and observations.
* Failing to edit for grammatical and structural problems.
* Failing to spell check.

\*Adapted from *Using Bolman and Deal’s Reframing Organizations: An Instructor’s Guide to Effective Teaching, Fourth Edition*(2008) by Joan V. Gallos.

