

Comparing between 3 companies (semco , google , apple)

[Finance](#)



Assignment Differences between Three Companies (Semco, Google, and Apple) Differences as Revealed by Situational Analysis

Comparing the three companies, Semco prominently stands apart from the other two. Semco is based in Brazil, which is a developing country in South America. Semco was at the verge of collapse during the early 1980s when its policymakers decided “ to professionalize and to diversify” (Semler, 76).

However, Brazil’s GDP was growing at that time and it is still growing today. Expanding economy of the country provides it with better domestic opportunities.

But Google and Apple started in a much more different industrial environment. They are based in the Silicon Valley of USA, where they face fierce competition right within the domestic market. Moreover, despite having numerous product lines, both Google and Apple are in the IT industry. Hence, these companies are overly dependent on their capabilities to use information and communication technology skills. (Kahney)

Semco has more focus on Brazil while Google and Apple are rivaling various IT organizations throughout the global markets. Further, Semco has seldom entangled in political issues though it has a declared socio-economic mission of ushering workplace democracy. On the other hand, Apple maintains a strict corporate tone. Further, Google often raises ideological issues such as freedom of expression. Hence, it had to withdraw its business from China due to political reasons.

Differences in Combating Market Challenges

In the context of business diversification, Semco did not select to follow any rigid industrial segment. Hence, it appears to have minimized the major

business risks by diversifying its investments and specialties across different industries. According to The Leigh Bureau, Semco is aggressively expanding its market shares in the sectors like real estate, energy, legal services, etc. But Apple diversified its products and packages in the same business segment. At the same time it created a “ proprietary ecosystem” (Kahney). It maintained its technology and business secrets and embarked on a policy of using license agreements and copyright protection.

Google has a totally different marketing strategy. It does not venture in cross industry diversification like Semco. It also does not excessively emphasize on protecting its intellectual properties. It largely operates through open source technologies providing highly flexible and accessible IT platforms to its customers. Experts like Lashinsky describe the company to be aggressive but generous in handling the market challenges.

Administration

Semco follows a highly decentralized management system which is anti-hierarchical. It believes in participative leadership and allows its workers to decide its policies.

Unlike Semco, Apple is orthodox. It follows a command and control framework with clearly defined corporate hierarchies in every department. Although the company does not believe in discriminating its lower rank executives and technicians; it has a perfectionist approach, which was inducted by Steve Jobs.

Google follows a middle path. Unlike Apple, it gives its employees high degree of independence. In fact, Google treats its employees “ like gods” (Kahney) and aims to do business rather differently (Lashinsky). However,

Google does not allow its employees to interfere in its most critical financial policies. The company is more interested in ushering meritocracy than workforce democracy.

Categorization schemes that help us to understand different leadership practices may “ transcend organizational and national boundaries” (Bass, 130) Semco has some regulatory mechanisms of its own. Although it asks its employees to decide their salaries, it conducts periodic “ salary market surveys” (Semler, 83). These surveys help the managers to bargain the expenses with their subordinates, which may even result into sacking the employees with unreasonable expectations. Hence, the company does not depend on an entirely follower centric leadership model. Apple adopted a strict command and control framework right from the beginning giving very limited room to its employees for innovative or free thinking. Talented policy makers like Steve Jobs have been pivotal in Apple’s success. They neither allow their staff to participate in the critical decision making processes nor deviate from their strict hire and fire principles. Google, on the other hand, does not aim to inoculate itself from the open market and laissez-faire principles. It invites ideas and suggestions from not only its employees but also its customers and the coding enthusiasts.

Works Cited

Bass, Bernard M. " Does the transactional-transformational leadership paradigm transcend organizational and national boundaries?" *American Psychologist* 52 (1997): 130-139. Print.

Kahney, Leander. " How Apple Got Everything Right By Doing Everything Wrong." *wired. com. Conde Nast*, 18 Mar. 2008. Web. 29 Nov. 2012. .

<https://assignbuster.com/comparing-between-3-companies-semco-google-apple/>

Lashinsky, Adam. " Where does Google go next? - May 12, 2008." CNNMoney - Business, financial and personal finance news. CNN, 12 May 2008. Web. 29 Nov. 2012. .

Semler, Ricardo. " Managing without managers." Harvard Business Review September-October (1989): 76-84. Print.

The Leigh Bureau. " Ricardo Semler - Bio." 2012. Web. 29 Nov. 2012. .