

Good example of case study on managing groups and teams, mode 3 case

[Business](#), [Management](#)



Introduction

Leadership is the act of influencing other people's minds to the extent that they blend their own perceptions with one's perceptions and eventually incline their loyalty towards your principles. However, it's only the positive qualities that define an effective leader. In strategic management, leaders often experience situational dilemma when implementing the mechanisms of corporate governance as stipulated by the executive members of the organization (Hunger & Wheelen, 2003). Leaders often devise the procedures to follow, possible solutions as well as unforeseen challenges that may cripple the success of an organization. In any circumstance of resolving a contention, a temporary strategy is always the basis of a solution and thus allows for periodic assessment and improvement of specific strategic plan.

Problem statement.

Cooperation among a group of people is the most difficult social aspect to achieve due to the unrealized principal-agent problem or the diverse opinions among the parties. Consequently, some relevant suggestions provided by some individuals are often trivialized in favor of the axiomatic strategies whose strategies yield substandard results. Such cases occur in managerial positions where only the best principles are endorsed oblivious of their counter-act factors. This paper will analyze the co-evolutionary gaming technique applied by the defense forces, its benefits and its impeding factors to delivering an impeccable decision in an organization.

How co-evolutionary gaming technique facilitates group decision making?

Co-evolutionary gaming technique is widely used by the US forces during their pre-analysis of an imminent attack by their adversaries. The technique operates on the basis of a social dilemma that engulfs individuals in their daily activities. The technique operates as Pareto optimal balance where either party is as an equal to the other for the benefit of the overall objective (Cares & Miskel, 2007). Most leaders have defined the approach as an ingredient to emotional intelligence where the solution to every problem is subjected to a comprehensive evaluation of every party's opinions. In group decision making, two factors are likely to impede the outcome of the decision-making process; principal –agent problem and partisanship. In traditional strategic approach, only the historical and the current data make relevance in the decision-making process. However, unforeseen factors are often overlooked.

In co-evolutionary technique, every party's suggestion is relevant until discarded by strong suggestion. The technique takes into consideration that the opponent parties are not inactive but rather would strive to devise plans to counter their opponent's moves to curtail their dominance. For instance, when a producer considers increasing the price of his output, he/she has to consider the opponents current market scenario and the likely reaction path that he would take to counter the primary initiative. Consequently, the marketing managers may be able to devise the counter –action decisions that would continue to dominate over the competitors' forces. The strategic leaders divide into several groups who are allocated action and reaction

perspectives in a given scenario (Cares & Miskel, 2007). The active group is supposed to strategize on the possible ways to achieve a given objective. On the other hand, the reaction group must intuitively propose the possible reaction moves to shield themselves from the effects of the initial approach. When the groups meet, every party must defend their approach and convince the action group on why they need to incorporate the ideas in the re-strategizing stage. Finally, the action group endorses the key elements proposed by the reaction group into their initial strategic plan. The final strategic plan is established and ready for application.

John Lufts and Harrington Ingham portrayed the scenarios that exist between understanding the intuitive connection between oneself and others through the Johari window process. In Johari window approach, understanding of internal self by a leader is the shield to safeguarding the preemptive character of the problem. The Johari window analyzes the essence of the principal-agent problem in a managerial role (Cares & Miskel, 2007).

Different groups view a certain problem in different dimensions and thus have diverse opinions to solve the problem. It is a case where "What you view as a problem is a benefit to me." For instance, a company's management may decide to withdraw transport services for workers with a private company in order to reduce operation cost. However, the management may be oblivious of the several shareholders' indirect interest in the transport company. As a result, implementation of the strategy may take long than anticipated.

Co-evolutionary gaming helps in sealing the loops of Johari window in that it enables managers to assess possible counter-moves to a certain strategy

before its implementation. It is the subject of deflating biasness and conflict of interest among management players in an organization. The players focus on undermining each other's managerial approach by fronting strategies that overwhelm the anticipated success of the approach. No party is willing to shift to the other and, therefore, the relevance of avoidance and accommodative decision approach dispensable. Parties strive to outsmart their opponents and thus create an enabling environment for improving the mover's strategy before implementation (Hunger & Wheelen, 2003). The advantageous climax of Co-evolutionary approach is that Pareto optimal decision is attained since no of the player teams is subdued to the other. Instead, the teams collaborate towards constructing a comprehensive strategic plan for the organization.

Unlike in the traditional approach, co-evolutionary gaming is a favorable approach in management because it expands the narrow decision field to a wide field of deliberation where every scenario is a successive stage to improve the strategic plan towards the core objective. It eliminates the imposed vacuum between the management and the market.

Limitations

One of the limitations to co-evolutionary gaming is that it cannot be applied in situations where urgent action is needed due to its long process. Instead, the technique is favorable in situations where the influencing factors are many, and the project completion time is long. Additionally, important strategic solutions may be overlooked due to the agency problem in the organization.

Recommendation to improve the Co-evolutionary gaming technique.

One of the major factors that impede the effectiveness of Co-evolutionary gaming technique is the collaborative approaches that derail timely implementation of the strategic plan. Collaborative approach in decision making thrives on the character of recognizing every party's opinions and scrutinizing it to realize its impact. The approach may be tedious and time consuming despite its increased chances of yielding accurate results. For instance, in a monopolistic market structure, the management may decide to increase the price of its Giffen goods. In the traditional approach, the management would brainstorm to incorporate the theoretical approach to market structure and analyze the general reaction of market competitors. In the co evolutionary technique, the strategic managers would divide themselves into different key competitors, whose immediate reaction would influence the market demand. The approach to only evaluate the reaction of key determiners in a strategic plan would accelerate decision -making process in an organization.

Conclusion

Strategic management is delicate social aspect that gives no room for trivialization of matters. Instead, the co evolutionary technique provides a mental approach where the movers can convert into a reactant with intent to improving the strategies principle factors before implementation (Hunger & Wheelen, 2003) As a result, managers are shielded from eventualities in course of implementing the strategic plan. Additionally, the gaming technique saves the organization from adjustment costs that traditionally

accrue due to unforeseen factors that deter effective implementation of the strategic plan.

References

Cares, J., & Miskel, J. (2007). Take Your Third Move First. *Harvard Business Review*, 85(3), 20-21.

Hunger, J. D., & Wheelen, T. L. (2003). *Essentials of strategic management*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.