**Topic:** Info Tech in Global Economy

**Question:**

**Chapter 13** – Our observations from the case study reading in the chapter material, Leadership and Management in Complex Systems research by Jager and van der Vegt (2005), is that leadership scholars seem to acknowledge the dynamic nature of leadership and have developed models and frameworks to organize and describe the factors that are important.  However, empirical research to test these models is scarce.  The authors have suggested several reasons for the lack of such research on dynamic leadership processes.

**Q1**: Carefully identify **at least four (4) reasons**, and provide a brief narrative about each reason, and why the authors provided that reason?

**Instructions:**

* Need 3 Responses for other student posts with APA references
* Minimum 150 words for each response (use uploaded document to see other student posts)
* Textbook attached
* No plagiarism please.

**Initial Post 1:**

Research has become a foundational building block for any organizational leadership. As posited by Morgeson, Scott, & Karam (n.d), research leadership is an essential factor that influences potency behavior for one to obtain more knowledge on certain areas of interest. Further studies by the above authors predict that professional research is needed in any discretional leadership. However, myriads of empirical challenges are still recorded in the research ecosystem.

Firstly, researchers lack resources. Morgeson et al. (n.d) further describe that the researchers are limited with tools and resources used in conducting research relating to the kind of complexity in complex systems of leadership. Some of the resources needed by researchers include information, finances, as well as field materials. The organization needs to motivate such passionate researchers as this motivates them to put more effort. This is because they feel honored by the work they do.

Secondly, there is a variant ill-defined manner in which arising problems are solved. This has been linked to poor teamwork from the hierarchical protocol whereby leadership is too much of self-leadership rather than a shared leadership. Morgeson et al. (n.d) further highlight that leadership in itself is a problem where teamwork is needed in order to bring discretional ideas together. This means that research cannot be facilitated if such potent teamwork and trust are lacking in such a complex system.

Thirdly, there are failures in task performance by assigned individuals Morgeson et al. (n.d). Often-times leaders are appointed to carry out some roles within specified stipulated timeframes. The whole executive management in an organization is waiting to see the real-time delivery of tasks, but at times those entrusted to perfume fail to accomplish. This causes mistrust of resource allocation for future research as anticipated by the top management leadership. Research fails to materialize when such cases occur hence limiting further research being facilitated.

Lastly, there is a lack of adequate result performance. Morgeson et al. (n.d) describe that for any leadership to succeed, there must be rating scales of performance where every bit of service delivery must be merited. Monitoring ensures timely task completion, resource utilization, teamwork, shared leadership as well as a proficient determination of deterrent research debilitations. Such factors are the reasons why dynamics in research development has been inhibited.

**Initial Post 2:**

The most important and influential characters in leadership research are to inspect the relationships between different leadership styles, like tasks and relationship-oriented behaviors and outcomes of these behaviors. Behaviors include follower attitudes (satisfaction, commitment, trust), behaviors (extra effort, cooperation, organizational citizenship behavior), and performance or unit levels outcomes, like group cohesion, collective efficacy, and unit performance. During this wide research range of studies showed that these relationships were ignored the dynamic characteristics of these relationships.

Effects of certain leadership styles depending on timing: Kozlowski et al. (2008) developed a team leadership framework that describes and helps team development as a cyclical and dynamic process. Leaders and team members are required to adopt this to the various phases of team development. This also describes that leaders need to be adaptive and be mindful of the key contingencies, which help with leadership behavior and to resolve challenges. Two major functions of leaders are as follows; (1) to be instructional and regulatory in nature; this helps leaders with variations in team tasks and helps team members to gain the research knowledge and skillset for team effectiveness. This function relates to leadership behaviors, which are transactional, structure-initiating, monitoring, authoritative, and directive leadership. (2) The leader second function is to be developmental, and this helps the leader to help the team with developing complex skills and capabilities (Kozlowski et al. 2008). This function relates to leadership behaviors which are transformational, consideration, coaching, empowerment, facilitative, and participative leadership.

Theoretical frameworks as a dynamic influence process: Along with this other research scholar identified that a theoretical framework which works as a dynamic influence process between leaders and followers. As per this, leadership is defined as a reciprocal interaction process between leaders and followers. When the reactions, actions, and characteristics from these two sides are considered (Collinson 2005, Uhl-Bien et al, 2007) proposed a complexity leadership theory (CLT). This theory identifies how leaders enable and coordinate dynamic interactions between interdependent individuals without affecting their adaptive and creative capacity and also explains the differences between the three major leadership functions adaptive, administrative, and enabling leadership. As per adaptive leadership, the creative and learning actions that emerge from the interactions between team members, this is informal. Administrative leadership helps the people in formal managerial roles to achieve business goals in an efficient and effective manner. Enabling leadership helps with the synchronization of behaviors between administrative and adaptive leadership.

Serious Gaming: Theoretical frameworks are tough to test in realtime. Serious gaming is used to study and train leadership and management using deterministic models. It is tough to capture the social complex phenomena due to a large amount of autonomous interacting agents. Many researchers from agent-based modeling community-identified serious gaming as a tool to test cases and predict future developments in complex systems (Arai et al. 2006; Guyot and Honiden 2006), but this is not being used to study social complex systems related to leadership and management. Using serious gaming turbulent developments in social systems can be problematic and require effective leadership, we propose agent-based gaming

Agent-based gaming: For understanding and researching complex social phenomena of management, agent-based gaming is introduced. In this, we introduce an autonomously behaving artificial population; in this framework, agents are required to exhibit management tasks that help to test and understand what system characteristics are required for a specific management strategy or leadership style to perform best. By using this framework, we assume that systems are more turbulent, adaptive, and people-oriented to overcome conservative and outcome-oriented styles. Using adaptivity helps with understanding the relations and performance in the long run. The consumat approach has specifically been designed to capture a number of main processes of human behavior and has been used in a variety of applications (see e.g., Jager 2000; Jager et al. 2000).

**Initial Post 3:**

As explained in the chapter about the observations from the case study reading in the chapter material and other factors where the dynamic leadership processes were lacked with and it was identified quite a few reasons, however, I am here concentrating on four of them with a simple narrative description

1. **Serious Gaming**: Serious Gaming is a tool that provides the users to test on an individual basis that helps to develop and maintain the skills with all kinds of needs as per the game with an individual perspective.
2. **Agent-Based Games for testing Leadership and Management**: The Agent-based games are totally a different type when considering the test, them against the Leadership and Management. Agent-based games and its concept have a consuming approach to guide different agent-based models. The agents differ in concerning the uncertainty of the tolerance and the aspirational levels for each based. The key variant to be considered for an Agent-based is this could be approached in a social network linked with various other agents.
3. **Single and Multiplayer Settings**: Single and Multiplayer settings are also the agent-based games as each player can be identified as an agent. In the chapter it was well explained by considering the example game World of Warcraft, I would also suggest a similar game Contra which has a single and multiplayer. This kind of multiplayer is the type where both the players work together in taking out the opponents, however, when considering a game called LUDO, it is a multiplayer game that will be played against each other. A very relevant attribute on analyzing the single and multiplayer is to see it how effective in making the decisions being failed.
4. **Experimentation with Management**: This a case that leads to consider the various other factors into consideration like speed, information collection, the behavior of the agents, opponent’s behavior, the performance of the single and multiplayer with respect to each case. The key attribute to consider when talking about the experiments is post measurement. The management can be handled only when the measurement is being captured and calculated accordingly.