

Extended Simulation Script

Research, Creation, and Execution Task Comparison of Leader2 (High Confidence, Low Competence) vs. Leader3 (Low Confidence, High Competence)

Task Overview Each team is asked to complete a three-part collaborative assignment:

1. **Research** a timely topic ("The Future of Climate Finance").
2. **Create** a clear, well-designed slide deck (10 minutes long).
3. **Execute** the presentation with coordinated delivery.

The team remains constant:

- **Researcher:** Expert in data analysis, prefers structure and logic.
- **Strategist:** Visual, creative, thrives with clear goals.
- **Executor:** Process-oriented, handles scheduling, deadlines, and final builds.

Two simulations are run, each with a different leader:

- **Leader1:** High Confidence, Low Competence
 - **Leader2:** Low Confidence, High Competence
-

SIMULATION A — Leader2: High Confidence, Low Competence

Phase 1: Research (Minutes 0-30)

- **Initial tone:** Leader1 opens with energy, body language is confident. "We've got this team!" echoes through the virtual room.
- **Assignment kickoff:** Leader1 avoids setting specific goals. Suggests everyone "follow their gut."
- **Team reaction:** Strategist begins ideating slide templates; Researcher starts pulling climate-related economic data but lacks direction.
- **Executor stalls:** Without a structure, they create a task tracker but flag a lack of task order.

Observation: The energy is high, but momentum is fragile. The leader encourages productivity without ensuring alignment.

Phase 2: Creation (Minutes 30-60)

- **Leader input:** Offers compliments, but not direction. "Looks great!" is said repeatedly but never followed by feedback.

- **Team progression:**
 - **Researcher** struggles to organize dense data with no thematic arc.
 - **Strategist** creates sleek visuals that don't tie into the content.
 - **Executor** drafts a tentative agenda based on guesswork.
- **Conflict emerges:** Researcher quietly messages Executor: "We need to redirect this or we'll fall apart."

Observation: Confidence no longer uplifts. Confusion rises. Team starts leaning away from the leader for support.

Phase 3: Execution (Minutes 60-90)

- **Presentation begins:** Leader1 opens strong, captivating the audience. But once details emerge, cracks show.
- **Q&A panic:** Leader1 is asked to explain a chart. Stumbles, passes it to Researcher awkwardly.
- **Team compensates:** Researcher delivers a technical explanation; Executor jumps in with a clarification slide.

Observation: Delivery is disjointed. Style over substance. Team delivers despite—not because of—the leader.

Post-Presentation Feedback

- **Researcher:** "We had good material. But no direction."
- **Strategist:** "We were designing into a void."
- **Executor:** "Next time, I want the leader to plan with me."

Score: 62/100

- Structure: 4
- Accuracy: 6
- Visuals: 8
- Team Trust: Downward slope

Theoretical Fit:

- Matches **Implicit Leadership Theory** (confidence interpreted as competence).
- Fails **Leader-Member Exchange Theory** (no trust built).
- Lacks **Transformational Leadership** elements.

SIMULATION B — Leader2: Low Confidence, High Competence

Phase 1: Research (Minutes 0-30)

- **Initial tone:** Leader2 is reserved. Shares a screen with a detailed framework. “We can adjust this — I just sketched a starting point.”
- **Team reaction:**
 - **Researcher:** Lights up. “Perfect — I’ll plug data into these sections.”
 - **Strategist:** Begins mapping out matching slide concepts.
 - **Executor:** Organizes the group in Asana with clear milestones.
- **Leader follows up:** Asks for clarification and quietly affirms progress.

Observation: Leader2’s value is not vocal — it’s cognitive. Team respects the clarity and builds trust fast.

Phase 2: Creation (Minutes 30-60)

- **Leader involvement:**
 - Provides thematic feedback: “Let’s ensure our case study links back to our thesis.”
 - Clarifies roles: “Executor — can you gatecheck the slide sequence?”
- **Team response:**
 - **Researcher** integrates modeling.
 - **Strategist** balances elegance with logic.
 - **Executor** guides transitions and preps presenter notes.

Observation: Feedback is subtle but sharp. Team operates with autonomy and accountability.

Phase 3: Execution (Minutes 60-90)

- **Presentation opens:** Leader2 is reserved, but speech is articulate and data-driven.
- **Hand-offs:** Slide transitions are fluid. Each member presents confidently, referring to the outline Leader2 created.
- **Q&A excellence:**
 - Question: “How would these risks apply in emerging markets?”
 - Leader2: Calmly brings up the slide, cites a case from Kenya, and connects it back to policy trends.

Observation: Team performs with pride. Leader3 is recognized not for flair, but for mastery.

Post-Presentation Feedback

- **Strategist:** “We had room to be creative because the map was already drawn.”
- **Executor:** “No wasted time. I knew my role the whole way.”
- **Researcher:** “It felt like a think tank, not just a project.”

Score: 89/100

- Structure: 10
- Accuracy: 10
- Visuals: 8
- Team Trust: Upward slope

Theoretical Fit:

- Confirms **LMX Theory**: Trust built gradually through demonstration.
 - Supports **Transformational Leadership**: Substance inspired performance.
 - Illustrates **Psychological Safety**: Members offered ideas without fear.
-

FINAL TAKEAWAY

This extended simulation shows that while confidence may be magnetic in early collaboration, competence forms the bedrock of sustainable team effectiveness. Leader2 exemplified quiet mastery, enabling strong collaboration and trust, while Leader1's style-first approach lost steam as demands increased.

Key Finding: Teams thrive not from who talks the most, but from who delivers the clearest, most empowering foundation.