

## **Mini Simulation / Role-Play Exercises**

*(For MBA, executive education, and advanced undergraduate courses)*

### **Dual-Class Shares Debate**

(Chapters 4–5: governance, shareholder rights, market regulation)

#### **Setup**

A fast-growing Asian technology company is considering listing with a dual-class share structure. Regulators permit it, but institutional investors are divided.

Participants must argue whether the structure should be:

- Approved as proposed
- Approved with safeguards
- Rejected

#### **Roles**

- Founder / Executive Chair
- Institutional Investor
- Exchange Representative
- Independent Governance Expert
- Minority Shareholder Advocate

#### **Script Cues**

- “Does control stability justify unequal voting rights?”
- “Are sunset clauses meaningful in practice?”

- “What is the market signalling effect?”

### **Tension Points**

- Innovation vs accountability
- Market competitiveness vs investor protection
- Long-term vision vs entrenchment risk

### **Debrief Questions**

- Which arguments resonated most across roles?
- How did power asymmetry influence outcomes?
- What safeguards, if any, changed perceptions?

## **ROLE CARD: Founder / Executive Chair**

### **Your position**

You believe control stability is essential for innovation.

### **Your objectives**

- Retain decision-making power
- Protect long-term vision

### **Key concerns**

- Short-term investor pressure
- Loss of strategic autonomy

## **ROLE CARD: Institutional Investor**

### **Your position**

You are wary of entrenchment risk.

### **Your objectives**

- Protect minority rights
- Secure safeguards

### **Key concerns**

- Permanent control
- Weak accountability

## **ROLE CARD: Exchange / Regulator Representative**

### **Your position**

You balance market competitiveness with investor protection.

### **Your objectives**

- Attract listings
- Maintain market credibility

### **Key concerns**

- Race to the bottom
- Reputational risk