



## Cards on the Table

*I went out for lunch with my colleagues. My colleague Martin proposed to pay the bill with his credit card and we gave him our share of the cost. A few weeks later I accidentally see his claim statement and notice he claimed the lunch at the expense of the firm. What do I do?*

- 1 *I know that he's been working long hours lately and think "good for him".*
- 2 *I ask him for my share*
- 3 *I alert Martin's supervisor*
- 4 *I suggest that he points out his 'mistake' to the Claims Department*

### ***Playing the game***

The case described above is one of the 50 dilemmas from the KPMG game *Cards on the table*. The game is played in groups of four people. The dilemmas, taken from everyday life, place the players in the role of the "I" character. Each player has to give reasons for his or her choice in the situation described because the choices and the reasons behind them quite often differ within the groups, a discussion arises among the players as to what is and is not acceptable. Following the discussion, the players are "dealt with" in two ways: first of all, by moving their pieces on the board, the players make their approval or disapproval known; secondly, on the back of each dilemma, an economic evaluation is made. Each choice costs or delivers image and money points. In that way, the capital of each player increases or decreases with every round. The game goes on for about one hour, during which time roughly 12 dilemmas are discussed.

### ***Aim of the game***

The game is a light-hearted introduction to the theme of integrity. It allows the players to become familiar, in a playful atmosphere, with what integrity dilemmas are and how dilemmas can occur in organisations. At the same time, the game stimulates discussion over the subject of integrity. There is often a taboo about speaking about integrity issues. By talking about them, players learn about each others points of view. Chatting about it afterwards can take place in different ways. One of the possibilities is discussed briefly below.

### ***Chatting***

During the playing of the game, the dilemmas undoubtedly strike a chord; something like that also happens here. The employees are invited after the game to write these “aha-experiences” down. Within 10 minutes the players easily formulated two or three real dilemmas. Just a few dilemmas can be discussed in the larger group of about 20. During this discussion, the different solutions can be discussed. It is of great value to see how much the organisation can contribute to the solution of such dilemmas. That way, insight is created into how the integrity of one’s own organisation can be developed.

### ***Playing equipment***

The game consists of the following equipment:

- 1 playing board
- 1 set of instructions
- 4 sets of 3 pawns
- 4 sets of 4 option cards numbered 1-4
- series of dilemma cards
- 30 image cards
- 30 revenue cards

### ***Starting the game***

The game is played by four players to each board.

The playing board is positioned so that each corner faces a player. The players use the pawns of the same colour as the corner nearest them. The pawns are placed on the starting positions (of corresponding colour) on the board together with those of the other players.

Each player receives four option cards (with numbers 1-4) in their own colour.

Each player starts with three revenue cards and three image cards. The remainder of the \$ and image cards are placed in the compartments on the board. The dilemma cards are shuffled and placed face-upwards with the text (i.e. not showing the evaluation) in the middle of the board. The game can start. It doesn’t matter who starts; everyone gets the same number of turns.

### ***Playing the game***

A player picks up a dilemma card from the board. The player clearly reads out the dilemma and the possible solutions. The players all decide for themselves (without communicating with one another) which solution they would select in the given situation. The selected alternative is determined by placing the appropriate option card (numbered 1-4) for that choice face downwards on the table. When each player has made his or her selection the player who has read out the dilemma announces his choice first. This is done by turning over the option card and (important!) providing reasons for the choice. His/her choice and supporting reasons are then compared with those of the other players. The co-players turn over their cards one by one and explain their choices.

After each player has announced his or her choice the choice made by the first player is assessed. This takes place on the board with the aid of the pawns. If someone considers the player's choice including the argumentation to be justified the pawn in question is moved one square towards the player. Rejection means that the player's choice as well as argumentation are not regarded as justified. In that case the co-players will move the pawn back a space on the board. If co-players reject or accept the choice and argumentation of the player they can let their pawn in place.

It is possible that a co-player will have chosen the same alternative as the player but that the latter's choice has been based on arguments unacceptable to the co-player. In that case the co-player moves back a square. Conversely it is possible the player will select an alternative different from that of one or all of the co-players whereas his motivation is regarded as highly creditable. In that case the pawn can still be moved one square towards the player in order to express appreciation of the choice and underlying reasons.

### ***End of the game***

- The game ends when the previously agreed time has elapsed. For proper assessment it is desirable for each player to have the same number of turns.
- The game has no winners or losers. In fact everyone gains insight.
- It is possible to compare the players' positions on the board with one another:
  - Which player has scored the highest (i.e. been given the highest rating by the co-players) and which the lowest: how may this be explained? Could this for example be due to the positive rating or critical attitude of the co-players?
  - The number of image cards that the players have earned.
  - The number of euro cards that the players have earned. How is this number related to the individual image cards and to the positions of the pawns on the board?
- It is also possible to compare the various boards with one another. The weakest link determines the strength of the playing team: which board has the lowest score and which board has the highest low score?