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This article has its genesis in my doctoral study with the University of South Africa’s (UNISA) School of Business Leadership (SBL) from 2001 to 2003. An electronic version of the thesis is available on the UNISA Institutional Repository. Twelve (12) books have since been self-published – four (4) in 2011, seven (7) in 2012 and one (1) in 2013. Seventeen (17) articles, derived from the study, are available on the University of Zimbabwe Institutional Repository since 2013.

The overarching lens for all works is the Madzivire Collaborative Transformation (MaCoTra) model developed during my UNISA study. The MaCoTra model is based on the metaphor of seven (7) CHORUSES. Each of the model CHORUSES constitutes one (1) book of the MaCoTra Seven-CHORUS-Book CHAIN, self-published in 2012, and an article forming the MaCoTra Seven-CHORUS-Article CHAIN. The structure of each of the 7 articles is meant to ease referencing across the Seven-CHORUS-Article CHAIN. Article 1 covers new insights on CHORUS 1, Article 2 on CHORUS 2, Article 3 on CHORUS 3, Article 4 on CHORUS 4, Article 5 on CHORUS 5, Article 6 on CHORUS 6 and Article 7 on CHORUS 7.

Having made a random selection of thirteen (13) private sector, eleven (11) public sector and eleven (11) civic sector organisations for inclusion in the Seven-CHORUS-Article CHAIN and Seven-CHORUS-Book CHAIN, I documented my experiences in applying each CHORUS in these organisations from 2003 to 2012. I relied heavily on documents that I accessed and/or created during my consulting assignments. After a sector based analysis, I have included major reflections that I consider relevant in understanding the dynamics at play for each CHORUS. In some cases, I have also leaned on ‘words of wisdom’ from thought leaders to spice the reflections.

I believe that the organisations sampled reflected polar types in the way they engaged in CHORUS 6. Of course, there have been discords particularly when some organisational members did not fully cuddle in CHOIR or CHORUS practice.

I trust that the Seven-CHORUS-Article CHAIN will energise those scholars/practitioners who have been questioning how to apply the MaCoTra model. This preface is a MODIFIED MELODY to suit each of the 7 articles, much like a CHORUS!!!

This article features new insights on; and a generic framework for SINGING; MaCoTra CHORUS 6: Collaborative Setting Up of Distinctive Structures and Systems.

1.0 Introduction

The overarching frame for this article is the Madzivire Collaborative Transformation (MaCoTra) model (Exhibit 1). The MaCoTra model is also reflected in my 2011 book publication entitled MaCoTra Singing ORGANISATIONS THAT TRANSFORM: ADDRESSING THE CHALLENGES in the Emerging Economy of Zimbabwe and each book of the Seven-CHORUS-Book CHAIN self-published in 2012.

Outlining the CHORUS-based MaCoTra model differentiating features, I indicate:

The MaCoTra model encapsulates the transformation song composed of seven CHORUSES for the organizational choir.

Each CHORUS may be sung on its own and also in combination with any one or more of the other CHORUSES. This means an organization may transform as a result of work on one or more CHORUSES.

Further, from a systems perspective, each CHORUS is a subsystem of suprasystem - the total MaCoTra model. In this regard, whatever is done to any one of the CHORUS subsystems affects the other subsystems and has an effect on the suprasystem.
What the MaCoTra model advocates is for each organizational member to go beyond singing individual CHORUSES. MaCoTra invites all organizational members to synchronize the CHORUSES resulting in a melodious overarching organizational choir – the transformation itself.

The MaCoTra colour coding stresses that diversity has to be celebrated as part of organizational transformation.

What a way to celebrate it through any combination of the seven MaCoTra song CHORUSES, and dance!

I also prescribe the MaCoTra Model for companies in Zimbabwe.

Sources: Madzivire (2003) & Madzivire (2011:76)

Exhibit 1: The Madzivire Collaborative Transformation (MaCoTra) Model
This article is the SIXTH of a Seven-CHORUS-Article CHAIN (Exhibit 2), related to MaCoTra CHORUS 6: COLLABORATIVE SETTING UP OF DISTINCTIVE STRUCTURES AND SYSTEMS.

Exhibit 2: The MaCoTra Seven-CHORUS-Article Chain

The article is a ‘Symphony of the MaCoTra CHORUS 6 Experiences in the Three Sectors’ from 2003 to 2012’ in which I summarise the major experiences I had applying MaCoTra CHORUS 6. In this CHORUS 6 article, I provide further insights on this CHORUS given what I covered in my doctoral thesis and subsequent publications. Organisations, some places/features/products/services and participants have been code-named...
for anonymity. Where experiences have been drawn from the same organisation, its code name has been retained throughout the Seven-CHORUS-Article CHAIN. This is meant for those readers who are interested in appreciating the interfaces in experiences in that organisation across some or all of the seven (7) MaCoTra CHORUSES.

1.1 An Overview of CHORUS 6

Explaining the seven (7) MaCoTra model CHORUSES, this is what I said in my earlier work in connection with CHORUS 6:

Distinctive organizational structures and systems in the elaborated MaCoTra model are around value streams not hierarchies. Someone or a team is responsible for each end-to-end value stream.

Designing value streams should be cross-functional. This means the human changes resulting out of the developed value streams must be coordinated and not developed in isolation by the different functional areas. Martin (1995:115) suggests, “the functional areas must participate in joint workshops for the planning and design of the systems required”.

This confirms that the designing of value streams and setting up of distinctive organizational structures and systems based on value streams has to be collaborative. A selected few of the value stream customers need to give feedback on the organizational structure and systems as the customers continue to co-create value with the organization.


1.2 Analytical Space

For a more coherent analysis, I searched for thought leaders that had used metaphorical language to depict organisational designs. The most relevant text was one by Morgan’s *Images of Organization*. Morgan (1988:xi) says of it “*Images of Organization* shows that the medium of organization and management is metaphor”. He proceeds to isolate eight images of organisations as: *Machines, Organisms, Brains, Cultures, Political Systems, Psychic Prisons, Flux and Transformation, and Instruments and Domination*.

What is profound is that Morgan (1998:5) admits:

We have to accept that any theory or perspective that we bring to the study of organization and management, while capable of creating valuable insights, is also incomplete, biased, and potentially misleading.

Source: Morgan (1998:5)

I took this admission as a pointer to the effect that my experiences in collaboratively setting up of distinctive structures and systems may add more insights to Morgan’s work.
In Table 1, I have condensed what Morgan conceived as the characteristics, strengths and limitations of each of his metaphors in order to identify examples of organisations whose designs/responses mirrored the metaphors. The key I used is: None=0, Few=1 to 3, Several=From 4 to 7, Many=From 8 to 10, All=11 or 13.

Table 1: Assessment of Organisations Against Morgan’s (1998) ‘Images of Organization’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>METAPHOR: Organizations as</th>
<th>CHARACTERISTICS (From Morgan)</th>
<th>STRENGTHS (From Morgan)</th>
<th>LIMITATIONS (From Morgan)</th>
<th>PRIVATE SECTOR ORGANISATIONS</th>
<th>PUBLIC SECTOR ORGANISATIONS</th>
<th>CIVIC SECTOR ORGANISATIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MACHINES</td>
<td>The organization machine is given goals &amp; objectives.</td>
<td>Mechanistic approaches to organization work well under conditions when machines work well.</td>
<td>Mechanistic approaches create organizational forms that have difficulty in adapting to change.</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>Few</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>It is designed as a rational structure of jobs &amp; activities.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mechanistic approaches can result in mindless &amp; unquestioning bureaucracy.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Its blueprint becomes an organizational chart.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>People are hired to operate the machine &amp; everyone is expected to behave in a predetermined way.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORGANISMS</td>
<td>The metaphor helps us understand organizations as clusters of interconnected human, business &amp; technical needs.</td>
<td>The metaphor suggests that organizations must always pay close attention to their external environments.</td>
<td>Organizations are not organisms &amp; their environments are far less concrete than the metaphor presumes.</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>It encourages us to learn about the art of corporate survival</td>
<td>Survival &amp; evolution become central concerns.</td>
<td>The metaphor overstates the degree of “functional unity” &amp; internal cohesion found in most organizations.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>It urges us to develop vibrant organic systems that remain open to new challenges.</td>
<td>Achieving congruence with the environment becomes a key managerial task.</td>
<td>The metaphor can easily become ideology.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The perspective contributes to the theory &amp; practice of organization development.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>We acquire a new understanding of organization ecology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>METAPHOR: Organizations as</td>
<td>CHARACTERISTICS (From Morgan)</td>
<td>STRENGTHS (From Morgan)</td>
<td>LIMITATIONS (From Morgan)</td>
<td>PRIVATE SECTOR ORGANISATIONS</td>
<td>PUBLIC SECTOR ORGANISATIONS</td>
<td>CIVIC SECTOR ORGANISATIONS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRAINS</td>
<td>• We focus on their learning abilities &amp; the processes that can either stunt or enhance organizational intelligence. • We discover how the findings of modern brain research can be translated into design principles for creating learning organizations. • We learn how intelligence can be distributed throughout an enterprise. • We see how the power of information technology (IT) can be used to develop decentralised modes of organization that are simultaneously global &amp; local.</td>
<td>• The metaphor gives clear guidelines for creating learning organizations. • We learn how IT can support intelligent evolution. • We gain a new theory of management based on principles of self-organization. • We recognize the importance of dealing with paradox.</td>
<td>• There may be conflict between requirements of organizational learning &amp; the realities of power &amp; control. • Learning for the sake of learning can become just another ideology.</td>
<td>• All</td>
<td>• All</td>
<td>• All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>METAPHOR: Organizations as</td>
<td>CHARACTERISTICS (From Morgan)</td>
<td>STRENGTHS (From Morgan)</td>
<td>LIMITATIONS (From Morgan)</td>
<td>PRIVATE SECTOR ORGANISATIONS</td>
<td>PUBLIC SECTOR ORGANISATIONS</td>
<td>CIVIC SECTOR ORGANISATIONS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CULTURES</td>
<td>• We see important cross-national variations in cultural style.</td>
<td>• The metaphor emphasizes the symbolic significance of almost everything we do.</td>
<td>• The metaphor can be used to support ideological manipulation &amp; control.</td>
<td>• All</td>
<td>• All</td>
<td>• All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• We see that individual organizations may also have their own unique cultures.</td>
<td>• We learn that organization &amp; shared meaning are one &amp; the same thing.</td>
<td>• Culture is holographic &amp; cannot really be managed.</td>
<td>• All</td>
<td>• All</td>
<td>• All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• We learn that what unfolds in any organization is a reflection of what is in people’s minds.</td>
<td>• Leaders &amp; managers see how their success hinges on the creation of shared meaning.</td>
<td>• Like an iceberg, important dimensions of culture are always invisible &amp; what is easily seen can be relatively unimportant.</td>
<td>• All</td>
<td>• All</td>
<td>• All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• We note that while some corporate cultures may be uniform &amp; strong, others are often fragmented by the presence of subcultures.</td>
<td>• Leaders &amp; managers gain a new understanding of their impacts &amp; roles.</td>
<td>• Culture usually has a deep political dimension, making it impossible to grasp the full significance of culture through the culture metaphor.</td>
<td>• All</td>
<td>• All</td>
<td>• All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• We realize that organization rests in the shared meanings that allow people to behave in organized ways.</td>
<td>• We see that organizations &amp; their environments are enacted domains.</td>
<td>• Strategic management is understood as an enactment process.</td>
<td>• All</td>
<td>• All</td>
<td>• All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The metaphor offers fresh perspectives on organizational change.</td>
<td></td>
<td>• The metaphor offers fresh perspectives on organizational change.</td>
<td>• All</td>
<td>• All</td>
<td>• All</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1: Assessment of Organisations Against Morgan’s (1998) ‘Images of Organization’ (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>METAPHOR: Organizations as</th>
<th>CHARACTERISTICS (From Morgan)</th>
<th>STRENGTHS (From Morgan)</th>
<th>LIMITATIONS (From Morgan)</th>
<th>PRIVATE SECTOR ORGANISATIONS</th>
<th>PUBLIC SECTOR ORGANISATIONS</th>
<th>CIVIC SECTOR ORGANISATIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>POLITICAL SYSTEMS</td>
<td>• We view organization &amp; management as a political process.</td>
<td>• The political metaphor encourages us to see how all organizational activity is interest based &amp; to evaluate organizational functioning with this in mind.</td>
<td>• Politics may breed more politics! • From certain standpoints, the political metaphor can seem too friendly because it underplays gross inequalities in power &amp; influence.</td>
<td>• All</td>
<td>• All</td>
<td>• All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• We can identify different styles of government.</td>
<td>• The role of power is placed centre stage.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• We see how organization becomes politicised because of divergent interests of individuals &amp; groups.</td>
<td>• Conflict management becomes a key activity.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• We appreciate the fact that conflict is a natural property of every organization.</td>
<td>• The myth of organizational rationality is debunked.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• We observe many different sources of power &amp; learn how they can be used to our advantage.</td>
<td>• Organizational integration becomes problematic.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Politics is a natural feature of organization.</td>
<td>• Politics is a natural feature of organization.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The political metaphor raises fundamental questions about power &amp; control in society.</td>
<td>• The political metaphor raises fundamental questions about power &amp; control in society.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1: Assessment of Organisations Against Morgan’s (1998) ‘Images of Organization’ (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>METAPHOR: Organizations as</th>
<th>CHARACTERISTICS (From Morgan)</th>
<th>STRENGTHS (From Morgan)</th>
<th>LIMITATIONS (From Morgan)</th>
<th>PRIVATE SECTOR ORGANISATIONS</th>
<th>PUBLIC SECTOR ORGANISATIONS</th>
<th>CIVIC SECTOR ORGANISATIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PYCHIC PRISONS</td>
<td>• We see that organization always has unconscious significance.</td>
<td>• The metaphor encourages us to challenge basic assumptions about how we see &amp; experience our world.</td>
<td>• A focus on the unconscious may deflect attention from other forces of control.</td>
<td>• Many</td>
<td>• Many</td>
<td>• Few</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• We learn how psychic forces can act as hidden dimensions of organization that encourage or block innovation.</td>
<td>• We gain important insights into the challenges of organizational innovation &amp; change.</td>
<td>• The metaphor underestimates the power of vested interests in sustaining the status quo.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• We pay particular attention to how frozen mindsets &amp; unconscious forces can make people resist organizational change.</td>
<td>• The “irrational” is put in a new perspective.</td>
<td>• There is a danger that the insights of the metaphor can be used to exploit the unconscious for organizational gain.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• We recognize the power &amp; significance of what, on the surface, seems irrational.</td>
<td>• We are encouraged to integrate &amp; manage competing tensions rather than allow one side to dominate.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• We recognise how we can become imprisoned by our ways of thinking &amp; how, if desired, this pattern can be changed.</td>
<td>• Ethical management acquires a new dimension.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1: Assessment of Organisations Against Morgan’s (1998) ‘Images of Organization’ (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>METAPHOR: Organizations as</th>
<th>CHARACTERISTICS (From Morgan)</th>
<th>STRENGTHS (From Morgan)</th>
<th>LIMITATIONS (From Morgan)</th>
<th>PRIVATE SECTOR ORGANISATIONS</th>
<th>PUBLIC SECTOR ORGANISATIONS</th>
<th>CIVIC SECTOR ORGANISATIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FLUX &amp; TRANSFORMATION</td>
<td>• We gain insights into the fundamental nature of change. • We see that deep systemic forces are constantly either locking organizations into the status quo or driving their transformation. • We acquire new &amp; powerful perspectives for intervention, using images of spirals, loops &amp; contradictions to help organizations shift from one pattern of operation to another.</td>
<td>• The metaphor offers new understandings of the nature &amp; source of change. • The metaphor offers new horizons of thought that can be used to enrich our understanding of management. • Leaders &amp; managers gain a powerful new perspective on their role in facilitating emergent change.</td>
<td>• Powerless power: Is this a message that managers really want to hear?</td>
<td>• All</td>
<td>• All</td>
<td>• All</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1: Assessment of Organisations Against Morgan’s (1998) ‘Images of Organization’ (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>METAPHOR: Organizations as</th>
<th>CHARACTERISTICS (From Morgan)</th>
<th>STRENGTHS (From Morgan)</th>
<th>LIMITATIONS (From Morgan)</th>
<th>PRIVATE SECTOR ORGANISATIONS</th>
<th>PUBLIC SECTOR ORGANISATIONS</th>
<th>CIVIC SECTOR ORGANISATIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>INSTRUMENTS OF DOMINATION</td>
<td>• ... our attention is lead to the processes of domination that underlie organized activity. • Workaholism, occupational accidents &amp; disease &amp; social &amp; mental stress become seen as the price inflicted on one group of people to serve the interests of others. • The role of global corporations in the exploitation of people &amp; resources becomes seen as part of a deep process of exploitation running throughout the corporate world.</td>
<td>• The metaphor shows that rationality is a mode of domination. • The ideological &amp; ethical aspects of organization become central concerns. • We see that domination may be intrinsic to organizations. • The metaphor provides a way of turning the table on existing power structures. • We gain an increased understanding of why the history of organization has been so conflict prone &amp; polarized. • The perspective challenges managers to develop a deeper appreciation of corporate responsibility</td>
<td>• The metaphor can add to the polarisation between social groups if domination is interpreted as an aim rather than an unintended result. • The metaphor can lead us to blame individual decision makers, rather than help us see that it is the “logic” of the whole system that needs to be addressed. • The focus on systemic patterns of domination can lead us to overlook opportunities for creating nondominating forms of organization. • The metaphor is sometimes seen as too extreme.</td>
<td>• All</td>
<td>• All</td>
<td>• Few</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Adapted from Morgan (1998)

1.3 Rhythm of the MaCoTra CHORUS 6 Experience in Private Sector Organisations

Below are highlights of the assessment I have made of how Morgan’s (1998) concepts played out in private sector organisations.

1.3.1 Organisations as Machines

The nature of the work in private sector organisations made all of them behave in mechanistic ways in one way or the other. The design was more to achieve predetermined goals.
1.3.2 Organisations as Organisms

All private sector organisations were operating in a survival mode given the dictates of a collapsing/collapsed Zimbabwean economy. The use of/and search for turnarounds became like an ideology.

1.3.3 Organisations as Brains

All private sector organisations exhibited characteristics of the brains metaphor in that they visibly sought to leverage their learning capabilities. As organisations pursued the learning organisation agenda, conflict between the requirements of organisational learning and the realities of power and control became more and more pronounced. Human resources/capital professionals were often accused of ‘advancing their scorecards’ at the expense of scorecards in the other functional areas. Unless these professionals reported directly to the chief executive and position was pegged at director level, they cried foul that their level in the organisation was not consistent with the role of creating learning organisations. In a number of organisations, the position of the human resources/capital executive was elevated to director to deal with the dissonance.

1.3.4 Organisations as Cultures

All organisations in the private sector battled to create corporate cultures. Where employees were attracted from competitors, for example, there were pockets of subcultures that were gasping for merging. Others tolerated subcultures only when these were aligned to the corporate culture. To all intents and purposes, the organisations viewed cultural change as the transformation of mindsets, values and shared meanings that had a heavy bearing on structures and systems.

1.3.5 Organisations as Political Systems

In each private sector organisation, managers/leaders were building capacity to be effective political actors, unlike the traditional belief that business and politics should not be mixed. Different –cracies played out the different power bases ranging from autocracies (the ‘We’ll do it this way’ tendencies), to bureaucracies (the ‘We’re supposed to do it this way’ tendencies), technocracies (the ‘It’s best to do it this way’ tendencies) and a sprinkling of democracies (the ‘How shall we do it’ tendencies) *(italics descriptors by Morgan, 1998:152)*. The most dominant was technocracy where power and accountabilities were linked directly to a person’s technical expertise. Leaders were generally wielding power through controlling decision premises, decision processes, decision issues and objectives.
1.3.6 Organisations as Psychic Prisons

Many private sector organisations qualified under this metaphor as there existed a proportion of resistors to change. The tendency was to preserve their own frames of references, quick to retract to old ways upon the departure of an external consultant or collaborating partner. Messages from such cynical messengers of negativity as “if objectives are not met, blame the external consultant; if the objectives are met, praise the organisation for having made the correct choice of external consultant” dominated corridor/toilet talk.

1.3.7 Organisations as Flux and Transformation

Morgan (1998:254) positions this metaphor through what he classifies as “four sets of ideas” providing “alternative yet complementary means of” understanding the nature and source of change: autopoiesis, chaos and complexity, mutual causality and dialectical analysis.

Firstly, Morgan (1998:254-255) captures key elements of autopoiesis this way:

Autopoiesis suggests that the way we see and manage change is ultimately a product of how we see and think about ourselves and consequently how we enact relationships with the environment. ...

... New mindsets redefining boundaries to embrace customers, competitors, and other significant elements of the environment are part of the required trend.


I witnessed this phenomenon in all the sampled private sector organisations from 2003 to 2012.

Secondly, Morgan (1998:255) discusses chaos and complexity:

Chaos and complexity teach us that organizations and their relationships with the environment are part of an attractor pattern. Key organizing rules-embedded in various aspects of structure, culture, information, mindsets, beliefs, and perceived identity-tend to hold organization-environment relations in a particular configuration. When pushed into edge-of-chaos situations the basic pattern can flip into new forms. The managerial challenge rests in nudging systems into desired paths by initiating small changes that can produce large effects.

Source: Morgan (1998:255)

Again, all of the sampled private sector organisations were, in their own special way, embracing chaos and complexity during the period 2003 to 2012.

Thirdly, Morgan (1998:255-256) touches mutual causality:

Mutual causality encourages us to understand attractor patterns and the processes of change in terms of the positive and negative feedback loops that define complete fields of relations.

All the sampled private sector organisations, particularly towards 2012, were applying strategic insights that had to do with mutual causality. Some spent time indicating these loops while coming up with their strategy maps or service scorecards.

Fourthly, Morgan (1998:256) paints a picture of **dialectical analysis**:

*Dialectical analysis* offers yet another perspective of pattern and how it evolves. This time, the emphasis is placed on understanding the paradoxes and tensions that are created whenever elements of a system try to push in a particular direction. Each phase of development sets up conditions leading to its own transformation. ... The perspective encourages us to recognize how the management of organization, society and personal life ultimately involves the management of contradiction. It invites us to find ways through which key tensions can be reframed to create new paths of development.

*Source: Morgan (1998:256)*

All the private sector organizations sampled were fighting for survival, aiming to grow in shrinking markets, often reducing employee numbers at high cost while striving to retain the competent who would rather have been given severance packages to start their own small businesses.

Across all the private sector organisations, management/leadership was screaming for competencies to facilitate change. For me, reference to Weaver & Farrell’s (1999) book *Managers as Facilitators: A Practical Guide to Getting Work Done in a Changing Workplace* became handy.

### 1.3.8 Organisations as Instruments of Domination

The most characteristic feature in all sampled private sector organisations was the concern for safety, health, environment, and security management (SHESM). In one organisation all these components, which were scattered in different functions were regrouped so that SHESM would fall under engineering, and not human resources/capital (HR/C). The argument was that if HR/C was responsible, employees would be short-changed as the function would ‘self-police.’

After introducing inspirational leadership, the concept of creating *soul space* under the key result area (KRA) *climate of action/performance/execution* was adopted. The following key performance indicators (KPIs) under *soul space* were common: zero work-related incidents, zero work-related near misses, zero work-related accidents, zero work-related injuries and zero work-related deaths.

As far as compensation packages were concerned, employees felt cheated when goal posts were changed as businesses struggled to survive. Some organisations experienced work stoppages. Ideological and ethical considerations became key issues as the calls for organisations to act responsibly were pitched to higher notches.
From the assessment above, all sampled organisations had characteristics of seven (7) metaphors with the exception of the ‘psychic prisons’ metaphor where many organisations responded in ways representative of that metaphor.

1.4 Rhythm of the MaCoTra CHORUS 6 Experiences in Public Sector Organisations

Below are highlights of the assessment I have made of how Morgan’s (1998) concepts played out in public sector organisations.

1.4.1 Organisations as Machines

All public sector organisations operated from mandates, given either by the appointing authority or Acts of Parliament. The machine metaphor, therefore, was applicable. Any attempt to change was checked against the mandate to guarantee that there were no deviations from the mandate.

1.4.2 Organisations as Organisms

The use of/and search for turnarounds became like an ideology, fitting all organisations under this metaphor. Changes in boards and top leadership were meant to usher an era of adaptation to the environment.

1.4.3 Organisations as Brains

All Public sector organisations were challenged to use their brains to turn around their fortunes. Often they were accused of bleeding the national economy instead of being custodians. Calls for the diffusion of leadership became louder and louder, stressing how organisations needed to learn how to learn.

1.4.4 Organisations as Cultures

The main challenge for all organisations in the public sector was the creation of a culture of performance/execution. Again, the perception was that no such change would take place with the same leadership that had caused poor performance. Hence, often new board members and top leadership were tasked with the responsibility of culture creation. In one organisation, for example, the elected leader championed the creation of a culture of developmental politics out of polarized political groupings.

1.4.5 Organisations as Political Systems

Of the three sectors, this metaphor was loudest in public sector organisations. Board members and some top leaders lost power as part of turnaround strategies. In some of them autocracy was the order
of the day, others were moving towards being democracies, a few had technocrats and the majority were stuck in bureaucracies. For those striving to be democracies, leaders were busy rooting their power and authority on cultures and ideologies.

1.4.6. Organisations as Psychic Prisons

Employees who had stayed long in many public sector organisations were apparently living “their lives as prisoners or products of their individual and collective psychic history.” The tendency was to live in the past, creating “distorted and uncomfortable relations with the external world” (Morgan, 1998:187). Quite often one would hear statements like “we tried it before and ..,” “we did it before and ...,” “give them time, they will get tired, they don’t know what this organisation is all about.”

1.4.7 Organisations as Flux and Transformation

_Autopoiesis, chaos and complexity, mutual causality and dialectical analysis_ dominated how all sampled public sector organisations were confronting change. In all instances, calls were for these organisations to reclaim their positions in the revival of the national economy.

1.4.8 Organisations as Instruments of Domination

The assessment under this metaphor yielded the same results as for the sampled private sector organisations above.

The overall assessment of the behaviour of sampled public sector organisations painted the same picture as that for private sector organisations.

1.5 Rhythm of MaCoTra CHORUS 6 Experiences in Civic Sector Organisations

Below are highlights of the assessment I have made of how Morgan’s (1998) concepts played out in civic sector organisations.

1.5.1 Organisations as Machines

The few organisations that required CHORUS 6 operated as machines, with structures and systems established from the centre. The slight deviation from programme to issue-based approaches may have been mistaken to be a move out of this metaphor. It was not, as even this move was dictated from the centre. The organisations had no room to toy around with these. Those that did not engage in CHORUS 6 were definitely breaking out of the machine metaphor as their focus was on adapting to change.
1.5.2 Organisations as Organisms

Whether or not they were in need of CHORUS 6, all civic sector organisms were responding to their environment, particularly the political. These organisations were more of open systems with permeable boundaries even though they wanted to give a posture of being closed systems.

1.5.3 Organisations as Brains

Even though most civic organisations did not express needs that could have been addressed through CHORUS 6, all had to learn how to deal with paradox. For example, they needed to advance their programmes through shrinking donor funds and help disadvantaged communities yet being apolitical.

1.5.4 Organisations as Cultures

Evidently, civic sector organisations were concerned with donor fatigue. All these organisations were seeking ways of surviving with limited/no donor funding. This demanded the creation of a culture of independence/interdependence out of one of dependence. They also could not continue pretending that there was no political dimension related to their work.

1.5.5 Organisations as Political Systems

The two (2) most dominant of the –cracies were autocracy and technocracy. For example, in family and church organisations, the role of some individuals or small groups tended to take the form of absolute, bordering on, dictatorial power. For example, a bread winner in an extended family dictated the pace on the basis of his technical expertise and church leaders dictated the moral fabric they desired in their church. Like in private sector organisations, leaders in civic sector organisations were generally wielding power through controlling decision premises, decision processes, decision issues and objectives.

1.5.6 Organisations as Psychic Prisons

On the surface, none of the few civic sector organisations that participated in CHORUS 6 reflected the metaphor of psychic prisons. They were aiming at breaking new ground. However, such new ground had to be sanctioned by their centres. They, therefore, were operating in the psychic prisons of their centres.
1.5.7 Organisations as Flux and Transformation

*Autopoiesis, chaos and complexity, mutual causality* and *dialectical analysis* were inherent in the interventions I facilitated based on both the explicit and implicit need for singing CHORUS 6 in the sampled civic organisations.

1.5.8 Organisations as Instruments of Domination

Concerns for employee welfare, SHESM and responsible leadership were also pronounced in the few sampled civic sector organisations that needed me to include CHORUS 6 in their interventions. Those whose needs were addressed through other CHORUSES were behaving like free-spirited and liberated organisations.

The overall assessment of how civic sector organisations responded shows that only a few of them had characteristics of organisations as ‘machines’ or ‘psychic prisons’ or ‘instruments of domination’. The rest of the metaphors were applicable to all sampled civic organisations.

2.0 Singing MaCoTra CHORUS 6

I have come up with a generic framework for singing CHORUS 6 (Exhibit 3) based on the experiences across the three sectors. Applying this Exhibit will fortify the positives from and minimize/eliminate the limitations of the eight metaphors.

Thus, collaboration in the setting up of distinctive structures and systems for a business unit under a business unit leader (BUL) will be based of strategic themes. Each of the strategic themes will be under a strategic theme team leader (STTL). Under each STTL will be strategic theme team members (STTMs) responsible for delivery against value streams.

CHORUS 6 feeds from work on CHORUS 5 (collaborative designing of distinctive value streams). For example, the people perspective STTL (PP STTL) may have a strategic theme ‘people development’ and a position called ‘people development team leader’ (PDTL). The PDTL would then have team members responsible for delivery against people development value streams, say P1, P2 and P3. The internal processes and systems that need to be collaboratively set up are then aimed at satisfying specific categories of internal customers (employees) at least cost. Thus the PDTL and team members will have scorecards with the heaviest weighting in the people perspective.

Similarly, the internal perspective STTL (IP STTL), with a strategic theme of ‘wholesomeness’, may have a position called ‘wholesomeness’ team leader (WTL) and team members accountable for value streams I1, I2 and I3 in the internal perspective. The WTL would then require capable team members (with input from PDTL
and his/her team) to respond to process and system needs from varied stakeholders at least cost. This way the WTL and team members also get their service scorecards cut.

**Exhibit 3: MaCoTra CHORUS 6 Generic Framework: Values-Based Collaborative Setting Up of Distinctive Structures & Systems**

The external perspective theme may be sustainable development (SD) under a strategic theme team leader (TL) called SDTL with a team responsible for value streams E1, E2 and E3. SDTL will earn the much needed revenue, for example, by having in place competent team members (with input from PDTL and his/her team) who apply wholesome processes collaboratively developed with the WTL and his/her team. Consequently, relevant service scorecards will be in place for the WTL and team members.

Finally, the financial perspective strategic theme may be ‘business accountability’ (BA) under a TL called BATL. BATL will in turn have value streams F1, F2 and F3 delivered by capable team members (with input from PDTL and his/her team) to provide financial consultancy services internally through distinctive financial processes and systems (with input from WTL and his/her team). Consequently, the service scorecards for BATL and his/her team will guarantee that the organisation is functioning under responsible leadership.

Sub-teams will then be formed using similar logic and supporting systems put in place to enhance intra and inter team collaboration.

**Enjoy collaborating through CHORUS 6!!!**
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