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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 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 7. 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 7: Collaborative Capacity and Capability Enhancement.

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 of the Seven-CHORUS-Book CHAIN elements 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 SEVENTH of a Seven-CHORUS-Article CHAIN (Exhibit 2), related to MaCoTro CHORUS 7: COLLABORATIVE CAPACITY AND CAPABILITY ENHANCEMENT.

Exhibit 2: The MaCoTra Seven-CHORUS-Article Chain

Source: Nyashadzasheshe Benjamin Madzivire’s 2012 Artistic Impressions

The article is a ‘Symphony of the MaCoTro CHORUS 7 Experiences in the Three Sectors’ from 2003 to 2012’ in which I summarise the major experiences I had applying MaCoTro CHORUS 7. In this CHORUS 7 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 MaCoTra CHORUS 7


In my earlier work, I remarked:

Mbigi’s (1997 & 2000) guidelines for organizational transformation are derived from Africa. The framework used is the African Spirit Religion metaphor for managing spiritual, emotional, and cultural resources in order to catalyze the optimum development of human talent in an organization.

Sources: Madzivire (2003) & Madzivire (2011:84)


I then proceeded to say:

The deliberate focus is spiritual, consonant with Secretan’s soul focus.

Mbigi suggests that transformation agents use burning platforms to diagnose the dominant spirit of an organisation by identifying the creative attributes .... Bishop (2001:134) says “In the change communication process ... the burning platform provides the ‘push’ while the destination is the pull”.

The starting point in creating capacity is to help all employees understand the destination of the organisation. There is need to allow employees appreciate, for example, that the changes will benefit the organisation by making it a great company to do business with, a great place to work and a great long-term investment.

Whereas the first benefit presents the business case, the other two benefits will steer employees into supporting the change as they are benefits at a personal level. From a self-interest viewpoint, employees always ask “What’s in it for me?”. The change should be positioned to allow each employee relate to the following questions:

i. How is the change going to affect my career opportunities, help me become more employable and create a workplace that’s both fun and meaningful?

ii. What work benefits (like having a financial stake in the future of the company) will result as part of the change?

iii. Will it become easier to obtain the needed resources?

iv. Are employees going to be given more opportunities to make decisions and get their ideas heard?

Finding out what the dominant spirit is enables employees to agree the spirit they want to create.

Thus, depending on the situation or organisation, some spirits may be dominant over others. For example an organisation aiming for global reach as a business may express creative attributes of the rainmaker, the hunter, and the wanderer taking precedence over the parochial clanship and dogmatic divination spirits.
Burning platforms are similar to the sensitisation programmes that Jack Welch of General Electric (GE) held in ‘the pit’ (Tichy & Sherman 1993). In the GE case, there was boundarylessness engagement of staff – akin to collaboration.

In African culture, positive and negative spirits do not live in isolation just as dialectics positions nature. In this regard, it is important to collectively and ritualistically upgrade the positive spirits and downgrade the negative spirits. Secretan (1997) calls this moving from weaknesses to strengths.


A second tool I adopted was prescribed for building capacity and capability by Secretan (1997).

Secretan (1997:54) gives an example which I quoted extensively:

...: *The Values Cycle: The Vector*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Primary Values</th>
<th>Rating 0 - 10</th>
<th>The Accelerators</th>
<th>Rating 0 - 10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>MASTERY</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>LEARNING</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undertaking whatever you do in both your personal and professional life to the highest standards of which you are capable.</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Placing a high value on the importance of knowledge, learning and wisdom.</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CHEMISTRY</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>EMPATHIZING</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relating so well with others on a personal and professional level that they actively seek to associate themselves with you.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Identifying with the thoughts, feelings and perspectives of others.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DELIVERY</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>LISTENING</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finding customers, both internal and external, identifying their needs and meeting them.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Possessing a high level of attentiveness devoted to understanding the communications of others.</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| TOTAL | 20 | TOTAL | 20 |

Source: Secretan (1997:54)

*The Vector* ... is a tool that helps in measuring the relationship between *The Primary Values* and the *Accelerators* in Secretan’s (1997) Value-Centred Leadership model.

Secretan (1997:54-55) explains the above example this way:

The *Vector* is determined by subtracting the number value of the *Primary Value* from the number value of the *Accelerator*. The rule is that the number ranking of the *Accelerator* must always exceed the number ranking of the *Primary Value*, if the *Primary Value* is to grow.

The exhibit above illustrates how *The Vector* works. In the example, the rating for *Mastery* is an impressive 9, whereas the rating for *learning* (the *Accelerator* that provides growth in *Mastery*) is a more modest 6. This suggests that the current high level of *Mastery* cannot be sustained indefinitely because there is insufficient *learning* present to maintain this pace.

In the case of *Chemistry*, the position is reversed. At 4, the level of *Chemistry* present is weak, but this is likely to improve because there is a significant level of *empathizing* (7) present.

Finally, *Delivery* is rated at a respectable level of 7 and is matched by a similar level for *listening*. This suggests that *Delivery* can be maintained at current levels, although no significant improvement is likely, because *listening* (the *Accelerator for Delivery*) is being maintained at a correspondingly similar level.
Used this way, the Accelerators are predictors of future change in The Primary Values. A review of the totals of The Vector in the figure suggests that the person or situation, to which it was applied, is in relative balance. However, as the analysis of the individual vector components indicates, it can be misleading to look at totals alone since this may obscure the variances within each Primary Value and Accelerator.

...Secretan (1997) proposes that many other work-related processes can be designed using the Values-centered Leadership model. These include designing job descriptions, business plans, customer feedback, service and quality standards, compensation plans, performance assessment, consensus building, and leadership feedback and project management.

My experience using the Values-Centred Leadership model confirms Secretan’s (1997) argument that one of the greatest benefits of Values-Centred Leadership is that it is a life-model, not just a work-model, transferable to any situation and usable in any context.

...

As mentioned earlier, the premise of Secretan ideas is spiritual, just like Mbigi’s.

The marriage of the two futurists’ ideas enables a transforming organization to build capacity and capability to serve diverse stakeholders from a deep cultural root.


Because CHORUS 7 was the most intense of the 7 CHORUSES, I had this as comment:

What MaCoTra does is to provide organizational members with the competence to participate in each of the CHORUSES. This enhances their employability. Attraction to, compensation and retention of key talents in the organization is enhanced. This sustains the momentum of the change.


The symphony of the MaCoTra CHORUS 7 experiences is consistent with Rubenstein & Grundy’s (1999:31) conclusion that:

Strategy, strategy anticipation, strategic thinking and strategic planning constitute the fuel in the world’s entrepreneurial engines. Entrepreneurial engines exist in the non-profit world and the government sector as well as the for-profit world.

Source: Rubenstein & Grundy’s (1999:31)

Further insights on CHORUS 7 are reflected below.

1.2 Rhythm of the MaCoTra CHORUS 7 Experiences in Private Sector Organisations

All the private sector organisations sampled had strategy as the pivot for CHORUS 7.

Organisations traced their life-stories, spent time appreciating their current state and then painted a future state that they desired. This was followed by detailed planning.

The strategies were in all cases externally and internally focused. Whereas the external focus had to do with capturing the market, the internal focus was on enhancing individual/team/organisational capacities and capabilities to get into such markets.
Both quantitative and qualitative aspects were taken into account in coming up with the strategies. Quantitative aspects were to steam roll economic and social value. The qualitative aspects were mainly centred on relationships with the external environment and the organisations’ employees, collaborating partners and customers.

A number of organisations provided me with an opportunity to facilitate strategy workshops and subsequent reviews. In all cases, the quality of strategic input, outcome and impact was significantly improved. Where reviews were done by a different consultant, there were reported cases of reversals in what had been gained. This was attributed to the differences in facilitation approaches.

All strategies were transformational, though the densities were at different levels. Some were for turnaround, others survival and the majority high-growth.

Board members tended to be in the background. In one case the board chair set the context for the strategic workshop, then left.

The levels of employee engagement varied. The majority of the organisations accepted the inclusion of multi-level and cross-functional employee representations. In some cases, shopfloor workers’ committee members were taken as representatives of the generality of employees. Middle managerial employees who were not considered under the constitution of workers’ committees felt left out. In other cases, middle managerial employees had a separate committee and appointed representatives to participate in the strategy workshops.

Organisations with less than forty employees engaged all employees over weekends. Such practice was reflective of Charles Handy’s suggestion that the concept “employees” should be transformed to “members” to create membership organisations (Rubenstein & Grundy, 1999:30).

What featured significantly was that values drive behaviour and high performance.

1.3 Rhythm of the MaCoTra CHORUS 7 Experiences in Public Sector Organisations

Most aspects I have raised in connection with private sector organisations mirrored my experiences in public sector organisations. The most remarkable difference was the high level of presence and involvement of board members, Ministry representatives and top politicians. These leaders had adopted and showed belief in stakeholder inclusion and were prepared to engage in pre-strategy stakeholder fora. Their conversations with stakeholders were candid and appreciated by the stakeholders.
The processes were such that planning and execution became concurrent processes. For example, board members would conduct parallel sessions at the workshop venue and feedback decisions to all the participants. While setting the context for strategic planning sessions, there was evidence that these top leaders were in quest for various kinds of knowledge:

- **Know why** – commitment/inspiration through values alignment;
- **Know why** – understanding through having a business case for the strategy;
- **Know what** – cognitive knowledge through environmental assessments;
- **Know about** – insight/creativity generally through political mapping; and
- **Know-how** – skills through broad expertise to articulate institutional mandates/provisions of Acts of Parliament governing the operations of the individual public sector entities.

Generally, the context setting captured, in one way or the other, what Rubenstein & Grundy (1999:220) say about David Osborne & Peter Plastrik’s (1997) book contribution:

> Strategy, for government or business, must have five components: 1) core strategy based on clarity of vision, purpose and direction; 2) incentive strategy designed to promote the right behaviour; 3) customer satisfaction and service strategy; 4) employee and stakeholder involvement strategy; 5) culture strategy – a designed effort to instill the best values and behaviors in the organization.

**Source: Rubenstein & Grundy (1999:220)**

The top leaders knew that they had to deal with corporate reputation and work ethic decisively.

All organisations were in love with Vision and Mission statements and begrudgingly accepted having Destiny, Cause and Calling statements. The acceptance only came when I suggested how to create Vision and Mission statements from Destiny, Cause and Calling statements.

Strategy workshops participants were amused when I brought to their attention that the uniqueness of mandates/Acts of Parliament of necessity required the understanding of blue ocean strategy. I also argued that not operating in these uncontested market spaces would render them irrelevant, with some other organisations encroaching into those spaces.

All the strategies for public entities had to be within the provisions of the governing mandates/Acts of Parliament. Where there was dissonance, particularly misalignment of structure to the mandates/Acts of Parliament, there was heavy dysfunctional conflict based on political persuasions.

In cases where new boards were appointed mid-stream, strategies were reviewed, structures scuttled and leadership changed. Such changes occurred mostly in those entities whose parent Ministry leadership had been changed.

The creation of cross-functional and multi-level transformational strategy implementation teams (TSIT) was readily accepted. This was as a result of the multi-stakeholder approach highlighted above. Such TSITs were tasked with the responsibility of championing capacity and capability enhancement across the organisations.
1.4. Rhythm of the MaCoTra CHORUS 7 Experiences in Civic Sector Organisations

Quite a sizeable number of organisations in the civic sector also had strategy as the entry point for CHORUS 7. A number of them had to align strategies with umbrella strategies from their parent. In such instances, innovation was restricted as the “principles”, “aims”, “issues” were generally cast in concrete from the centres.

What was clear to me was that most of the organisations thrived on strategic partnering to close internal competency gaps. There was generally a deliberate effort to heed William Finnie’s (1998) definitive suggestions, captured by Rubenstein & Grundy (1999:204):

Organizations must identify the breakthrough opportunity or contribution that a potential strategic partner will make before making the alliance. Since the costs of these alliances is high, the rewards must be very high in order to justify the cost. ... In the research for an alliance partner, a partner profile of a potential partner must be developed in depth in order to assure compatibility. Each alliance needs an improvement plan operating at the individual and organizational level from the very beginning. Every alliance must be based on a clear conception of what the customer is looking for and the alliance must be an effort to serve that customer need with higher quality or at lower cost. All alliances must be based on trust.

Source: Rubenstein & Grundy (1999:204)

In three organisations where my services were on strategy work, board members came in full force and made their contribution.

One organisation had a double dose of interwoven interventions to raise the competencies of board members in corporate governance, leadership and project cycle management.

A fascinating case was CivicSo which called me in for a strategy, followed by documentation of human resources policies and procedures, job descriptions, development of a corporate governance charter, and subsequently a strategy review. Whereas the full board came for the strategy sessions, they gave space to the employees to do the documentation with me. The board then approved the documents and sanctioned their use.

CivicSoc’s capacity and capability enhancement requests were for trainer-the-trainer courses for youth and community leaders. These needs resonated with Suzanne W. Morse’s (in Hesselbein, Goldsmith, Beckhard & Schubert, 1998:234) call for the creation of more avenues for leadership when she says:

Successful communities, even those with long traditions of organized community leadership, will continue to broaden the circles of leadership to create a system for the community that is neither centralized nor decentralized, but rather polycentric. The polycentric view of community leadership assumes that there are many centers of leadership that interrelate.

By the nature of their work, the organisations were keen to enhance capacities and capabilities to earn “friends” and make a difference in “families”. Values alignment played centre stage. Inclusiveness was more pronounced in this sector. I would argue that the civic sector organisations were striving to go in the direction of Gandhi’s vision of a future human family.

Hesselbein et al. (1998:84) vividly portray Arun Gandhi saying:

...Although they retained their family names, in all other respects they were part of one ashram family. This was, in a microcosm, Gandhi’s vision of a future human family. Inclusiveness, he was certain, was the only way humanity could be saved from self-destruction. Humanity must break down barriers and build bridges to create peace and harmony in this world. A community, he said, is only as strong as the family. If there is love and harmony in a family there will be love and harmony in a community. What happens to one must happen to all. Love and harmony in a family can only be achieved through strong bonds of relationship built on respect, understanding, acceptance, and appreciation. Respect leads to understanding who we are, followed by acceptance and appreciation of our differences.

Source: Hesselbein et al. (1998:84)

In summary, there was more readiness in this sector to begin serious work on values, destiny, cause and calling statements. This sounds more in line with Stephen R. Covey’s message on adopting a cause (in Hesselbein et al., 1998:53):

...You might adopt some good cause as part of your individual and family mission statement. You can leverage yourself further in this cause by involving your friends and family and by making a core contribution in one or more of four areas: living (the economic area), loving (the emotional and social area), learning (the mental and intellectual area), and leaving a legacy (the spiritual area).


2.0 Singing MaCoTra CHORUS 7

In my invitation to you to sing CHORUS 7, I am persuaded to adopt Charan’s (2008:159) distinction of capacity from capability:

Capacity is how much a person can do in a given amount of time. When she expands her capacity, she can do more in the same amount of time. Capability describes the quality of what a person can do.

Source: Charan (2008:159)

On the basis of this distinction, I propose a values-based collaborative capacity and capability enhancement process in EIGHT foci as given in the CHORUS 7 Generic Framework in Exhibit 3 below.
2.1 Values-Based Collaborative Capacity & Capability Enhancement to Lead People

I recommend the use of MaCoTra Transformational People Leadership (TPL) Tool 1 as a basis for values-based collaborative capacity and capability enhancement to lead people.

The MaCoTra TPL Tool 1 crystallizes what entities require to conduct productive conversations premised on the breakthrough thinking ideas that all work is conversation and work can be seen as the management of complex conversations. In which case, everyone should be aware of what conversation they are in, the context of that conversation and the outcomes intended out of the conversation.

I have found the ‘STOP/START/CONTINUE DOING, CAR NOW and WHY?, CAR IN FUTURE and WHY?’ exercises highlighted in the specific case experiences are a solid starting point for conversations for relationships. In this regard, a relationship is one’s connection to or perspective of something.

Organisational members have to develop capacities and capabilities to lay foundations for solid relationships. Breakthrough thinkers suggest, quite rightly, that a solid foundation of relationships allows for concentrated
and efficient action, making challenging requests, increased risk taking and greater results (MaCoTra Technology Toolkits, 2003 – 2012). Unless there is such a foundation, it will be fortuitous to move on to the next level of conversations.

MaCoTra Transformation People Leadership Tool 1: Platform for Collaborative Promise Delivery Forums with Staff

Conversations for relationships are based on the understanding that possibilities are significant new openings for thinking and action, unbounded by the past and often do not include clear pathways. Thus, possibilities fly in the face of resignation and cynicism, hence, always need to be managed. Possibilities are based on the future and help keep hope alive.

Conversations for opportunities emanate from answering the question: Which of these possibilities, if we could do it, would most likely allow us to fulfil our commitment?

Opportunities, as leverage possibilities, have to be shifted further into conversations for actions. Conversations that produce action express commitments. Effectiveness depends on one’s skill in stating clear commitments and getting clear commitments from others.

The productive conversation pyramid is completed through conversations for results. When the results are not forthcoming, one does not interrogate the previous layer – conversations for actions – but search for the depth of relationships. Conversations for relationships have to be revisited and the process moved up again.
Most organisational members play between the last two conversations not realizing that there is need to build the foundation first.

The creation of a platform for values-based collaborative capacity and capability enhancement to lead people has all to do with leading people to achieve results. All the actions should therefore be towards adding value.

### 2.2 Values-Based Collaborative Capacity & Capability Enhancement to Lead Transformation

I have found that the MaCoTra Breakthrough Thinking (BT) Tool 1 is useful in values-based collaborative enhancement of capacities and capabilities to lead transformation.

MaCoTra Breakthrough Thinking Tool 1: Platform for Collaborative Capacity & Capability Enhancement to Lead Transformation

MaCoTra BT Tool 1 builds onto MaCoTra TPL Tool 1. The conversations for results piece at the top of MaCoTra TPL Tool 1 should be seen being a little lower than the accomplishment in MaCoTra BT Tool 1. This is because, from a breakthrough thinking point of view, accomplishment is a success where acknowledgement is shared. This means, accomplishment is distinct from results, it is a non-quantifiable success about which we feel good and share acknowledgement. It is a tool to maintain enthusiasm and momentum and counter resignation and burnout. One looks for what difference they have made, areas they are proud of, something learnt and something one is building. So, individuals should always be aware of and focus on what is being accomplished.
For this to happen, four pillars for breakthrough thinking/transformation (*relationship, listening, speaking and managing conversations*), in MaCoTra BT Tool 1, have to be erected.

Expanding on what I have covered under conversations for relationships for the MaCoTra TPL Tool 1, this is what I have included in the MaCoTra Technology Toolkits in particular reference to the creation of transformational high-performing teams:

- Successful teams are built on successful relationships.
- There are relationships between team members, such as
  - Coaching relationships;
  - Relationships of accountabilities which call for coordinated actions;
  - Relationships of alignment;
  - Relationships which demand and allow straight talk; and
  - Relationships of committed speaking and listening;
- And there are relationships which refer to our outlook or perspective on things, such as
  - Relationships to accomplishment;
  - Relationships to breakdowns;
  - Relationships to decisions; and
  - Relationships to our stand and commitment.

*Source: MaCoTra Technology Toolkits (2003 – 2012)*

The second pillar is *listening* – being purposeful in how one pays attention to oneself and others. Individuals have to listen in a manner that empowers the speaker, aware that communication is what is heard, not what is said. To this effect, one has to be 100% responsible for what one says and 100% responsible for what is heard.

In my MaCoTra Technology Toolkits, I add:

- Some distinctions of listening that inhibit effective communication are
  - “out to lunch”
  - Already listening: listening for
    - Being right (making others wrong);
    - No possibility;
    - The fatal flow; or
    - Pigeon-holing the speaker.
- The distinction of listening that enables effective communication is
  - Generated listening: listening for
    - Another’s reality;
    - Possibility;
    - Alignment;
    - Commitment;
    - Understanding; or
    - Another’s brilliance.

*Source: MaCoTra Technology Toolkits (2003 – 2012)*
The third pillar, *speaking*, is about moving the action forward with words. This is what I have noted in my MaCoTra Technology Toolkits:

- Always speak in a manner which empowers the listening.
- Specific, agreed-upon language provides precision in communication.
- Being intentional in one’s speaking
  - Creating the context: how you want the listener to listen;
  - With clear purpose and intended outcomes; and
  - Communicating your commitment in the background.

*Source: MaCoTra Technology Toolkits (2003 – 2012)*

The last pillar for effective leadership of transformation is *managing conversations* – intentional ways of speaking and listening that cause effective action.

Over and above what I have included under conversations related to the MaCoTra TPL Tool 1 above, I have also pointed out in my MaCoTra Technology Toolkits:

- Conversation occurs between a speaker and listener with a background of shared practices, i.e., language or meaning;
- A conversation may occur privately and silently as thinking, or publicly as speaking, writing, gesturing;
- ... Some conversations disable a team’s ability to succeed, such as, resignation, cynicism, complaining, blaming, and breakdown;
- Some conversations enable a team’s ability to succeed, such as, possibility, opportunity, alignment, action, and relationship.

*Source: MaCoTra Technology Toolkits (2003 – 2012)*

For transformation to occur, organisational members need to have deep appreciation of all the constituent elements of MaCoTra BT Tool 1. *Accomplishment* is an immediate outcome of *coordinated action* in which enrolment is aided by inquiring into the impact (cost/benefit) of the action. There is *straight talk* - demonstrating commitment by saying what needs to be said to move the action forward.

Relevant *coaching* modules have to be included for members to be able to apply themselves in leading transformation. As far as leading transformation is concerned, *coaching* should be taken as *supporting another to act consistent with their commitments*.

In the face of most commitments, breakdowns occur. Any situation which appears to threaten progress toward a commitment has within it a potential for a breakthrough. Breakdowns normally produce finger-pointing, fire-fighting, erosion of teamwork, trust and effectiveness. Members need to be effective in managing breakdowns by following the process:

- Declare the breakdown;
- State what happened objectively, separating fact from interpretation;
- Identify the commitment behind the breakdown;
- Take responsibility (not blame) for the breakdown;
- Look for learnings and possibilities for action; and
- Organize action.

*Source: MaCoTra Technology Toolkits (2003 – 2012)*
Leading transformation demands alignment (a commitment to have a decision work). Some key concepts to be covered in learning about alignment include:

- Alignment is the most powerful relationship we can have to a decision once it’s been made;
- Alignment is distinct from agreement, it is a commitment to own a decision, to have a decision work, whether you agree or not;
- Success has more to do with ownership of a decision than with the quality of the decision;
- In a transformational high-performing team, each person is committed to work towards alignment;
- Transformational high-performing teams allow people to say when they are not aligned in order to develop a higher level of integration and a higher quality outcome;
- Alignment is not a method of making a decision, rather it refers to the relationship we have to a decision;
- Some possible relationships one can have to a decision are ownership (alignment), buy-in, compliance, resistance, sabotage, apathy;
- How do we get aligned?
  - Agree to alignment as a team principle;
  - Provide an environment where people can talk straight - it is often sufficient that people experience being heard;
  - Ask for alignment ("Who is not aligned?");
  - Find out what is needed to get aligned;
  - Align.

Source: MaCoTra Technology Toolkits (2003 – 2012)

Most organisations still talk about “buy-in”, not aware that buy-in should not be equated with “total alignment” – “ownership”. Conscious effort has to be made to have organisational members totally align.

Alignment requires people to know the spectrum of alternative decision making processes covering:

- Directive (where the leader makes the decision and informs the group);
- Testing (where the leader makes a tentative decision and tests it with others - the leader is willing to modify the decision based on feedback);
- Consulting (where the leader presents a problem/situation and asks the group for recommendations, the leader reviews input and makes the final decisions);
- Delegation [where the leader (or the group) sets some boundaries and delegates the decision to others (an individual, a task team, or the entire team)];
- Voting (where majority, quorum, etc. counts); and
- Consensus (where the leader joins the team as an equal partner, having no more or less authority – the final decision must be acceptable to all parties)

Source: MaCoTra Technology Toolkits (2003 – 2012)

People need to be accountable in transformation efforts, being responsible for their actions. As such, responsibility expands upon accountability and is consistent with a stand for the success of the whole, enveloping a search for possibility and resourcefulness.
At the heart of any transformation is the act of *generating a stand*, based on one’s values. A stand is a common commitment to something worthwhile or compelling. Some notes that should be included in learning modules to collaboratively enhance capacity and capability for generating a stand are:

- A stand is a commitment to building a future that would not have existed had we not created it;
- A stand is a place to come from, to stand in, rather than a goal to aspire to;
- This is the central tenant of transformational high-performing teams;
- If you have a strong alignment around a compelling stand, all other elements will naturally evolve;
- A true stand
  - Is demonstrated in one’s everyday life through actions,
  - Provides stability during turbulence,
  - Allows one to declare breakdowns, and
  - Provides the basis for coaching and being coached; and
- A stand is put into motion via a declaration.

Source: MaCoTra Technology Toolkits (2003 – 2012)

2.3 Values-Based Collaborative Capacity & Capability Enhancement to Lead Businesses

I recommend the MaCoTra Transformational Human Capital Readiness (THCR) Tool 1 below, rooted in organizational values, as a basis for collaborative capacity and capability enhancement to lead businesses. This tool has four components that organisational members have to align around. MaCoTra THCR Tool 1 aggregates the meta-competencies required to lead businesses effectively.

First, the organizational values should be expressed in behavioural terms (*Core Behavioural Competencies*) and be an outcome of the alignment of personal values, natural work team and organisational values.

Second, there also has to be a business skills and knowledge dimension (*Core Business Competencies*). This details the competencies required to make a contribution to the business at large.

A third component of the collaborative competency profiling framework is the technical dimension (*Core Technical Competencies*) which deals with the specific capabilities as required in each functional area.

The forth component reflects the *Core Leadership Competencies* required to provide the inspiration for those led to perform in any given position.

Consultants are well advised to enhance capacities and capabilities of the human capital professionals and transformational strategy implementation teams (TSITs) to conduct job and person profiling internally. The TSITs should be constituted in such a manner that they are multi-disciplinary and cut across hierarchical levels.

Such TSITs would then become business champions, identifying competency gaps that the human capital professionals have to close with business unit leaders for businesses to be led responsibly.
I recommend that the business leadership meta-competencies be developed as informed by the collaborative profiling process instead of picking on irrelevant business courses from shelves.

2.4 Values-Based Collaborative Capacity & Capability Enhancement to Lead Promise Delivery

Across the three sectors, I recommend MaCoTra Transformational Promise Delivery (TPD) Tool 1 as the platform for collaborative capacity and capability enhancement programmes to lead promise delivery.

The MaCoTra TPD Tool 1 is premised on the interactions between employees, customers/suppliers/communities and the board/trustee/shareholder, depending on whether the organisation is in the private, public or civic sector.

Taking the employee as the first stakeholder, the board/trustee/shareholder has to build capacities and capabilities to develop distinctive employee value propositions packaged as distinctive employee promises.

Such distinction helps organisations attract and retain strategic talent. In turn, the satisfied employees become productive and gain competencies to generate distinctive customer/supplier/communities value propositions, also packaged as distinctive promises for the customer/supplier/communities.

The triangular relationship is then completed when the customers/suppliers/communities release their money/supplies/energy for the board/trustee/shareholder to account for the investment. And, the triangular relationship is turned cyclical.
Where capacities and capabilities are not collaboratively enhanced, the cycle is reversed, resulting in employee, customer/supplier/communities and board/trustee/shareholder defection, negatively impacting the entity.

2.5 Values-Based Collaborative Capacity & Capability Enhancement to Lead Strategy

In this section, I highlight what I consider critical dimensions in values-based collaborative capacity and capability enhancement to lead strategy. I will dwell mainly on the fourteen (14) transformational strategic thinking tools that I developed and tested across the three sectors and/or in my company.

I argue that the starting point in strategy work is a solid foundation of core values. This is consonant with Kouzes & Posner’s (1995:215) view to the effect “... values form the bedrock of an organization’s culture”.

Across the sectors, capacity and capability was enhanced in aligning employees’ values to come up with team/family values, unit/function values and finally organisational values.

Where this was effectively done, employees became more committed to their organisations. Organisations that had a lukewarm approach to values alignment struggled to gain the trust and confidence of their members.
Again, reference may be made to Kouzes & Posner’s (1995:218) summary of their findings:

Somewhat to our surprise, we found that individuals who had a great degree of clarity about the organization’s values but little clarity about their own values had no more commitment to the organization than those who had little understanding of their own and the organization’s values. Even more astounding was the finding that the group with a great degree of clarity about personal values but less clarity about organizational values had almost as much commitment as the group that had high congruence between their own and the organization’s values. ...  

Having clarity about personal values may thus be more important, in relation to attitudes about work and ethical practices, than being clear about organizational values alone.


Thus, choices are values based. And, as an extension, my take is that principles are derived from values.

The employees had to then craft destiny, cause and calling statements from these values. In one private sector organisation, the group chief executive later changed the destiny, cause and calling to principles – a confirmation that principles are offshoots of values.

Kouzes & Posner (1995:219) proceed to suggest and, then, caution:

Better to explore early the fit between person and organization than to have members find out late some sleepless night that they’re in violent disagreement over matters of principle.

One word of caution: values should never be used as an excuse for the suppression of dissent.


In all organisations where values alignment was not coerced, those whose values did not align with team/unit-functional/organisational values voluntarily made an early exit!

From the varied experiences, I provide below MaCoTra Strategic Thinking Tools 1 through 14 adopted by a number of organisations to deepen strategy execution.

Almost all organisations proceeded from the values-destiny-cause-calling conversations to outlining the life histories and then scanning the environment. Quite a number did not want to change from the traditional presentation of organisational history in composition format as background. I propose what quite a significant number of organisations adopted – storylines giving relevant key highlights on a year to year basis.

The storylines would then be an integral part of induction programmes so that employees and board members have the same information about the organisation. Those interested in more detail would use the storyline as a basis for further exploration or research.

Thurbin (1998:39) posits “Stakeholder analysis is the start point for the strategist”. A have a different view.

The MaCoTra sequence that has had impact has been from values-destiny-cause-calling conversations to storylines, then stakeholder analysis.
Where storylines indicate the existence of related Acts of Parliament or mandates, there is need for a common understanding of the Acts of Parliament or mandates. Each function and/or duty in the Act of Parliament/mandate has to be crystallised into a specific role to enhance alignment of the organisational values to such a role.

Organisations need to go beyond just identifying stakeholder groups to having competencies to apply MaCoTra Transformational Strategic Thinking (TST) Tool 1.

MaCoTra Transformational Strategic Thinking Tool 1: Platform for Collaborative Stakeholder Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholder Group</th>
<th>Needs</th>
<th>Expectations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>·</td>
<td>· Output</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>· Outcome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>· Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>·</td>
<td>·</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>·</td>
<td>·</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>·</td>
<td>·</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>·</td>
<td>·</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: MaCoTra Multiple Lens Analysis Tools (2003 – 2012)

This platform demands that for each stakeholder group need, there be measurable expectations at three levels – each output must have an outcome and a related impact. Thus, these expectations must be uplifted to constitute key performance indicators (KPIs) in the detailed plan section of the strategy document. Hence, the performance of the organisation will be measured from the perspectives of the different stakeholder groups, as given in the KPIs.

However, this type of stakeholder analysis is not enough.

The MaCoTra TST Tool 2 has an added facet – unearthing new and enriched understandings of determining the pay-off.
MaCoTra Transformational Strategy Thinking Tool 2: Platform for Collaborative Stakeholder Prioritization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholder Group</th>
<th>Tangible Contributions from Stakeholder Group</th>
<th>Intangible Contributions from Stakeholder Group</th>
<th>Links Between Stakeholder Groups</th>
<th>Performance Measures Used by Stakeholder Group</th>
<th>Power of Stakeholder Group Over the Entity</th>
<th>Key Values &amp; Beliefs Held by Stakeholder Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


This platform also sharpens capabilities in analyzing political forces at play.

I have found that this tool may be used to group key players into four categories identified by Rubenstein & Grundy (1999:58-59):

- **Decision maker** – the one who ultimately decides.
- **Sponsor** – a key designer, architect or potential financial supporter of the high-growth strategy.
- **Advocate** – a supporter who would welcome the opportunity to work on the particular high-growth strategy at issue and who would bet some or all of his or her bonus, organizational prestige and capital on the high-growth strategy.
- **Potential blockers** – persons or groups with something to lose from the high-growth strategy or who have expressed some opposition to the strategy and who could only reluctantly be won over to support it.

Source: Rubenstein & Grundy (1999:58-59)

Organisations that had applied the traditional SWOT (strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats) before were surprised when I flagged Rubenstein & Grundy’s (1999:67) positioning of SWOT analysis towards the end of their list of tools asserting that:

... we want to correct the misrepresentation that doing a SWOT analysis alone is doing strategic analysis – it is not. It is simply an inventory devise or assessment devise that alone will never produce a clear high-growth strategy, nor will it tell your organization with any great certainty or precision the potential for success of any high-growth strategy being considered.

Source: Rubenstein & Grundy (1999:67)

The two authorities warn entrepreneurial organisations against relying too extensively on SWOT analysis. They further advise:

Employing other analytical tools before performing a SWOT analysis will improve the chances of developing robust, successful high-growth strategies.

Source Rubenstein & Grundy’s (1999:67)
Most organisations, up to about 2010, went only as far as accepting to translate threats into challenges to perform a SWOC (strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and challenges) analysis. A significant number applied a PESTeL (political, economic, social, technological and legal forces) analysis, having added the legal piece ignored in the traditional PEST analysis.

Rubenstein & Grundy’s (1999:56) reversed PEST to TESP arguing that “the impact of technology has become so high in the US and the impact of politics on the day-to-day business climate is now so low”. Although no organisation talked about TESP but PESTeL, politics is still a major looming factor in submerging/emerging economies to be placed last in the analysis. In fact, isolating political issues was very weak in all organisations. Most talked of political concerns!

A number of organisations changed PESTeL to PESTEL converting the “e” into “E” to include environmental issues. Indeed, environmental issues are a serious concern globally to be ignored. I am of the conviction that organisations will gain more leverage by addressing political forces that give rise to legal frameworks which create conducive economic environments where technology with bring social value – what I call a PLEETS (political, legal, economic, environmental, technological and social lenses) analysis from a MaCoTra technology point of view.

A singular approach to SWOC and PESTEL analysis was evidently not as thorough as when I cross-casted SWOC with PESTEL. Although no organisation used the PLEETS analysis I have recommended above, I have since refined the cross-casting of SWOC with PESTEL to cross-casting SWOC with PLEETS as in MaCoTra TST Tool 3 below so that there is seamless alignment with my thought process.

**MaCoTra Transformational Strategic Thinking Tool 3: Platform for Collaborative SWOC vs. PLEETS Analysis**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LENS</th>
<th>Strengths</th>
<th>Weaknesses</th>
<th>Opportunities</th>
<th>Challenges</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Political</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technological</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: MaCoTra Multiple Lens Analysis Tools (2003 – 2012)

After using MaCoTra TST Tool 3, quite a few organisations applied MaCoTra TST Tool 4. They indicated it was well suited for organisations that had limited time for further analysis. The organisations also discovered that some issues from Tool 3 were filtered in/out of this Tool 4, achieving more focus.
Organisations that created time for more strategic thinking went full-scale in applying MaCoTra TST Tool 5. Again, some issues from Tool 3 were filtered in/out of Tool 5. Even more focus was achieved.

MaCoTra TST Tool 6 was preferred by organisations that had limited time to explore new tools. Quite often it was those entities that had gone the route of MaCoTra TST Tool 4.

Applying this platform requires even deeper competencies. Each of the New 7-S’s has to be understood first. Use of vernacular and African examples, particularly drawn from family life, such as approaches to marriage, demystifies these terms. Where participants have some military background, reference to elements of The Art of War by Sun Tsu, translated by Thomas Cleary (1988), and Robert Greene’s (2008) book entitled The Concise 33 Strategies of War livens the conversations.

I found the use of Sun Tsu methodologies eased the learning of this section for organisations that interface heavily with politicians.

Where specifics on women are essential, rich conversations may be based on Becky Sheetz-Runkle’s (2011) book Sun Tsu for Women: The Art of War for Winning in Business.
MaCoTra Transformational Strategic Thinking Tool 6: Platform for Collaboratively Diagnosing Strengths & Weaknesses Given D’Aveni’s (1994) New 7-S’s

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>New 7-S</th>
<th>Strengths</th>
<th>Weaknesses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S-1: Superior Stakeholder Satisfaction</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-2: Strategic Soothsaying</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-3: Positioning for Speed</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-4: Positioning for Surprise</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-5: Shifting the Rules</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-6: Signalling Strategic Intent</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-7: Simultaneous &amp; Sequential Strategic Thrusts</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: MaCoTra Multiple Lens Analysis Tools (2003 – 2012)

There is need to contextualize how D’Aveni conceived the interactions between the New 7-S’s clustered under vision for disruption, capability for disruption and tactics for disruption aimed at market disruption:

**VISION FOR DISRUPTION:**
- Identifying and creating opportunities for temporary advantage through understanding
  - Stakeholder Satisfaction
  - Strategic Soothsaying
- directed at identifying new ways to serve existing customers better or new customers that no one else serves now.

**CAPABILITY FOR DISRUPTION:**
- Sustaining the momentum by developing flexible capacities for
  - Speed
  - Surprise
- that can be applied across many actions to build a series of temporary advantages.

**TACTICS FOR DISRUPTION:**
- Seizing the initiative to gain advantage by
  - Shifting the Rules
  - Signaling
  - Simultaneous and Sequential Strategic Thrusts
- with actions that shape, mold or influence the direction or nature of the competitors’ responses.

Source: D’Aveni (1994:248), Figure 7-2

Organisations that had resources for intense analysis used MaCoTra TST Tool 7 instead of Tool 6.

For both Tool 7 and 6, the most complex of the New 7-S’s were S-2 and S-5. A lot more examples have to be given for organisations to appreciate the dangers and advantages involved in operating in these two areas.
Recovery strategies have to be crafted, in case the intended objectives are not achieved.

MaCoTra Transformational Strategic Thinking Tool 7: Platform for Collaborative SWOC Analysis Given D’Aveni’s (1994)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>New 7-S’s</th>
<th>Strengths</th>
<th>Weaknesses</th>
<th>Opportunities</th>
<th>Challenges</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S-1:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superior Stakeholder Satisfaction</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-2:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Soothsaying</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-3:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positioning for Speed</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-4:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positioning for Surprise</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-5:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shifting the Rules</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-6:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signalling Strategic Intent</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-7:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simultaneous &amp; Sequential Strategic Thrusts</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: MaCoTra Multiple Lens Analysis Tools (2003 – 2012)

For organisations with complex operations and employees gravitating towards becoming knowledge workers, MaCoTra TST Tool 8 is handy. The degree of analytical penetration required in understanding and applying this tool is much more demanding. However, organisations that used this tool testified that they found it worthwhile.

MaCoTra Transformational Strategic Thinking Tool 8: Platform for Collaborative Four Arena Analysis Given D’Aveni’s (1994)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>New 7-S’s</th>
<th>Cost &amp; Quality</th>
<th>Timing &amp; Know-How</th>
<th>Strongholds</th>
<th>Deep Pockets</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S-1:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superior Stakeholder Satisfaction</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-2:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Soothsaying</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-3:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positioning for Speed</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-4:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positioning for Surprise</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-5:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shifting the Rules</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-6:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signalling Strategic Intent</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-7:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simultaneous &amp; Sequential Strategic Thrusts</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: MaCoTra Multiple Lens Analysis Tools (2003 – 2012)
In organisations that have an appreciation of the concept of a balanced scorecard, MaCoTra TST Tool 9 may be applied. This will enhance analytical capabilities around the four perspectives of their scorecards. I have taken the external perspective as covering customers, suppliers, communities whereas the internal perspective is still about processes and systems. By people perspective I am referring to the staff or learning and growth perspective as adopted by some organisations.

MaCoTra Transformational Strategic Thinking Tool 9: Platform for Collaborative SWOC Analysis Given Balanced Scorecard Perspectives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PERSPECTIVE</th>
<th>STRENGTHS</th>
<th>WEAKNESSES</th>
<th>OPPORTUNITIES</th>
<th>CHALLENGES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Financial</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: MaCoTra Multiple Lens Analysis Tools (2003 – 2012)

Organisations that intend to go beyond Porter’s 5 forces are well advised to enhance competencies in the deployment of MaCoTra TST Tool 10. Dimensions of competition have to be identified under each of the Arenas, followed by the paired comparisons, starting with the top competitor. This entails that the industry would have been clearly defined first, just like one would do for Porter’s 5 forces analysis.

MaCoTra Transformational Strategic Thinking Tool 10: Platform for Collaborative Paired Comparisons Given D’Aveni’s (1994) Four Arenas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ARENA</th>
<th>COMPETITION DIMENSION</th>
<th>COMPETITOR A</th>
<th>COMPETITOR B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cost &amp; Quality</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timing &amp; Know-How</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongholds</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deep Pockets</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: MaCoTra Multiple Lens Analysis Tools (2003 – 2012)

A more comprehensive analysis of competitors will be arrived at when organisations have earned capabilities to apply MaCoTra TST Tool 11. Again, the industry has to be clearly defined first, competition dimensions specified for each New 7-S, and analysis done considering the top competitor first.

No organisation experienced the use of Tool 11. I include it here as I have used it in my own business with resounding results. The meticulousness involved in using this tool is quite enriching.
MaCoTra Transformational Strategic Thinking Tool 11: Platform for Collaboratively Paired Comparisons Given D'Aveni’s (1994) New 7-S’s

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>New 7-S</th>
<th>Competition Dimension</th>
<th>Competitor A</th>
<th>Competitor B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S-1: Superior Stakeholder Satisfaction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-2: Strategic Soothsaying</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-3: Positioning for Speed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-4: Positioning for Surprise</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-5: Shifting the Rules</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-6: Signalling Strategic Intent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-7: Simultaneous &amp; Sequential Strategic Thrusts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: MaCoTra Multiple Lens Analysis Tools (2003 – 2012)

By far the most intense tool, up to this point, is MaCoTra TST Tool 12.


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ARENA</th>
<th>NEW 7-S's</th>
<th>STRENGTH/WEAKNESS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>COST &amp; QUALITY</td>
<td>✓ S-1: Superior Stakeholder Satisfaction</td>
<td>✓ Strength/Weakness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✓ S-2: Strategic Soothsaying</td>
<td>✓ Strength/Weakness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✓ S-3: Positioning for Speed</td>
<td>✓ Strength/Weakness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✓ S-4: Positioning for Surprise</td>
<td>✓ Strength/Weakness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✓ S-5: Shifting the Rules</td>
<td>✓ Strength/Weakness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✓ S-6: Signalling Strategic Intent</td>
<td>✓ Strength/Weakness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✓ S-7: Simultaneous &amp; Sequential Strategic Thrusts</td>
<td>✓ Strength/Weakness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TIMING &amp; KNOW-HOW</td>
<td>✓ S-1: Superior Stakeholder Satisfaction</td>
<td>✓ Strength/Weakness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✓ S-2: Strategic Soothsaying</td>
<td>✓ Strength/Weakness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✓ S-3: Positioning for Speed</td>
<td>✓ Strength/Weakness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✓ S-4: Positioning for Surprise</td>
<td>✓ Strength/Weakness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✓ S-5: Shifting the Rules</td>
<td>✓ Strength/Weakness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✓ S-6: Signalling Strategic Intent</td>
<td>✓ Strength/Weakness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✓ S-7: Simultaneous &amp; Sequential Strategic Thrusts</td>
<td>✓ Strength/Weakness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STRONGHOLDS</td>
<td>✓ S-1: Superior Stakeholder Satisfaction</td>
<td>✓ Strength/Weakness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✓ S-2: Strategic Soothsaying</td>
<td>✓ Strength/Weakness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✓ S-3: Positioning for Speed</td>
<td>✓ Strength/Weakness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✓ S-4: Positioning for Surprise</td>
<td>✓ Strength/Weakness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✓ S-5: Shifting the Rules</td>
<td>✓ Strength/Weakness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✓ S-6: Signalling Strategic Intent</td>
<td>✓ Strength/Weakness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✓ S-7: Simultaneous &amp; Sequential Strategic Thrusts</td>
<td>✓ Strength/Weakness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEEP POCKETS</td>
<td>✓ S-1: Superior Stakeholder Satisfaction</td>
<td>✓ Strength/Weakness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✓ S-2: Strategic Soothsaying</td>
<td>✓ Strength/Weakness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✓ S-3: Positioning for Speed</td>
<td>✓ Strength/Weakness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✓ S-4: Positioning for Surprise</td>
<td>✓ Strength/Weakness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✓ S-5: Shifting the Rules</td>
<td>✓ Strength/Weakness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✓ S-6: Signalling Strategic Intent</td>
<td>✓ Strength/Weakness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✓ S-7: Simultaneous &amp; Sequential Strategic Thrusts</td>
<td>✓ Strength/Weakness</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: MaCoTra Multiple Lens Analysis Tools (2003 – 2012)
For each of the Arenas, a search for strengths and weaknesses is done related to each of the New 7-S’s.

The second last platform that I recommend, which was not used by any organisation except my own company, MaCoTra, is MaCoTra TST Tool 13.

This platform necessitates wearing triple lenses at any given moment of analysis. Any strategic issue that survives this type of interrogation is a hybrid issue that certainly will bring strategic leverage when focused on.

MaCoTra Transformational Strategic Thinking Tool 13: Platform for Collaborative SWOC Analysis Given D’Aveni’s (1994) New 7-S’s & Four Arenas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ARENA</th>
<th>NEW 7-S’s</th>
<th>STRENGTHS</th>
<th>WEAKNESSES</th>
<th>OPPORTUNITIES</th>
<th>CHALLENGES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>COST &amp; QUALITY</td>
<td>S-1: Superior Stakeholder Satisfaction</td>
<td>✓ S</td>
<td>❖ W</td>
<td>✓ 0</td>
<td>❖ C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S-2: Strategic Soothsaying</td>
<td>✓ S</td>
<td>❖ W</td>
<td>✓ 0</td>
<td>❖ C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S-3: Positioning for Speed</td>
<td>✓ S</td>
<td>❖ W</td>
<td>✓ 0</td>
<td>❖ C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S-4: Positioning for Surprise</td>
<td>✓ S</td>
<td>❖ W</td>
<td>✓ 0</td>
<td>❖ C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S-5: Shifting the Rules</td>
<td>✓ S</td>
<td>❖ W</td>
<td>✓ 0</td>
<td>❖ C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S-6: Signalling Strategic Intent</td>
<td>✓ S</td>
<td>❖ W</td>
<td>✓ 0</td>
<td>❖ C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S-7: Simultaneous &amp; Sequential Strategic Thrusts</td>
<td>✓ S</td>
<td>❖ W</td>
<td>✓ 0</td>
<td>❖ C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TIMING &amp; KNOW-HOW</td>
<td>S-1: Superior Stakeholder Satisfaction</td>
<td>✓ S</td>
<td>❖ W</td>
<td>✓ 0</td>
<td>❖ C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S-2: Strategic Soothsaying</td>
<td>✓ S</td>
<td>❖ W</td>
<td>✓ 0</td>
<td>❖ C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S-3: Positioning for Speed</td>
<td>✓ S</td>
<td>❖ W</td>
<td>✓ 0</td>
<td>❖ C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S-4: Positioning for Surprise</td>
<td>✓ S</td>
<td>❖ W</td>
<td>✓ 0</td>
<td>❖ C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S-5: Shifting the Rules</td>
<td>✓ S</td>
<td>❖ W</td>
<td>✓ 0</td>
<td>❖ C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S-6: Signalling Strategic Intent</td>
<td>✓ S</td>
<td>❖ W</td>
<td>✓ 0</td>
<td>❖ C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S-7: Simultaneous &amp; Sequential Strategic Thrusts</td>
<td>✓ S</td>
<td>❖ W</td>
<td>✓ 0</td>
<td>❖ C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STRONG-HOLDS</td>
<td>S-1: Superior Stakeholder Satisfaction</td>
<td>✓ S</td>
<td>❖ W</td>
<td>✓ 0</td>
<td>❖ C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S-2: Strategic Soothsaying</td>
<td>✓ S</td>
<td>❖ W</td>
<td>✓ 0</td>
<td>❖ C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S-3: Positioning for Speed</td>
<td>✓ S</td>
<td>❖ W</td>
<td>✓ 0</td>
<td>❖ C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S-4: Positioning for Surprise</td>
<td>✓ S</td>
<td>❖ W</td>
<td>✓ 0</td>
<td>❖ C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S-5: Shifting the Rules</td>
<td>✓ S</td>
<td>❖ W</td>
<td>✓ 0</td>
<td>❖ C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S-6: Signalling Strategic Intent</td>
<td>✓ S</td>
<td>❖ W</td>
<td>✓ 0</td>
<td>❖ C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S-7: Simultaneous &amp; Sequential Strategic Thrusts</td>
<td>✓ S</td>
<td>❖ W</td>
<td>✓ 0</td>
<td>❖ C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEEP POCKETS</td>
<td>S-1: Superior Stakeholder Satisfaction</td>
<td>✓ S</td>
<td>❖ W</td>
<td>✓ 0</td>
<td>❖ C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S-2: Strategic Soothsaying</td>
<td>✓ S</td>
<td>❖ W</td>
<td>✓ 0</td>
<td>❖ C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S-3: Positioning for Speed</td>
<td>✓ S</td>
<td>❖ W</td>
<td>✓ 0</td>
<td>❖ C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S-4: Positioning for Surprise</td>
<td>✓ S</td>
<td>❖ W</td>
<td>✓ 0</td>
<td>❖ C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S-5: Shifting the Rules</td>
<td>✓ S</td>
<td>❖ W</td>
<td>✓ 0</td>
<td>❖ C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S-6: Signalling Strategic Intent</td>
<td>✓ S</td>
<td>❖ W</td>
<td>✓ 0</td>
<td>❖ C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S-7: Simultaneous &amp; Sequential Strategic Thrusts</td>
<td>✓ S</td>
<td>❖ W</td>
<td>✓ 0</td>
<td>❖ C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: MaCoTra Multiple Lens Analysis Tools (2003 – 2012)

The last tool of analysis that I have created this far is MaCoTra TST Tool 14.

This tool is an amalgam of pointers from the tools above. It slices key result areas into four segments based on Kim & Mauborgne’s (2005) explicit four actions framework. Kim & Mauborgne, in their book, do not indicate how and where to get material to complete their framework. I recommend that organisations select appropriate tools that will generate the information to slide into MaCoTra TST Tool 14.

A study of the organisation has to be done before strategy facilitators guide the choice of tools. I always make a conscious effort to do that in order to augment value as I do my work with organisations.
I have realized that values-based collaborative enhancement of capacity and capability to lead strategy has been a front-runner in collective learning across the three sectors.

Boninelli & Meyer (2011:440) in suggesting “additional developmental practices” propagate:

The building of communities of learning and practice in which participants from around the organisation are able to network and interact to build collective competence and challenge traditional thinking.

Source: Boninelli & Meyer (2011:440)

MaCoTra Transformational Strategic Thinking Tool 14: Platform for Collaboratively Superimposing Kim & Mauborgne's (2005) Four Actions Framework on Balanced Scorecard Perspectives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PERSPECTIVE</th>
<th>Key Result Area</th>
<th>Eliminate</th>
<th>Reduce</th>
<th>Raise</th>
<th>Create</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FINANCIAL</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXTERNAL</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTERNAL</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEOPLE</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: MaCoTra Multiple Lens Analysis Tools (2003 – 2012)

I have confidence organisations which want to create thought leaders in strategy will give their members the opportunity to innovate around my 14 tools. Perhaps even come up with their combinations.

Capacities and capabilities have to be collaboratively enhanced so that the key strategic issues are synthesized into scorecard-based key result areas (KRAs) convertible to value streams. The value streams will inform the organisational structures guided by activities related to each value stream in the detailed action plan. Employees have to gain competencies to link budgeting to the detailed action plan. In particular, each activity in the detailed plan should have a related strategy expenditure (STRATEX) budget.

The last aspect would be coming with a pager that forms the executive summary of the strategy. I had to spend a lot of time creating these pagers as most organisations had not done this before. Members had to confirm whether I had captured all they had experienced on such pagers. They remarked, later, that this was helping them in communicating to those who had limited time to go through the strategy documents.
2.6 **Values-Based Collaborative Capacity & Capability Enhancement to Lead Corporate Engineering**

I have developed a scorecard-focused MaCoTra Transformational Corporate Engineering (TCE) Tool 1 as a platform for values-based collaborative setting up of distinctive structures and systems. This tool is for use by internal or external consultants tasked with creating strategy-supportive structures and systems.

In this simplified example, we start with the top leader, say managing director (MD) reporting to the board. In this tool, the MD is R1 and the organisation is to execute its strategy on four strategic themes (one for each perspective) and 8 value streams (2 for each perspective). Each of the value streams has 3 activities.

As the strategy will have been collaboratively developed, this tool constitutes part of the detailed action plan. The competencies required are for the transformational strategy planning team (TSPT) to be in a position to integrate corporate engineering into the detailed plan. What this means is that they need to be capable of identifying positions to be accountable for each activity under each value stream (VS), say VSF1 in the financial perspective. In this case activities for this value stream are VSF1 A1, VSF1 A2 and VSF1 A3. Since R1, the MD, is ultimately responsible for the execution of the strategy across all value streams, R1 is found under Responsibility (R). So a box for R1 has been created on the organisation chart.

**MaCoTra Transformational Corporate Engineering Tool 1: Platform for Collaborative Setting Up of Distinctive Structures & Systems**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perspective</th>
<th>ValueStream (VS)</th>
<th>Activities (A)</th>
<th>Responsibility (R)</th>
<th>Accountability (Acc)</th>
<th>STRATEX (S)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>FINANCIAL (F)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VSF1</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>VSF1 A1</td>
<td>R1</td>
<td>Acc1</td>
<td>S1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>VSF1 A2</td>
<td>R1</td>
<td>Acc1</td>
<td>S2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>VSF1 A3</td>
<td>R1</td>
<td>Acc2</td>
<td>S3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>VSF2</td>
<td>R1</td>
<td>Acc3</td>
<td>S4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>VSF2 A1</td>
<td>R1</td>
<td>Acc3</td>
<td>S5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>VSF2 A2</td>
<td>R1</td>
<td>Acc3</td>
<td>S6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>VSF2 A3</td>
<td>R1</td>
<td>Acc3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EXTERNAL (E)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VSE1</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>VSE1 A1</td>
<td>R1</td>
<td>Acc2</td>
<td>S7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>VSE1 A2</td>
<td>R1</td>
<td>Acc3</td>
<td>S8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>VSE1 A3</td>
<td>R1</td>
<td>Acc3</td>
<td>S9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>VSE2</td>
<td>R1</td>
<td>Acc4</td>
<td>S10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>VSE2 A1</td>
<td>R1</td>
<td>Acc4</td>
<td>S11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>VSE2 A2</td>
<td>R1</td>
<td>Acc4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>VSE2 A3</td>
<td>R1</td>
<td>Acc5</td>
<td>S12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>INTERNAL (I)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VS11</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>VS1 H A1</td>
<td>R1</td>
<td>Acc3</td>
<td>S13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>VS1 H A2</td>
<td>R1</td>
<td>Acc3</td>
<td>S14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>VS1 H A3</td>
<td>R1</td>
<td>Acc1</td>
<td>S15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>VS12</td>
<td>R1</td>
<td>Acc2</td>
<td>S16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>VS12 A1</td>
<td>R1</td>
<td>Acc5</td>
<td>S17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>VS12 A2</td>
<td>R1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>VS12 A3</td>
<td>R1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PEOPLE (P)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VSP1</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>VSP1 A1</td>
<td>R1</td>
<td>Acc3</td>
<td>S19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>VSP1 A2</td>
<td>R1</td>
<td>Acc6</td>
<td>S20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>VSP1 A3</td>
<td>R1</td>
<td>Acc6</td>
<td>S21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>VSP2</td>
<td>R1</td>
<td>Acc6</td>
<td>S22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>VSP2 A1</td>
<td>R1</td>
<td>Acc6</td>
<td>S23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>VSP2 A2</td>
<td>R1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>VSP2 A3</td>
<td>R1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: MaCoTra Technology Toolkits (2003 – 2012)
Next, we see that R1 has a subordinate Acc1 under Accountability (Acc) who will deliver on VSF1. Acc1 is also accountable when it comes to delivery on VSF1 A2. Consequently, one box on level 2 has been created on the organisation chart. VSF1 A3, although under VSF1, is an activity requiring different strategic competencies. So the TSPT might allocate this to a different subordinate to R1, in this case, Acc2. Hence, the organisation chart has an additional post.

Similar logic is employed for the rest of the activities. In this example, R1, the MD, has six subordinates. And, level 2 is complete.

Evidently, if one were to use the frequency of activities as a measure for naming the subordinate positions, out of the 6 subordinates, Acc3, who is responsible for 8 activities, may be at director level. The TSPT might also take Acc6, responsible for 5 activities, as a second director. The rest of level 2 positions may be executive/perhaps management positions.

The basis of this argument is that these activities will be primary in the creation of value streams for level 2 positions. Each of the level 2 positions would be considered, in turn, using the same tool. Of course, the number of value streams and their related activities will vary depending on the positions. The process is continued until the TSPT gets to those positions with no subordinates. At that point, the whole organisation chart will be done.

The TSPT has to be aware that some members may be tempted to think about current positions and/or personalities in post. Whoever will be facilitating the competency acquisition process has to remind TSPT members or whoever is involved to create organisation charts with no names attached to them.

The value streams and activities inform the job contracts/descriptions which will then be used for job evaluation. The activities will also have a bearing on collaborative policies/procedures/processes/systems development. In which case, the TSPT will have to be developed to perform multiple roles to contain costs.

### 2.7 Values-Based Collaborative Capacity & Capability Enhancement to Lead Performance

I recommend MaCoTra Transformational SelfPerformance Appraisal (TSPA) Tool 1 as a platform for collaboratively leading performance.

All organisational members will have to learn how to lead and manage their own performance using this tool, with their team leaders as coaches/mentors.

There are 3 phases to the MaCoTra TSPA Tool 1:
- **Planning Performance** - planning what each employee will achieve in the year ahead;
- **Checking In (Interim review)** - regular discussions (at least quarterly) during the year, assessing and reviewing progress towards achieving objectives and learning and development actions; and
• **Final Review** - formally discussing and recording performance results for the past year, and agreeing future objectives and learning and development needs.

The overarching objective of MaCoTra TSPA *Tool 1* is to lead performance so as to achieve an entity’s overall business objectives and to maximise the learning and development of each employee.

The hallmarks of success using this tool will be:

- **objective setting** – all team members will have stretching yet attainable objectives, to which they are committed because they are involved in creating them;
- **feedback** – ongoing, direct feedback is given, with team leaders fully acknowledging positive aspects but also not shrinking from engaging in difficult conversations where necessary; and
- **coaching and development** – a supportive environment is created which enables team members to grow and develop.

The main aims of the *TSPA* learning are:

- Understanding what’s different and new in the *TSPA* approach;
- Understanding the roles of the team leader and individual employees in *TSPA*;
- Creating and practicing the completion of the *TSPA* documentation and being able to do so in terms of the roles of both team leader and individual employee;
- Practising applying the *TSPA* competencies.
The benefits of effective TSPA are:

- Ensuring achievement of an entity’s overall strategy;
- Establishing a powerful link between the entity’s strategy and individual employee contribution;
- Identifying a process and the competencies necessary to deal with those aspects of transformational selfperformance appraisal employees need to develop;
- Linking TSPA to an entity’s HR measures; and
- Providing a platform for improved individual development processes.

The team member and team leader roles change with each of the 3 phases of the TSPA process. The learning, therefore, has to include both parties as such engagement will provide a learning environment for close to real-life practice sessions. From my experiences in different companies, team leaders and team members have to gain skills in dealing with disagreements and impasses during the three phases. This is better achieved when team leaders and team members are together during the TSPA learning. I provide, below, a few pointers on how to deal with disagreements and impasses:

To deal with disagreements:

- Find out how the other came to that view;
- Explore their data and views;
- Make sure you genuinely understand their view;
- Introduce your data, feelings and conclusions; and
- Raise your concerns and the reasoning that has led to them.

To deal with an impasse:

- Acknowledge the impasse and analyze current position -
  - what is known as a fact, that is, what is known data?
  - what isn’t known?
- Start moving forward by asking for information which will help movement forward -
  - what do we agree upon and what not?
- Explore each side’s mental models, looking for assumptions on which they are based.
- Ask what data or logic might change their views -
  - try to develop an experiment or inquiry that could provide new information.

**Source:** MaCoTra TSPA Technology Toolkit (2003 – 2012)

To deal with disagreements and impasses effectively, team leaders and team members need to be exposed to the concepts of:

- conversations,
- discussions,
- dialogues,
- mental models,
- ladder of inference
- advocacy, and
- inquiry.


Briefly, the ladder of inference (Exhibit 4), developed by Chris Argyris and applied by management gurus like Peter Senge, attempts to explain how, when faced with a situation, one tends to jump to conclusions. What organisational members have to be capable of doing is learn how to move up and down the steps of the ladder.
The ladder of inference may be put to good effect in advocacy and inquiry to enhance TSPA capabilities, particularly when faced with disagreements and impasses between team leaders and team members. I cover here part of what I have included, in enhancing capacity and capability in my 48-page MaCoTra TSPA Technology Toolkit, related to advocacy and inquiry:

During TSPA discussions involving in-depth conversations, you will need to put your view across in a powerful way – as well as listen, explore and understand the other person’s views. Here are some tips to do this, using the ladder of inference:

**Improving advocacy:** Make your thinking process visible by walking up the ladder of inference
- State the data you considered.
- Explain your assumptions.
- Outline your conclusions, and give examples.
- Encourage others to explore your thinking.
- Ask for others to help where your thinking is least clear.

**Improving inquiry:** Ask others to make their thinking visible by walking (gently!) down the ladder of inference
- Ask what lead them to that conclusion:
- Ask on what data they based their conclusion.
- Explain the reasons for your inquiry.
- Test what is said by asking for broader contexts or for examples.
- Check your understanding to what you have heard.

Source: MaCoTra SPA Technology Toolkits (2003 – 2012)
Ultimately, any collaborative capacity and capability enhancement to lead performance has to include how to engage in $360^\text{degree}$ feedback. The learning should be staggered to move from one-on-one feedback to peer feedback, then upward feedback, and finally, $360^\text{degree}$ feedback.

Each employee will have to agree and implement a personal development plan (PDP) with their immediate superior. That is, the TSPA process should always end with a review of the PDP. As such the TSPA process becomes developmental.

Employees, through inclusive transformational strategy implementation teams, should engage in designing TSPA documentation as part of their development. Relevant learning & development interventions have to be put in place to test and roll-out the TSPA documentation across the organisation.

To all intents and purposes, collaborative capacity and capability enhancement covers the EIGHT MaCoTra-based foci derived from the MaCoTra model insights (Exhibit 3):

- values-based collaborative capacity and capability enhancement TO LEAD PEOPLE (CHORUS 1);
- values-based collaborative capacity and capability enhancement TO LEAD TRANSFORMATION (CHORUS 2);
- values-based collaborative capacity and capability enhancement TO LEAD BUSINESSES (CHORUS 3);
- values-based collaborative capacity and capability enhancement TO LEAD PROMISE DELIVERY (CHORUS 4);
- values-based collaborative capacity and capability enhancement TO LEAD STRATEGY (CHORUS 5);
- values-based collaborative capacity and capability enhancement TO LEAD CORPORATE ENGINEERING (CHORUS 6);
- values-based collaborative capacity and capability enhancement TO LEAD PERFORMANCE (CHORUS 7);
- values-based collaborative capacity and capability enhancement TO LEAD RESEARCH (Cutting across the SEVEN CHORUSES).

### 2.8 Values-based Collaborative Capacity & Capability Enhancement to Lead Research

The values-based collaborative capacity and capability enhancement to lead research should produce outcomes that overall feed into the deployment of transformational business leadership methodologies across organisations.

I have adopted Leedy’s (1997:10) research cycle in coming up with learning and development programmes for organisations across the three sectors. Leedy (1997:9) summarizes the research cycle succinctly:

*Research is, by its nature, cyclical; or more exactly, helical.* The research process follows a cycle and begins simply. It follows logical, developmental steps:

- **a.** A questioning mind observes a particular situation and asks, Why? What caused that? How come? (This is the subjective origin of research.)
- **b.** The answer to those questions becomes formally stated as a problem. (This is the overt beginning of research.)
- **c.** Data are gathered that seem to bear on the problem.
- **d.** The data seem to point to a tentative solution of the problem. A guess is made; a hypothesis or guiding question is formed.
- **e.** The quest for more data continues.
f. The body of data is processed and interpreted.
g. A discovery is made; a conclusion is reached.
h. The tentative hypothesis is either supported or is not supported; the question is partially/completely answered or not.
i. The cycle is complete.

Source: Leedy (1997:9)

Whereas a number of organisations established/had a research and development (R&D) function, the MaCoTra CHORUSES are all concerned with questioning minds. Hence, I argue that research is everyone’s business. Where R&D functions exist, they should be champions of R&D in each and every other function. In other words, the R&D functions should partner with the learning & development function to build research competencies across organisations.

There should be a deliberate focus on the fusion of qualitative and quantitative research. The different R&D models have to be covered so that each organisation can select the model to use across all functions. The R&D model chosen should facilitate organisational branding and a consistent research culture. Without diluting creativity and innovation of the researchers in the organisation, one should be able to identify an organisation through a particular research approach.

As each of Leedy’s (1997) suggested cycle is completed, more questions should be raised. Such continual questioning will then result in the discovering of new knowledge in the various functions as well as at organisational levels. The new knowledge should be published in books or captured in business journals and newsletters to preserve institutional memory and trigger further research.

The implication of the values-based approach to collaborative capacity and capability enhancement across the SEVEN MaCoTra CHORUSES (Exhibit 3) is that such enhancement will result in capacities and capabilities to SHIFT from:

- ‘Human Resources Management’ to **LEADING PEOPLE**;
- ‘Change Management’ to **LEADING TRANSFORMATION**;
- ‘Management and Organization Behaviour’ to **LEADING BUSINESSES**;
- ‘Marketing Management’ to **LEADING PROMISE DELIVERY**;
- ‘Strategic Management’ to **LEADING STRATEGY**;
- ‘Business Process Reengineering’ to **LEADING CORPORATE ENGINEERING**;
- Performance Management to **LEADING PERFORMANCE**; and
- Operations Research to **LEADING RESEARCH**.
The last section of this article summarizes how the use of my ideas in my company may benefit other organisations that aim to shift to the MaCoTra values-destiny-cause-calling paradigm.

3.0 Singing MaCoTra CHORUS 7 in MaCoTra (Pvt) Ltd ITSELF from 2003 to 2012

MaCoTra CHORUS 7 has been sung in MaCoTra (Pvt) Ltd alongside the experiences I have had across the three sectors. There have always been calls to demonstrate how this CHORUS is applied in my company. Below are reflections on some of the sticking areas that I had to address.

Collaborative enhancement of capacity and capability to transition from Vision and Mission statements proved a significant challenge in most organisations.

A recurring question was: how does an organisation know that they have described the values and crafted the destiny, cause and calling properly? Show us yours!

I am always conscious of Kouzes & Posner’s (1995:210-211) words of wisdom on credibility:

... When it comes to deciding whether a leader is believable, people first listen to the words; then they watch the actions. They listen to the talk and watch the walk. Then they measure the congruence. A judgment of “credible” is handed down when the two are consonant. If people don’t see consistency, they conclude that the leader is (at best) not really serious about the words or (at worst) an outright hypocrite.

Source: Kouzes & Posner’s (1995:210-211)

I had to continuously refine my approach, starting off from my own company, MaCoTra (Pvt) Ltd. Of particular interest was coming up with robust MaCoTra test parameters relating to the creation of **Destiny, Cause** and **Calling** statements from **Core Values**. I also had to address the demand by some organisations for **Vision** and **Mission** statements, not Destiny, Cause and Calling statements.
I have now crystallized ELEVEN (11) MaCoTra test parameters:

i. team/family/organisational Core Values should be collaboratively agreed, from confirmed personal Core Values, reflecting spiritual confluence;

ii. each individual member should align personal Core Values to team/family/organisational Core Values on a one-to-one basis;

iii. team/family/organisational Core Values should be described using the individual members’ anchor Core Values;

iv. each of the Core Values should be used only once – EITHER in the Destiny, OR the Cause, OR the Calling;

v. no Core Value should be changed in crafting EITHER the Destiny, OR Cause, OR Calling;

vi. when the descriptor replaces the Core Value in EITHER the Destiny, OR Cause, OR Calling, the Destiny, OR Cause, OR Calling should read as a flowing statement;

vii. each of the statements reflecting the Destiny, OR Cause, OR Calling should not be more than eight (8) words;

viii. the Destiny, Cause and Calling should read as one statement;

ix. the Calling, Cause and Destiny should read as one statement;

x. the Destiny may be converted to a Vision statement;

xi. the Cause and Calling may be combined to become a Mission statement.

I had to test my original conceptualizations of my company Core Values, Destiny, Cause and Calling against the MaCoTra test parameters above. This resulted in me revisiting the MaCoTra Core Values, Destiny, Cause and Calling which were derivatives of my personal Core Values, Destiny, Cause and Calling. Indeed, MaCoTra (Pvt) Ltd and I are also transforming from these experiences as reflected in Exhibit 5.
### Exhibit 5: MaCoTra Core Values, Destiny, Cause, and Calling Transformations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>MaCoTra Core Values</strong></th>
<th><strong>Dr A. B. Madzivire’s Core Values</strong></th>
<th><strong>Contributions</strong></th>
<th><strong>Transformations</strong></th>
<th><strong>Legacy</strong></th>
<th><strong>Lifelong Learning</strong></th>
<th><strong>Inspiration</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Contribution</strong></td>
<td>- adding value at both individual and organisational levels.</td>
<td>- collaborative enhancement of capacity and capability.</td>
<td>- creating sacred environments for organisations to change one person at a time.</td>
<td>- being missed after each intervention.</td>
<td>- engaging in continuous self-upliftment.</td>
<td>- inviting values and the spirit into the workplace.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transformation</strong></td>
<td>- creating sacred environments for organisations to change one person at a time.</td>
<td>- creating sacred environments for entities to change one person at a time.</td>
<td>- creating sacred environments for entities to change one person at a time.</td>
<td>- serial reciprocity bequest.</td>
<td>- engagement in continuous self-renewal.</td>
<td>- inviting the soul to work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Legacy</strong></td>
<td>- being missed after each intervention.</td>
<td>- serial reciprocity bequest.</td>
<td>- serial reciprocity bequest.</td>
<td>- serial reciprocity bequest.</td>
<td>- engagement in continuous self-renewal.</td>
<td>- inviting the soul to work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Inspiration</strong></td>
<td>- inviting values and the spirit into the workplace.</td>
<td>- inviting the soul to work.</td>
<td>- inviting the soul to work.</td>
<td>- serial reciprocity bequest.</td>
<td>- inviting the soul to work.</td>
<td>- inviting the soul to work.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Dr A. B. Madzivire’s Destiny**
- To evolve the human spirit.

**Dr A. B. Madzivire’s Cause**
- To nurture lifelong learning.

**Dr A. B. Madzivire’s Calling**
- To inspire people through story-telling, writing and consulting.

**MaCoTra Destiny**
- MaCoTra leaves a legacy of transformed individuals and organisations.

**MaCoTra Cause**
- MaCoTra builds sanctuaries for sacred relationships.

**MaCoTra Calling**
- MaCoTra nurtures life-long learning through story-telling, writing and consulting.

**Source:** MaCoTra Technology Toolkits (2003 – 2012)
MaCoTra (Pvt) Ltd (given the transformations in Exhibit 5) passes ALL the ELEVEN (11) MaCoTra test parameters since:

i. I confirmed my Core Values;

ii. my personal Core Values are the MaCoTra (Pvt) Ltd Core Values;

iii. the MaCoTra (Pvt) Ltd Core Values have been described as have been my personal Core Values;

iv. each of the MaCoTra (Pvt) Ltd Core Values is used only once – EITHER in the Destiny, OR the Cause, OR the Calling;

v. no MaCoTra (Pvt) Ltd Core Value has been changed in crafting EITHER the Destiny, OR Cause, OR Calling;

vi. the MaCoTra (Pvt) Ltd Destiny, Cause and Calling flow with descriptors replacing Core Values:
   - i. DESTINY TEST passed: to evolve the human spirit in “creating sacred environments for entities to change one person at a time”.
   - ii. CAUSE TEST passed: to nurture “engagement in continuous self-renewal”.
   - iii. CALLING TEST passed: to LIVE a “serial reciprocity bequest” of “inviting the soul to work” through “collaborative enhancement of capacity and capability”;

vii. each of the statements reflecting the MaCoTra (Pvt) Ltd Destiny, OR Cause, OR Calling is not more than eight (8) words;

viii. the MaCoTra (Pvt) Ltd Destiny, Cause and Calling read as one statement:
   - i. to evolve the human spirit in transformation, nurture lifelong learning and LIVE a legacy of inspiration through contribution;

ix. the MaCoTra (Pvt) Ltd Calling, Cause and Destiny read as one statement:
   - i. to LIVE a legacy of inspiration through contribution, nurture lifelong learning and evolve the human spirit in transformation;

x. the MaCoTra (Pvt) Ltd Destiny may be converted to a MaCoTra Vision statement:
   - i. to evolve the human spirit in transformation;

xi. the MaCoTra (Pvt) Ltd Cause and Calling may be combined to become a MaCoTra Mission statement:
   - i. to nurture lifelong learning and LIVE a legacy of inspiration through contribution.

My argument is that if any one of the parameters is not satisfied, the values description and/or crafting of the Destiny, Cause and Calling need further elaboration. I invite you to apply the MaCoTra test parameters at personal level and in your team/family/organisation.

Have a fulfilling life in values-based collaborative enhancement of capacity and capability!

I am!!

The fruits from my Seven-Chorus-Book-Chain have been reconfigured into articles for the UZ institutional repository in 2014 as part of my academic contribution to current and future generations. Every reader of any one of these articles is encouraged to access the remainder so that they gain complete insights from the Seven-Chorus-Article-Chain.
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