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Abstract

The researcher was appointed into the position of General Manager within the Clothing and General Merchandise Supply Chain in a large retail organisation as part of a transformation strategy to turn around a business unit which had historically been delivering substandard performance and had led to significant impacts on organisational performance.

Despite the organisation having a number of mechanisms in place to assist line managers to manage the life cycle of an employee during their employment, the performance measures as well as selection of a talent pipeline were measured against the framework of an underperforming environment. Competence was therefore benchmarked on overrated performance against underrated goals which led to ineffective performance and no validity in talent identification.

Critical Realism was chosen as an ontological philosophy. Data was generated through four research cycles and processed through grounded theory meta-synthesis methodology. Four core variables emerged from the research: *Identification of inherent DNA required for talent succession development, Quality of leadership, Effectiveness of a performance plan and Leading with heart*. The driving variable within the balancing loop identified in the causal mechanism was *Quality of leadership* which is the initial point of influence in the system, and sets off a chain of cause and effect interactions between all the other variables, resulting in either a positive or negative stabilization within this system.

This research suggests interventions and mechanisms to improve performance while simultaneously developing a future fit workforce who have the ability to focus on a number of moving parts at the same time. Efficiency is created through their competence in ensuring outstanding operational performance, the engagement and effective management of staff as well as the ability to handle constant change, complexity and uncertainty.

The theory built, as well as the proposed interventions and mechanisms were tested and modified within the environment and delivered significant business results. The results achieved as a result of the implementation of the theory, are therefore concrete evidence of relevance, validity and utility.

Contributions to practice, theory and research are discussed in this closing chapter of this dissertation.
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Chapter 1: Background to research, situational context and concern

This chapter sets the background to the research undertaken, and explores the organisational setting in which the situation and concern are embedded. It contextualizes the environment within Stafford Beer’s (Walker 1998) Viable Systems Model (VSM) and provides a link between organisational roles embedded in the situation, and the VSM, within Jaques and Clement (1994) theory of levels of work and Hoebeke’s (1994) process levels. Organisational talent management is also discussed in relation to the concern, and relevance is established through both empirical and theoretical perspectives. Although this chapter initially focuses on Supply Chain concerns, it is done in order to contextualise the impact of the failure of the system to achieve operational excellence and people growth, and why management development is a compelling concern. This chapter culminates in research goals being articulated and the formulation of a research question.

1.1 Organisational Context

The organisation is a JSE listed South African based large retail group which services over 400 stores in South Africa. The company extends through Africa into the Middle East as well as into Australia, and at the time of the research was the largest retailer in the Southern Hemisphere.

The organisation prides itself on consistently high quality merchandise at affordable prices and their range includes women’s, men’s and children’s wear, accessories, footwear and beauty products.
Multiple supply chains exist within this organisation to move goods from suppliers to stores for different product offerings, and these supply chains are responsible for managing the flow of products through the distribution centers from origin to stores, 24 hours a day, seven days a week.

The environment in a fashion focused supply chain is driven by a number of factors, principal amongst which is volume volatility which is dictated by allocations created through customer demand. Supply Chain efficiency has long been recognized as being critical to building an organisations competitive advantage, and there is a fine balance to achieve between factors such as speed to market, availability (ie getting the right product to the right store in the appropriate size curves in time for the sale) and cost management within this volatile market.

The service we provide to our stakeholders, who include head office planners, product groups, supply chain managers and stores, needs to be perceived as not only consistently reliable, but also continuously surpassing of expectations, and we need to enable their value chains through delivering and creating value for them. This can only be achieved through a culture which strives for excellence and delivers operational performance in line with these expectations.

At the time of the research, I was the General Manager of the Clothing & General Merchandise Supply Chain within the organisation. My portfolio was a national one which included being responsible for 7 facilities across 4 cities, and employing almost 800 staff members around the country.

1.2 Viable Systems Model

Stafford Beer’s (Walker 1998) Viable Systems Model (VSM) is used in order to contextualize the interacting parts within the environment within the Clothing & General Merchandise Supply Chain. The VSM views the organisation as a whole system consisting of factors which are inextricably linked to each other with degrees of complexity.

Based on a cybernetic approach of dividing an organisational system into a similar functioning as that of the human body viz body, brain and environment, it is a recursive model, composed of smaller VSM’s which are embedded in a larger viable system. Beers identified three continuously interacting parts within the VSM. The first two are in the organisation and consist of the operations, which do the primary functions, as well as the metasystem which provides a service to the operations and ensures that they work together in an integrated way. The third interacting part is the environment within which the systems in the organisation are embedded. The
metasystem design needs to be balanced to the conditions of the operation, and as the operation adapts to changes in the environment, the metasystem too has to adapt to be in balance.

Within the Operations, which from a cybernic view can be likened to the human body’s muscles and organs, the right conditions need to be created for all the operational units to function optimally and with autonomy. They should have the ability to resolve conflicts and create synergy in the system by working together effectively as parts of the whole system. The Metasystem, equated with the brain’s and nervous system of the body, has the role of ensuring stability, optimisation, future planning and adaptation to environmental changes within the boundaries of policy and procedures. It receives information both from the internal and external environments, and needs to create balance between the two.

These three elements are further sub divided into five interacting systems within the Operation and the Metasystem, which is displayed in the below diagram and followed by a description:

**Figure 1**: Research context depicted as a VSM

![Research context depicted as a VSM](Image)

Source: Adapted from VSM model depicted in Walker (1998)
Operation:

System 1 – These are the operational systems which do the basic work and primary activities and are made up of all the interacting operational units within the organisation. Various levels of recursion occur within the Operation, which is comprised of smaller VSM’s, and which in itself is embedded in a larger VSM. Each of these units need to be autonomous and exhibit all five features of a VSM.

Within my environment, System 1 functions are performed by Level 1 and 2 employees, consisting of both staff level and first line management within the framework of Jaques and Clement (1994) levels of work. System1 includes activities such as the receipt of inbound stock from suppliers, inventory management as well as the picking and dispatching of stock to stores.

Due to the inability of System 1 to cope with demands from Head Office, and meet operational targets, allocations of orders to be picked for stores have had to be suspended three times in prior years in order to allow them time to catch up. The ripple effect of not being able to get stock out meant the distribution centre within the Clothing & General Merchandise Supply Chain had to be shut down seven times for inbound stock receipts due to capacity constraints. This impacted the ability of the organisation to do stock replenishment designed to drive sales.

Not only was the time taken to process orders significantly delayed, the accuracy of stock sent to stores was compromised with error rates of up to 3% against a target of 1.5%. Despite this target being relaxed to 2.5% in subsequent years due to the inability of System 1 to achieve it, the new target was not achieved either.

Figure 2: Accuracy of stock sent to stores

The operational units need to work as an integrated part of the whole, and based on this should be autonomous and free from interference unless there is deterioration in performance, which is currently visible from both a measurement and empirical level.
• Metasystem:

System 2 is the function of the middle management Level 3 (Jaques and Clement, 1994) Operations Managers. These Operations Managers are responsible for interacting with the internal environment, dealing with problems, ensuring coordination, conflict resolution and stability within the interacting parts of the operational units in System 1.

The operational activities which the Operations Managers control have a direct impact on costs and despite total volume growth between 2011 and 2012 being 14%, the benefits from economy of scale were not felt as it only translated into a 1% benefit on the cost per unit processed. This was, in part, driven by decline in productivity coupled with a 7% increase in labour cost, against the 2011 South African annual inflation rate of 5.01% (www.inflation.eu)

Figure 3 : Costs versus volumes and productivity

The slow and inaccurate service delivery coupled with a lack of achievement of financial and operational performance indicators have a profound impact on stakeholders. This results in sales losses as a consequence of stock missing seasonal launches and promotions, late into store deliveries, lower margins and higher costs as a result of supply chain inefficiencies.

Senior Operations managers at Level 3 (Jaques and Clement, 1994) are responsible for System 3, and their function is to interact with the internal environment ensuring internal regulation, synergy and optimisation between the operational units in System 1.

System 3 monitors the operational units and maintains internal stability and allocates resources to the units in System 1, which need to demonstrate the appropriate use of resources allocated in order to justify the continuation of resource allocation by System 3. It needs the operational units to be accountable for performance and regulates System 1’s optimisation ensuring that they work efficiently as a whole.
If System 1 does not perform optimally, System 3 must have the ability to intervene if there is a threat to viability.

Staff satisfaction levels, measured through the organisational employee engagement survey which assesses perceptions regarding leadership, culture and employee engagement, is consistently below the organisational target of 70%, indicating that below standard individual and team performance have resulted in a demoralized culture with high service level failures and customer dissatisfaction.

**Figure 4 : Staff satisfaction levels**

This lack of synergy between Systems 1, 2 and 3 further manifests itself through the non-achievement of financial targets. This is measured at the highest level, as the cost per unit, and at a sub level as a labour cost per unit, which equates to around 40 percent of total cost.

**Figure 5 : Financial targets**

Operational and other indicators are consolidated and measured for audit purposes. Despite targets being reduced, these remain below the required target achievement of a minimum of 75% of all indicators being achieved.
Observations and interactions with the management team reveal that there is limited understanding of causality between any actions, an absence of knowledge regarding cost drivers, employee management, or an understanding and ownership of the areas which they are responsible for. Operational excellence is therefore impacted as resources for System 1 are continuously increased in an effort to correct, with no return on investment, and visible value erosion.

Managers in both Systems 2 and 3, which function at Level 3 (Jaques and Clement, 1994) have all been internal promotions, placed into their positions after having been identified as talent. They do not however operate effectively, exhibit the ability to link cause and effect, are not adding current value or display strategic thinking abilities in order to add future value. The culture which exists is therefore not one which strives for excellence.

My role within the environment is that of System 4, operating at Level 4 (Jaques and Clement, 1994), which scans the external environment looking for threats and opportunities and needs to ensure that plans are made in order to adapt and ensure long term viability.

System 4’s focus is on future planning and strategy and ensuring survival to a changing environment. It needs to balance information received from both the external environment and the internal environment (as received from System 3) and ensure plans are made to adapt to changes required. As information received from lower systems is not at the required standard, the ability of System 4 to perform optimally is compromised.

System 5 is located in the organisation’s Head Office and establishes the ground rules through policy and procedure. System 5 is the ultimate control and ultimate authority. It oversees the processes and only interferes to ensure compliance to rules and to ensure that the whole system is pulling in the same direction.
Theoretically, the metasystem is meant to provide a service to the System 1 operational units ensuring they work together in a cohesive integrated and efficient manner. It holds the whole system together and is divided into an internal eye which focuses on getting the operational units work optimally in Systems 2 & 3, and the external eye in Systems 4 & 5 which ensure threats and opportunities are considered in adaptation to a changing environment. System 4 is the conduit between the internal and external environment, receiving information from both.

Practically however, both System 2 and 3 are not operating optimally which often results in System 4 having to interfere in System 1’s management process as operational units work in isolation, and deliver inferior performance in a non-cost effective manner. The desired balance between the metasystem and the operation is compromised by the operational system’s inability to be able to adapt to metasystem requirements.

The design is therefore heavily dictated by the operation failing to adequately respond not only to changes, but to deliver basic requirements, impacting the metasystems ability to ensure plans are made to adapt to the external environment’s requirements.
1.3 Research Context

The below rich picture below, together with the description provided, presents an overview of the research context.

Figure 7 : Rich picture of research context

The supply chain has a critical role to play in terms of managing both inbound and outbound flow of stock for allocation to stores. The current inability of the distribution centre to be able to process the daily stock picking requirements from Head Office, and the management of this flow, impacts the ability of suppliers to deliver fresh stock into the warehouse due to capacity being reached as the old stock needs to be dispatched in order to make space.

As the majority of managers have been promoted into their positions from lower System levels, the lack of competent performance and skill level displayed suggests that the correct people have not been placed into the organisational talent pipeline.

The ripple effect is seen in the delay of delivering the correct stock to stores at the required time as well as the costs to operate, as significant costs are incurred as a result of unproductive staff
and overtime payments. As a result of the decrease in sales and the increase in costs, both revenue and profit are impacted.

The research context depicted in this rich picture reflects the compelling rationale for this research and the implication for both the individual and on organisational sustainability and viability, if this is not attended to.

### 1.4 Levels of work

Within the viable systems model discussed above, organisational roles are graded according to the level of work required, with expectations of defined outputs, competencies, abilities, and skills for each role. Based on Jaques and Clement (1994) theory of levels of work, these align broad categories of jobs into their correct levels of work and form the basis for benchmarking remuneration, career and succession planning, and career paths linked to the organisation framework. These levels of work range from Levels 1 to 8, with lowest graded staff level roles placed in Level 1 and the highest in Level 8, which refers to the executive employees at Board Level.

Jaques and Clement (1994) found that roles in an organisation could be categorized according to the maximum complexity of tasks (complexity of data and variables involved with the completion of the task) which had to be performed within that function and identified 8 levels or strata which relate to the maximum time-span and complexity (and therefore increased cognitive abilities, decision making, accountabilities and responsibilities) which are required at each level within an organisation. They also included a “time span of discretion” in each role, which relates to the maximum time which had been allocated to planning and task completion.

These levels create layers of accountability and skill with increasing degrees of complexity (Jaques, E., 1990) and are needed to ensure work is done at the correct level in order to ensure high performance (Shepard, K., & Fowke, D. 2001) which leads to improvement in organisation results (Cason, K., 1997).

Within these levels, Jaques and Clement (1994) identified four orders of information complexity (the quantity and quality of data to be processed) which further contain four levels of cognitive processes and four levels of task complexities. Although these levels are repeated within each information category, they become more complex as individuals move from one information complexity category to the next and the complexity level of each category is also equal to the most complex task which has to be performed.
When viewed against this framework, my direct managers fall into level 3 which has a timespan of 1 – 2 years, an information complexity of Level B (Second order complexity: First level abstraction of verbal variables) and a Task complexity of 3 (alternative serial plans), as reflected below.

**Figure 8 : Timespans of decision making**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level (Stratum)</th>
<th>Time Span</th>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Complexity of task (Information complexity A-D / Task complexity 1-4)</th>
<th>Contribution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 day – 3 months</td>
<td>Staff level Admin/ Clerical</td>
<td>B-1</td>
<td>Service – adding value for the present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3 – 12 months</td>
<td>First Line Managers:</td>
<td>B-2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1 – 2 years</td>
<td>Finance Mgr Operations Mgr I Site Services Mgr II</td>
<td>B-3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2 – 5 years</td>
<td>General Manager Director</td>
<td>B-4</td>
<td>Adding value for the future</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5 – 10 years</td>
<td>Managing Director</td>
<td>C-1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>10 – 20 years</td>
<td>CEO</td>
<td>C-2</td>
<td>Values</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>20 - 50 years</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>C-3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>50 years +</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>C-4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Adapted from Jaques & Clement, 1994)

Although there are differences in both information and task complexity between the levels which represent middle (level 3) and senior management (level 4) roles, the value contribution significantly shifts. While Levels 1 - 3 are about adding value for the present, the step up at level 4 starts moving into adding value for the future.

The information complexity, cognitive processes and task complexities are presented below.
**Figure 9**: Task and information complexities – Level 3 and 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Time Span</th>
<th>Stratum of Role</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>COGNITIVE PROCESS</th>
<th>TASK COMPLEXITY</th>
<th>Value Contribution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Operations Manager W4</td>
<td>1-2 years</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Variables are handled by grouping together in categories in order to handle multiple items with ease. Deals in verbal terms without having to point to specific concrete things</td>
<td>Reasons by putting information together in linear serial form in some logical sequence (e.g., a progressive story or algorithm, or logic/decision tree) as a cause and effect series of events connected through time leading to envisaged consequences, and possibly to predicted future courses of events</td>
<td>Mutually interactive programs</td>
<td>Service - Adding value for the present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Manager W2</td>
<td>2-5 years</td>
<td>IV</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Second Order Complexity (first level abstraction of verbal variables)</td>
<td>Reasons by organising information into a number of separate serial processes, and then deals with the information in each of those processes in parallel with each other, making relationships between the processes themselves as found relevant; that is to say, showing how the processes impact upon each other</td>
<td>Situational response</td>
<td>Adding value for the future</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Adapted from Jaques & Clement, 1994*

Hoebeke (1994) building on Jaques & Clements (1994) theory of levels of work, separated work systems into overlapping time domains and levels of work called process levels, which he defined as those “whose output creates conditions for one of a lower order” (Hoebeke, L., p. 7. 1994). The operationally orientated added-value time domain (which spans periods between 1 day and 2 years, and in which processes are characterized by throughput time, volume, quality and price requirements) can be associated with Levels 1 - 3 of Jaques and Clement (1994) theory of levels of work, and the strategically orientated innovation domain (which spans periods between 1 and
10 years and in which processes are characterized by desirability, feasibility, transferability and systemicity) to Jacques and Clements (1994) levels 4 and 5.

Figure 10: S Curves of Management Development integrated with Jaques and Clement (1994) theory of levels of work

The S curves on the Nature of Management Development reflected above integrate both theories and identify the development gap between levels 3 and 4, and the jump required to move from operational to strategic management.

1.5 Organisational Talent management

The human resource department within the organisation provides management with an employee lifecycle framework which is designed to measure and improve performance, build skill level, ensure talent management and assist line managers to manage employee performance and development during their employment. The promotion of individuals through the levels of work as described above, is an outcome of the application of this framework, the detail of which can be seen in Appendix A.

Within this framework, performance planning is done relating to the annual expectation of outputs for an employee, and is a performance contract between the organisation and the employee for the year ahead which translates the organisational strategy into the business unit strategy. This is then cascaded into employee goals, based on their specific roles in order to enable
achievement of the overriding strategy. Employees are rated against goals in this performance contract and allocated placement positions in a nine box talent framework, as reflected below.

Figure 11: Talent Placement Grid

The succession management identification block ‘A’, is where high potential employees are placed for visibility in order to create a selection for a talent aimed at ensuring a supply of future leaders and possible succession candidates. It is in essence our talent pipeline, and is the pool from which level 3 operational management is selected for promotion into level 4 strategic management.

While managers are given a clear sense regarding a future role which they are expected to fulfill, they are faced with increasing complexity and uncertainty which arises as they attempt to navigate their way. The pipeline also implies that there is one, and only one, path from where the manager is, to where they need to journey to in their development; and that this path is linear. This easily gives rise to the assumption that a linear causality understanding can, and will, allow the manager to achieve successful development. What is not acknowledged is that within a context characterised by complexity, the principles of multi-finality and equifinality (Cicchetti, D., Rogosch, F.A. 1996) are alive. Multi-finality raises the possibility that starting from the same point, and following the same path, managers can arrive at different end points in their developmental
journey, only some of which may represent success. Equifinality raises that even when starting from varied points and even when following different paths, managers can arrive at the same end point – in this case the desired successful developmental jump of the S curve.

Cappelli, P. (2008) defines talent management as nothing more than the execution of a plan for forecasted human capital. This is a compelling argument as it will ensure that the organisation is able to draw from a ready developed pool of suitable candidates as the demand arises (Garrow, V., Hirsh, W., 2008) and gives them the ability to put the right people in the right positions at the right time (Ready, D.A., Conger, J.A., 2007). This is of particular relevance when viewed against the framework of Jaques and Clement (1994), as the organisation has a corporate responsibility to not only ensure that all employees are sufficiently developed to perform optimally in their current levels of work, but that they have a readily available “bubbling under” talent pipeline which has been suitably developed on competencies required for the next level, in order to ensure sustainability of performance as they are promoted between the S curves of management development.

Because we do not fully understand the differences in competencies between the various levels, or the depth and breadth of similar ones from a complexity level, we are not adequately dealing with employee development or the creation of future value. It is critical that competencies at each level need to be clarified and articulated to individuals in order to create clear expectations of performance and behaviours required (De Meuse, K.P., Dai, F., Wu, J., 2011) because promoting people between these levels without fully considering the implications on competencies required to adapt at the new level leads to tension (McMorland, J. 2005). This is visible at both measurement and empirical levels in Systems 1, 2 and 3 in the VSM.

As people move up the levels in an organisation, both the competencies required to fulfill the role as well as the importance of these competencies increase and become more specific, and managers need to acquire new skills in order to be effective (Dai, Tang & De Meuse, 2011). In addition the promotional shift from the level where the focus is only on maintaining performance, to including finding new ways of building for the future is the most problematic (McMorland, J. 2005). These individuals need to learn that from a continuity perspective, roles at higher levels of work require the skills which have been acquired during the time spent in lower levels, but simultaneously from a discontinuity perspective they need to let go of some of those skills in order to be effective (De Meuse, K.P., Dai, F., Wu, J., 2011).

Cohn, J.M., Khurana, R., and Reeves, L., (2005), argue that while many managers view talent management as a human resource function, it is only when it is a priority at all levels, and line
managers participate and take accountability and responsibility for talent development in the organisation that it is effective (Stahl et al, 2012).

It is within this framework that the identification of which competencies are required, need to be evaluated and understood in order to create a sustainable talent pipeline as there is a “disturbing lack of clarity regarding the definition, scope and overall goals of talent management” (Lewis & Heckman, 2006, p. 139). To enable value creation not only for the present, but also for the future, it is critical that the correct competencies are in place to enable a high performance culture and a sustainable talent pipeline.

Talent management needs to be applied, irrespective of the level of work, throughout the organisation to prevent demoralization and to ensure organisational performance by all of it’s workforce (Guthridge, M., Komm, A. B., Lawson, E., 2008).

1.6 Concern: Failure of the system to achieve operational excellence and people growth

Despite the organisation having, what appears in theory to be an effective program in place to develop skills and manage talent, the performance, behaviours and skills from my management team are not congruent with either a highly functioning team, or the organisational values.

This is visible through the non-achievement of key output measures such as the accuracy of stock which is sent to stores and service levels required, both of which are continually below target.

The majority of managers in my business unit have been promoted into their positions internally through placement into succession management identification placement in the above mentioned grid. Based on performance, observations and interactions however, there is little empirical evidence to suggest that the correct people have been placed into the talent pipeline, or that they have been selected on the correct competencies as they have been promoted through the system levels in the VSM. As a result, the jump from the operational to the strategic S curve of Management Development which is required in order to perform adequately at a senior level, has also been compromised.

Further empirical observations obtained during the investigation and reviewing of procedures followed internally which contribute the phenomenon include:
• Recruiting context

New recruits are interviewed and selected by line managers who are limited by their own skill and competence level and whose selection criteria is positioned within the framework of an underperforming environment. If the interviewer’s own skills have not been developed sufficiently within their roles, and if they are not from a culture which strives for excellence, they do not have the frame of reference in order to critically evaluate the attributes required to support a high performing environment. They are only able to evaluate the answers given by the candidates against their own standards, abilities and current performance, which are not congruent with supporting an environment which demands excellence, and therefore the appointment of candidates measured against this framework continues to dilute the skill level required to shift the environmental performance.

• Performance context

Line managers set performance objectives which are based on goals which have softened over time, and do not include stretched targets or developmental competencies into these objectives. The goals allocated yearly are therefore not reflective of the performance required and result in a lower than required base goal which needs to be achieved, year on year.

Line managers award higher ratings in performance reviews than should be allocated against an already reduced goal. This results in the inability to have a robust conversation or to include specific developmental requirements. The flow of ratings from the annual review into the talent framework is therefore compromised if the placement into the talent grid is as a result of an employee being overrated against an underrated performance, which negatively impacts the viability of the talent pipeline.

• Talent pipeline context

Employees are placed into the talent pipeline based on their ability to perform operationally despite empirical evidence that they are missing a large amount of attributes needed to make a successful promotional transition between System levels in the VSM. This emerged during the first research cycle where constructs regarding competencies required at a middle management were elicited, and a key research finding emerged where the talent placement of level 3 managers was largely determined by operational performance of the individual. Placement of employees into the talent pipeline is therefore subjective according to the line managers ability to be able to
maintain high standards, set stretched goals, critically evaluate performance, and view an entire skill set (and not just operational achievement) when doing so.

- Development context

Line management do not take ownership of the employees development and do not follow up on application of learning as a result of training provided in order to ensure a return on investment. Most line managers are not familiar with the course content or the signs of improvement which are required to be visible, and ongoing, as measures of success, and therefore much is lost in translation for the majority of the candidates, as these skills are not maintained.

Attendance on training is often not enough to ensure that the individual is able to discerningly select appropriate skills and translate them into reality and apply the framing of this within their own leadership styles, and the return to the workplace gradually dilutes any skills learnt as they adapt to the environmental influence again.

As a result of the above phenomenon, development is not targeted against actual competencies required because the employee is not being measured, rated or appraised correctly, and we are not closing the development gap between levels of work or between the operational and strategic levels on the management development S curves.

- Culture context

Behaviours of both management and staff are not aligned with a performance driven culture or the organisational values. There is little regard for rules, regulations, policy or procedure and disciplinary action is seldom applied for transgressions.

1.7 Research Goals

The effectiveness of the development of individuals placed into the talent pipeline and the subsequent management of talent has a direct bearing on the outputs and service delivery required to achieve operational excellence. In order to develop a future fit workforce, which is critical to organisational sustainability and competitive advantage, it is essential that competency gaps addressed in the work environment are specific to the individual and developed to support the intent. Development must enable the jump from the operational to strategic S curve, and
viewed in conjunction with Jaques and Clement (1994) levels of work, ensure that they are not only able to add value for the present, but also to add value for the future.

The lack of targeted development as well as the promotion of middle managers into senior management positions without developing the correct competencies has over time led to the attrition of requirements in terms of what is expected from both candidates who are being identified as being high performers and put into the talent pipeline, as well as line management performance.

The long term consequence is that over time because of the promotion of these individuals, there are a growing number of managers who have been promoted between levels of work and between the operational to strategic S curve of Management Development, and who are unprepared for the required performance outputs at their new level. While the environment evolves, these managers are not able to display emergent properties, transcend the changes, move beyond their previous skill level or make a significant contribution to the development of the people they are meant to lead and mentor. The result is that our ability to create a talent pipeline which enables the transition between levels of work and jump from the operational to strategic S curve of Management Development is compromised.

It is therefore critical to determine points of influence, proposed interventions and mechanisms which need to be put in place to enable a successful transition across the S curves, which lead to a future fit talent pipeline.

While the intellectual goal of this research is to identify the underlying causal mechanism for talent pipeline creation through understanding the drivers and constraints of the ability to jump across the operational S curve of management development from Level 3, and into the strategic S curve at Level 4, within the framework of Jaques and Clement (1994), the practical aim is to understand what competencies need to be developed to facilitate this in a way which will ensure viability of performance as individuals are promoted, and lead to a valid talent pipeline.

Through developing theory which is based on practice based evidence and grounded in data, this research will therefore enable the identification of the underlying causal mechanism for talent pipeline creation and the context in which it is embedded, and determine points of influence, proposed interventions and mechanisms which need to be put in place, as it is only through the identification and understanding of the variable factors within an interconnected system that pattern interruption can be done in order to influence the outcome of a phenomenon.
1.8 Research Question

While the human resource provide a development framework based on a linear multi-finality principle, the identification of talent is largely determined on the ability to perform operationally, and the equifinality principle is not considered. The identification of specific and individual competencies for each employee to enable a leap on the S curve of management development, is not dealt with as line managers do not fully understand the competencies required. Line managers also do not take ownership of their staff’s development.

In order to gather data to discover the answers to resolve these concerns, four research cycles were undertaken.

The first two cycles involved answering the question “Which competencies do we need to develop in order to create a pipeline of middle/senior managers who are able to ensure viability of performance during times of complexity and uncertainty and deliver sustainable performance as they are developed and promoted to senior management?” The aim was to uncover which leadership competencies were perceived as critical indicators of effective performance at both middle and senior management levels by the levels above them. These two cycles were combined in order to compare and identify differences between the levels.

As value creation within the framework of Jaques and Clement (1994) significantly shifted from adding value for the present at level 3 to adding value for the future at level 4, the third cycle sought to answer the following question “Does the mode of behaviour in which managers operate affect their ability to create future value?” It involved gathering data to identify and understand the relationship between strategic and operational behaviour in order to identify the causal mechanism for value creation.

In the fourth cycle, the learnings were applied in the form of a case study to identify principles for development within both the levels of work and the S curves on management development, and to test the theory built, and the question asked was “What principles need to be followed, and what needs to be in place in order to facilitate the jump on the development curve and develop missing competencies at a middle management level in order to create a sustainable talent pipeline at senior management level?”

In order to focus on individual and targeted development which is based on an equifinality principle, and which will enable the creation of a valid talent pipeline, the research question to be answered is:
What is the core driver that will enable a future fit practice-based talent pipeline of managers who are able to jump between the operational and strategic S curve in a way that ensures viability of performance during times of complexity and uncertainty, and do so in a way that is self-sustaining and delivers improved business results?

1.9 Structure of the dissertation

This research report is written up in 6 chapters, an overview of each chapter is provided below. For ease of reference, a diagrammatic flow chart depicting the below is included at the start of each chapter.

Chapter 1 describes the background to the research, the situational context, explores the concern, the research objective, and defines the research question.

Chapter 2 details the research methodology used in each of the research cycles, as well as the various stages of the qualitative meta-synthesis (concept formation, development, modification and integration). Core variables are identified during this process, a causal mechanism is built and an archetype identified.

Chapter 3 discusses the research results of each of the research cycles, and the process followed in identifying core variables and building a final theory using grounded theory meta-synthesis as a data analysis methodology.

Chapter 4 reviews three levels of literature, the first being Human Capital Development, the second, Management Develop and then finally at the third level, all of the core variables identified during this research. This is done to review existing theories in order to add richness and validity to the theory, or identify key differences.

Chapter 5 examines six contexts within the environment where the situation is embedded, and proposes interventions and mechanisms within each of these contexts, with the aim to create a predetermined desired outcome which addresses the concern and answers the research question. It further links research results to systemic performance management and discusses the research findings in relation to the core variables identified, and in relation to the interventions and mechanisms proposed in the contexts.
**Chapter 6** discusses contributions to theory and further research, as well as ethical considerations within the framework of Velasquez et al (1996).

### 1.10 Conclusion

This chapter has, together with personal, intellectual and practical goals, provided an overview of the research context and detailed the complex and messy situation, and resulting concern, which paints the context for the research undertaken as well as the relevance to the environment within which I operate.

The aim of the research is to assist me to transform my business unit into a highly functioning and performance driven culture within which the development and selection of talent is encouraged and is relevant to the creation of a future fit workforce.

The following chapter will describe the research methodology used in order to develop a theory which is grounded in data in order to adequately provide an answer to the research question.
Chapter 2: Research Methodology

2.1 Introduction

The previous chapter described the research situation, and goal which is to identify and understand the underlying causal mechanisms in order to resolve the concern regarding the creation of a talent pipeline. Relevance was established through both empirical and theoretical perspectives which led to a strong integration between the research goals, conceptual framework and the research question.

This chapter details the methodology used to establish the research framework. It not only discusses the reasons for the methodology selected, but also the application of it through a research process which will be used to develop the theory. The combination of critical realism ontology and grounded theory as an epistemology, are discussed in relation to their suitability in achieving the goals of the research. The choice of this research methodology enables the framing of my worldview, from the German term Weltanschauung, in which different perspectives of reality and of the social world are considered from multiple perspectives.

Systemic thinking ideas are incorporated into the research design in order to understand multiple causality and deal with the complexity which is created by processes, patterns and relationships which interact with each other to create a phenomenon. The final theory is developed through grounded theory meta-synthesis of data collected during research cycles.
2.2 Quantitative vs Qualitative research

Quantitative research seeks to confirm a hypothesis and relies on a largely inflexible style of gathering data through the use of methods such as questionnaires, and does not encourage emergence and the building of new theory which is context bound. Conversely, qualitative research seeks answers to a question through using a predefined set of procedures, and collects evidence and produces findings that were not determined in advance.

In qualitative research, knowledge is gained through a deep understanding of the phenomenon from the perspectives of the local population it involves and is effective in obtaining culturally specific information about the values, opinions, behaviours, and social contexts of particular populations (Mack et al, 2010, p.1). Researchers interact with the study subjects to obtain data. The exploratory nature of qualitative research and sense making of unstructured data guides the understanding of the phenomenon under review, and is therefore ideally suited to this research.

2.3 Critical Realism

Critical realism postulates that the physical and social worlds exist independently of our knowledge of them and separates the theory of being, or ontology, from the theory of knowledge, or epistemology. Whilst epistemology involves the nature of knowledge (how we know, what we know and why we know things), ontology deals with understanding the causal mechanisms that exist to shape this knowledge. Critical realists retain an ontological realism in that “there is a real world that exists independently of our perceptions, theories, and constructions” (Maxwell & Mittapalli, 2010, p 146) and that “our knowledge of reality is a result of social conditioning and, thus, cannot be understood independently of the social actors involved in the knowledge derivation process” (Dobson 2002). Our reality is therefore independent of our depictions of it; “the reality and the "representation of reality" operating in different domains” (Dobson 2002).

Critical realism therefore proposes a stratified ontology, and accepts that social reality is stratified into three domains: the real level in which the mechanisms, structures and processes which create events are in place, the actual level where observed or unobserved events occur and the empirical level, derived from observations (Critical Realism and Causal Mechanisms. n.d.). In as much as they are separate, they are subsets of each other with the actual being a subset of the real, and the empirical a subset of the actual (Longshore Smith, 2005).
The real level is greater than either of the other two domains, and failure to acknowledge this, results in either empiricism or actualism instead of critical realism (Bates, S.R. 2006). In the real domain, where the causal interactions of the systems at play occur, the result occurs in the actual domain, and the effects of this causality become visible in the empirical domain. The interaction of various features within these domains creates emergence which is able to produce a new phenomenon. This is particularly true in a social world where there are human dependencies, interactions and influence which causally affect the elements, structure, each other and the whole (Sayer, 2000). Critical realism allows the researcher to move between these levels to differentiate between the phenomenon and how it is created while simultaneously identifying the interdependencies which exist, as observation in the empirical and actual domain alone is unlikely to reveal the complexity and causality which exists and enable understanding of the full social world, (Easton, 2010).

The social world can only be changed if the structures which create the phenomenon are recognised and understood. Multiple, changing realities exist and social beings give meaning, and construct reality, based on specific contexts (Hudson & Ozanne 1988). Because meaning is context bound, the phenomenon needs to be examined in its natural setting (Patton, 1980). While prior theory may be considered, the focus on gaining substantive insights into how and why a phenomenon occurs aids in the building of new theory in a specific situation. (Carson et al 2001). “Critical realists argue for a shift from prediction to explanation, the use of abstraction, and reliance on interpretive forms of investigation” (Wikgren 2005 p13), and therefore epistemology is based on the building of models of mechanisms. Causality in the interaction of underlying
systems or structures, which are largely unobservable, create empirical evidence of observable events.

Retroduction within critical realism is used as a method of identifying these unobservable mechanisms, and is an iterative process which seeks to answer the question of what created the event (Easton, 2010). It is a "...mode of inference in which events are explained by postulating (and identifying) mechanisms which are capable of producing them" (Sayer, 1992, p.107) and thus "theoretical explanation proceeds by description of significant features, retroduction to possible causes, elimination of alternatives and identification of the generative mechanism or causal structure at work" (Bhaskar, 1998, p. xvii). As retroduction seeks to make observable mechanisms which exist to create an event, the practical application of retroduction within the layered ontology is to identify the phenomenon through observation at an empirical level, collect data within the actual level where the observed or unobserved events occur, and process this data to explain the mechanisms, structures and processes which create events in the real level.

While it is possible to attempt to create the condition for the observable event, it is the interaction of the unobservable system which creates the actual event, and may lead to unintended consequences if the underlying mechanism is not thoroughly understood. The aim of critical realism is to understand, be able to explain, and influence the underlying mechanism which creates the phenomena, as "the conditions for a phenomena exist intransitively and may therefore exist independently of their appropriate conceptualization" (Bhaskar, 1979 p 51).

It is the underlying systems or structures within the real world of stratified ontology which are physically experienced, and through identifying and understanding these systems or structures the phenomenon can be explained. Bhaskar (1993) later argued that these ideas required a dialectical inclusion which postulates that "wholes gain their identity through their parts, and that parts come into being through wholes" (Roberts, 2014 p20). This can be applied to both the social and natural world (Lewontin & Levins, 2007) as the boundaries between a living organism and the environment in which it exists are not clearly demarcated (Haldane, 1913). The dialectical inclusion recognizes that social objects such as organisations are simultaneously influencing, while being influenced, as individuals coexist and coevolve within this environment.

While social reality is viewed as a socially constructed world, within this world even though individuals fulfill roles within a social structure, these roles ‘pre-exist and are independent of the individual’ within the network of roles that they occupy (Bhaskar, 1979). Accumulation of ideas, beliefs and actions contribute to producing an overall social context which, while essential to
maintain the social structure, cannot be attributed to single contributions (King, 2001), and social reconstruction can therefore not be reduced to individuals (Bhaskar, 1979).

The combination of qualitative research together with critical realism will enable emergence of new theory through deep understanding and sense making, and identify causality in the interaction of underlying systems. It will enable the researcher to not only understand the current development and the selection of the talent pipeline, both at an actual and empirical level from multiple perspectives, but also to uncover underlying issues which lead to an ineffective talent pipeline. These issues are not always immediately visible, but could have a significant impact in the real level, and become visible in the other two levels.

2.4 Systems thinking

Systems thinking has already incorporated the fundamentals of the critical realism philosophy and the core ideology is that there is a dependency on the structure of relationships between factors rather than the properties of the factors themselves. The interaction of these relationships causes emergence, stratification and boundaries which can stretch to indefinite levels as they produce reactions within each interdependent system (Mingers, 2010).

Senge (1990) describes systems thinking as the fifth discipline which integrates four other disciplines namely personal mastery, mental models, shared vision and team learning, in a “coherent body of theory and practice” and signals a shift from seeing parts of a system, to seeing a whole system in order to shape the future rather than reacting to the past.

The first discipline, personal mastery, is embodied by a strong sense of purpose, and supported by a process of continual leaning. Although it is grounded in competence and skill, it is attained through staying focused on what is important, and learning to see current reality in order to make the necessary adjustments, in order to achieve the goal set.

The second discipline, mental models describe the existence of preconceived beliefs which lead to assumptions regarding how reality is constructed. Leaps of abstraction in linear thought processes provide opinions, which are based on belief systems shaped by past experiences, and applied to empirical observations as fact. They therefore have the ability to undermine the fundamentals of systems thinking and discourage emergence. This is best illustrated through the ladder of inference (based on Argyris and illustrated by Senge et al 1994) which reflects the thinking process from data selected at an empirical level to action taken. The illustration below
reflects the abstraction process as it moves through the three levels of stratified ontology in critical realism.

Figure 13: Ladder of inference

As the nature of critical realism seeks to understand causality in the real domain, the application of systemic thinking in conjunction with grounded theory ensure validity in the theory built, as any personal meanings, assumptions and beliefs which individuals tend to attach to empirical data is avoided. Data is collected from an empirical level at the lower rung of the ladder of abstraction, taking multiple perspectives into consideration and abstracted without the reflective loop which serves to only select data which supports individual beliefs.

The third discipline, building a shared vision, is important to ensure that people are pulling together in the same direction, and have a common sense of purpose. It provides the strategy map against which to work towards, and links current reality with what is needed to achieve this vision. The integration with systems thinking enables the understanding of how reality has been created and what is required in order to shape the future.

Team learning, the fourth discipline, builds both on personal mastery and having a shared vision, as it encompasses aligning individual efforts into a common sense of purpose. It requires the need to think insightfully about complex issues and how our assumptions are challenged by the mental models which we apply. It involves coordinating action between individuals in a manner which complements each member’s contribution. The tools used from a systems thinking perspective enable the ability to deal with the complexity created by multiple teams, or actions, which have interrelated and interdependent relationships.

Systems thinking goes beyond looking at individual events, which have multiple levels of valid explanations, but rather at the underlying mechanisms which exist in order to create the pattern
of behaviour over time (Senge 1990). It therefore focusses on interrelationships and observing changes in processes and patterns rather than a linear viewpoint.

While the qualitative approach of critical realism enables emergence of new theory, the application of systems thinking within this research will enable seeing the whole system and the interrelated and interdependent relationships which create patterns of behaviour over time, and reveal how reality is constructed in the real domain.

2.5 Action Research

The fundamental issue when looking at symptomatic solutions, is that the cause and effect are not necessarily close in time or space, and could therefore lead to incorrect assumptions regarding the interaction of the underlying mechanism which creates the phenomenon. Solutions put in place could therefore have a positive effect on one part of the system and negatively impact another, either immediately or at a delayed time in future. The result is that more time and energy is devoted on finding solutions to a particular problem, with little recognition to the long term consequence on the system as a whole.

In order to combat this, systems thinkers refer to a principle of ‘leverage’ where interventions can lead to long lasting benefits. While small changes can lead to significant improvements, areas of highest leverage are often not obvious (Senge 1990), and therefore the combination of systems thinking and action research are ideally suited to achieve this goal.

Action research learning (ARL) is where action and reflection occur simultaneously. Dick (as quoted in in Krogh. n.d. p.2) argues “…when one considers the terms action research, action learning and experiential learning it can be determined that all are cyclic; all involve action and reflection on that action; all have learning as one of their goals… action informs reflection and is informed by it. The reflection produces the learning…”

Action research is concerned with emergent theory which occurs as a result of the synthesis of data and it’s use in practice. It can be seen to be ‘developing and elaborating theory from practice’ (Parington, 2002, p. 260). It therefore “goes beyond the notion that theory can inform practice, to a recognition that theory can, and should be generated through practice” (Brydon-Miller et al 2003, p 15).

Critical thinking, systems thinking and action research are incorporated to promote a continuous cycle of action and reflection through the use of the Deming (1994) PDCA (Plan, Do, Check, Act)
cycle where the result of each cycle informs the focus for the next. This provides the link between the abstract world (the real level in critical realism’s stratified ontology) and the concrete world (empirical and actual levels) where sense making, thinking and theory creation are tested and adapted through continuous reflection and learning from reflections, as reflected below.

**Figure 14 : Experiential Learning**

![Experiential Learning Diagram](source)

As action research tests the implementation of knowledge in action, it is more effective in ensuring validity of theory than many other forms of social research (Brydon-Miller et al, 2003)

### 2.6 Grounded Theory

Glaser (1992, p. 16) defined ground theory as “a general methodology of analysis linked with data collection that uses a systematically applied set of methods to generate an inductive theory about a substantive area”. This was further expanded on by Goulding (2006, p. 296) who defined it as an “iterative, inductive and interactional process of data collection, simultaneous analysis, and emergent interpretation” which precedes literature reviews and therefore encourages new theories pertinent to the phenomenon under review.

The most useful application of grounded theory is one where the researcher has an intense interest in an unexplained phenomenon and in which they want to “discover theory from data” (Glaser & Strauss, 1967, p.1) and elicit new understanding about patterns in relationships, and gain understanding of how reality is constructed. The integration of critical realism and grounded theory as ontological and epistemological positions ensure that multiple perspectives are taken into account from the real, actual and empirical levels and that data collected is constantly
compared. This ensures a qualitative research approach which takes into account the social processes which occur to create the phenomenon.

Grounded theory is a qualitative approach which builds theory using empirical data observed in the context of the research through induction, not deduction (Egan, T.M., 2002) and it constructs reality based on specific contexts. It should not only be descriptive, but explanatory, and based on specific conditions be able to give a sense of predictability (Corbin, J., Strauss, A., 1990).

While the purpose of selecting grounded theory as a methodology is to encourage emergence through theory which is grounded in data, critics argue that complete impartiality is not possible. They feel that despite not reviewing literature prior to the commencement of the study, that the researcher already has an existing body of knowledge, and views the world through an already developed lens and mental map, which will influence results.

In addition, novice researchers, in their aim to adhere strictly to the principle of disregarding prior knowledge and allowing categories to emerge from data, often experience researcher fatigue, as the number of categories created are too many to deal with. The quandary for them of not following this principle, is the emergence versus the forcing of data.

Both of these critiques apply an “all or nothing” approach, and Glaser and Strauss acknowledged both of these limitations, and dealt with this criticism by applying a reasonability principle. “Of course, the researcher does not approach reality as a tabula rasa. He must have a perspective that will help him see relevant data and abstract significant categories from his scrutiny of the data” (Glaser & Strauss, 1967, p.3). They coined the term “theoretical sensitivity” to denote the researcher’s ability to "see relevant data", that means to reflect upon empirical data material with the help of theoretical terms. (Kelle, U. 2005)

While grounded theory ensures that the theory developed is grounded in data, the combination with action research ensures that it is also grounded in practice (Parington, 2002).

Stern (1980) lists 5 steps involved in the grounded theory process, beginning with the collection of empirical data, followed by concept formation, development, modification and integration and concluding with the research report.
2.6.1 Data Generation

Data generated during research can originate from a number of sources, or a combination of sources. Grounded theory’s data collection, coding and analyzing of data is “circular, allowing the researcher to change focus and pursue leads revealed by the ongoing data analysis” (Hutchinson, 1986, p. 119). The abstraction process in which data is captured as propositions involves collecting propositions relevant to the research cycle through a chosen data collection method/s, and abstracting the data which is relevant in the smallest form of unit, into a proposition, which consists of a subject (existence) and a predicate (identity).

Data collection during the research cycles leading up to this dissertation was done in a number of ways, and discussed in more detail below:

- Repertory grid interviewing technique

The application of the repertory grid interviewing technique, based on the personal construct theory of Kelly (1995) into grounded theory encourages discovering how actors interpret reality (Suddaby, 2006). It enables a deeper level of thinking than other data collection methods, such as interviewing, as it uncovers constructs with which line managers make sense of their world and develop perceptions of leadership competencies.

The repertory grid is useful in exploring an individual’s cognitive map which reflects their perceptions and the constructs which they use to apply meaning, understanding, and the subsequent management of their world (Easterby-Smith, Lowe & Thorpe, 2002, p. 97) as well as enabling pattern identification, associations, new insights, understanding and sense making (Easterby-Smith, Holman & Thorpe, 1996) and it makes the creation of the mechanism, structure and process visible.

The repertory grid interview is structured to the degree that participants are asked to select six people (referred to in the repertory grid technique, and therefore in this research as ‘elements’) and to base their selection on two top performers, two average performers and two mediocre or unskilled performers. Elements are numbered, and a triading method used to elicit constructs. Triad selection is calculated prior to the interview based on the numbering allocated to each element. With a 6 element selection, a combination of 20 triads is possible however at least two elements need to be changed between triads as eliciting meaningful constructs becomes challenging if successive triads are too similar (Parington, 2002, p. 204).
Although a lack of credible performance at management level is often visible at an empirical level, the application of the repertory grid explores the real level in stratified ontology.

While the repertory grid technique as a data gathering method is helpful in uncovering perceptions and how participants reconstruct reality, a combination of grounded theory with ethnography will further enable data gathering across settings. The combination of the two methodologies will compensate for any shortcomings in either methodology, and encourage greater depth of insight. (Bamkin et al., 2016).

- Ethnography

Ethnography was chosen as a data collection method as it allows the direct observation of a phenomenon, the interpretation and description of these observations in relation to the context of the environment which uncovers meaning using “interpretation, interaction, context, emotion and aesthetic experience” (Parrington, 2002, p. 117), as well as the identification of relationship influences from any cultural or sub cultural (as either enablers or disablers) on the behaviours displayed within these cultures.

Data collection in ethnographic research includes methodologies such as interviews, surveys, documentation and participant and non-participant observations of both verbal and non-verbal constructs, and subsequent reflection of this data gathering is central to ethnographic research (Seale et al, 2007, p. 214).

In ethnographic research, the "ethnographer participates, overtly or covertly, in people’s daily lives for an extended period of time, watching what happens, listening to what is said, asking questions and collecting other relevant data" (Hammersley and Atkinson as quoted in in Punch. 2005. p.150). Punch (2005, p. 152) lists the following six important features of ethnographic research:

- Shared cultural meanings of a group are vital to understanding it’s behaviour, and through ethnographic research, the meaning is revealed
- The ethnographer is able to reveal an insider’s perspective on events, actions and context
- Research is conducted primarily through participant observation in its natural setting
- The research goals will develop as the study proceeds, as opposed to being formulated at the onset of the research
- Data collection is extensive and wide ranging, however fieldwork is central to ethnographic research
• Data collection is prolonged, in order to gain access to the deeper levels of the cultures being researched is repetitive and focuses on re-occurrences

The qualitative combination of ethnography (as an emic interpretation) and grounded theory (as an etic interpretation) are applied. Emic (an analysis that reflects the perspectives of the native informants) and etic (analysis achieved through the methodological tools and categories of the researcher) interpretation approaches are used as “insider and outsider views combine to provide deeper insights than would be possible by the “native” alone” (Goulding, 2006, p. 300).

2.6.2 Concept formation and development

Central to grounded theory is the ability to categorise, or use a process called constant comparison, and data collected is constantly compared as they are grouped together into similar categories. The affinity diagram is used as a tool with which to organise large amounts of data into logical relationships with a common theme and enables the sorting and categorizing processes.

Categories are saturated through theoretical sampling in order to ensure completeness, and data saturation occurs by looking for further propositions which could add richness to the categories. A heading is assigned to each category which encapsulates the meaning of all the propositions, and this heading then becomes the attribute or variable for the causal model.

Relationships between the variables in the categories identified, are explored by determining if one is part of the other (and not which one has the stronger relationship) through the use of an interrelationship diagram. Once the variables with the highest level of abstraction have been identified through the number of parts they have, the lowest level of abstraction variables identified are subsumed into them.

Grounded theory’s constant comparison and theoretical sampling concepts are ‘invaluable to the determination of quality in research on how individuals construct meaning from inter-subjective experiences’ (Fendt & Sachs, 2007) and the theory which emerges is grounded in data and not easily challenged (Parington, 2002, p. 155). As the application of grounded theory is used to collect, process and analyse data in order to construct a new theory which is grounded in practice based evidence it will enable deep understanding of the underlying mechanisms which exist.

Whilst theoretical coding provides data direction, memoing maintains the existence of emergent ideas which otherwise might have been forgotten (Struebert & Carpenter, 1999). Memoing is a technique within grounded theory which allows the researcher to record ideas, insights,
reflections, thoughts and observations as they occur. Memos are the essential link between the researcher and the data which results in the transformation of data into new theory and the discovery of emergent social patterns (Bryant & Charmaz, 2007), and not only alert the researcher to areas of potential personal bias but also contribute to the quality of data analysis (Elliott & Lazenbatt, 2005). The value which they contribute to research depends on two factors: the ability of the researcher to engage in quality reflection, analysis and self-critique by moving beyond mechanically recording events and data, and the organisation of them in a manner that makes it easy to retrieve (Maxwell, 2005).

2.7 Integrated Research Framework

While Critical Realism (Ontology) separates social reality into three domains, the combination of Grounded Theory (Epistemology) enables the researcher to move between these domains to differentiate between the phenomenon and how it is created.

Figure 15: Integrated Research Framework

The integrated research framework reflects the building of theory through a process of sense making, thinking and theory creation.

Grounded theory uses empirical data observed in the context of the research to build theory to resolve the concern and answer the research question. This occurs in three stages, beginning with the identification of the phenomenon at an empirical level during the first stage, and the
collection of data from the actual domain in the second stage. The application of grounded theory’s process of theory concept formation, development, modification and integration in the third stage, enables understanding of the mechanisms, structures and process which exist to create the phenomenon in the real level of critical realism.

While the ‘map’ is an element of the ‘territory’, the application of this framework ensures that the models constructed of the ‘territory’ are not influenced by reality outside of what is true.

2.8 Research Cycles

Four research cycles will be undertaken and data gathered in each research cycle will be processed through the grounded theory methodology as described above. Action research learning will influence the direction of the following cycle as emergence happens in the previous one.

Concept development and formation, as described above, take place in each cycle using the data collected. As each individual research cycle seeks to answer a sub question relating to the overriding research question, the use of individual research cycles enables a deep insight into parts of the phenomenon under review.

2.9 Meta-Synthesis

In order to synthesise the qualitative research data obtained in the above research cycles leading to building of theory, data gathered will be processed through a meta-synthesis method as a qualitative research design. While many meta-synthesis studies are done by using data from findings from related topic studies by other researchers, in this research, the meta-synthesis will be done on findings from the researchers’ original research cycles in order to formulate a new synthesized theory.

The meta-synthesis approach can be simplified as “quantitative knowledge arises from qualitative understanding” (Gu & Tang, 2004) and "is the bringing together and breaking down of findings, examining them, discovering essential features, and combining phenomena into a transformed whole” (Schreiber et al, 1997, p. 314). It integrates interrelated qualitative study results, which in contrast to meta-analysis, has an interpretive intent (Walsh & Downe, 2005), however widely accepted qualitative methods must be used and the findings must be well supported by the raw data (Finfgeld-Connett, 2010).
A review of findings by other researchers in a meta-synthesis involves a considerable amount of pre-planning, which include setting up research teams, formulating the problem through a research question or focus of investigation, making decisions around scope and designing the study (including sample sizes, choice of samples selection) (Polit & Beck, 2008). An advantage of doing meta-synthesis on original work is the researchers in-depth knowledge on the subject, the ability to consider the subject at an abstract level and be mindful of nuances, however a disadvantage could be bias and impartiality towards one’s own work (Polit & Beck, 2008). This however is mitigated in the validity section of this chapter.

Unlike meta-analysis of quantitative data, which uses aggregation to reduce the data to a single unit, qualitative meta-synthesis entails “comparison, translation, and analysis of original findings from which new interpretations are generated, encompassing and distilling the meanings in the constituent studies” (Zimmer, 2006)

There are a number of considerations when electing to do a meta-synthesis, and Finlayson and Dixon (2008) list the following as prerequisites for the researcher:

- Experience in previous qualitative research
- The topic of the research must be of interest to the researcher due to the commitment of time involved in the process
- Objectives must be clearly articulated at the onset of the research. This will guide framework and boundary decisions regarding sampling and methods
- It is essential that the research question is carefully constructed as this will influence the inclusion of data into the study
- Appraisal criteria regarding what studies should be included, if not using own work

Meta-synthesis is viewed as the logical extension of grounded theory as it adopts the same techniques of coding, categorizing and constant comparison of data (Finlayson & Dixon, 2008)

The purpose is to come out with a core variable, which becomes the basis of the grounded theory. ‘The concept of a core variable refers to a category which accounts for most of the variation in pattern of behaviour and which helps to integrate other categories that have been discovered in the data’ (Mullen & Reynolds, 1978, p.282)
2.10 Concept Analysis

Following the identification of the core variables through the meta-synthesis of the data in Chapter 3, a concept analysis is done as part of the level 3 literature review. The purpose is to have a precise definition which is reflective of the theoretical constructs obtained during the research process, and must not happen before the building of the theory it must be part of it. This will be presented in Chapter 4 of this paper.

Through using the propositions which form the structure of the variable, antecedents (which create the condition which makes the attribute possible), attributes (observable indicators) and consequences are assigned during the concept analysis process. “It makes the meaning of a concept explicit” (Risjord, 2009), and although it results in theoretical and operational definitions, concepts are not static but evolve as new knowledge emerges (Walker & Avant, 2005). It stands to reason that the richer the data, the more complete the concept analysis will be. Grounded theory’s data saturation ensures rigor in ensuring the completeness in the encapsulating of the meaning.

The practical benefit of a concept analysis is the ability once constructed to be aware of the potential consequences which are likely to be created through the presence of attributes. This can be used to either create the consequence, or avoid it. Similarly, in order to create the consequence, the creation, or destruction, of the antecedents will increase the likelihood of the desired outcome.

While the presence of attributes can lead to a degree of certainty in a result or consequence, there is no guarantee of the quality of the consequence. Frondizi (1971) argues that despite any product or service being provided having quality as an attribute, if that quality is not valued then it remains just that. The attribute needs to lead to the consequence being of such a nature that it leads to the desired outcome in the view of those that value it.

2.11 Research Process

Based on the methodology detailed, the figure below provides a graphical overview of the research process to be followed.
Data Collection methods in the Research Cycles (RC 1 - 4):
RC1/RC2: Repertory Grid
RC3/RC4: Ethnography

Identification of phenomenon → Identification of sub questions to be answered which will lead to final theory

Stage 1:
Research Cycle 1 (RC1): Concept Development, Concept Modification & Integration, Research Answer, Data Collection, Research Question, Data Processing & Analysis

Stage 2:
Research Cycle 2 (RC2): Concept Development, Concept Modification & Integration, Research Answer, Data Collection, Research Question, Data Processing & Analysis

Stage 3:
Research Cycle 3 (RC3): Concept Development, Concept Modification & Integration, Research Answer, Data Collection, Research Question, Data Processing & Analysis

Stage 4:
Research Cycle 4 (RC4): Concept Development, Concept Modification & Integration, Research Answer, Data Collection, Research Question, Data Processing & Analysis

What is the core driver that will enable a future fit, practice-based talent pipeline of managers who are able to jump between the operational and strategic S curve in a way that ensures viability of performance during times of complexity and uncertainty, and does so in a way that is self-sustaining and delivers improved business results?

Definitions of labels in research process:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concept Formation</th>
<th>Data Collection</th>
<th>Data Processing &amp; Analysis</th>
<th>Concept Development</th>
<th>Concept Modification &amp; Integration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Empirical evidence regarding performance, competencies, behaviours and attitudes.</strong> Personal observation, reflection, Participant observation, interviews, conversations, structured and non-structured interviews.</td>
<td>Establish categories through constant comparison.</td>
<td>Assign heading to category and saturate through theoretical sampling.</td>
<td>Reduction sampling in order to subsume categories to get to higher level of abstraction.</td>
<td>Build theory/ mechanism and do literature review. Assign system archetype and do concept analysis.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The research processed can be described in four stages:

Stage 1 involves not only the identification of the phenomenon and the research question to be answered but also the selection of the research methodology and framework. The above research process illustrates a combination of critical realism, grounded theory, systems thinking and action research, as underpinning the research process, and forming the foundation of each phase during the research process.

The first research cycle is undertaken within this methodology and framework, and data is collected with relevance to the sub research question asked. This data is processed through the selected methodology and through a process of concept development, modification and integration provides the answer to the sub research question.

Stage 2 consists of three further research cycles, each of which follow the same sequence as the first cycle. The results of each of the individual research cycles determine the focus for the next, and the sub question asked in each cycle is as a result of emergence from the previous research cycle. Data collection methods in each cycle vary based on the research question asked, as well as the ability of the technique selected to gather the information required in order to answer these questions.

The data processing and analysis in Stage 3 is the same as those in the four individual research cycles. The key difference however is that the parts of each of the four individual research cycles will be pulled into a whole. No new data will therefore be collected; instead, a meta-synthesis will be done on the consolidation of all the data generated during the four research cycles. This will be processed using grounded theory methodology, and follow the stages of data processing and analysis, concept development, concept modification and integration in order to formulate a new synthesized theory. The core variable which emerges as a result of the meta-synthesis becomes the basis of the grounded theory, and therefore the answer to resolve the overriding research question.

Stage 4 involves theory building using the core variables identified in stage 3, and the CIMO model will be used to construct a model predicing which actions in specific contexts will lead to a desired outcome. This is the practical solution which can be implemented in order to resolve the concern.

The use of memo’s is central to grounded theory and used at moments throughout the research process as required in order to record ideas, insights, reflections, thoughts and observations as
they occur. They are recorded and then revisited, as they are the means of keeping the researcher linked to the data and need to be reviewed for relevance to emergent patterns.

2.12 Threats to validity

Validity considerations will be conducted within the framework of Maxwell (1992) who suggests a test for validity is one in which the researcher questions under what circumstances the results and conclusions could be wrong, what alternative interpretations could be made and if you are able to allow the data to challenge your ideas.

Based on the framework he suggests, validity will be approached using descriptive, interpretive, theoretical, generalizability and evaluative categories.

Descriptive validity comprises of primary validity which pertains to knowledge gained through firsthand experience of the researcher, and secondary validity in which the researcher may infer meaning from data regarding events, either physical or behavioural, that are observable (Maxwell, 1992). In order to ensure primary validity, the precise words and exact descriptions given by participants will be recorded. Researcher bias will be mitigated in this way as precise and exact words will maintain the original meaning and factual accuracy as intended by the participants. Clarification will be sought if not immediately clear or if the answer is too broad, which will ensure the data obtained retains its original meaning in the smallest form of unit.

Validity is further dependent on the ability of the researcher to understand how these meanings are constructed through observing body language, noting beliefs and reviewing against past actions (Martella et al. 2013), and interpretive validity relates to the participants perspective and their interpretation of events (Maxwell, 1992). During the research, attention will be paid to the subjective application of meaning as a result of participant’s personal belief systems and how they construe reality. This will be evaluated against accounts from other sources to ensure validity. Researcher bias is mitigated and validity is maintained through continuous triangulation (Denzin & Lincoln, 2005) which is “the use of one or more method or source of data in the study of a social phenomenon so that findings may be cross checked” (Bryman, 2012, p. 717), and is critical for ensuring accuracy and incorporating complexity. Triangulation methods include using ethnography (direct observation), interviews, and surveys.

While the validity of the concepts and the relationships between them (Maxwell, 1992) and evaluation is dependent on how the community interprets and accepts the plausibility of the theory constructed (Martella et al. 2013), theoretical validity can be compromised through the unintended
influencing of research results as a consequence of preconceived beliefs instead of allowing emergence which could influence research results. The key issue surrounding researcher involvement in grounded theory is the ability of the researcher to remain truly open to emerging data and not to influence the process through the use of preconceived ideas, previous experience, knowledge, and own mental maps (Holton, 2009). The existence of preconceived notions could result in forced categories by overlooking emergent ones, which then confirms the researchers understanding of the phenomenon as opposed to identifying new theory (Suddaby, 2006). Ensuring theoretical validity will require that the researcher be mindful of potential bias in influencing the outcome, applies rigour in the grounded theory process and exercises patience until emergence happens.

Maxwell (1992) argues that validity is relative and while it can be challenged in different contexts, it “…is not an inherent property of a particular method, but pertains to the data, accounts, or conclusions reached by using that method in a particular context for a particular purpose,” however, the extent to which a theory can be applied into an environment other than that studied during the research (Maxwell, 1992) is a test for generalizability, and needs to show how both similar and different results can be obtained in both similar and different conditions (Martella et al. 2013). Evaluative validity assesses the evaluations drawn by the researcher (Maxwell 1992) and involves the application of opinions that either support or oppose those of the public (Martella et al. 2013).

2.13 Overview of Research Design

The below graphical summary of the research design follows an interactive sequence rather than a linear one, where the research question becomes the link between the goals and conceptual framework as well as the methods and validity. This ensures all parts of the framework are aligned, connected and integrated, as reflected by the directional arrows in below.

The conceptual framework is constructed, not found and, while importance must be paid to existing and relevant theories which could lead to increased understanding regarding the phenomenon under review, they are not always complete or accurate.

The conceptual framework is therefore a tentative theory of the phenomena under investigation, and the function of the theory is to inform the rest of the research design “to help you to assess and refine your goals, develop realistic and relevant research questions, select appropriate methods, and identify potential validity threats to your conclusions” (Maxwell 2005 p39).
There is therefore a critical integration between the concern variable and goals (which justify the importance of the study of the phenomenon), and the conceptual framework.

**Figure 17:** Graphical Summary of Research Design

- **Concern:** Ability to create a talent pipeline which enables managers to transition between levels of work and jump from the operational to strategic S curve of Management Development.

  - **Goals:**
    - **Intellectual:** Identify the underlying causal mechanism for talent pipeline creation through understanding the drivers and constraints of the ability to transition levels of work and jump across S curves of management development.
    - **Practical:** Identify which competencies need to be developed to facilitate the leap between each of the levels of work and the S curves on management development in a way which will ensure viability of performance as individuals are promoted, and lead to a valid talent pipeline.
    - **Personal:** Transformation of my business unit into a highly functioning and performance driven culture within which the development and selection of talent is relevant to the creation of a future fit workforce.

- **Conceptual Framework:**
  - Experiential knowledge
  - Empirical evidence regarding performance, behaviours and attitudes of my direct management team
  - Organisational framework for the management of the employee lifecycle and talent pipeline
  - Levels of Work (Jaques and Clement, 1994)
  - Nature of Management Development
  - Literature reviews on talent management and human capital development

- **Research Question:**
  - Under conditions of complexity and uncertainty, what is the core variable that drives a talent pipeline system that gives rise to a future fit management workforce in a way that is self-sustaining and delivers improved business results?
  - What leadership competencies are perceived as critical indicators of effective performance at both middle and senior management levels by the levels above them?

- **Research Methods:**
  - Critical realism ontology; Grounded theory methodology
  - Systems Thinking
  - Action Research Learning
  - Selection of appropriate methods for data collection: interviews; surveys; observations; formal and informal conversations; feedback from stakeholders; performance reviews; observations; reflections
  - Memo’s
  - Categorisation
  - Theoretical sampling
  - Theoretical coding
  - System Archetype identification
  - Meta Synthesis
  - CIMO Modelling

- **Research Validity Framework (Maxwell, 1992):**
  - Considerations regarding:
    - Descriptive validity – Primary & Secondary
    - Interpretive validity
    - Theoretical validity
    - Generalizability
    - Evaluative validity

Source: Based on Maxwell (2005)
This chapter described and detailed the methodology and process which will be used to conduct the research into talent development in my organisation and develop a theory through grounded theory meta-synthesis of data collected during research cycles.

Organisations are made up of many interconnected complex systems, and the social interactions within this system where human behaviour, dependencies and decisions have an influence on the underlying mechanisms, gives rise to causality which is specific to the context in which they occur, and not only influence this context but also the interdependent systems. Approaching this research from any other perspective than one in which understanding of the social world is explored does not enable a deep understanding of the phenomenon under review.

The choice of research strategy and framework was therefore selected because the use of critical realism as an ontological and grounded theory as epistemology philosophy enable the development of the research with an inductive approach which facilitates the emergence of new theory and the ability to uncover reality within the specific context in which change is required. This ensures that multiple perspectives are taken into account from the real, actual and empirical levels and considers the social processes which occur to create the phenomenon.

The understanding of how reality is constructed and patterns that are formed in relationships reveal the causality in the interaction of underlying systems and enable the identification of proposed interventions in order to resolve the concern and determination in which contexts the theory will be more likely to produce a specific outcome.

Threats and limitations to validity in the research process were discussed and dealt with.

The following chapter details the research results produced through the implementation of the above framework and process.
Chapter 3: Research Results – data collection and concept development

The previous chapter described the ontological and epistemology philosophies as well as the research framework which will be applied during the research process.

The goal of the research is to identify the core variable which accounts for most of the variation in patterns of behavior. A further goal is to suggest ways in which the ability to create a talent pipeline which enables managers to transition between levels of work and jump from the operational to strategic S curve of Management Development can be enabled successfully.

This research results follows the process described in the previous chapter and Chapter 3 deals with the results of each of the research cycles undertaken; the meta-synthesis of data gathered during these research cycles as well as the concept development which leads to the identification of the final set of core variables which will form the basis of the theory. Validity considerations are discussed in the concluding paragraph. A literature review of the core variables is done in Chapter 4, and the final theory developed through concept modification and integration is presented in Chapter 5.

Four research cycles were undertaken and data was collected primarily from human resource managers, senior management and executives in retail supply chains. The results from each research cycle are detailed below.
3.1 Research cycle 1

The focus of the first research cycle was to identify what leadership competencies were perceived as critical indicators of effective performance at level 3 of Jaques and Clement (1994) levels of work in order to identify development gaps. The qualitative combination of the repertory grid interviewing technique, based on the Personal Construct Theory of Kelly (1995) was used as an initial method of data collection.

In order to ensure that the worldview of talent was not limited to the individuals’ perspective of what they needed to do in order to be considered effective but that multiple perspectives were obtained, level 4 managers were interviewed regarding level 3 competencies.

Interviews were conducted with 3 senior managers, and they were asked to base their selection on what they considered to be, two top middle management performers, two average and two mediocre or unskilled performers (referred to in the repertory grid technique as “elements”).

These elements were numbered, and a triading method used to elicit constructs. Triad selection was calculated prior to the interview based on the numbering allocated to each element (See Appendix B1). They were asked to consider ways in which two of the elements selected were similar, and how the third differed, in terms of leadership effectiveness from the two which had been identified as being similar. In order to develop critical thinking both time as a resource (silence) as well as ‘what else’ prompting was used.

After each construct, interviewees were asked to determine which of the ‘two poles’ best applied to the element, and to rate the elements on a 5 point scale against the constructs elicited, as illustrated below, with the lowest scoring number indicating that an element was more skilled in that particular construct than a higher scoring number which indicated less skill.
The data was processed through levels two and three of the grounded theory methodology (Glaser and Strauss. 1967) as described in Chapter 2.

A total of 184 propositions gathered in this research cycle were grouped together into 10 similar themes, and a heading assigned during the constant comparison process. The full list can be seen on Appendix B2.

Table 1: Sample of propositions listing both positive and negative constructs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ability to understand data and build a coherent argument</th>
<th>Effectiveness of engagement and integration with stakeholders</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>Opposite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compelling rationale behind argument</td>
<td>No logic in argument</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Makes sense when speaking and presents a coherent argument</td>
<td>Doesn't think response through waffles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willingness to be questioned on decisions</td>
<td>Closed to decisions being questioned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over communicates</td>
<td>Under communicates</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reduction sampling, in order to reach a higher level of abstraction was done, as can be seen on Appendices B3–5, which led to the identification of 5 main categories, as reflected below, which reflect the competencies required at Level 3.
Table 2: Categories depicting competencies required at Level 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Degree of presence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree of self-development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriate combination of task and people activities to ensure operational achievement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willingness to challenge the status quo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Readiness to explore innovative options (as a form of divergent thinking)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Incorrect skill level placement

As each element had been rated on the constructs elicited, the lower the score, the more effective the manager was considered in relation to the applicable construct. It stands to reason therefore, that the lower the overall score for each element, the higher the level of overall effectiveness.

In reviewing the results however, two of the three senior managers ratings (sum of) positions moved middle managers to other skill placement levels than that initially selected i.e. a middle manager initially selected as skilled performer became an average performer, an average either became unskilled or skilled, and an unskilled became a skilled. Results of the changes are visible below and indicated in grey.

Figure 19: Skill placement levels of middle managers selected as elements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Element 1</th>
<th>Element 2</th>
<th>Element 3</th>
<th>Element 4</th>
<th>Element 5</th>
<th>Element 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interview 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall rating</td>
<td>Skilled</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revised position</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>Skilled</td>
<td>Unskilled</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>Skilled</td>
<td>Unskilled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall rating</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revised position</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>Skilled</td>
<td>Skilled</td>
<td>Unskilled</td>
<td>Unskilled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall rating</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revised position</td>
<td>Skilled</td>
<td>Skilled</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>Unskilled</td>
<td>Unskilled</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on this rating system, it was evident that at a senior management level a perception of leadership effectiveness of middle managers existed which was not congruent with the scores allocated.
This necessitated a change in approach to the research methodology (See memo note 1 in Appendix G), and while the methodology initially selected for the research was qualitative, the results obtained through the repertory grid did not enable sense making. With the aim of gaining a deep understanding of the underlying mechanism, a quantitative approach was therefore applied to the qualitatively extracted data.

In order to enable insight and uncover mental models of interviewees, it was necessary to go back to variable headings which had been assigned to the propositions, and which had best encapsulated their meaning, and analyse the movement of scoring. An analysis was done on the categories at the highest level of abstraction which had been achieved through reduction sampling.

The scores allocated to the middle management elements were re-allocated based on the overall scoring. The two lowest overall scores for elements (indicating highest overall effectiveness) were placed in the skilled group, and the two highest scores (indicating lowest overall effectiveness) were placed in the unskilled group. The remainder was placed in the average performer category. Based on number of constructs applied to each variable heading, the percentage importance of that category was determined, and data was analysed, first with original scoring, and then with the actual skill placement and referred to as ‘adjusted scoring’

The reduction sampling categories revealed that at a senior level, “readiness to explore innovative options (as a form of divergent thinking)” and the “appropriate combination of task and people activities” to ensure operational achievement “contributed 69% towards considering a middle manager talented.

Figure 20 : Reduction sampling categories - original scoring
Although the weightings changed between the original and adjusted scoring, as reflected below, these two categories remained the two largest factors based on a weighting score which separated the skilled from the unskilled.

Figure 21: Reduction sampling categories - adjusted scoring

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Importance based on % Constructs</th>
<th>Sum Skilled</th>
<th>Sum Unskilled</th>
<th>Diff</th>
<th>% Diff</th>
<th>Weighting of differences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Readiness to explore innovative options (as a form of divergent thinking)</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriate combination of task and people activities to ensure operational achievement</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>151%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree of presence</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>160%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willingness to challenge the status quo</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree of self development</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>348</td>
<td>681</td>
<td>333</td>
<td>96%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This analysis did not however reveal the mental models of the senior managers interviewed and still did not provide any insight or understanding in order to enable sense making. It was therefore necessary to step down another layer and into a lower level of detail and return to the original 10 categories, as reflected in Appendix B2, which were identified during the categorisation process.

Within these categories, in the original scoring, although the category called “consistency of operational achievement” was the second highest rated construct, it carried the most importance based on weighting. It was also the category which showed the highest difference between a skilled and an unskilled performer at 27%.

Figure 22: Proposition categorisation into 10 categories - original scoring

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Importance based on % Constructs</th>
<th>Sum Skilled</th>
<th>Sum Unskilled</th>
<th>Diff</th>
<th>% Diff</th>
<th>Weighting of differences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level of understanding cogiscience of own behaviour</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consistency of Operational Achievement</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness of engagement and integration with stakeholders</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree of Renewable Energy</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of staff development</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to understand data and build a coherent argument</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willingness to take risks and challenge the status quo</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree of focus and ownership of own development</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of understanding the impact of decisions outside of own area</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perception of strength of character created by having a presence</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>381</td>
<td>641</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>98%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
If scores were reallocated to actual skill placement levels based on scores allocated, the adjusted scoring showed that the top rated category “level of understanding impact of own behaviour” and “consistency of operational achievement” were equally ranked in terms of weighting, as reflected below.

Figure 23: Proposition categorization into 10 categories - adjusted scoring

The movement in the differences between the skilled and unskilled performers between these two categories were also offset by each other. Where the “consistency of operational achievement” had an initial difference of 27% between a skilled and an unskilled performer, this dropped by 6%, to 21% on an adjusted score. The “level of understanding the impact of own behaviour” initially showed a difference of 8% between a skilled and an unskilled performer, however at an adjusted score this increased by a corresponding 6%, to 14%.

This showed that the Level 4 skill placement of Level 3 managers was largely determined by operational performance of the individual. The more somebody achieved operationally – the more skilled they were rated.

Despite the category called “level of understanding impact of own behaviour” being rated as the top construct category for level 3 managers, it was actually the “consistency of operational achievement” which determined the skill placement level. The reasons for the move between categories was largely due to those managers who had been identified as skilled performers being marked down as a result of poor scores allocated to the level of understanding the impact of their own behaviour.

In reviewing the relationships identified in the reduction sampling interrelationship diagraph (Appendix B5) the only category which did not directly influence the “appropriate combination of task and people activities to ensure operational achievement” was the “degree of presence”
The combination of these categories means that the importance of operational achievement comprised 86% towards a senior manager considering someone a skilled performer.

- Middle management archetype: Success to the Successful

The behaviour over time for middle management performers revealed that those individuals who deliver operational performance are therefore viewed as talented and are rewarded with training interventions, placement onto developmental programs, receive larger salary increases and are considered for promotion to senior management.

Based on this signature pattern of behaviour over time, the archetype which can be linked to this is success to the successful. The dynamic theory behind this archetype is ‘….if one person or group (A) is given more resources than another equally capable group (B); A has a higher likelihood of succeeding. It hypothesizes that A’s initial success justifies devoting more resources to A, further widening the performance gap between the two groups over time’ (Braun, W. 2001 p 10).

Figure 24: Success to the Successful archetype: middle management categories

Good performance is rewarded with more resources in the expectation that performance will continue – there is a belief that the successful people have ‘earned’ their increased share of resources. However, for those individuals who do not perform operationally and are not considered effective leaders, current performance may be a better reflection of the initial or
starting conditions than they are of true ability for commitment to top performance (Braun, W. 2001 p 10).

The more middle managers perform operationally, the less important the non-operational attributes become to senior managers in terms of viewing them as talented. This ensures that those who perform operationally, and are therefore allocated resources, are those that are considered talented. The ripple effect could be seen when they are promoted into senior management as the limitations of their capabilities are felt when they are unable to ensure viability of performance during times of complexity and uncertainty, and deliver sustainable performance.

Research did not only lead to the identification of competencies required at level 3, but through the placement level of elements, unexpectedly revealed that the mental models of level 4 managers focused only on those competencies which supported operational achievement and largely overlooked the absence of any non-operational attributes when considering the skill placement level into the talent pipeline.

This is relevant in terms of the concern outlined in the employee lifecycle process as explored in the research context because good performance is rewarded with more resources in the expectation that performance will continue as there is a belief that the successful people have ‘earned’ their increased share of resources (Braun, 2001, p. 10). There is a direct correlation between being viewed as skilled and being placed into the talent pipeline, and this is an important finding for this research, not only in my business unit, but within a larger context, as it links the performance at a senior management level to the promotion of middle managers who are selected on a singular view of talent.

3.2 Research cycle 2

The findings from the first research cycle led to a sense of curiosity as to whether a similar singular view of competency was present at a level 4 talent perspective. It also raised a consideration that by identifying level 4 competencies, the development leap between the S curves of management development between levels 3 and 4 would become visible. The identification of these competencies would enable development to be targeted and individualized.

The same process and methodology followed in research cycle one was followed in the second one, and constructs were gathered from three executive management participants at level 5. They were interviewed to give insights into senior management competencies and 110 constructs were obtained regarding their perceptions of critical competencies which they felt should be
present at level 4. During the constant comparison phase, these were grouped together into 10 categories. The full list can be seen on Appendix C1.

Table 3: Sample of propositions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ability to analyse and get value from information</th>
<th>Ability to consider impacts of decisions on the organisation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opposite</td>
<td>Opposite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Able to prepare data and do analysis</td>
<td>Struggles to prepare data and analyse it</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understands financial management information</td>
<td>No financial acumen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Able to analyse and get value from information</td>
<td>Commercial understanding - greater good of organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Logical clear thinker - ability to process data and get meaning from it</td>
<td>No understanding of commercial impact of decisions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3: Sample of propositions

Reduction sampling, in order to reach a higher level of abstraction was done, and this can be seen on Appendices C2-4. This led to the identification of 5 main categories which reflect the competencies required at Level 4, as reflected below.

Table 4: Categories depicting competencies required at Level 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effectiveness of communication</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness of delegation to enable operational achievement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree of passion for work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree of business acumen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of synthesis (as a form of convergent thinking)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In contrast to the first research cycle, level 5 ratings for level 4 managers were reflective of mental models, and scores allocated were consistent with the skill placement level. Revised skill placement level was therefore congruent with the original skill placement level based on ratings of constructs.
Based on number of constructs applied to each variable heading, the percentage importance of that category was determined. Ratings of categories for senior management competency requirements were far more evenly spread than those elicited for middle management, as reflected below.

This indicates that at a senior management level, overall performance is more important than a single aspect. This is further evident through the weighting of differences. Whilst “degree of passion for work” reflected the highest difference between a skilled and unskilled performer, once weighted, ranked the lowest.

Due to the data extracted during the first and second research cycles being particularly suited for comparative purposes as it related to differences in competencies between levels of work, as well
as the perception around the performance of these competencies, a decision was made to do further analysis. Therefore before commencing with the third research cycle, the differences in, and implications of, competencies required in Levels 3 and 4 were explored by comparing the data between the first and second research cycle. This was done not only from a competency comparison perspective but through an exploration of both the depth and breadth of perceptions which existed as well.

Many of the competencies which were required at a level 3 were also present at level 4, but were more defined. An example of this is stakeholder engagement at level 3, where influencing stakeholders by use of data to support arguments in order to achieve operational excellence is perceived as a critical competence. The focus at level 4 however, is less about understanding the detail behind the data and more about a higher level of synthesis. Level 4 also uses the data to influence stakeholders to make business decisions.

Instead of the ‘doing’ activities, which they did at middle management level, senior managers are required to step above this, and ‘direct’ more than ‘do’ and delegation becomes a more critical competency which is evident from the category differences – “appropriate combination of task and people activities to ensure operational achievement” for middle managers as opposed to “effectiveness of delegation to enable operational achievement” for senior managers.

Different, more complex, levels of activities and thinking are also required, as is evident from the categories “readiness to explore innovative options (as a form of divergent thinking)” for middle managers vs. “level of synthesis (as a form of convergent thinking)” for senior managers.

The emphasis at senior management level also moves away from having to apply the middle management competency of using a “willingness to challenge the status quo” to enable finding multiple, out of the box solutions, to a single problem, to a higher level of synthesis at senior management level where they are required to consider multiple facts from multiple sources, and apply a sufficient “degree of business acumen” in order to make a sound business decision.

As a result of the enhanced requirements from the non-operational competencies at a level 3, which research showed are largely overlooked, they became limiting conditions at a level 4, with the degree of business acumen being the slowing action and the limit to growth at that level.

This has far reaching consequences as these individuals are promoted, where these limiting conditions eventually make themselves known and those individuals are unable to transcend the change and cannot sustain performance. While performance is successful in the beginning as
the limits to growth are approached, the performance begins to lose its effectiveness and the rate of growth begins to flatten. In the end despite continued pressure from the growth engine, the rate of growth stops and then reverses. (Braun, W. 2001 p 10).

Figure 27: Limits to Growth archetype: senior management categories.

The dynamic theory behind this archetype is ‘...something always pushes back. There is no such thing as unrestricted positive reinforcing behaviour. There are always limits that eventually make themselves known and felt.’ (Braun, W. 2001 p 2).

In order to explore both depth and breadth of perceptions, further analysis was done in order to understand the impact of perceptions on skill placement. At an executive management level, skilled senior management performers were scored 22% higher on overall leadership effectiveness than the skilled middle managers rated by senior management level.
The reason for this large variance relates to the low scores allocated by senior managers to skilled middle managers on constructs forming part of the category called “level of understanding impact of own behaviour”, however if elements were put into the correct skill categories based on the overall score given, this gap decreased to 12%. This in turn was as a result of the now skilled middle managers scoring significantly lower scores on “consistency of operational achievement” but average to higher scores on “level of understanding impact of own behaviour”. Because the combination of the two categories was not present in most individuals, the overall scoring of a skilled middle manager was far lower than that of a skilled senior manager.

Furthermore, as can be seen below, the difference in ratings between skill levels was far more significant for senior managers being rated by executive managers than those of middle managers being rated by senior managers, even at an adjusted score. Whereas senior managers perceived far less of a difference between skilled and average middle managers, executive managers had clear differentiators regarding senior management performance.

Figure 29: Comparison of differences in skill level between Levels 3 and 4 as rated by executive and senior managers:
The difference between a skilled vs. unskilled senior manager was 114% versus a perceived difference of 68%, at middle management level. In reality the actual difference is far higher at 96%.

From the percentage differences between skill levels of elements as well as the percentage differences in ratings for overall skill, it is clear that executive management consider both the depth and breadth of effectiveness, and view overall performance of a senior manager as an indicator of leadership effectiveness, whereas senior managers tend to focus on those attributes which support their own operational achievement. The constructs which do not directly apply to consistency of operational achievement, reduce the overall leadership competency.

Although senior managers focused on the extent to which middle managers took ownership of their own development, this aspect was completely absent at an executive level. It can therefore be assumed that with promotion into senior management there is also an expectation that they are at the correct skill level. Openness to seeking assistance or development could be seen as a weakness or inability to cope from both perspectives, and they are unlikely to be encouraged to increase their human capital. Research therefore indicates that it is critical that the majority of development takes place at a level 3.

### 3.3 Research cycle 3

Notwithstanding competencies required at management levels, which the previous two research cycles revealed, it is ultimately the role of every manager to create and add value to the organisation. When viewed within the framework of Jaques and Clement (1994) where value shifts between levels 3 and 4, from adding value to the present to adding value to the future, the third research cycle focused on identifying the mechanism which leads to value creation.

Although the primary application of ethnographic research is to learn either the culture or subculture of a group of people, in this research it was utilized as a data collection method to identify specific behaviours, thinking styles and actions which support the achievement of a strategic intent and/or the creation of future value versus finding an immediate solutions to a problem in order to attain operational excellence.

My belief when commencing this research was that I would see a significant difference between executive, senior and operational management in terms of value contributing behaviours, which would be very clearly defined. The intention was therefore to group propositions exhibited by
each level into their respective management categories, and use grounded theory to identify the underlying causal mechanism of the different behaviours exhibited within each level, in order to identify a gap for development between them.

During the data processing phase a memo note made (as can be seen in an extract from Memo 3 in Appendix G), alerted me to the fact that I had inadvertently not encouraged emergence as I had been applying my own mental model to the research.

> A lot of the interactions viewed at executive management level have been more focused on operational behaviour than strategic behaviour, and similarly, senior management and middle interactions are often more strategic than those exhibited by executive management. (Extract from Memo 3 in Appendix G)

I had automatically assumed that types of value creation were only created by certain levels of management. This memo reminded me of the observation made at one stage that there was not a clearly defined boundary, with many individuals in strategic positions appearing to display operational behaviours, and that it was often their subordinates who exhibited strategic behaviours.

This necessitated going back to the raw data, which had already been partially processed, and instead of coding it by level of management, I elected instead to explore the relationship between strategic and operational behaviours, and sought to discover if there was an interdependent or interconnected relationship between them.

Data was gathered through middle, senior and executive management meetings, both formal and informal conversations, observations and reflections on experiences and was collected in the form of 271 propositions (150 for operational behaviours and 121 for strategic behaviours), an extract of which is below. Operational and strategic behaviour data was processed separately and once categorised, through the constant comparison process, resulted in 10 categories for each. The full list can be seen on Appendices D1 and 2
Reduction sampling, in order to reach a higher level of abstraction was done, the detail of which can be seen on Appendices D3-7 and led to the identification of 5 main categories on each behavioural style linked to value creation.

Table 5 : Sample of propositions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Operational behaviours</th>
<th>Strategic behaviours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Creating clarity of purpose</td>
<td>Effectiveness of decisions on organisational sustainability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to get people activated and moving in the right direction</td>
<td>Allows negative impact to an organisation for greater good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action plans in place to ensure operational delivery</td>
<td>Decides strategy upfront and does not leave it to chance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis of data to establish pattern or trends</td>
<td>Grasps and links comments/situations/events to long term implication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear understanding given to everyone so they can know what to do</td>
<td>Understands holistic implications on business of changes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus on solution to resolve issue and does not get lost in the problem</td>
<td>Define strategy for 5 year goal achievement based on financial as well as other goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does not get too caught up in detail</td>
<td>Grasps concepts quickly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gain clarity on statements in order to understand</td>
<td>Fights for what they believe will negatively impact the business as a whole</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responds to issues proactively</td>
<td>Out of the box thinking for long term benefit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding detail to ensure correct activities are being measured</td>
<td>Link and uses inside information to mitigate potential issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to explain concepts both up and downstream</td>
<td>Seeks opportunities to differentiate offering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resolves own issues does not wait for others to resolve</td>
<td>Relentlessly seeks opportunities for improvement to profit and growth of organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding of detail in order to justify answer</td>
<td>Grasps long term implications of allowing current status quo to continue</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on relationships explored in the interrelationship diagraph (see Appendix D7), a CLD was developed. This revealed that there are however two limiting conditions which prevent individuals from transcending into a strategic mode – “the ability to connect the dots” and the “effectiveness of their ability to recognize and respond to change” – this is where the biggest divide can be seen between those who exhibit strategic behaviours and those who do not. Both of these influence the effectiveness of making decisions for the greater good of the organisation and therefore create a slowing effect in the ability to adopt, or refine, a new strategic intent. These are key competencies which need to be developed.
The archetype which can be linked to value creation is the attractiveness principle. The dynamic theory behind this archetype is that the result (i.e. strategy) ‘may be subjected to multiple slowing actions, each of which represent an opportunity and an opportunity cost to managers. Insight into the interdependencies between the slowing actions is a critical insight into deciding how scarce resources should be utilized to reduce or remove the slowing actions.’ (Braun, 2001, p. 21).

**Figure 30 : System Archetype for value creation**

While I initially anticipated discovering that level 4 managers fulfilled the definition of strategic behaviour, and therefore future value creation, research revealed it was not the level of authority which dictated the behavioural mode. Irrespective of the level, behaviours were either solely operational or alternated between strategic and operational, both with varying degrees of competence. Those who were effective at future value creation, situational dependent, alternated between strategic and operational modes. There was no single defining line in terms of purely strategic behaviours between the various levels in the cultures studied.

It was noted that some managers (see Memo note 3 in Appendix G), displayed behaviours which demonstrated that they are locked into operational mode – it could also therefore be inferred that individuals could also get locked into strategic mode, although this would be less prevalent, as it is unlikely that these individuals would be likely to survive in an operational functioning environment.

The operational mode is a reinforcing loop which has the sole purpose of delivering to the strategic intent, while the strategic mode is influenced and defined by both strategic and operational variables. This is not a linear process and is subjected to multiple revisions within these loops as
new information, opportunities or threats become known, and those who are able to recognise either patterns or opportunities (both negative and positive) during the execution of the strategy, are the individuals who are able to transcend into a strategic behavioural mode. When in a strategic behavioural pattern it is an evolving balancing loop, which is only limited by the individual’s ability to see a cause and effect, and respond to it. The interconnectedness of movement between the current and future value loops would resemble a figure of 8, as either strategy is executed or new opportunities emerge.

The results obtained in the strategy execution, as well as benefits realised or threats identified and mitigated as a result of the pattern/opportunity recognition provide a feedback loop to the main strategy and are incorporated into the building of a new strategy which will need to be executed.

Future value creation is therefore not a constant, but a state of evolution in response to changes and new opportunities which emerge and is limited only by the individual’s ability to see a cause and effect, and react to it in an appropriate manner, and not by the level of work in which they operate.

3.4 Research cycle 4

The first and second research cycle revealed the critical competencies required for both level 3 and 4 managers and the third built on this and uncovered the mechanism which would lead to current and future value creation. The aim of the fourth research cycle was threefold. Firstly to apply learnings from the previous research cycles within the environment in order to develop competencies required at both levels 3 and 4 within the framework of Jaques and Clement (1994) and thereby enable a successful development transition. Secondly to change culture, behaviours and performance and thirdly to expand upon it by identifying principles for development of a candidate, who displayed operational excellence (which would have placed him in the talent pipeline as mentioned in the phenomenon discovered during the first research cycle) but did not possess all the required attributes to transition naturally between the S curves of management development.

Taking into account insights and findings from the first three research cycles, action research cycles were carried out over a two year period in the fourth research cycle, to identify the principles for development in order to ensure a sustainable talent pipeline as candidates transcend from middle to senior management.
Data was gathered through the following interactions:

- Psychometric testing
- Empirical evidence
- Structured development plan based on comparison of existing competencies against those identified in previous research as being essential
- Executive, senior management and stakeholder meetings
- Feedback received from stakeholders, staff and business coach
- Formal and informal conversations, performance reviews, interviews and surveys
- Observations and memo notes recorded, including reflections on experiences

A total of 274 new data propositions were obtained in this research cycle, which were categorised into 11 different headings during the second level of grounded theory, a sample of which is below, and the full list on Appendix E1.

**Table 7 : Sample of propositions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clarity of decision making and willingness to fail forward</th>
<th>Level of perception management</th>
<th>Repositioning framing of own leadership and engagement styles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Confidence to stand by decision</td>
<td>Understanding others perceptions of you</td>
<td>Role models behaviour on superior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discernment vs black &amp; white decision making</td>
<td>Strategy around influencing others opinions</td>
<td>Redefine framework of own leadership style</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Build mindset of problem solving and improvement</td>
<td>Notice others reactions to you</td>
<td>It's own definition of leadership congruent with organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cannot experiment if you are scared of failure</td>
<td>Previous bad behaviours impact people's opinions</td>
<td>Develop style that mimics others but is a natural fit with you</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Once the data had been subsumed to a higher level of abstraction through reduction sampling, 5 main categories were identified

**Table 8 : Five main categories**

- Demonstration of inherent conditions required for suitability of development
- Willingness of line manager to actively engage in development process
- Effectiveness of tangible measurement system
- Strong leadership with heart
- Impact of environmental stability and influence

Based on relationships explored in the interrelationship diagraph (see Appendices E2-3), a CLD was developed. This, together with a decision tree, is displayed below.
The principles for development in order to resolve a gap identified are grouped together in three stages:

Stage 1: When a gap in outputs or performance is identified a decision needs to be taken regarding whether the gap is created through a developmental need which needs to be addressed with an individual, or if it is a performance management issue. The decision to apply development is more likely to succeed and be optimised if there is a demonstration by the candidate which indicates suitability towards it, such as willingness to learn. Development required will differ from candidate to candidate, based on the outcome of the competencies required, the competencies which need to be developed, and the emergent factors which make themselves visible during the transformation process. The decision around the type of performance management applied is based on the merits of each case.

Stage 2: Coupled with development, is the “willingness of line manager to actively engage in development process” (subject to skill level as mentioned above) and the positive “impact of environmental stability and influence” which is necessary in a learning environment. These variables can therefore be classified as antecedents in the development process of S Curve.
Stage 3: In order to support the actions to improve the gap, it needs to be supported by a strong leader who manages both people and task aspects, coupled with a “tangible measurement system”. The measurement system needs to contain an adequate level of detail in terms of performance required, based on strategies which are broken down into the steps which are required to achieve them.

Based on the results of this research cycle, there are a number of principles which need to be in place in order to successfully implement an appropriate action plan which is both meaningful and has purpose for long term sustainability for the development of candidates.

- The identification, analysis and understanding between both the key competencies required for an individual’s current role (level 3) as well as that of the next level (level 4) is critical in order to perform a gap analysis which is indicative of the level of development required.
- This provides the journey map towards development, as well as the ability to assess the suitability of the candidate in terms of them being both willing and capable of being stretched in order to achieve these.
- In addition to the competence of the line manager in terms of providing an adequate level of development, is their willingness in order to do so.
- Coupled with the line managers involvement is both the stability, as well as the influence, which the environment has on the development process.

The application of these principles improves the actual quality delivered and serves to close the gap on either performance or outputs.

3.5 Overview of Research Cycles 1 – 4

Competencies required for effective level 3 management performance were identified during the first research cycle based on interviews with level 4 managers through the repertory grid interviewing technique. A disparity between scoring of skill levels resulted in a perception of competence being revealed which placed individuals into a talent rating based solely on operational achievement. The archetype associated with this phenomenon was ‘success to the successful’ whereby increased resources are allocated to those individuals in the belief that they have earned them, and that performance will continue to improve if they are allocated more.
In Research cycle 2, level 4 competencies were extracted from level 5 managers again utilizing the repertory grid interviewing technique. Skill ratings were congruent with the scores allocated and far more evenly spread, indicating that overall performance is more important than a singular view of talent. Non-operational competency requirements were more enhanced than those elicited in the first research cycle. As a result of individuals being promoted through level 3 operational achievement, the non-operational competencies became limiting conditions and performance was no longer effective, leading to the ‘limits to growth’ archetype being associated with this phenomenon.

In order to achieve completeness of competencies required for level 3 managers, research cycle 3, through ethnographic research as a data collection method, identified the causal mechanism which leads to both current and future value creation. The archetype associated with this mechanism is ‘attractiveness principle’ and limiting conditions were identified for development which create slowing actions in the ability to implement or improve on a strategic intent.

The focus of the fourth research cycle was to apply and develop learnings from the previous research cycles and ultimately identify principles for development of an individual in order to ensure a successful transition between the S curves of management development. Principles identified included doing a gap analysis in terms of competencies required, decisions around either performance management or development needs, support from both line managers and the environment and the use of a measurement system to provide clarity and expectations for individual performance.

While each individual research cycle resulted in valuable insights, a meta-synthesis of the data is necessary in order to pull these parts into a coherent whole theory.

### 3.6 Meta-synthesis

The qualitative approach of grounded theory was used as an analysis methodology throughout all research cycles, as well as in the meta-synthesis.

Grounded theory processes data through four stages, however meta-synthesis aims to bring together all the findings and combine them into a new complete theory. The stage one process of data collection in which propositions regarding the phenomenon are gathered was not comprised of new data during the final theory building, but of the total propositions extracted during the four research cycles.
3.6.1 Concept formation

Data was originally collected through a variety of methods such as interviews, surveys, documentation, meetings, observations, reflections, formal and informal conversations and participant and non-participant observations of both verbal and non-verbal constructs and 839 raw data constructs were extracted from the four research cycles (see Appendices B2, C1, D1-2 and E1) and reviewed in terms of relevance to the research question. 36 data points were discarded as they did not specifically relate to the research question. Examples of these include propositions recorded which were related to mental models of participants interviewed.

Table 9 : Examples of propositions removed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>He uses fear to drive performance because he doesn’t like me</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>He issues very direct instructions, which tolerate no debate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>He presents data which is offered as a solution, however is actually intended as an obstacle as to why request for change will not work</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Each individual proposition was reviewed in terms of what it related to, and grouped together if it related to a similar theme. If it could not be placed within a group of propositions, a new category was established. During the constant comparison process, each new proposition was consistently compared to others, and either grouped together or used to establish a new category and a list of propositions which related to similar themes emerged.

Propositions were kept in the original form in which they were captured to ensure validity of categorization, and 42 initial categories with headings which encapsulated their meaning, were established during Stage 2, a sample of which appears below. The full set can be found in Appendix F1.
A further comparison process took place between each category in order to group together categories with similar themes in a broader context at a higher level of abstraction. Raw data propositions within each category were re-examined to ensure validation within the broader context, and as a result a number of propositions were moved to a different category which better suited the overall meaning at the abstraction level. As an example there were a number of propositions related to ‘risk management’ of varying descriptions, and although they could apply to a number of categories, they were grouped together in a central category to get a broader and more holistic view of the category.

A heading was assigned to each category which encapsulated the meaning of all the propositions within the sub categories which had been grouped together. This resulted in 12 main categories with 42 sub categories (as seen in Appendix F2). The 12 main categories are reflected in the below table.

Table 11 : 12 Main categories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effectiveness of decisions made for the greater good of the organisation</th>
<th>Effectiveness of a performance plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness of engagement and integration with stakeholders</td>
<td>Ability to create value for the future</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact of environmental influence</td>
<td>Willingness of line manager to actively engage in development process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to build and communicate a credible, compelling and coherent argument</td>
<td>Demonstration of presence of inherent leadership DNA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to create value for the present</td>
<td>Ownership of own development journey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree of Presence</td>
<td>Degree of leadership competencies</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A literature review was done on the 12 categories to ensure completeness, and while a number of propositions were added to categories, they added substance and supported the existing data, as opposed to fundamentally changing the meanings of the categories.

3.6.2 Concept development

In order to develop variables at a higher level of abstraction, reduction sampling was done to subsume categories within each other.

Initially three core variables emerged from the reduction sampling however after reviewing the memo’s as part of the development phase, it was necessary to revisit the data and adapt the theory built. The review and incorporation of these memo’s into the concept development ensures validity of the results and that the emerging theory built has theoretical completeness.

Figure 32: Adaptation to research process – memo review

A review of the memo’s in which insights, reflections and thoughts were captured during the research process resulting in having to revisit the data and extract the variable, and all its propositions, called "Identification of inherent DNA required for talent succession development" from the variable called ‘Likelihood of strong leadership with heart’, and keep it separate.

The reason for this is reflected in the below memo:

Not everyone who expresses an interest in being developed, or is placed in a development pipeline, is capable of actually translating this into reality. What is it about the differences in two candidates that make one successful and the other not? Are there overriding or inherent competencies which will differentiate them so that I can be aware upfront of the likelihood of success in development?

(Appendix G6 – memo 5 and 6)

Once the incorporation of the memo’s had been completed, reduction sampling was re-done to subsume categories within each other. An Inter-relationship diagraph (see Appendix F3) was done to examine the relationships between the 12 categories created during the data categorization process, and relationships were then explored by determining if one variable was part of another (see Appendix F4-5). Once complete the number of ‘in’ and ‘out’ arrows into each variable were counted. The more ‘in’ arrows a variable had, the higher the level of abstraction, and the more likely that it would be responsible for variations within a causal mechanism.

An excerpt of the final reduction sampling can be seen in the below table, and the full extract in Appendix F4.
Table 12: Subsuming of categories to higher levels of abstraction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Number of 'in' arrows</th>
<th>Number of 'out' arrows</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Core Variable: Degree of environmental influence on culture creation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and leadership framing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact of environmental influence on behaviours</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willingness of line manager to actively engage in development process</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ownership of own development journey</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The variables with the lowest ‘in’ arrows were then subsumed into the others and new headings given to the grouping of categories in order to encapsulate meanings at the highest level of abstraction. This led to the identification of four core variables:

1. Identification of inherent DNA required for talent succession development
2. Quality of leadership
3. Effectiveness of a performance plan
4. Leading with heart

3.6.3 Meta-synthesis overview

The milestones achieved in the research conducted in this chapter are reflected in the below figure, commencing from data generation to the identification of core variables.

Figure 33: Meta-synthesis milestones leading to core variable identification
3.7 Validity considerations

Validity considerations during the research were done within the framework suggested by Maxwell (1992) and specific threads to validity within each research cycle are incorporated into this framework.

3.7.1 Descriptive validity

In the context of this research, descriptive validity pertains to the completeness and accuracy of data captured during each research cycle. The use of the repertory grid interviewing technique in the first two research cycles particularly lends itself to descriptive validity as both positive and negative perspectives are obtained on constructs elicited which enables precision in understanding meaning. In order to gain clarity on the constructs elicited, and to get to the lowest level of abstraction, both laddering up and laddering down was applied.

Personal contact for data collection was done to avoid non-verbal omissions such as tone of voice and body language. The data was recorded verbatim in order to retain original meanings and factual accuracy.

In order to maintain descriptive validity, data points which related more to the mental models of the participants interviewed than to the research question, were discarded during the meta synthesis process. (see Table 9)

Secondary validity was maintained through clarification and either perspective differences noted, or an agreement of understanding reached from the different participants.

As a last step, and in order to ensure completeness, a literature review was done which added richness and further substance to the data.

3.7.2 Interpretive validity

Interpretive validity in the context of this research meant that particular attention had to be paid to ensuring that the participants perspectives were accurately captured. During the research cycles, time was spent subsequent to the initial data collection process reflecting on interactions, actions, observations, and the application of meanings, as well as specific cultural and sub cultural influences on the natives. This was evaluated against accounts from other sources through triangulation, which ensured further interpretive validity.
Further threats to interpretive validity are discussed below within the applicable research cycle.

- **Researcher involvement in the research process**

The researcher is in the fortunate position of having access to a broad range of resources in Levels 3 to 5 as identified within the framework of Jaques and Clement (1994) levels of work, and ethical considerations such as confidentiality, impartiality and bias had to be strongly considered as data was gathered from participants who are known to the researcher, and extracted from contexts in which she is strongly imbedded. In order to mitigate researcher bias and the inadvertent application of personal meaning, validity was maintained through continuous triangulation.

During research cycles one and two, due to my position within the organisation, not only were the interviewees known to me, but I was also familiar with the managers being rated. This ethical dilemma was mitigated by not only guaranteeing confidentiality but also giving the interviewees the option of assigning numbers to the individuals, as opposed to names, so that the identity of the managers would not be known. Approximately 50% of the interviewees chose this option. This was balanced with descriptive validity by recording precise words and phrases to ensure personal bias was avoided.

Furthermore, with the application of the repertory grid interviewing technique as a data collection method in ensuring validity is fairly unique in that there is very little input from the researcher, and constructs are elicited from, and rated by the interviewees.

- **Researcher bias**

The converse side to ethnographic research conducted in research cycle 3, is that the researcher could apply personal meaning, or attempt to influence, the data being gathered, however in this research the ethnographic approach was used to identify specific behaviours pertinent to strategic versus operational behaviours. There was therefore no personal agenda or bias in terms of influencing outcomes, but rather the identification of behaviours pertinent to a thinking style in order to identify the current state, the desired state and the gap for development.

The researcher is a native in multiple cultures and subcultures within the organisation, and as a result is in the fortunate position of being able to generate diverse ethnographic data unobtrusively from multiple cultures in relation to middle, senior and executive management. Because the primary goal of ethnographic research is to understand the phenomenon being researched through allowing the culture or natural setting not to be influenced or altered, it stands to reason...
that if the researcher is already part of the existing culture being researched that behaviours will not be modified or changed in response to the researchers presence, which ensures a larger degree of validity.

3.7.3 Theoretical validity

Theoretical validity is relevant to ensure that the grouping together and categorization of data as well as the concept formation and development have coherence, and are reflective of the data gathered for the phenomenon under review.

The process of constant comparison and grouping together of data into similar categories was a slow and laborious one due to the amount of raw data, and in order not to make rash judgments and ensure legitimacy, it was necessary to do it over a length of time in order to avoid validity threats due to researcher fatigue.

Further threats to theoretical validity are discussed below within the applicable research cycle.

- Sample size in research cycles

The small sample of people interviewed in the first and second research cycles could be considered to be a limiting factor to this research, however, depth of the research was more possible than if more people had been interviewed. In most research papers reviewed which have used repertory grids, the average number of constructs elicited per interview was 8, whereas this research had an average of 26 at executive level and 30 at senior management level. This indicates a deeper level of critical thinking, and therefore richness of data.

Qualitative research is not dictated by sample size, but rather by depth and duration of interviews (Britten, N. 1995) and while depth in small samples is acceptable even purposefully chosen single cases meet the criteria for the intense study of a phenomenon (Patton, M. 1990). The ensuing limitation is that it might not be relevant, or wholly applicable, to a larger population, however a realist approach as opposed to a scientific approach is to generate rich and not soft data (Reige, 2003).

In order to mitigate these limitations, the research was approached from a principle perspective outcome (as opposed to a process or practice perspective), and to ensure validity of results and alleviation of researcher bias, triangulation, both from a quantitative and qualitative perspective was applied to data sources.
• Researcher bias

The researcher was the line manager of the candidate who was the subject of the action research cycles in research cycle 4, and had a vested interest in allowing, and ensuring, emergence as she is ultimately accountable within her environment to ensure that there is an emerging talent pipeline which is fit for purpose and readily available as needed.

In as much as the best intentions are to avoid researcher bias, a memo note during Research Cycle 3 (See pg 70) alerted me to the fact that I had inadvertently not encouraged emergence as I had been applying my own mental model to the research. This necessitated going back to the raw data and processing it without any pre-conceived notions.

Researcher bias could have an influence on the validity of the data presented (Bromley, 1986) and furthermore researcher feelings could lead to findings reached which have a lack of reliability (Becker, 1986), however this would not have not been to the researchers’ advantage as performance standards in the business unit which she took over, and was responsible for, had to be improved.

3.7.4 Generalizability

As this research was context bound, and therefore reflective of the environment in which the study was undertaken, generalizability refers to the extent to which the results obtained can be applied to a larger population. While the choice of qualitative grounded theory as a research methodology investigates a phenomenon in a specific environment and context in which it is embedded, the CiMO model will be applied in the researchers’ environment during the theory building process, in order to demonstrate generalizability. It will seek to identify in which context a specific intervention will produce a mechanism and attain a desired outcome. This will make explicit in which contexts the proposed interventions will work, and in which they will not, and under what circumstances.

3.7.5 Evaluative validity

As the researcher’s focus is to understand reality and the emergence of new theory, the combination of critical realism and grounded theory ensures that the theory is grounded in data. The aim of this research is therefore not to be evaluative but to focus on descriptive, theoretical and interpretative validity in order to understand, be able to explain, and influence the underlying mechanisms.
3.8 Conclusion

This chapter described the research process and research results from each individual research cycle undertaken, and the meta-synthesis of the data collected. The results chapter follows the graphical display of the research process as outlined in Chapter 2.

The data collected was processed through grounded theory methodology and through a process of constant comparison, categorised into similar themes. 12 main categories emerged and an inter-relationship diagram was used to examine the relationships between the variables. Through reduction sampling variables were taken to a higher level of abstraction, which led to the identification of the final set of core variables. The application of the research framework selected was particularly effective in enabling the understanding of the social world and revealing the complex relationships within the specific context. Threats to validity specific to the research process were acknowledged and discussed.

A literature review will be done in the following chapter on three levels, namely, the parent discipline, the focus discipline of this research and the core variables identified in this chapter. The literature review of the core variables incorporates the concept analysis from data processed in the meta-synthesis.
Chapter 4: Literature review

Chapter 3 detailed the results from the research process from data collection, through concept formation and concept development which culminated in the identification of four key variables.

This chapter seeks to locate the research findings in a wider body of knowledge and provide either validation, supplementary and/or contrary evidence to that presented in the theory in order to present a broader perspective.

Figure 34: Literature review process

The highest level of abstraction, Level 1, focuses on human capital development. The second level looks at management development, and the third level reviews literature for the four core variables identified in the research. To have an exact and explicit definition and meaning of the variables identified during the concept development phase of the meta-synthesis, a concept
analysis on each of the core variables was done. This was accomplished through the identification of antecedents, attributes and consequences from the propositions in each category, and has been integrated with literature reviewed.

4.1 Human Capital Development – Level 1

“Human capital represents the human factor in the organisation; the combined intelligence, skills and expertise that gives the organisation its distinctive character” (Bontis et al. 1999). It includes, but is not limited to, knowledge gained from academic studies, both skills and knowledge gained from prior experience, the ability to perform effectively and efficiently, and create value through the application of this knowledge. An increase in human capital is dependent on higher levels of individual competence (Dae-Bong, 2009) and contribution can be measured “… in terms of their value or cost to an organization” (Oxford English Dictionary). The sum of these properties and the effectiveness of its application therefore describe the collective value which individual resources within the organisation are able to contribute to an environment.

Developing human capital not only increases the earning potential of the individual (Bekker, 1975) but leads to significant organisational benefits (Renwick, 2003) such as sustaining and increasing organisational performance and delivering competitive advantage (Dunphy, Turner & Crawford, 1997). Research shows a 30 percent higher customer service satisfaction and innovation levels in organisations which have ‘high impact learning’ cultures (Deloitte’s Global Human Capital Trends, 2015).

Human resources have traditionally focused on effective service delivery, however at board level there was a realisation that talent, and specifically developing new leaders and planning for leadership succession, was the critical factor in ensuring business performance, sustainable growth, and management of new opportunities and risks. Possibly as a result of this realisation, when asked to rate their top three human-capital priorities in 2012, leadership development was rated as a current and future priority by 500 executives, with almost two-thirds rating it as their number-one concern (McKinsey & Company 2012).

This saw a global shift in 2103 with the involvement and incorporation of human resource practitioners into business strategy at board level, which signaled a move towards human resources as an enabler of strategy and no longer merely as a business support function. In the same year leadership development was rated on top of the list of talent concerns in the annual Deloitte’s Global Human Capital Trends report by executives, perhaps indicating a reason for the inclusion of human resources at a strategic level. They listed both the shift from a ‘war for talent’
to a ‘war to develop talent’ and the transformation of human resources to meet business priorities in their top 5 concerns as they faced increasingly higher levels of complexity and uncertainty and needed leaders who could function within these parameters. (Deloitte’s Global Human Capital Trends, 2013).

Despite the inclusion of human resources at a strategic level, a repeat of the survey in 2014 showed a significant gap between the development of human capital and the organisations readiness to respond to this demand, with leadership, retention and engagement, the reskilling of HR, and talent acquisition and access being cited as the most important issues facing organisations. CEO’s listed human capital strategies as a top priority for organisations, and were holding human resources responsible for talent acquisition, skill building and leadership development. The survey found that while human resources were in a transformational stage, the inclusion at board level had not delivered the benefits initially anticipated, and that there was an urgent need to address this challenge with concerns being raised as to whether the human resources teams had the necessary skills to enable this. This view was not shared by human resource leaders surveyed who rated organisational readiness far higher than business leaders did, highlighting either the need for improved engagement or increased understanding to ensure alignment between business requirement and the ability of human resources to deliver this. (Deloitte’s Global Human Capital Trends, 2014).

In 2015 building leadership remained a top concern and challenge facing organisations, while the ability and readiness to address the increasing skills gap declined dramatically, moving from the 8th position in the prior year, to now being rated as the 3rd highest challenge facing organisations today. Data suggested that organisations had not made significant progress in addressing this issue since the 2013 survey, with the capability gap widening even further, leading to findings that human resources were not able to react to change in the business at the required pace, meet business needs and were in need of an ‘extreme makeover’ to deliver effectively to business strategy. This gap in capability was due to business leaders associating skill shortage as a barrier to executing business strategies and the need to develop talent internally to ensure a constant supply. Both human resource professionals and business leaders rated their performance in this area as low, however disparities between perceptions of competence and capability to execute still existed, with human resources rating their performance 20% higher than business leaders did, perhaps explaining why the study showed an increasing trend towards hiring non-human resource professionals to close this gap (Deloitte’s Global Human Capital Trends, 2015).

A study conducted by DDI and The Conference Board’s Global Leadership Forecast 2014/2015, which gathered data from more than 13,000 leaders and 1,500 HR professionals from 2,000
organizations across 48 countries revealed that leaders no longer viewed formal learning as adding value, citing low job and business challenge relevance with limited opportunity to apply these formal learnings (Sinar, Wellins & Ray, 2014).

Human capital development is a core component of the human resource approach (Dae-Bong, 2009) and human resource professionals themselves have high degrees of confidence in leadership development solutions which they have implemented delivering value, however the tendency is to over use recruitment as a means of injecting new human capital in the organisation rather than finding sustainable solutions to developing from within (McKinsey & Company 2012). Human resource practitioners typically enable human capital through both general and specific training, the former not being specific to a task or organisation and transferable to future careers for the individual while the latter increases productivity or quality of outputs at the organisation in which the training occurs (Bekker, 1975). Development is applied as a one size fits all approach irrespective of context (Gurdjian, P., Halbeisen, T., & Lane, K. 2014), and the problem is that it is based on either focused research (patterns identified from similar leader identified behaviours) or broad based research (qualities picked from different leadership styles). This research is then used as a blueprint for training development and measurement of competency, and instead of developing leaders, it develops followers (Patching, 2011). While focused or broad based training can provide management with an overview of typical behaviours and competencies of successful leadership, it does not address specific competency gaps at an individual level.

The learning process surrounding the growth in human capital goes further than merely increasing knowledge, but includes the way that knowledge is used and the performance that arises as a result of it within the context that it is applied (Queuey, 2000). The learnings are applied through a process of sense making between the knowledge gained and the application of it into the context in which it is applied (Daley, 2001), and can therefore be described as the process of acquisition of knowledge to the use of this knowledge (Rastogi, as quoted in Stevens, 2010). The internal learning and the application of it into the context of the external environment in which they operate are intrinsically linked and need to be aligned to maximize both individual and organisational benefit (Sleezer, Conti & Nolan, 2003).

The future learning organisation will move away from traditional formal learning methods to increase human capital. They will instead opt to use peer networks to facilitate learning, sharing knowledge, best practices and experiences. (Sanchez-Arias et al. 2013). Adults typically retain around 10 percent of formal classroom learning, versus nearly two-thirds when they learn by doing. (Gurdjian, P., Halbeisen, T., & Lane, K. 2014). The learning journey needs to be an ongoing meaningful, focused and deliberate one (Sinar, Wellins & Ray, 2014). A targeted
approach to specific competence development is therefore required which necessitates a “tailored and individual focused approach to meet the needs of the individual leader and the organisational context in which s/he is embedded” (McDermott, Kidney & Flood, 2011). It will only be effective if it is a self-developed, carefully thought out program, and not comprised of purely off the shelf components (Cohn, Khurana & Reeves, 2005), and learning opportunities need to be defined and redefined, with an understanding of what needs to happen to optimize learning (Mumford, 1995).

The Deloitte’s Global Human Capital Trends annual survey reflects the pressing need by organisations to find sustainable solutions to human capital development in order to build leadership to enable growth, sustainability and viability. As it has the potential to influence the organisation either positively as a value, or negatively as a cost, development to enable competencies which add value should therefore be a key focus area in order to increase the level of human capital which directly influences and impacts contributions to the organisation.

Evidence that increased competence leads to increased organisational performance and competitive advantage has led to a strategic focus at board level to enable human capital development. However, despite the global shift in 2013 to include the human resources department at board level to enable this, the Deloitte annual surveys reports that the gap between business leaders perception of organisational readiness has widened.

While literature reveals that human resources typically enable human capital through both general and specific training, it is applied as a one sized fits all solution. This not only fails to adequately deal with competency gaps at individual level but also does not optimize the transfer of knowledge back into the workplace in a meaningful way which delivers the required benefits.

This reflects a need for a change to strategy, and away from the traditional learning methods in which human capital development is enabled in organisations to a future learning environment which is dynamic and focused on competencies required. Sense making between the acquisition and the application of knowledge, and the development therefore needs to be focused on specific competence development which benefits both the individual and organisation.

Human capital represents the collective sum of knowledge, skill level, prior experience and abilities of employees within an organisation, and comprises of many elements. In the context of this research however, management development, as a subset of human capital, will be the focus of the level 2 literature review.
4.2 Management Development – Level 2

As an enabler of a strategic intent to increase human capital, management development is required to not only enhance the ability of an individual to be able to contribute effectively in their current role, but to successfully manage changing demands and evolution of business requirements (Qiao & Wang, 2009). It ensures viability of performance as individuals are promoted which will also lead to effective performance and organisational achievement (Qiao & Wang, 2009).

In keeping with literature findings on human capital development researchers argue that management development needs to be done as a supplementary action to the organisational framework for human capital development (McDermott, Kidney & Flood, 2011) which needs to be implemented in a top-down development, and a bottom up execution approach (Murray & Greenes, 2006), and that it is only when the employer takes responsibility for this development within an established framework as part of the organisational priority that it works (Cook, 2006). Others expand on this theoretical perspective and believe the supplementary action can be enabled through either senior management involvement or self-management of the development process.

- Senior management involvement in line management development

Getting senior management involvement in the development of their line managers is critical, and there needs to be evaluation and understanding of the individuals skill set with short term development plans (Goodge, 1998). This not only ensures the development is relevant to the role and the environment in which the individual is operating in, but that plans are amended as new direction emerges (Cacioppe, 1998). This will enhance their ability to critically evaluate the gap for competency development and requires discipline, decisiveness and responsible risk-taking by the line manager (Kesler, 2002). This involvement not only encourages managers participation, and is rewarding to them, but also motivating to the individuals being developed (Harris & Barner, 2006).

This viewpoint however assumes that there is a commitment by line managers to actively participate in development, and the reality is that line managers often fail to take responsibility for employee development and implementation happens with varying degrees of success and consistency (Sikora & Ferris, 2014). This is further compounded by line managers not following
up on the application of learning as a result of training provided to employees in order to ensure a return on investment.

- Line managers ownership of their own self-development journey

Getting individuals to grow involves their self-management of the process which increases their strategic thinking ability, commitment to the process and practical application of learning (Davies, 2006). Self-development is however only effective within the context of the environment in which it is being applied because different competencies are also seen to be important by managers working in different environments (Hayes, Rose-Quirie & Allinson, 2000), and managers not only view different competencies as being important, but also only tend to focus on those areas which are important for their current goal achievement within their specific environments. If competencies are not fully understood at their own level, or the next, self-development will not aligned to either their own promotional needs or talent development within their teams.

Despite the theoretical perspective, self-development was not listed as a required competency for senior managers at all in the data gathered during the research cycles. It can therefore be assumed that with promotion into senior management there is also an expectation that they are at the correct skill level, both from the individual and the organisations perspective, and are consequently unlikely to be actively encouraged to increase their human capital. Openness to seeking assistance or development could be seen as a weakness or inability to cope from both perspectives. As these individuals refine their leadership styles and pursue and receive career opportunities, this willingness to develop can lessen, as the higher they rise in status, the more they are expected to have the skills to handle all situations, and coupled with the status attached to the position, they are less open to receiving feedback regarding their shortfalls (Kaplan, Drath, & Kofodimos, 1987).

This is compounded if an individual benchmarks their skill, competence and leadership framing within an environment which is not functioning optimally which poses a limitation to self-development effectiveness, as it is based on the managers perceptions of what needs to be developed, and their perception of their “own managerial competency is often understood narrowly and content-specific” (Viitala, 2005). Getting individuals to self-manage the development process is also limited both by their commitment and ability, and also largely determined by the context of their own skill and capability level to critically evaluate gaps in competencies as they do not fully understand the competencies required either at their own level, or the next. Where this happens, own self development is not aligned to either their own promotional needs or talent development within their own teams.
From an individuals' perspective it appears that those with characteristics such as greater work and mastery orientation have a higher motivation to perform leader self-development; but that those individuals with a combination of greater career-growth, as well as mastery orientation, are more skilled at actually doing it. (Boyce, Zaccaro & Zazanis Wisecarver, 2010). Increasing human capital through development therefore needs to focus on increasing both the work and mastery orientation, which will naturally enable potential career growth, and those individuals with a career growth orientation will benefit as a result.

While leadership development is a high focus at board level, it does not appear logical that the human resource department will be able to address individual competence gaps at a management level of an entire workforce, particularly in larger organisations. While traditional learning methods have a role to play to increase academic knowledge, unless it is translated into value within the environment, it will not be aligned to organisational needs and readiness gaps will continue to widen. Intrinsic issues with development being led by the organisation, senior management and self-development indicate that a supplementary action is required in order to align the three.

From a competence perspective, literature reviewed supports senior management development being centered on meeting people-related aspects (Analoui, 1995) as it is an essential competency of leadership and is required for satisfaction, commitment, superior performance and obtaining results (Carmeli, 2003; Carmeli & Tishler, 2006). Although responsible for both, senior managers themselves also believed that people rather than task skills were more important, perhaps due to their reliance on people rather than technical competencies in their roles (Farhad, 1995). In contrast, Peterson and Van Fleet (2004) argue that because most managers receive promotions based on their technical skills, and because of their comfort and competence in this area, their focus tends to be the technical rather than the managerial aspects. This statement was supported by findings in the research cycles which revealed that middle managers are largely promoted to senior management on the visibility of a single competence, the ability to deliver operational effectiveness. The implication of this is particularly concerning when reviewed in light of the senior management competencies which indicate that people skills, rather than technical ones become more critical as people move into senior management. Technical skills were precisely what middle managers were promoted on, and people skills, together with a lack of cognizance of the impact of their own behaviour, were largely ignored when considering overall effectiveness. This bodes poorly for success at senior management level.

While people management skills were the most important competency at a senior management level in literature, it is at odds with the findings in the research cycles. Although people
management skills were indeed listed as propositions, it was almost a given that they would be there as a base and not an overriding competency. This has implications for theory which will be discussed in Chapter 6.

Within the context of the literature view on human capital development and the strategic priority in terms of finding sustainable solutions, the focus on management development was to understand within a broader body of knowledge what suggested supplementary actions exist which could serve to close the gap between the strategic intent and it’s enablement. The two most common methods namely, senior management involvement in line management development and the line managers ownership of their own self-development journey while being beneficial, had intrinsic limitations which were discussed above.

As the aim of this research from intellectual, practical and performance goals was to identify how to enable the development and selection of talent which was relevant to the creation of a future fit workforce in order to facilitate the leap between the levels of work and the S curves on management development, research was undertaken to identify the core variables from a practiced based evidence perspective. The core variable identified through the application of the research, as discussed in Chapter 3, are:

- Leadership Quality (Environment)
- Leading with Heart
- Visibility of inherent DNA
- Effectiveness of a performance plan

These core variables are therefore a subset of management development and serve to mitigate the intrinsic issues identified within the two supplementary actions described above, both of which have validity in application.

The meaning of these variables, as well as the inclusion of a concept analysis developed from research findings, and with support from a wider body of theoretical knowledge, are described below.
4.3 Level 3: Literature review on the four core variables

4.3.1 Leadership Quality (Environment)

Leadership quality (Environment) describes the culture of an environment which is created as a result of the framework and boundaries which are enforced by the leaders in that environment.

Research findings indicated that leadership plays a critical role in determining the culture of the environment which is driven through the setting of goals, the management and engagement with staff, the development of skills as well as the tolerance levels with regards to performance and behaviours. This environmental influence is referred to as social learning and happens through the observation of other people’s behaviour within the environment, and the consequences which occur in response to the behaviour, (LeNir, P. 2016). This leads to integration of learnings without the individual having to experience the patterns themselves (Bandura, 1977).

There are three elements to social learning, attention, retention, and reproduction (Black & Mendenhall, 1990). Through these elements, interactions are cognitively processed, and either become learned behaviours or influence future behaviours (Caligiuri & Tarique, 2009, p. 338).

The impact of this is visible when the individual being developed begins to notice that they need to judge the successfulness of their actions according to people and/or environmental response. The individual being developed then begins to redefine the framework of their own leadership style, to role model and mimic behaviour on that of the leader, while updating and expanding their own definition of leadership. They simultaneously develop their own style, which is congruent with the organisational values and culture.

This translates into managers succumbing to the leadership style, as they depend on the leadership in the environment, to provide guidance regarding environmental cues (Miller & Dollard, 1941). In order to comply with leadership expectations they need to adjust their own framework and cascade this philosophy down through staffing levels in order to avoid negative consequences for themselves. The research finding that employees redefine their own frameworks to role model and mimic leadership behaviour is further supported by literature which reveals pattern recognition, created by cognitive frameworks, built from having prior experiences, provides the foundation for making connections between events and for applying meaning to these patterns (Baron & Ensley, 2006). It also involves making connections between multiple factors, although our tendency, based on simplicity and certainty, is to focus on the information we believe to be important and use past experience to decide the most credible explanation (Kelly, 2010).
2006). The individual becomes aware of the need for perception management and relationship differentiation, and begins to associate with the correct level of people while developing a strategy around alignment of expectations to actions to influence others opinions in order to ensure environmental fit. They adjust their behaviours, and change language, when engaging at higher levels, in order to blend in. They are quick to notice others reactions to them and understand that they need to deal directly with others to influence opinions.

The benefit to development within the context of social learning is the ability of line managers to do individualized development and refine the program based on shifts within employees as they grow, decline or move balance too far in one area. This increases employees’ competence and confidence to be able to manage pressure and uncertainty with an increased understanding of themselves, their roles, the environment in which they operate, as well as the organisation (Robinson, 1988). It provides the platform for them to learn from their own experiences supported by an access to knowledge and relationship networks (Kolb et al, 1986), and creates an environment conducive to problem identification and solution (Goh, 2002). Through group interaction, employees are also able to learn from one another, to develop skills and competencies, in both a formal and informal manner, and to experience both personal and professional growth (Manuti et al., 2015). Learning within a community environment can translate an abstract learning concept into one which is concrete and real, and delivers benefit both to the individuals as well as the organisation (Manuti et al., 2017).

Throughout the development process both the manager and the employee being developed need to remember the purpose. This allows them to stay on track and committed, ensure there is consistent feedback, and in a similar vein to the leadership being applied to them, they need to hold employees accountable for the full depth and breadth of the role. There needs to be a willingness to sacrifice of their own time in order to allow the employee the opportunity to use them as a ‘sounding board’. However at a point they need to recognise that they need to consciously break the dependency in the development cycle, and be aware and honest about their own limitations in terms of development, and be able to identify where external assistance is required.

These antecedents become visible through line managers’ encouragement and feedback, both from themselves as well as 360 degree stakeholder feedback with regard to visible change, being able to synthesize feedback, recognise a jump in the development curve, and to be able to identify which progress needs to be kept going, maintained or adjusted as well as an awareness of the employee swinging too much in one direction. They see any kind of stuck-ness as opportunity for improvement.
They drive this through managing at the correct level of abstraction; they will assist, guide, mentor and coach where necessary, but simultaneously apply the principle that you do not grow someone by taking ownership of responsibility for their accountabilities. They hold people accountable to deliver their full depth and breadth of the function in which they were appointed. They provide a support structure which limits negative environmental factors influencing both behaviours and outputs, and deliver an environment which is optimal for development and talent growth. Feedback on negative perceptions is done strategically in order to maintain this environment. They provide the framework for behaviours which are encouraged versus not tolerated and ensure a highly emotionally regulated environment, with boundaries which drive consistent behaviour.

Their role is to challenge, to stretch, to be uncompromising in their expectations, within realistic limits of what is achievable. Behaviour cannot be self-serving - if expectations are set too low in order to avoid failure, the environment will accommodate this.

The role models within the environment for vicarious learning therefore become highly significant (Popper & Maysless, 2007), and behaviours need to be inclined towards cooperation and integration (Mintu-Wimsatt & Calantone, 1996). In addition if training and development is undertaken with someone who the person being developed identifies with, it is greatly facilitated (Leavitt, Pondy & Boje, 1989). This has a positive impact on the subordinate in terms of increased psychological empowerment (Ladegard & Gjerde, 2014). The consequence is clear and observable signs of employee development movement in the right direction, an understanding of the parts in order to be able to influence the whole, and a structured development plan which is subject to multiple revisions as emergence happens.

“The best leaders do not simply respond to change but proactively recognize when change is necessary, understand the change management process, and foster an environment of agility, learning, and strategic anticipation. They prepare people to adapt readily to compete” (Gebelein, 2001, p.10.). Anticipatory leaders “continually scan the external environment, engage in organisational dialogue and participate in learning processes in order to discover possibilities, mobilize positive energy and build commitment within their organisations to achieve a shared, robust view of the future” (Savage & Sales, 2008, p. 28). The benefit of high leadership quality is tangible – those organisations with quality leadership are six times more likely to be amongst the top 20 financial performers than those without (Sinar, Wellins & Ray, 2014).
It is clear from the literature review, and in support of the theory built, that leadership influence is critical in determining not only behaviours, management styles (as determined by the mimicry of leadership skills which exist in the environment), the tacit influence of acceptable and non-acceptable standards, aligning of values, but also the opportunity and potential to use this influence to drive development within the organisation. Environmental and demographic factors influence management behaviour more than the individual personalities (Dakin, Nilakant & Jensen, 1994) and there needs to be alertness to shifts and changes in the value alignment between their employees and the organisation, because organisational values drive ethical decision making (Cowan & Todorovic, 2000)

4.3.2 Leading with Heart

Leadership with heart describes a leader who has an inner locus of control with regards to their own behaviour, is focused as much on people as they are with tasks, and manages with care and empathy while holding people fully accountable. The combination of applying both task and people orientation has a far greater benefit on organisational effectiveness and performance, than using one particular style (Adeyemi-Bello, 2001). An effective leader has both components within their management practice, and is able to use either as the situation demands (Breakwell and Millward as cited in Millward & Bryan, 2005, p. 15).

This research expands on both people and task components, and has them listed under separate variables, with an interdependent relationship. This core variable therefore focusses on the people component, as a subset of a strong leader, and the task aspect is subsumed into outputs as discussed in the literature review of the effectiveness of the performance plan. This ensures that managers have a framework within which to manage behaviours and performance, and thereby focus on the task aspect in a constructive and non-emotional way, while simultaneously demonstrating the people development capability.

It is created by an awareness of both verbal and non-verbal communication and a display of understanding, assertiveness, self-confidence, articulation, approachability, integrity, tenacity, flexibility, as well as appropriate levels of maturity and respect.

From a people component perspective, employee engagement is enabled by the consistency of leadership behaviour, a caring but competent management style combined with creating clarity of purpose and expectation. Consistency of the way communication is done (Thornhill, Lewis & Saunders, 1996) and delivering a consistent message through the alignment of verbal and non-verbal expressions and ensuring you stay true to your values by basing your decisions and actions
on them (Halpern & Lubar, 2003) ensures relationship commitment (Sharma & Patterson, 1999). Leaders therefore need to have a large degree of self-regulation of their own communication, both verbal and non-verbal, and the ability to pay attention to the responses of both themselves, and others, through reflection, is a critical antecedent. They allow subordinates to express their thoughts and ideas, to see things from their point of view, give them a signal that they have been heard, respond without shutting them down, and then add their own perspective to the conversation.

Competent leaders use their cognitive skills, emotional resilience and personal drive to involve employees and employee engagement is enabled through their involvement to achieve operational excellence (Das, Kumar & Kumar, 2011). They seek their own clarity in order to gain understanding, and can explain the changes and the impact of them to their staff in order to create ‘buy in’, and link operational performance to a strategic intent. As a result of being able to explain concepts both up and down stream, they are able to get people activated and moving in the right direction through having a common sense of purpose, and being very clear about the requirements needed to deliver to this purpose, which not only creates clarity and meaning (Piasecka, 2000), the building of genuine connections, but also positively influences and reduces resistance to change (Elving, 2005). The ability to communicate the same message consistently, confidently, and get meaning across at all levels, create clear understanding of requirements with subordinates, be non-defensive and open to feedback, listen to what others have to say and show the appropriate levels of respect to seniors and authority levels, ensures there is clarity of purpose and expectation, and the identification with change and the mastery required in the change (Moran & Brightman, 2001).

Employee engagement positively impacts the quality of a relationship, and does not only “take place in the head of the passionate individual but is also experienced by other individuals as well’ (Lafrenière et al, 2011. p. 150) and once present and reinforced, becomes contagious (Chang, 2001).

The teams reporting to them need to be self-directed, motivated, committed, understand their objectives and the necessary investment in their employees skills need to have taken place to enable this (Aghazadeh, 2003). It hinges on the following factors: team creativity enabled through the combination of a common understanding of the problem to be resolved and the sharing of a desired outcome. (Feurer, Chaharbaghi & Wargin, 1996), the ability to solve problems, meet commitments, have a plan, deal with facts, be process compliant, learn quickly, empower people, speed up processes, learn from mistakes, and ensure that there are consequences for bad performance and reward or recognition for good (Macatee, 2007). It requires giving direction,
working with others, maintaining relationships and paying attention to detail (Rowley, 1997), looking after your customers, innovation, having committed staff and managerial leadership. (Darling, Gabriëlssohn & Seristö, 2007, p. 19). In order to be truly successful you need to display care and capability (Gilbert, 2013), lead with, and create a culture of, honesty, commitment and trust (Mackenzie & Welch, 2005), display emotional intelligence (Groves, 2006) be in the moment and flexible enough to handle the unexpected. (Halpern & Lubar, 2003), be passionate (Day, 2004, p. 350),

These leaders are mindful, command the attention of others through their presence, exude self-confidence and are prepared to state their case, participate and give their viewpoint. They are able to delegate, and although they need to maintain control of the tasks, they need to trust their teams to deliver and manage exceptions in terms of delivery. These antecedents are visible through a no blame approach to dealing with issues, a willingness to experiment, an understanding of the importance of asking good questions, and a framework update regarding ideas of failure: a willingness to change their unwillingness to fail.

Intangibly perceived attributes such as the tone of their voices, as well as a sense of purpose with the way they walk and talk, the speed displayed when reacting to requests, the resilience and flexibility displayed when things do not go according to plan, and the initiative displayed in identifying and solving problems become visible. They reduce resistance to change and build relationship commitment at all levels and there is a consistent deliverable of own objectives and a team who goes out of their way for their manager.

These individuals do not wait to be developed – they create their own environment for development, which is visible through the ability to apply learnings into practice. They have a strong sense of purpose in terms of wanting to learn and grow which is fostered by openness to receiving feedback, and using the feedback as an opportunity to improve their own knowledge, skills, development and growth. They take cognizance of the impact of their behaviour on others and display an appropriate level of maturity, are seen as role models who lead by example and are respected by both seniors and subordinates.

The consequence is the emergence of an individual who delivers strong leadership with heart, takes complete ownership of their own areas, questions for clarity but builds a mindset of problem solving and improvement within their teams, has a high degree of people and team engagement, is focused on management/leadership growth, exhibits a balance between toughness and softness, is fair but firm, and has trust, and confidence in their own decision making capability.
4.3.3 Visibility of inherent DNA

There are inherent characteristics which predispose an individual to appropriate development for promotion and a number of critical antecedents need to be in present in an employee in order to give the line manager a sense of comfort that the candidate selected has the potential to be developed, and therefore commit to invest time and resources to them.

Critical to talent management and the development of a candidate is the decision of whether an individual is first and foremost worthy, and indeed capable of development, as spending inordinate amounts of time developing someone who is not likely to rise above their current level is futile. In order to create a successful future fit talent pipeline, it is essential to ensure that resources in terms of time and money are allocated to the correct individuals as not all candidates who partake in development activities benefit equally, (Caligiuri & Tarique, 2009) and consequently not everyone should be treated in the same way (Boudreau & Ramstad, 2005).

While employees may achieve an ‘above target’ rating in the talent placement grid as reflected in figure 11 in the research context, this does not necessarily indicate a high readiness for promotion or progression to the next level. It is essential to identify who the correct candidates are - the right development needs to be aimed at the right people who possess the relevant knowledge, skills, abilities and other personality characteristics, which will give reassurance to a high possibility of successful development (Caligiuri, 2006). The requirement is however for the competency to be observable and as a result needs to be defined in demonstrable terms rather than in abstract, conceptual ones.

Antecedents include demonstrating a high ability to be able to reflect, and being able to use learning from experience (both success or failure) to modify their plans, behaviours and strategies to determine new direction; an expression regarding commitment and openness to change; a willingness to be disturbed and experiment with trying something different, both from a thinking as well as doing perspective; a willingness to fail forward, and maintain a sense of humour while doing so, personality factors such as: extroversion, agreeableness, conscientiousness, emotional stability; and openness or intellect (Costa & McCrae, 1992), motivation to learn (Colquitt, LePine & Noe, 2000) and self-efficacy (Gist, Stevens & Bavetta, 1991).

There needs to be respect towards authority, boundaries, policies, procedures, rules and regulations, the line manager as well as for the organisation. They need to care about what people think about them, have a strong sense of responsibility, be self-assured, results driven, show speed in response, demonstrate energy and a willingness to go the extra mile.
When these antecedents are in place, the candidate is more likely to submit to development, to be open to accepting feedback on areas of improvement in a non-defensive way, to be committed and receptive to both change and exploration, to have an eagerness and sense of urgency to experiment and be both mindful and present during the process. Candidates who demonstrate a high degree of openness are more likely to also have a strong sense of curiosity and exhibit a willingness to assess what is required for situational adaptation (Caligiuri, 2000).

The consequence is that they use feedback to effect change, are very quick to identify opportunities to operationalize learnings, to select information and decide how it could be used and are able to translate concepts into practical implementation and be aware of the impacts of these changes.

The candidates who display the attributes as defined above are more likely to succeed in terms of development, and the presence of these attributes will provide a sense of reassurance to the line manager that the journey of development will be a mutually rewarding one. This strengthens the willingness of the line manager to engage in a development process with the candidate, and be committed to it.

4.3.4 Effectiveness of a performance plan

A performance plan is in essence a contract between the line manager and the employee for the year ahead, and details outputs required to achieve goals set in order to deliver the organisational strategy. It is essential to identify the important factors of the strategy which need to be accomplished, determining how to measure them and to assign accountability in order to execute them, and they should be used to develop and improve performance (Schneier, Shaw, & Beatty, 1991). There needs to be a sense of identification and engagement with the strategy at all levels of staff (Haudan, 2007), followed by total alignment of accountabilities, competencies, behaviours and compensation (Khadem, 2008). The performance plan set for each individual manager therefore needs to be cascaded down from the strategy in an abstraction process from the most senior to lowest level employee, with senior managers having goals at higher levels of abstraction, and junior staff assigned specific tasks required to support these achievements.

Organisations hoping to achieve a differentiation strategy use both financial and non-financial indicators in order to measure performance. This is in contrast to companies who focus on a cost-leadership strategy, and who tend to largely use financial ones. Comprehensive
performance measurement indicators bridge the gap between both strategic and organisational performance, and therefore lead to improved company performance. (Micheli & Mura. 2017).

Performance measurement systems serve to maintain performance and contain goals which are measurable and defined. There needs to be clarity of measurement and goals assigned which are required to drive focus areas which need to be met from a performance output requirement, or from a developmental need. They require constant monitoring and holding people accountable for their achievement (Sterling, 2003), and not only provide the means to manage outputs but can also be used to influence the behaviour and decisions of managers. (O’Mara, Hyland & Chapman, 1998). Organisations have to focus on individual performance first before they are able to build organisational performance (Collings & Mellahi, 2009), and as people are an organisation’s largest asset, they need to be measured and managed in a manner which reflects this (Bassi & McMurrer, 2005), and therefore need to be kept motivated and engaged to ensure strategy execution (Berggren & Bernshteyn, 2007).

As ultimate aim of a performance plan is to achieve strategy, it is done by all the parts pulling in the same direction to enable value creation, both for the present (to meet strategy) or for the future (to create future strategy).

In order to ensure this alignment and to ensure a balanced individual performance and achievement of goals for the greater good for the organisation, performance plans need to encompass more than technical goals. Leaders need to “balance intuition with data, confidence with context, personal needs with the greater good” (Allio, 2007, p. 16). Performance plans need to include other aspects such as people or finance goals, which discourage silo mentality and self-serving behaviour, as even when there is evidence to the contrary, leaders believe their intentions were good (Nash as cited in Odom & Green, 2003, p. 66).

Three areas which need to be driven through the performance plan to enable this are stakeholder engagement, business acumen and resource allocation, and while not core variables identified through the metasynthesis process, are critical enablers of the performance plan effectiveness and therefore worth inclusion. These are therefore discussed below.

- Stakeholder engagement

In order to mitigate self-serving behaviour multiple perspectives need to be considered which ensures both vertical and horizontal alignment between areas and the balancing of individual scorecard achievement with the need of the greater organisation. Measures which encourage
engagement and integration with stakeholders should be included to ensure multiple perspectives are taken into account. While the literature review does not specifically link stakeholder engagement and the subsequent networking to a performance management system, it does link it to both improving individual as well as organisational performance. It should therefore be included in the performance plan to encourage and develop a ‘world view’ and to ensure that the reciprocity is maintained within an ethical framework. While “agile” groups are customer centric and engage with stakeholders to increase satisfaction, the “less agile” groups view stakeholders as a means to improving their performance only and “can be characterized as more internally focused with a bias toward internal operational outcomes.” (Power, Sohal & Rahman, 2001, p. 262). Networking is “effective in communicating complex information, sensing subtle signals and transferring knowledge” (Kase & Yu-Shan Liu, 1996, p. 14). It leads to an increase in promotional prospects (Robbins, Odendaal & Roodt, 2003), as well as organisational performance. (Meier & O’Toole, 2010).

As much as strength and diversity of networks lead to increased “trust, reciprocity, information flow, collective action, happiness and personal wealth” (Kouzes & Posner, 2002, p. 280), there are also disadvantages, in that strong network relationships require more reciprocity to maintain in exchange for assistance received (Martinez & Aldrich, 2011). An ethical balance needs to be maintained, and focus needs to be more on cooperation and collaboration than individual benefit. Stakeholder engagement is conditional on the desire of an individual to seek competitive advantage through gaining knowledge from, or about, other stakeholders. Antecedents include being patient and mindful and showing a level of care for their customer - balancing interests and going the extra mile. These individuals proactively network, anticipate stakeholder resistance, integrate and with engage them and use this to influence the outcome for their own areas while simultaneously considering the impact on the organisation.

The result is observable by stakeholder perceptions being managed, collaboration with them, understanding their constraints, needs and impacts, and working together to better understand an issue. As an outcome these individuals build relationships to ensure collaboration for future use, and not only network for current and future opportunities, but also for reciprocity. They understand their stakeholder needs and keep others informed and in the loop thereby creating understanding.

- Business acumen

Competencies such as business acumen should be included in the performance plan (Prince, 2008) specifically in areas where an entity’s success is dependent on another (Van Vactor, 2011),
as it can generate significant progress towards achieving organisational results (Moore, 2004). The knowledge and perspectives gained during the stakeholder engagement, coupled with the argument building capability created by understanding multiple perspectives, increase the degree of business acumen which is created by being open to new ideas and embracing change and by taking others opinions and factors into account before making a decision.

Antecedents include the ability to focus at the correct level of detail, consider all facts, as well as the ability to analyse, understand and get value from information, and argue and support an opinion. A continuous improvement mindset and good judgement calls regarding boundary testing are essential as well as being willing to fight for one’s own area, but listening and taking cognizance of all sides of an argument.

As a result of these antecedents being in place, the individual is able to take calculated risks, proactively go out of their way to find a solution to a problem, take responsibility for decisions and make good judgement calls. The willingness to challenge the status quo and the ability to stand their ground in conflict means that issues are dealt with in a constructive manner.

They know their subject matter, have knowledge of other areas of the business, and speak confidently and present a coherent argument, through creating a balance between data analysis, by digging into the detail and gaining understanding in order to be able to defend their argument. There is an understanding of the bigger picture, as well as the need to compromise their position if the benefit is greater for another department and as a result, the overall organisation.

These antecedents are visible through them constantly seeking opportunities to differentiate their offering and fighting against decisions which could negatively impact the business as a whole, whilst also considering ethical implications of these decisions. They do not consider any area that they perceive to be impacting on their own achievement or not adding value, untouchable and do not feel confined by boundaries or afraid to interfere in areas outside own areas of responsibility to ensure value creation.

As a consequence a credible, coherent and compelling rationale behind arguments is presented in a way that covers most potential questions, and there is an increased ability to be able to answer questions on the detail behind the numbers. They are seen to be willing to take risk or make decisions which will differentiate them, as well as a willingness to create positive changes in the system, which increases their ability to create value for the organisation.
• Resource allocation

It is ultimately the organisational strategy which guides the utilization of resources through the objectives which it aims to achieve, and as these resources are used and aligned the performance of the organisation increases (Fawcett, Smith & Cooper, 1997). Management therefore need to consider resource utilization as a skill which enables organisational agility (Gagnon, 1999) as it is more about the creation of competitive advantage than ensuring organisational stability (Chaharbaghi & Lynch, 1999). Resources can be divided into two categories; the individual resources of the organisation (which consist of both tangible and intangible resources) and secondly, the way these individual resources work together to deliver value (Lowson, 2003).

Intangible assets such as human, information and organisation capital need be aligned and integrated in order to deliver, and support, the strategic intent and to create value (Kaplan & Norton, 2004). There are decisions which need to be taken around usage and alignment of resources for the protection of own areas and scorecard, versus making decisions for the greater good of the organisation. Optimum balance must be achieved between people, physical assets and technology (Shiem-Shin Then, 1999), and alignment must not only happen vertically (within functional areas) but also as horizontally (between different functional areas) (Kathuria, Joshi & Porth, 2007).

In order to create current value, the protection of your scorecard drives the effectiveness of resources in order to achieve operational goals, and is necessary, however organisational benefit is sometimes created through the compromise of resources in one area for the benefit of another. Stone (2004) agrees it has a positive effect because there are clear boundaries which drive accountability, but admits that it does not foster collaboration, and that of aligning of resources for future value creation.

There must be alignment between the goals of individual areas and the overall organisational strategy (Katunzi, 2011), and the ripple effect of multiple perspectives, combined with an increase in business acumen, ensure that future value creation is enabled and that individuals are comfortable to step out of the role of protecting their own scorecard and performance measurement at all costs and make discerning decisions which could impact their own scorecard negatively, but provide benefit to the organisation.

No literature could be found where the interconnected relationship between these were made explicit.
4.4 Literature Review Conclusion

The benefits of human capital development are clearly documented in literature and concerns surrounding the inability of organisations to ensure a consistent reliable supply of leadership candidates has resulted in a global shift from a ‘war for talent’ to ‘war to develop talent’. Despite the inclusion of human resources practitioners at board level in order to enable this, the perception of organisational readiness in order to supply a consistently reliable talent pool has widened. Planning for leadership succession in order to ensure a talent pipeline is critical to organisational performance, competitor advantage, opportunity and risk management, and reflects the pressing need to find methods of leadership development which are able to ensure organisational viability and sustainable growth.

While the approach to increasing human capital is traditionally enabled through training interventions, it is approached as a one size fits all approach which does not focus on addressing specific competency gaps required on an individualised basis, or the process of translating this learning into practical application.

The solution required therefore needs to focus on supplementing the human resources approach, which is based on either focused or broad based research development, and address the closure of specific competency gaps of each individual, while ensuring the translation of these skills into the environment in which they operate. While literature reviewed, and global trend, has human resources at the centre of this debate, development is largely treated as a linear multi-finality process, where in reality it is subject to multiple revisions as competency requirements emerge.

In order to ensure viability of performance in current roles, and as individuals are promoted, management development needs to be done in a top down development and bottom up execution approach. Various approaches exist within this development journey, the first of which is the employer taking responsibility for development, which is largely the generic approach to human capital by human resources. The second option is the involvement of senior managers into line management development, which while simultaneously ensuring relevant competency development and the adaptation of this development as the candidate progresses, is limited by their commitment and willingness to do so. Self-development as a third option, although ensuring commitment to the process, is limited by the individual’s ability to critically evaluate which competencies require development, the context against which they benchmark themselves, and the application of these skills back into their environment.
While each of the three approaches within management development delivers value, there are intrinsic limitations which limit their effectiveness. In order to align them and mitigate limitations, supplementary action is required in order to effectively increase human capital, and therefore close the competency development gap.

Environmental influence, or social learning, will create the culture which is determined by the leadership styles exhibited within an environment. Through observing behaviours and the consequences of non-conformance against the framework set by the leadership within the environment, employees experience learning without having to physically experience it themselves. This provides a mechanism for leadership mimicry and the alignment of behaviours and leadership styles which are in sync with those exhibited in the environment. A highly regulated emotionally stable environment in which learning is encouraged and promoted by leadership will provide the platform for line managers to do development which is both targeted and individualized based on specific competency gaps identified.

A positive environmental influence dictates that a manager leads with heart and therefore focusses as much on the people aspect as they do on the task component. It provides the framework within which to manage behaviours and performance in a constructive manner, providing clarity of purpose and expectation together with a caring but competent management style which ensures employee engagement. This creates a safe space for openness regarding vertical and horizontal communication, problem solving ideas and employee development as there is a willingness to allow exploration and failure in a controlled manner. As a result, there will be individuals who demonstrate a high reflection ability which is used to learn from experiences and operationalize learning. They stand out in terms of performance and potential for further development, and therefore become the potential future talent pipeline.

In as much as the management of the people aspect is important, a framework needs to be in place to ensure that individual performance requirements are in place to ensure execution of the organisational strategy. The performance plan is therefore broken down into accountabilities which provide clarity of expectation and the means to measure and manage performance in a constructive manner. The sum of all the individual performance plans ensures that the whole is achieved through the combination of all the parts of the strategy pulling in the same direction.

Literature reveals the need to align individual goals with organisational strategy and to potentially compromise individual scorecard achievement for that of a larger organisational benefit. In order to avoid silo behaviour and focus solely on individual goal achievement at the cost of the organisation, three key areas need to be included in the performance plan:
• Stakeholder engagement which ensures multiple perspective consideration and the balancing of individual performance plan achievement with the larger organisation strategy. It ensures that individual as well as organisation performance is improved and that stakeholder collaboration is prioritised.

• Business acumen which is created through multiple perspectives obtained by increasing stakeholder engagement increases the ability to create credible arguments and serves to attain a balance between the achievement of individual performance plans and compromises to these plans which would benefit the larger organisation.

• Resource allocation decisions regarding the usage and/or alignment of resources, further determine individual scorecard benefit versus organisational benefit and require optimum balance between the two to ensure that the correct decision is taken.

The placement of a high quality leader into an environment therefore plays the pivotal role in ensuring that the three management development perspectives are aligned while changing the culture into a high performing one driven through environmental influence and an effective performance management system in which competency development is a focus area.

This ensures, while simultaneously developing and holding senior management accountable for performance, that there is a specific and individualistic approach to development as recommended for a future learning environment, and that the senior managers’ own competence and skill level increases, thereby enhancing their ability to critically evaluate the gap for competency development at lower levels and create an equifinality approach to development.

Each individual review provided support of the theory to the parts in which they were reviewed, and although there was supporting theoretical evidence in each section, there were no papers which consolidated the parts of human capital development into a whole, which therefore makes this paper distinctive in that regard.

The literature review sought to provide theoretical grounding to the research undertaken, with particular focus on cascading levels of abstraction, beginning with human capital development, followed by management development, and then of the core variables identified in this research. The following chapter links research results to systemic performance management, and proposes interventions within the various contexts.
Chapter 5: Transforming research results into a theory of systemic performance management

The previous two chapters detailed the research process towards building the final theory with Chapter 3 culminating in the identification of four core variables through a meta-synthesis of the data collected in individual research cycles, and Chapter 4 locating the research findings in a wider body of knowledge. This chapter will use the core variables and insights from the literature reviewed to construct a theory which answers the research question, proposed interventions in the CMO, and construct a Causal Loop Diagram which reflects the application of these interventions.

5.1 Theory Building

Beyond identifying the causal mechanisms, it is important to understand when, how and if various variable factors interact, and under what circumstances (Sayer, 2000, p. 14). This is critical as human decisions, behaviours and reactions are very often situation dependent and reactions are not always predictable, and failure to identify, understand and influence the underlying structure will result in the inability to influence the event or phenomenon which is visible in the real world. Variations in the results will therefore also not be fully understood, as attempting to change the phenomenon without changing the causal mechanism often returns it to its original state as change only happens through pattern interruption and positive feedback loops within this system.
The Context, Intervention, Mechanism Outcome (CIMO) model is used to contextualize an intervention which proposes to change the outcome through a mechanism, which has been set off by an intervention put in place with this aim in mind.

The CIMO Model is used to develop a theory which will specify in which situational Context, a specific Intervention, will produce a certain Mechanism and attain a desired Outcome. They therefore offer insight into design propositions - specifically around what to do, where to do it, what effect it would have, and why it happened. (Denyer et al. 2008) and determine in which contexts the theory will be more likely to produce a specific outcome. As the aim of this research is to practically implement the theory built, it is important to identify where the points of influence are, in order to resolve the current situation and enable the creation of a viable talent pipeline.

Christensen and Raynor (2003) believe rigorous theories pinpoint causation and move toward predictability and analysis of failures. They list three ways in which to develop sound theories:

- through observation and description of a phenomenon,
- the classification of aspects of the phenomenon into categories
- the formulation of a hypothesis of what causes the phenomenon

The more intensely a phenomenon is described and understood, its depth and complexity, the more sound the theory is likely to be. Good theories assist us to make predictions about future events, and interpret the present (understanding the what, and why), and should also define in which circumstances the mechanism will or will not lead to the desired outcome. (Christensen & Raynor, 2003)

As similar interventions in different contexts could give rise to different results, the integration of critical realism with the CIMO model allows the underlying causal mechanisms to become visible and enables the identification of the conditions which will be required to obtain a similar result (Tilley, N. 2000)

The four CIMO Elements are explained as follows (Adapted from Denyer et al. 2008)

**Context (C)** – The environment in which the situation is embedded, and where the intervention can be successfully implemented – it consists of both internal and external factors which create the situation. Pawson and Tilley (1997), list four contextual layers with this context: the individual, the interpersonal relationships, institutional setting and the wider infrastructural system.
**Intervention (I)** - The intervention is specific to the context, and is designed to attain a predetermined outcome. If the context changes, it is highly likely that the intervention would need to change and adapt to suit the environment. Implementation of the intervention needs to be carefully monitored and nuances need to be taken note of.

**Mechanism (M)** - the causal mechanism which is triggered by the intervention in a certain context, and lives in the ‘real’ domain of critical realism ontology. The building of the theory (or mechanism), is also called theoretical coding, and this is the real level within stratified ontology.

**Outcome (O)** – the desired result, or outcome, in the specified context which has been created through the triggering of the mechanism by a specific intervention, the results of which are visible in both the ‘actual’ and the ‘empirical domains’

As part of the final theory building, the matching of the pattern with a system archetype occurs. System Archetypes are visual displays of commonly occurring themed causalities within a system, and are made up of at least two loops, which are made up of reinforcing and balancing feedback.

5.1.1 Systems thinking diagrams

Systems thinking diagrams enable the ability to deal with complexity and provide a visual display with which to communicate understanding as they reflect nonlinear cause and effects. They are represented by Causal Loop diagrams and System Archetypes, as discussed in their applicable order below. These are both simplified maps of the dynamic patterns of inter-connectedness. They therefore provide clear visual articulation of circular causality concepts such as positive and negative reinforcing loops (Mingers, 2010).

- Causal Loop Diagram

The use of a causal loop diagram aids in visualization of the inter-dependent interconnected relationships in order to understand and influence the social world. Systems within these causal loop diagrams are classified as either open or closed, the former being reliant on an input, over which it has no control, but responds to it as an outcome. A closed system, which is the more prevalent of the two, however responds to an input but also has influence over it.

Within the ‘closed’ system, feedback loops are created when an action sets off a chain of events and eventually returns to influence its point of origin. If this chain of events reinforces the initial action it is a reinforcing feedback loop, which provides either sources of growth or accelerating
collapse. Conversely if it opposes the initial action, it is a balancing feedback loop which is goal-seeking, equilibrating, or stabilizes the processes (Meyers, 2008).

Reinforcing loops are therefore self-reinforcing as the initial action will continue to generate the same result unless a change is made to the initial action, and depending on the action and outcome, this loop can result in a vicious or virtuous cycle. Balancing loops on the other hand maintain the status quo and continue to stabilize (or destabilize) the system.

- **Systems Archetype**

System archetypes represent patterns of structure which are reoccurring (Senge 1990). Each archetype has a set pattern of behaviour over time which can be linked to story lines in the real world of stratified ontology. They display a simplified visual of a complex system at play, which enables an ease of explanation to non-systems thinking people. They can be used to make future predictions on behaviours or outcomes, and assist to identify where to put an intervention in place to change the mechanism.

Below are some of the more common archetypes, and potential strategies to deal with them, which are generally recognized as those that represent patterns of behaviour in a system:

- **Limits to Growth** is characterized by a reinforcing process of growth which eventually runs up against a balancing process which slows down or stops the rate of improvement (Senge 1990). The focus needs to be on removing, or mitigating the effect of the limit, rather than driving the reinforcing growth process (Brawn 2001).

- **Shifting the Burden** comprises of two balancing processes, both of which are attempting to deal with the same issue. While a symptomatic solution resolves the concern almost instantaneously, a delay in the second balancing process can lead to long term and unintended consequences (Senge 1990). A strategic move could involve implementing the symptomatic solution while working on a more fundamental and long term solution (Braun 2001).

- **Eroding Goals** occurs where a short term solution is implemented through allowing a long term goal to decline (Senge 1990). A prescriptive action could include benchmarking goals to prevent them from sliding or putting corrective action in place to ensure their achievement (Braun 2001).

- **Escalation** happens when one group’s wellbeing is seen as gaining a relative advantage over another, and leads to more aggressive behaviour to establish advantage (Senge 1990).
This can be mitigated through exploring ways, such as identifying a larger goal, which aligns individual goals, to overcome this (Braun 2001).

- **Success to the Successful** is a competition for shared or limited resources which are allocated to the successful party to the detriment of the other party (Senge 1990) and can be avoided through the setting of objectives which encompass broader measures of success (Braun 2001).

- **Tragedy of the Commons** is created by the depletion or erosion of limited resources based solely on the meeting individual needs (Senge 1990) and be overcome through identifying alternative resources, or limiting access to resources based on the need of the larger system could be implemented (Braun 2001).

- **Fixes that Fail** describes an effective short term fix which may require more use of the same fix at later stages (Senge 1990) and can be corrected by either removing the cause of the problem or finding a fundamental solution (Braun 2001).

The behaviour over time produced by these archetypes assists in the recognition of patterns, and for gaining insight into the underlying system, in a diagnostic capacity (Braun 2001).

### 5.2 Simplified causal mechanism with main core variables

As discussed in the VSM analysis in the research context, both System 2 and 3 were weak which created strain often resulting in System 4 having to interfere in System 1’s management process, and communication channels between the interacting parts of the VSM were therefore compromised. Walker (1998) argues that if Systems 2 and 3 are out of balance it results in instability, lack of optimization and operational units working in isolation. He suggests increasing the capabilities of Systems 2 and 3 in order to resolve this through defining accountability and clear performance standards for System 1.

While the focus in System 4 is to ensure longevity and adaptation to a balance of information received both internally and externally, if the systems below are not functioning or integrating optimally, it compromises the flow of internal information as well as the ability to use this information to adapt and align to the changes required from the external environment. The long term implication on organisational sustainability and viability is that it is unable to react to potential threats or opportunities which arise.

Taking into account insights from the literature review which reveal that traditional methods of human capital learning are not delivering required results and that learning is optimized when
done through the use of peer networks with an individualized approach to competence
development, a supplementary action is required in order to drive this. The interventions need to
counteract literature and research findings that line managers do not take responsibility for
employee development, and tend to focus on technical aspects rather than holistic performance,
and consider social influence and the role of leadership in the environment to set standards and
drive behaviours.

The proposed interventions therefore need to not only focus on ensuring System 3 performs as
intended but that it aligns all the subsystems and also cascades down through the lower levels of
recursion in the VSM, ensuring optimal performance in all areas, and restoring flow of information
to System 4. In order to ensure holistic alignment, interventions were done in 6 contexts: process,
customer, finance, people, development and performance planning.

The result of the mechanism occurs in the actual domain, and the effects of this causality become
visible in the empirical domain. The CIMO model in which interventions and mechanisms are
proposed, are located within the contexts of process, customer, finance: people, performance
planning and development, and incorporated in the causal mechanism.

The use of a causal loop diagram aids in visualization of the patterns of inter-connectedness and
inter-dependent relationships. The simplified system is a ‘closed’ loop, responding to an input, or
action, setting off a chain of events and eventually returning to influence the original action. As it
opposes the original input, it is a balancing loop which maintains a system in either a stabilized
or destabilized way. The simplified causal mechanism reflected below, contains the core
variables and includes a discussion on each.
In order to influence the balancing loop, a change has to be made to the original and initial action within it, and this has a cause and effect not only within itself but also in the reinforcing loops on which it has an influence. Depending on the action and the response of the system to it, the reinforcing loop can either result in a vicious or virtuous cycle.

Within these balancing loops, as identified in the final theory, the core variable, *quality of leadership*, was identified as a driving variable through the exploration of relationships between variables on the interrelationship diagram (see Appendix F5), which means it is the initial point of influence in the system, and sets off a chain of cause and effect interactions between all the other variables, resulting in either positive or negative stabilization within this system. It is therefore also the answer to the research question.

The research findings indicated that leadership plays a critical role in determining the culture of an environment. An effective leader is the driving force behind setting the overall goals to be achieved by the business unit, the management and engagement with staff, the development of skills with their own direct reports, as well as the tolerance levels with regards to performance and behaviours, which is achieved through the mechanisms proposed in the CMO interventions.

This has a ripple effect within the environment, as management are expected (and held accountable) to cascade this philosophy down through system and staffing levels in order to avoid
negative consequences for themselves. The more demanding leadership is of an expectation for the combination of good performance, the management of staff with respect and dignity, together with the willingness to engage and listen, the more pressure is applied to line managers to succumb to this leadership style, and adjust their own leadership framework in order to comply.

This encourages line managers to take ownership of employee development and be aware of visible signs of improvement required. The way that line managers measure, manage and develop their own staff is adjusted in order to meet their own goals, and development is approached from a targeted and specific equifinality perspective in line with competencies required from their levels of work within the framework of Jaques and Clement (1994).

Leadership styles develop which are congruent with a fair but firm approach, and the emergence is a manager who leads with heart, who owns their own space, is not willing to negotiate on performance of their teams, behaves appropriately and manages people with empathy and caring.

The strength of the leadership with heart influences the quality of the people who are placed into the talent pipeline, as employees are not only measured against the requirements of a higher performing environment, but their performance assessments are done against a full range of competencies, and not only technical ones. Those who stand out in terms of performance, coupled with attributes which indicate potential for advanced development, become the talent pipeline for succession.

As the line managers become more developed and more competent in this process, their ability to critically review competence based answers to interview questions grows, as they will be looking for signs to indicate that the candidate can add value to their environment in the way in which it is required in order to maintain a high performance momentum. Performance objectives are therefore based on value creation, appropriate goals, include stretched targets and developmental competencies, and ratings awarded in performance reviews are reflective of the correct level of performance.

This results in less pressure to adjust goals down, as the competence level demanded by the environment ensures the skills necessary to be able to meet and exceed these goals, and ensures the ability to cope with complexity and change as the environment adapts to new circumstances or requirements.

As the system stabilizes, goals are increased over time and performance results in customer delight and enablement of value chains.
In order to assign an archetype to the causal mechanism built, the pattern of behaviour of historical poor performance and service level objectives not being met, employees not being held accountable for performance, and the culture of the business unit being an extremely negative one, meant that over time there was a lack of expectation and a great deal of customer mistrust in the business unit. With the intention of gradually increasing them over time, goals which had been set were lowered in an attempt to boost morale. This strategy did not however work in the business unit, as the achievement of the lowered goals remained a challenge.

Based on this signature pattern of behaviour over time, the overriding archetype in this research, which can be linked to the final theory, is Eroding Goals. The dynamic theory behind this archetype is that the gap between a goal and a result ‘may be resolved in two ways: by taking corrective action to achieve the goal, or by lowering the goal. It hypothesizes that when there is a gap between a goal and a condition, the goal is lowered to close the gap. Over time lowering the goal will deteriorate performance.’ (Braun, 2001, p. 21).

To further compound this issue is the fact that the cycle of eroding goals often occurs over years, which means the line managers themselves are a product of this phenomenon and therefore often not able to rise up to the challenge of developing subordinates past their own capabilities.

The quality of the leadership therefore becomes the catalyst which sets off the chain of events within the environment and changes the archetype action resolution from one of lowering goals to one of corrective action. As competencies are developed over time within this causal mechanism, behaviours are learnt through observation, leadership styles are mimicked, performance is optimized and development of employees happens throughout all the levels, creating the condition for a continual reinforcement of this cycle at the systems being managed in the VSM but also ensuring self-sustainability throughout the lower levels of recursion.

Each of the core variables within the simplified causal mechanism are discussed in detail below:

- **Core variable - Quality of leadership**

The *quality of leadership* variable is created by the presence of a leader who maintains an exemplary example setting and manages through values based leadership. They drive a highly accountable, performance driven culture which is maintained by consistent performance management while simultaneously focusing on environmental stability.
A high performance environment requires a large degree of people engagement and that the behaviours and attitudes exhibited are reflective of this.

It is impacted and influenced by all other contexts, and therefore evolves as the environment adapts to changes enforced by System 4 in System 3. This is achieved through the application of the mechanisms reflected in the people context in the CMO.
Simultaneously, the application of the CMO intervention within the development context, as reflected below, has a ripple effect which creates the condition for the commitment and willingness of managers to actively engage in a development process with their own staff. This is done not only in order to submit to this management style, but also to achieve the performance from their teams, which they are required to deliver.

This ensures that people are assigned goals which are in line with a high performing environment and that ratings against these goals are reflective of the correct standard. As the line managers’ knowledge increases, and their understanding of what is required in order to meet the outputs grows, a natural pattern of development happens as they need to raise similar knowledge within their own teams to ensure their own success.

It not only allows for the emergence of competencies required, but the ability to amend the development plan based on movements (both positive and negative). This creates the environment for improvement in competencies which are specific and directly relevant to the employee being reviewed.
As the performance measurement system caters for required standards across contexts, ratings applied against goals would be reflective of holistic performance and in line with those of a high performing team. It provides the opportunity to have unemotional discussions with individuals which is supported by tangible data, and allows the line manager to be able to identify areas for improvement and development opportunities. Development will therefore be individualized and based on specific competencies which were identified as areas for improvement.

Managers therefore develop a clear view of shortcomings which need to be addressed, look for opportunities to improve their employees capabilities and performance, provide feedback immediately on verbal and non-verbal behaviours which require attention, have the ability to recognise movement (both positive and negative) in terms of progress in order to adjust the development plan. They are able to articulate clarity of expectation, identification of particular behaviours which need to change, and have the willingness to allow the employee the opportunity to challenge them in both decisions and discussions in order to grow the employees thinking. Development is targeted and relevant to the specific competencies required for the step up between the levels of work within the framework of Jaques and Clement (1994) and the enablement of a successful jump between the operational and strategic S curves. As a result, placement into the talent pipeline will necessitate meeting all requirements and ensure that the correct people are identified as talent.
This results in a high performing culture which is self-sustaining, and reinforcing, as long as the leadership at a higher system level maintains focus on a high degree of accountability and zero tolerance towards goal erosion, causing environmental influence to drive the culture creation and leadership framing towards excellence.

As a result of the environmental influence on culture creation and leadership framing creating a culture of high performance through development of leadership competencies it influences both the leadership performance as well as the leadership styles within the business unit, and strong leadership begins to emerge.

- Core variable - *Leading with heart*

*Leading with Heart* refers to the ability of a manager to maintain high standards, while being fair but firm. Mastery is demonstrated through consistency of their behaviour as environmental influence makes them aware of the impact of their own behaviours. They regulate anger or emotions, and appear caring and competent while allowing people to see a soft side without compromising their principles.

Figure 39 : Causal Mechanism for the core variable *Leading with heart*
opportunities to learn through both training and on the job opportunities, recognise and reward performance, and simultaneously be able to have difficult conversations and give constructive feedback to others in order to develop them.

They learn through the leadership style which they are exposed to in the environment, to manage teams at a higher level of abstraction, and focus at the correct level of detail and involvement when managing down. Although they do step into the detail if necessary, they merely do it to gain understanding before stepping out again to manage at the appropriate level of abstraction.

Within this leadership style, they become aware of employees’ capabilities and potential, qualities demonstrated by the line manager and their team members become visible which fosters an environment in which the ability to truly recognize talent, and the inherent attributes required for development, emerge.

- Core variable - Identification of inherent DNA required for talent succession development

With the emergence of excellence within any team, there are those individuals who stand out in terms of both tangible and intangible factors that cause people to have a perception of their talent. While many of them are skilled technically, the requirement for a future fit leadership team is the ability to be able to transcend levels and manage at appropriate levels of complexity. The same degree of development applied to a group of individuals will not result in the same outcome for each one despite both the line manager and employee’s commitment to the process.

Figure 40: Causal Mechanism for the core variable Difficulty in identifying inherent DNA development

In as far as there are candidates who perform adequately and who are capable of being developed, there are also those who perform adequately in their current roles but are unlikely to
rise above them, and by the same token, also candidates whose performance is below standard and who need to be performance managed to bring the level of output to the required levels, or exited out of the organisation.

With the placement of a candidate within the organisational talent framework as discussed in the research context and seen below, the performance rating allocated during the annual reviews determine the horizontal axis position, and the line management view of the readiness of the employee to move to next levels, the vertical placement.

Figure 41: Variable influence on Talent Placement Grid

The attributes associated with this core variable do not refer to those whose performance is either ‘below target’ or ‘on target’ on the horizontal axis, but to those who will be placed in the ‘above target’ axis. This variable will therefore guide the decision as to whether this above target achiever should be placed in the low, medium or high vertical grid within the above target row, and require additional development aside from that which is offered by the environment.

The impact of the environment and strong leadership which emerges will ensure that performance is being measured and managed correctly, and the line managers increased ability to critically examine competencies together with the identification of attributes which lend themselves towards successful development will lend credibility and rigour to the selection of talent and ensure that whoever is placed in the talent box is worthy of being there. This has a positive impact to the creation of a future fit talent pipeline.
Core variable - Effectiveness of a performance plan

Management are influenced into setting higher standards for their own reports and aligning their performance plans to the new requirements, as a result of the environment creating a cycle which drives high accountability and performance. This leads to the effective use of a performance plan to ensure consistent achievement of goals, and the creation of value.

Figure 42: Causal Mechanism for the core variable Effectiveness of a performance plan

The performance plan serves to maintain performance and enable development and is reliant on the interventions proposed in the CMO in all contexts which are incorporated into a detailed operating plan being put in place. The operating plan contains goals which are measurable and defined, and have a quantitative link to improvements (with supporting data). These goals should not only be designed to deliver the key outputs of the roles, but also to provide a measurement tool for the areas of development as identified by the line manager during the gap analysis phase.

The effectiveness of the performance plan in any context is entirely dependent on the quality of the leadership, their ability to use this to drive improvement in the environment, have robust discussions, identify areas for development and improvement, hold people fully accountable, and manage performance against it.
These mechanisms will ensure relevance of goals to internal and external customer requirements, and the cascading of goals down to lower levels in order for line management to achieve their own goals. This will have a ripple effect throughout Systems 3, 2 and 1 as well as lower levels of recursion, as development will have to be applied at all levels to ensure achievement of line management goals.

Three further areas need to be included in the performance plan:

- **Process context**

Process compliance is critical to ensure that policy and procedures are followed, that risk and corporate governance are managed, and that decisions are governed by overriding principles. The aim is not only the protection of the organisation, but also of the employee who is guided by what the organisation requires and is not faced with the uncertainty of making incorrect decisions which could lead to disciplinary action.

The mechanisms proposed below ensure that all processes are reviewed to ensure they are fully comprehensive, effective for risk management and appropriate to the environment. It ensures that there is staff awareness regarding organisational requirements and that the audits and monitoring which System 3 is responsible for, occur to ensure employee compliance to process. Through measuring and assigning accountability to managers in System 3 it ensures that they
will apply disciplinary action in Systems 2 and 1 for any transgressions in order to avoid negative consequences to themselves.

Figure 44: Process Context Intervention, Mechanism and Outcome

This sets a very clear framework for the employees to work within, ensures daily compliance to process, manages organisational risk and ensures that all activities are aligned to requirements. It simultaneously assists to align behaviours across the business unit, and sends clear messages around the need of individuals to redefine their actions and comply to these processes in order to avoid performance management.

- **Customer context**

Assigning accountability for customer key performance indicator achievement, and the use of a performance plan to manage outputs, stakeholder integration as well as continuous improvement initiatives ensures that System 3 managers will have to actively understand reasons for non-achievement of goals, and also identify ways in which to improve them. This will lead to them understanding negative impacts from their locally embedded environments which impact on their own delivery and forces the daily management of the performance indicator to ensure achievement, as well as the engagement with, and management of, stakeholders.
Feedback from customers ensures that the leadership in System 4 is able to monitor and measure the effectiveness of engagement.

- Finance context

The mechanisms for ensuring financial cost management include assigning responsibilities and accountabilities to the managers in System 3 who control the resource allocation to the units in System 1.
Figure 46: Finance Context Intervention, Mechanism and Outcome

Making the System 3 responsible for the financial achievement of the areas for which they are responsible, creates awareness of cost drivers, and ensures that they manage their areas appropriately. This will not only increase the likelihood of the financial cost achievement, and ensure accuracy both in numbers as well as budgets, but also actively encourage them to delve into the detail to understand what has made up their costs and how to influence them in future.

Once variable components are better understood, relevant productivity targets can be set and the measurement of the flex budget becomes more critical in determining the effective use of resources which are allocated by System 3 to System 1.

The combination of the people, process, customer and finance interventions within the CMO ensure that the performance plan intervention is holistic and caters for all quadrants required for effective performance.

As the ultimate aim of any employee is to create this value for the organisation, it is the role of the performance plan to enable it, and it is therefore worthwhile to examine the causal mechanism which enables value creation both for the present as well as for the future, in more detail and it has been kept separate in this research to enable the identification of gaps for development.

This section describes the causal mechanisms within the framework of Jaques and Clement (1994) which create value for the present and for the future.
Value Creation in relation to the effectiveness of the performance plan

This research revealed that value for the present occurs in an operational cycle where the individual is required meet and deliver their current objectives in order to deliver the annual organisational strategy. Value for the future however, refers to a strategic cycle, where they are required to change their thinking, and operate at a higher level of abstraction. Through creating value for the future they are able to influence future organisational strategies.

Figure 47: Causal Mechanism for the sub variable Value Creation within the core variable Effectiveness of performance plan
The causal mechanisms which exist to create both current and future value are intrinsically interlinked, and not a constant, but in a state of evolution in response to changes and new opportunities which emerge.

When the strategic intent is defined, the organisation breaks it down into goals and accountabilities for each business unit and clear guidelines such as targets and key performance indicators are given to managers to achieve in order to enable the strategy execution.

**Creating value for the present – enablement of current strategic objective**

At an operational level the effectiveness of the strategy execution hinges on the managers ability to solve problems, utilize their resources, and protect their own areas in order to deliver their agreed goals. Whilst protecting their own area is a positive trait as it ensures that they will increase the likelihood of scorecard achievement, it can also be a limiting one in that decisions are not always taken for the greater good of the organisation. There needs to be healthy competition in this area, whilst being mindful of the bigger picture, and not allowing silo mentality to dominate to the detriment of the organisation.

In order to create current value and to achieve a scorecard measurement, an individual is forced to display a degree of protection of their own area of responsibility and this requires them to have a willingness to challenge other people if there is a negative impact on their own area in order not to impact scorecard achievement. This means that they offer solutions particular to their own perspectives and as a result their focus is solely on safeguarding their own areas in order to achieve their performance objective.

As they are required to problem solve in order to deliver the scorecard, it leads to an increased level of competence in problem resolution. They become more aware of the need to utilize their resources effectively in order to meet scorecard dependencies, such as efficiency, financial and other indicators and therefore focus of using their resources effectively.

They use their available resources to deliver value, which include both sweating of assets (people, machinery etc.) and cutting costs to deliver the bottom line. The outcome of this is that resources are allocated in order to fix problems and deliver the organisational strategy, and systems are integrated to drive a long term goal. As a result they not only achieve their scorecards but enable the strategic objective.
The operational mode is therefore a reinforcing loop which has the sole purpose of delivering to the strategic intent.

Creating value for the future – influencing future strategy

From a strategic perspective however, whilst executing the organisations strategy in the previously described loop, new information becomes available and the achievement, or improvement, of the strategic intent could be impacted, or influenced, by either internal or external factors and environments as displayed in the VSM.

The causal mechanism which creates future value creation comprises of two balancing loops, both of which reduce the likelihood of unintended consequences for the organisation, and leads to an increase in effectiveness of decisions made for the greater good and an increased ability to create value outside of the current strategy.

In the first balancing loop (indicated as B3 in Figure 47) the ability to connect the dots is dependent on the individual having the ability to grasp and link comments/situations/events to both positive and negative short, medium and long term implications.

In the second balancing loop (indicated as B4 in Figure 47) the effectiveness of the ability to recognise and respond to changes is created by being able to reflect and use learning from experience (both success or failure) to modify their plans or determine new direction based on changes which emerge.

Both balancing loops reduce the likelihood of unintended consequences for the organisation, through either mitigating risk or identifying potential or emerging opportunities, and therefore lead to future value creation.

If an individual is able to recognize and respond to change, the likelihood that they are able to align their resources in order to prepare the platform for change will increase, as opposed to the operational mode where resources need to be allocated and utilized efficiently.

Those who are locked into operational behaviours see the current situation and need to be persuaded to see into the future. Those who are able to transcend the operational boundaries and function at a strategic level see the impacts and then often work backward to fix, going into operational mode in order to resolve and then into strategic mode to create value for the future. They go beyond challenging the status quo - they change the status quo.
Many individuals are unable to make a link between cause and potential effect; to make connections between patterns or variables at play; to be mindful, aware and truly present; to recognise signs of disturbance and respond quickly in order to either take advantage of an opportunity, or to mitigate risks before they happen. Once that connection is made, strategic thinkers align resources to drive future change while operational thinkers still only use them to achieve goals. There is a sense of awareness that whilst they are responsible for the area, and demonstrate this by not being afraid to interfere in any area which is not adding value to them, it is not a limiting factor to making decisions for the greater good of the organisation.

The results obtained in the strategy execution, as well as benefits realized, or threats identified and mitigated, as a result of the pattern/opportunity recognition provide a feedback loop to the main strategy. These are incorporated into the building of a new strategy which will need to be executed, or the modification of an existing strategy taking the new value into account. The interaction between these two loops creates value for the present, as well as for the future.

- Variable - Pressure to reduce goal

The effectiveness of the interventions within the four core variables, which are measured and driven through the performance plan enable the achievement of the targets which have been set.

As the environment evolves and the cause and effect of the variables within the causal mechanism influence each other, the competence and skill levels increase through all levels of recursion in the VSM. This results in improved performance, continuous improvement and therefore the restating of targets which are required to meet and exceed stakeholder expectations.

5.3 Complex causal mechanism

The complex causal mechanism displayed below in Figure 48, is the overview and consolidation of the parts of the simplified causal mechanism as described above, including the patterns of inter-connectedness and inter-dependent relationships which exist.
Figure 48: Causal mechanism leading to the creation of a future fit talent pipeline

- **DNA**
  - Leading with heart
  - Difficulty in identifying inherent DNA required for talent succession development
  - Quality of leadership
    - Ability to build and communicate a credible, compelling and coherent argument
    - Degree of business acumen
    - Engagement and integration with stakeholders
    - Pressure to reduce goal
    - Ability to connect the dots

- **Performance Plan**
  - Value Creation
    - Achievement of operational indicators
    - Targeted competence development
    - Management of performance against gaps
    - Effectiveness of resource allocation and utilisation
    - Pattern recognition and opportunity spotting

- **Leading with heart**
  - Ingrid Harmse – May 4, 2017
5.4 Conclusion

The final theory (CMO) which answered the research question was described in this chapter. The effectiveness of the intervention and mechanism within the above mentioned contexts rely on the quality of leadership in the various systems within the VSM.

These mechanisms will therefore be applicable in any context where the leadership is able to maintain focus on driving excellence. It is however dependent on the leader appointed having the necessary knowledge, skill and competence in order to do so, as well as the willingness to devote time and resources to development. The leadership needs to be effective in setting standards and holding people accountable for their delivery, being able to create balance amongst the various contexts in order to ensure a holistic all-rounder, as well as the ability to develop their direct teams in order to ensure that they operate at the correct level. This theory is applicable irrespective of system level or level of management, and the higher up in the level of recursion it occurs, the more it filters down to lower levels of recursion and to lower levels of management.

The use of a performance management system as a mechanism to enable this plays a pivotal role in all of the contexts, and is used to change the culture, the business unit performance, as well as the drive and align expectations, manage performance, and enable the emergence of a solid talent pipeline in all levels of recursion, which is reflective of a high performing environment.

Despite the CMO interventions being presented as separate contexts, with separate interventions and mechanisms, each intervention and associated mechanisms, contribute to creating a coherent and dynamic balance between elements that ensures that ‘the whole is greater than the sum of its parts’ (Aristotle) and that the system has the ability to maintain itself in dynamic equilibrium. While each of the individual proposed solutions will deliver a form of benefit if done in isolation, the key element to adequately deal with the situation, and answer the research question, is the ability of the leader to create coherence across contexts. This will not only improve the business unit’s performance but simultaneously assist in developing managers and creating a talent pipeline in a way that is self-sustaining.

Whilst the core driver variable identified was the quality of leadership which resulted in environmental influence on culture creation and leadership framing, the interventions proposed in the CMO supported this variable in effecting changes throughout the system levels in the VSM.
Assuming that the quality of leadership at a System level in Beers Viable Systems Model (VSM) is a positive influence, the balancing loop in the CLD will encourage the emergence of a strong leader who manages with heart, and as a result increases the likelihood of the visibility of inherent DNA to identify those candidates who should go into the talent pipeline.

As overall performance increases, both at management and staff level, it ensures that the effectiveness of a performance plan to maintain, improve performance and enable the development of a future fit talent pipeline is realized, and therefore reduces the pressure to lower goals.

This not only improves performance at the system levels below the one driving the changes, but ensures that this philosophy is cascaded down into lower system levels and throughout the various levels of recursion within the operation. In the context of this research paper, improving System 3 results in System 2 being equipped to fulfill its function of coordination, conflict resolution and stability within the operational units leaving System 3 to do its job of focusing on internal regulation, synergy and optimization. Once there is synergy created by the systems working together effectively as parts of the whole system, System 4 is able to focus is on future planning and strategy and ensure adaptation to a changing environment.

The following chapter evaluates conclusions, discusses implications for practice, theory and further research within a RUVE (Relevance, Utility, Validity and Ethical) framework.
Chapter 6: Conclusion, recommendations and evaluation:
The proof of the theory is in the practice

The previous chapters described the research undertaken, commencing in Chapter 1 with the topic, context and research question. Chapters 2 and 3 detailed the research methodology and framework, and the application of these in order to identify the core variables which formed the basis of the theory built. As part of the theory building, Chapter 4 reviewed literature in order to construct a body of knowledge around the topic and to integrate the research findings within it. Using insights gained, a theory (CMO) was constructed in Chapter 5 to answer the research question, and a causal mechanism developed which made relationships between the variable factors explicit.

This chapter evaluates the conclusions reached and discusses implications and consequences for human capital development, the research problem as well as the goals within a RUVE (Relevance, Utility, Validity and Ethical) framework.

6.1 Relevance

Relevance is established through a combination of the context described in Chapter 1, the concern regarding the ability to create a valid and sustainable talent pipeline which delivers sustainable performance as people are promoted, and the review of literature regarding talent and human capital development.
At both an empirical and measurement level, performance of the business unit was negatively impacting the organisation’s ability to service customers effectively and to enable strategic growth. This dire situation was compounded by the failure of the system to achieve operational excellence. In addition, people growth which enabled managers to transition between levels of work and jump from the operational to strategic S curve of management development successfully. This did not support the effectiveness of the way the talent development strategy was translated into the building of a sustainable and valid pipeline. This in turn had a profound effect on performance and culture.

In order to enable organisational sustainability and create competitive advantage, a review of literature on talent management and human capital development revealed that not only are employees required to be sufficiently developed to perform optimally in their current levels of work, but that it is vital that the organisation has access to a ready developed pool of candidates in relation to demand. Despite the recognition at board level that talent development is a critical factor which leads to significant organisational benefits, and which was followed by the subsequent global trend of including talent development as a strategic intent, there has been little traction in finding a sustainable solution.

It was clear from the literature reviewed that a flexible approach which is relevant to a specific individual is required in order to enable effective development, and furthermore, of critical importance is line management involvement in the process. This is however simultaneously and equally limited by both their ability and their willingness to participate in the process.

This paper therefore serves to suggest supplementary actions, and in effect the bridging of the gap between executing the organisational talent strategy and the translation of this into the workforce, and supports the literature finding that there is a requirement to move away from traditional learning methods and the need to find an alternative to the “one size fits all” approach.

6.2 Utility - Contributions to practice

The researcher was not only able to gather data and build a theoretical model on the phenomenon identified, but was also able to test and adapt the theory in the environment. The results from the actual implementation therefore hold more validity and reliability than any form of hypothetical or theoretical assumption which could be
made, and provide evidence of rigour, theory which is grounded in data, and the practicality of the interventions and mechanisms implemented.

In as much as the interventions and mechanisms were listed separately in the CIMO model, they ran concurrently, and were designed to ensure that accountabilities, behaviours and actions were aligned to achieving the desired performance, environment and culture, as well as the creation of a valid and future fit talent pipeline.

The core variables in the simplified causal mechanism are discussed below in relation to the interventions in the various contexts as detailed in the CIMO model:

6.2.1 Quality of leadership

The research results showed that Quality of Leadership is the driving core variable in the causal mechanism, and is the initial action within the closed causal system which the system responds to, and thus sets off a chain of events. As evidence of the validity of the identification of this core variable being a driver and an initial action, the only change to this closed system was the appointment of a new General Manager at System 4 who implemented the proposed mechanisms as detailed in this paper. There were therefore no other factors within the environment which would have had more significant influence or bearing on the results obtained.

In order to transform the business unit, it was critical that there were clearly defined targets which were aligned across functions and which would get people moving in the right direction. The performance planning intervention as listed in the CIMO model (Figure 40) therefore included mechanisms which were designed to create clarity of performance, behaviour and outputs required and these were linked to goals which were required by the leader in order to transform the business unit and meet organisational strategy. The result was that each manager had very specific goals which were relative to their own areas, but which included targets for dependencies in other areas to avoid silo behaviour, and that were aligned and reflective of the performance required.

Simultaneously, the people intervention as listed in the CIMO (Figure 38) was to transform the business unit culture into a high performing, accountable and driven environment. Mechanisms to enable this included assigning responsibilities and accountabilities, and setting clear boundaries for behaviours.
Leadership engaging, mentoring and coaching of senior managers on all aspects including behaviours, attitudes, management styles, performance, and competency requirements was fairly time consuming in the beginning, and required a high degree of observation and awareness of activities in the business units. Any shifts in patterns which signaled a move in the wrong direction were followed up with immediate feedback in order to steer employees in the right direction.

It was made clear to the management team at System 3 that as they grew in skill level and confidence that the only way to succeed was to apply the same principle that was being applied to them, downwards into the lower system levels and through the various levels of recursion. The development intervention in the CIMO model (Figure 39) was therefore designed to have targeted development against competencies required and the cascading of development down was achieved through mechanisms such as performance planning, and the analysis of gaps in order to achieve this.

While many of the managers had previously believed that sharing of knowledge was a threat to their viability, they began to realize that the more teams are developed and equipped with knowledge, the less pressure there was on them to control and micro manage. In addition, team development enabled their ability to operate at the correct level of abstraction and add value in other aspects.

The assigning of total accountability meant that they remained responsible for their teams’ performance in times of their own absence, such as leave. The measure of leadership success was therefore not limited to how teams performed when they were there, but more importantly how teams performed in their absence. This was taken as an indication, and provided evidence, that there had been sufficient level of development to ensure sustainability.

In order to meet performance expectations as defined in the performance plans which were set for each manager, the development of competence, skills and the need to increase knowledge though all levels of recursion became paramount to meeting leadership expectations. In addition, achieving scorecards and the awareness of competencies required from their own direct reports and staff therefore became a key focus area at all levels.

This became visible in a number of ways – the ability of the teams to perform operationally, and find innovative ways to find solutions, the change in the culture to a
target driven one which not only embraced, but actively sought out change, and the ownership of development and building of skill levels.

Critical to the achievement of scorecards was the requirement to have the correct competencies and understanding in place to ensure their achievement. As the management team started cascading development principles down, it soon became apparent that a number of employees did not possess the correct base level understanding of technical competencies which led to the assessment and retraining of a large portion of the workforce.

Once the base level knowledge had been increased, and standardised across the business unit, the identification of true development needs became clear. Counselling, training, involvement, encouragement, praise and feedback became visible at all levels and both skills and competencies began to emerge. Meetings which had previously been leader led and leader solution prescriptive became more engaging, and all employees were encouraged to participate in debating solutions and suggesting ideas. This created a sense of communal ownership of achievement, and the culture started shifting from a collective problem and blaming one, to a collective solution building one.

Achievement against the business unit skills plan which measures the attendance of the person nominated attending the planned intervention as agreed in the development cycle in the employee lifecycle (as reflected in Appendix A4) increased from 50% in prior years to 92% for three consecutive years, which was not only the highest in the Supply Chain, but also in the entire organisation. This indicates both the commitment of the employee as well as the line manager towards the development of the staff. Development needs not offered on the skills plan were identified, as competency gaps were identified, and were either dealt with through mentorship if the skill sat within the business unit, or external training and coaching if it did not.

Attitudes and behaviours which were not in line with company values were swiftly dealt with, and together with an adaptation of management styles created shifts within the environment and a new positive culture began to emerge.

Feedback sessions were set up with staff to assist with creating an open and transparent culture in which there were no taboo subjects, and provided a bottom up perspective of management behaviour, and also provided a culture temperature barometer at staff level. All feedback was consolidated while maintaining individual confidentiality and
line managers were tasked with action plans in order to align behaviours and actions with leadership expectation. The second rounds of these sessions were also used to start encouraging staff to notice changes and do perception management. They were asked to verbalise positive changes they had noticed since previous sessions. Gradually over time, aside from minor issues, verbalization of positive change became the overriding theme as the environment evolved.

While line managers did not initially enjoy the feedback from these sessions as it made their own behaviours visible, it created the need to redefine their own leadership styles and role model behaviours on those displayed from the new leader in order to adjust to the culture, and positive shifts and feedback began to emerge from staff. This feedback not only increased the line managers confidence but also encouraged further integration and engagement with staff.

While labour turnover in prior years, as a direct result of accepting inferior performance and bad behaviours, was only around 0.74%, the creation of a high performance accountable culture, as behaviours and performance were addressed in the first year resulted in this figure rising to 11.40% of the workforce against an organisational target of no more than 8%. While this figure was a dramatic increase on previous years, it was needed for those staff who did not want to adapt to the new culture and sent a very clear message to the business unit staff that in order to avoid negative consequences, a certain level of behaviour was required which was aligned to organisational values and that substandard performance would no longer be tolerated. This figure dropped to 8.53% in the second year and to 3.74% in the third.

While it would have been logical to make the assumption that staff viewed the performance culture which was emerging as a stressful and negative factor, it had the opposite effect. It appeared that staff had been as frustrated with the culture and bad behaviours from both management and staff that were previously present, and many heartwarming letters such as the below were received from staff as the culture shifted:

“Hi I’m Timothy and I’m a Reach Truck driver. A couple of years back this was described as the worst place to work at by the staff. There was always negative talk, long faces, new staff coming on board talking about looking for other jobs after working just a month. The staff were calling for change and some of us even prayed for change and I can tell you that we all smiling again, you hardly hear any negative talk amongst the staff.”
I just want to say thank you to the person who is responsible for this. Ingrid, thank you for transforming this from a place that no one wanted to work at into a place that everyone is talking about retiring here at the age of 63. We going nowhere and we will make you proud.

Those that really wanted to be in the business unit, and were willing to come on the journey, were highly motivated as their efforts were being recognized, and they started qualifying for short term incentives which were offered by the organisation to business units who achieved their targets, which they had previously never received due to lackluster performance.

As employees realized that they were indeed capable of achieving targets and good performance, and were being rewarded for it, both from the business unit and the organisation, the implication that bad performance was impacting their own financial situations led them to begin to self-manage themselves and each other. Support increased both for the performance management culture as well as the requirement to comply to situational adaptation. It no longer became only a leader led community, but a self-driven and bottom up management of each other as well.

6.2.2 Leading with heart

The results from the variable, leading with heart, were more visible at an empirical, rather than measurement level.

Consistency of behaviour regarding emotions became regulated as a result of a combination of leadership framing within the environment, reduced chaos and the proactive dealing of issues. Guidelines regarding performance and outputs were clear, as were the measurements attached thereto, and it became easier to not only hold people accountable, but to review performance in a constructive manner.

Line managers were able to create clarity of purpose with teams as there was a common sense of purpose, and a reliance on each team member to perform their function in order for the team to succeed as a whole.

People engagement increased, which was visible through the involvement of teams in trying to find solutions, as well as the encouragement and comradery which individuals
displayed towards each other. This was evident in a growing level of staff satisfaction, measured through the organisational employee engagement survey which is focused on assessing perceptions regarding brand, leadership, culture, employee engagement, values measures and opinions. The intent of this survey is to measure employee satisfaction, views and knowledge in terms of their experience of the company both as an organisation and employer.

Figure 49: Annual results from employee climate survey

The emotional regulation created through a structured environment actively encouraged input participation at all levels, and the sharing of ideas which had previously not been encouraged as well as problems which had not been visible, were raised. Solutions offered were evaluated for logic and practicality and both line managers and individuals were encouraged to implement ideas and experiment in small steps to determine viability.

The willingness to experiment and fail forward increased, and many lessons were learnt which increased knowledge and individual growth and led to a deeper understanding of the underlying causal mechanisms. Successfully implemented ideas were acknowledged formally through a recognition and reward program, which further encouraged participation.
6.2.3 Identification of inherent DNA required for talent succession and development

As the environment stabilised, performance increased, and behaviours which would indicate the presence of the ability of a candidate to be developed, emerged.

The culture had switched from a ‘blaming’ one and an environment where people would focus on keeping their heads down to avoid getting into trouble, and changed to one where staff were motivated and energized and would not only offer to go above and beyond the requirements of their roles, but would actively ask to take on additional responsibilities and also offer suggestions for improvement to their own and other areas.

The visibility of behaviours and factors such as a willingness to step out of comfort zones, the ability to reflect not only on success but also failure, being able to modify plans, speed of response, quality of delivery, logical thought processes, respect for colleagues and the organisation, as well as a demonstration of a hunger for learning, became apparent, and those that were willing, were given opportunities to learn new skills.

While the organisation offered both NQF (National Qualification Framework) and AET (Adult Education Training in numeracy and literacy) to staff level employees as a development mechanism, the business unit historically had very few people accepted onto the NQF program after undergoing assessment, and was the only business unit in the Supply Chain which had not launched AET. As evidence of both knowledge and skills increasing through the development of staff, in the two subsequent years, our employees made up the majority of the numbers with 60% and 70% respectively of all national participants selected to attend, being from our business unit. Those that were selected, completed the course with 100% pass rate. AET was successfully launched in the business unit in the second year, and achieved a 92% pass rate in the first exams, and 100% pass rate in all subsequent exams.

First line managers and middle managers were also successfully accepted onto development programs, and for two consecutive years our participating first line managers were given a ‘best leader’ award on the course – the first time anyone in the organisation had been awarded this accolade. Our middle managers also did exceptionally well with some being awarded the highest individual score, as well as the Directors ‘best student’ award, on their respective courses.

As vacancies arose, we no longer had to look outside the business unit for talent and were able to do 21 internal promotions. This gave the staff a sense of having an
opportunity to have a career path, growth potential and sent a clear message that stepping up and doing hard work was rewarded. Feedback from other areas was that the business unit was an aspirational place to work due to the culture which emerged.

These factors provide evidence of the competence built up at all levels and the subsequent identification of talent, and are indicative not only of the level of development which occurred, but also demonstrate a commitment of line managers to the process.

6.2.4 Effectiveness of a performance plan

The contexts which were dealt with in the performance plans included people, process, customer finance and development. The performance plan was listed as a separate context, as the expectation was that the plan set for each individual manager would be broken down into goals for their direct reports, who would then break them down to individual staff members or teams. In this way the entire business unit from the lowest to most senior level, were aligned in terms of delivering to the entire business unit strategy, and it created a culture of accountability and performance management as the ripple effect of an individual or a team of not achieving targets, would be felt throughout the whole chain, and therefore impact the performance rating of the person above them.

Process interventions as listed in the CIMO (Figure 35) ensured that processes were mapped and audited which led to the environment complying to rules and regulations and the alignment of all tasks to requirements which provided the platform on which to do continuous improvement. The business unit subsequently achieved the highest scores in the Supply Chain in every internal, operational, health & safety as well as hygiene audits.

Further validation was received after a visit by the Head of Compliance who reviewed the business unit

“I wanted to thank you and your team for your time, the presentation and visit to the C&GM DC - It was a very informative and interesting morning.

I further wish to congratulate you on the entire operation, it is clear that you and your staff are on top of things and take pride in your work. Well done.”
The business unit is a service provider to many of the Head Office departments, and in as much as stakeholders have expectations of service delivery, many of their actions impact the ability of the business unit to perform optimally. Customer interventions as listed in the CIMO (Figure 36) ensured that stakeholder engagement became a critical factor to achieving scorecards and increasing customer satisfaction.

In order to provide a feedback loop to the business unit team, so they could see shifts and understand if they were on the right track, stakeholders were asked two questions during the year “What are the improvements which you have noted?” and “Is there anything you would particularly like to highlight as having been outstanding?” A sample of the responses can be seen below, and the full list on Appendix H1.

- Communication channels have improved dramatically, the overall mind-set of the team is very positive with a pro-active, solution focussed approach to their daily activities and outputs.
- There have been huge strides in the ways-of-working, the environment is structured and controlled and the “people” component has evolved into a unified, efficient operations team.
- Thank you for a year of excellent service which has assisted us in improving availability to our stores with great sales results
- There is now effective team integration with increased flexibility and much improved processes and controls

As stakeholder engagement was listed as a target on the performance plan, in order to measure this, 360 degree surveys were done at the end of each year. At the end of the first year, out of a maximum potential score of 4, which indicated excellent service, the business unit scored 3.71% and in the second year 3.81%.

As operational teams evolved with feedback, they invited stakeholder groups to the business unit in order to proactively manage issues which they were experiencing, create understanding, influence perceptions, build relationships and discuss any future value adding activities which the stakeholders required.

Through increased knowledge and understanding of their own areas, and the influencing of outcomes as a result of relationships built with stakeholders, the teams were able to either adapt to requirements, or build credible arguments as to why things needed to change or stay the same in order to deliver value.
Value Creation - For the current:

With the ownership and accountability assigned at the correct levels through the performance plan, management attitudes changed from viewing themselves as recipients and on the receiving end of accepting issues and consequences, to challenging aspects which would negatively impact their scorecards or destroy value. The protection of their own areas therefore increased, but was balanced through leader decisions to adjust scorecards if benefits were for the greater good of the organisation.

As teams became more competent due to increased knowledge and skills, they were able to resolve problems far more efficiently and more proactively. The understanding of cost implications and productivity losses as a consequence of exceptionally high absenteeism of employees was made, and managers started focusing on addressing this. Absenteeism of 0.20% against an organisational target of 0.02% was dealt with through counseling sessions initially and then through performance management if not improved. This resulted in an improvement to 0.09% in the first year, and 0.02% in the second.

Productivity studies done by the operational teams also gave benchmarking indications which were used to reset bases and plan staffing efficiently. This resulted in significant increases to the speed at which activities were carried out.

Figure 50: Productivity improvements

The increased productivity resulted in both inbound lead time and processing of order lead times reducing substantially which increased the throughput capability of the business unit. This meant that the business unit was able to work with far larger volumes
in a far shorter period of time, and therefore able to handle far greater volumes than previously without impacting capacity.

**Figure 51 : Lead Time improvements**

Simultaneously while speed improved, so did accuracy which was driven by the performance plan target as well as the requirement to manage substandard performance, and the business unit achieved significant improvements year on year.

**Figure 52 : Accuracy improvements**

Management teams' understanding of what drove costs, whether they had used their resources appropriately and efficiently in line with volumes, and the daily management of cost activities which had financial implications, increased. The impact of these factors was visible when viewed against prior trends and volume increases year on year. Historically an increase in volume and an increase in amount of labour used, and
therefore associated costs, followed a very similar pattern. For the first time, the trend of the labour cost per unit (calculated by dividing total labour cost into total volume) dropped dramatically against volumes, and did not increase by the same proportion during future years.

Figure 53: Volume worked versus people used

Finance interventions as listed in the CIMO (Figure 37) ensured that there was total responsibility and accountability assigned for cost management and financial knowledge growth. Having come from a position of consistently exceeding financial targets set, and reporting inaccurate data, the business unit now delivered savings against budgets set.

Figure 54: Achievement of cost per unit against targets

While the cost per unit (calculated by dividing total costs into total volume) trend historically had always been above volume growth, the restating of bases driven through cost management resulted in a shift to this pattern, delivering not only a reduction to the cost per unit against prior years, but total cost increases being below volume increases.
The impact of these improvements is particularly impressive when viewed against historical performance. The cost per unit being achieved was 2% cheaper, despite inflationary increases or a 30% volume growth, than that achieved 3 years previously, in 2011.

As a result of the business unit performance in not only achieving, but far exceeding, their operational and financial scorecard targets year on year, it not only ensured that the business unit scorecard was achieved and delivered current value, but that through the increased competence by the management team it also created value for the future, both in terms of opportunities outside the business unit, but also led to positive changes to the organisational strategy by creating value for the future.

**Value Creation - For the future:**

Through the creation of value for the present which was delivered by the achievement of the current strategy through the scorecards, the pendulum swung from a situation where
there was no confidence in the ability of the business unit to handle future growth, and resulted in a change to the strategy of the organisation.

While the organisation had previously announced a strategic intent to obtain another site in order to accommodate capacity requirement increases to position it for future growth, the turnaround of the business unit, and related improved efficiencies and increased throughput, changed this decision. This not only saved the organisation a considerable capital outlay and a duplication of operational expenses, but led to the realization that we could in fact sweat the existing facility for a further 5 years before any further capital outlay would be required.

Opportunities which came about included many innovative solutions to current ways of working, and the increased ability of the teams to manage more diverse functions and broader operations. As a result of this, the increased confidence of the organisation in the capabilities of the business unit led to further strategic changes including decisions to insource previously outsourced services which further provided a platform for future growth and organisational flexibility.

Over and above the operational budget savings delivered against the business unit budgets, these opportunities delivered R8 million in savings to the business in the first year and R12.7 million in the second.

These results not only led to the removal of the pressure to adjust goals downwards, but also the restating of targets in line with performance required.

6.2.5 Pressure to Adjust Goal

The archetype which was identified in the causal mechanism, eroding goals, had resulted in targets which were not achieved, being lowered. Morale was low as a result of targets not being achieved and performance continued to decline against targets required. This had led to a sense that achievement beyond what the team was delivering was impossible, and in order to avoid overwhelming the teams by restating targets in huge jumps, targets which had previously been adjusted down, were adjusted upwards as the teams achieved them.

To encourage consistency of achievement as well as the improvement of performance, once a number was achieved for the year, a similar number was banked as the new
target in the performance plan for the following year in order to score an on target achievement rating, and stretched targets were given to improve the targets for the following year in order to achieve an above target achievement rating. It was an effective strategy as the teams had the confidence they could repeat the previous years’ performance, and strove to improve on them to get the higher rating.

At a minimum therefore managers would score an on target achievement rating if they achieved the same results as the previous year, which would indicate that they achieved their objective, but in order to score an above target achievement rating and exceed expectations, they had to improve the score substantially.

This allowed the teams to mentally adjust to shifts in targets and gave them the sense of control as well as the ability to gradually adapt to the stretches and still find ways to achieve them. The culture began shifting from one of acceptance, to one of being target driven, and finding innovative ways to score ratings of above target achievement on their performance reviews in order to receive higher than average increases.

At the end of the first year, the business unit had gone from historically not achieving any targets, to overachieving against every one by an average of 34%, and by a further 15% in each subsequent year, as reflected below. The ripple effect was a reduction to the pressure to adjust the goal, and this led to the restating of targets upwards each year. By the end of the 2014 financial year, targets had increased by 44% since the implementation of the theory and actual achievement against them by 62%.

Figure 57: Achievement against operational targets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th></th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th></th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th></th>
<th>Target increase since 2012</th>
<th>Actual achievement since 2012 targets</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead Time</td>
<td>90.0%</td>
<td>92.0%</td>
<td>96.0%</td>
<td>96.0%</td>
<td>96.0%</td>
<td>96.0%</td>
<td>96.0%</td>
<td>96.0%</td>
<td>96.0%</td>
<td>6.67%</td>
<td>7.36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DC Receiving</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>530</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>950</td>
<td>910</td>
<td>1300</td>
<td>530</td>
<td>71.25%</td>
<td>77.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DC Allocation</td>
<td>0.08%</td>
<td>0.16%</td>
<td>0.25%</td>
<td>0.67%</td>
<td>0.03%</td>
<td>0.18%</td>
<td>0.87%</td>
<td>0.18%</td>
<td>0.02%</td>
<td>91.18%</td>
<td>143.24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DC Picking</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>41.67%</td>
<td>41.67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DC Picking Accuracy</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>14.67%</td>
<td>14.67%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average % Improvement 34% 15% 15% 44% 62%
With the performance of the business unit increasing, employees were measured against higher targets as well as a complete range of skill sets, which meant that holistic performance was measured, and those that received above target achievement ratings in the performance plan were the ones placed into the talent pipeline, and whose all-round performance justified their placement into this category. This has led to the emergence of a future fit valid and sustainable talent pipeline.

6.2.6 Overall Achievements

As evidence of the success of this research in practice, and supporting the validation of the theory, one needs only to look at the awards process in the organisation. Within the organisation, the distribution centers across the supply chain compete annually for awards which recognise outstanding performance and service delivery. The awards ceremony is extremely prestigious within the organisation, and takes the form of a two day conference which culminates in a formal black tie award ceremony.

In preparation for these awards, Distribution Centres are audited extensively throughout the year, and based on the results of these audits, as well as performance delivery; at the first level they compete for four individual quadrant awards (People, Process, Customer, and Finance). At the second level, they compete for Silver and Gold Awards. At the third level and final level, they compete for the Supply Chain Excellence award which is also known as the Managing Director’s award.

The last time the Clothing & General Merchandise supply chain team had ever won an award was in 2009 when they were awarded the Silver award, and this was also the highest level of award they had ever received in the history of the business unit.

Audit scores achieved were not only always below the required target of 75%, but were also the lowest out of the all supply chain competing business units. Within a year of the implementation of the CMO as detailed above, the business unit became the top achiever in 2012, and has subsequently retained this position each year.
At the end of the first year (2012) the business unit won the following awards: Difference Award; Process Award; Gold Award; Supply Chain Excellence Award (MD’s award) as well as the CEO Award (the first time in the history of the organisation that a Supply Chain team had won this award).

In 2013 the business unit won the Process Award; Finance Award and Supply Chain Excellence Award (MD’s award). This was the also first time in the history of the organisation that a team had won this in two consecutive years.

The researcher was also awarded a Difference Award for exceptional leadership for the transformation of the business unit.

The results achieved in the business unit as a result of the implementation of the theory, are therefore evidence of relevance, validity and utility.

6.3 Contributions to Theory

- Talent pipeline development

While literature reviewed on human capital development provided insight into theories, such as that development must be leader led, tailored to individuals and that there was a vast array of competencies which were required for effective performance, no paper could be found where a practical intervention or mechanism was proposed in order to enable holistic human capital development, the development of a talent pipeline, and address competency gaps in a sustaining manner which cascaded down through all levels of employees.
Solutions to mitigate the limitations experienced as a result of line manager willingness and commitment, framed within the contexts of their own skill and capability level, are also not addressed in the theory reviewed.

The contribution this research provides is that a single approach is unlikely to be sufficient to build an answer, and that a number of interventions need to be put in place to produce a balanced individual who is capable of delivering outstanding performance during times of complexity and uncertainty. The shift required is to therefore move from a conventional multi-finality developmental journey to an equifinality one, in which managers have an individualized and varied developmental process, yet arrive at the same end point – in this case the desired successful developmental jump of the S curve.

- Value Creation

The causal mechanism identified for value creation is unique in terms of literature reviewed in that it proposes that value creation delivered by employees (at all levels) is comprised not only of creating value for the present through delivering to the organisational strategy, but that with the correct competencies in place (their ability to connect the dots and being able to recognize and respond to change) it could lead to them delivering value in such a way that it positively influences future strategy. While these are individually supported in literature, no papers could be found where the interconnected and interdependent relationship between the two is made clear.

6.4 Contributions to Research

- Senior and Executive Management Self Development

Data gathered in the research revealed that self-development at senior management level was not listed as a required competency, which could indicate that once someone is at that level, there is both a belief and an expectation that they have all the required competencies in place. Openness to seeking assistance or development could therefore be seen as a weakness, or an inability to cope from both perspectives.

Further research is therefore important to investigate the benefits of applying self-development performance management at both a senior management and executive levels.
• Identification of gaps for development at management level

In all academic papers reviewed, researchers only elected to look at single level management categories ie at either middle or either senior management. No research could be found where both categories had been researched and compared in order to identify gaps for development.

A recommendation for future research is the comparison of middle and senior management competencies in order to identify competencies required at each level and also the gap for development between the two, in order to ensure viability of performance when promoted.

• Identification of competencies required at management level

Many of the competencies identified in the literature emerged from interviews with the same level managers themselves, and not through exploring what their line managers believed their critical competencies should be. The implication is that research findings could be limited by restrictions of the lower level individual’s skill, and competence, in evaluating what is required, and therefore not necessarily reflective of what is needed.

In order to establish competencies required, it is recommended that research is focused on obtaining the view of the level up, and that this should always be considered due to intrinsic limitations posed by interviewing lower level managers themselves.

• Senior management competencies

The literature review revealed that people management skills were the most important competency at a senior management level which is at odds with the findings in this research paper. Although people management skills were indeed listed as propositions within this research, it was almost a given that they would be there as a base and not an overriding competency. This contradiction between theory and practice based evidence would therefore need to be explored in more detail.
• Use of repertory grid interviewing technique in data collection

The research finding that managers are often promoted based on the visibility of a single skill, often being technical expertise, was made possible through the use of the repertory grid interviewing technique which is based on the Personal Construct Theory of George Kelly (1995)

This finding would not have been uncovered without the use of this technique. It was an invaluable method to counteract the tendency not only to provide surface level answers, but also to manage perceptions versus reality. It is therefore recommended as an initial method of data collection in research for uncovering deeper levels of data, and those factors which are not in the conscious minds of the interviewees. It therefore encourages emergence.

• Use of systemic tools to deal with vast amounts of data and complex and messy situations

Much of this dissertation focusses on dealing with levels of complexity and the use of systems thinking made it possible to deal with the relationships which exists within and between the various contexts. A strong recommendation for research is the use of systemic tools, together with a grounded theory approach which needs to be done at a methodological level in order to be able to counter balance this problem and enable the ability to manage complexity.

• Building theory in iterative cycles

In order to build the right level of abstraction it is necessary to engage with the detail, supported by grounded theory. A core competency of management is to deliver value, and without following an iterative process the causal mechanism for value creation would have got lost in abstraction, and the differences between both current and future value creation models would not have been possible to identify, or therefore influence.

It is therefore recommended that researchers work in in iterative cycles, and build theory from detailed data in order not to impact the relevance, utility and validity of the theory built.
Talent identification and development

The approach of selecting an individual based on inherent qualities, as opposed to a complete skill set may be very challenging for traditional performance management practice because it implies that there are people who appear not be talented, but who have the exact ingredients, or DNA, which is required for talent development.

In a country like South Africa with the focus being on the addressing imbalances, particularly at senior management and executive levels this is a real contribution to talent identification and development, and therefore to practice, theory and future research.

6.5 Validity

Validity considerations during the research process were done within the framework suggested by Maxwell (1992) and specific threads to validity, using descriptive, interpretive, theoretical, generalizability and evaluative categories within each research cycle were discussed in Chapter 3.

From a theoretical perspective, while most researchers ask the readers through argument building to accept that the research results have validity, the benefit of the position which this researcher held within the organisation, was that she had the ability to implement, test and adapt the theory in the context in which the concern was embedded prior to it being made public. The utility section of this chapter therefore deals with the actual results obtained from the practical implementation of this research. There can be no greater test of theoretical validity than the application of the theory into an environment and the results obtained from the implementation thereof.

In terms of generalizability, while it is a reasonable assumption to make that specific skills requirements will differ from context to context, management per se, extends above the requirement to have specialized context knowledge. It is the ability to maintain and improve standards, and get people moving in the right direction towards those goals, irrespective of context. Despite this however, perceptions of leadership are context driven (Schyns & Sanders, 2007) and the concept analysis in which meanings are made explicit and which influences the perception of leadership effectiveness, might therefore differ in other contexts where operational effectiveness is less of a driver. This does not
however detract from the findings in both this paper, as well as literature reviewed, that managers often receive promotions based on their technical skills, this factor should therefore be a consideration in the applicability of the model in a different context.

Additional threats and limitations to the applicability of this research in different environments, is that the archetype of eroding goals which was identified through the pattern of behaviour over time, is that goals have been so eroded, or not stretched enough over time that it is not a recognized phenomenon, and a degree of resistance could therefore be anticipated both from human resource practitioners as well as line management in the validity of the archetype.

In addition, different leaderships have different perspectives on what constitutes a talented employee based on their own level of skill, and therefore the quality of leadership will determine the degree to which this theory is effective.

6.6 Ethics

“Ethics goes beyond the legal requirements for a company and is, therefore, about discretionary decisions and behaviour guided by values. Business ethics is relevant both to the conduct of individuals and to the conduct of the organisation as a whole” (Institute of Business Ethics)

The purpose of any corporate business is to generate profit in order to ensure sustainability, and in the case of a listed company it is further driven by the organisation’s need to increase the confidence which shareholders have in the ability of the company to manage costs, increase revenue and generate profit in order to ensure a good return on the investment which they are willing to make. Ethical considerations would therefore be a balance between what the company requires in order to achieve shareholder confidence and the obligation towards employees who work to deliver this value.

Velasquez et al (1996) list 5 approaches to deal with ethical issues:

- Evaluating all available options and determining which one will lead to the greatest good with the least amount of harm (utilitarian approach)
- Dealing with the protection of individual rights to hearing the truth and not being harmed, ensuring maintenance of privacy, and upholding agreements (rights approach)
• Avoiding favouritism and discrimination by making sure that everybody is treated in the same way (fairness or Justice approach)
• Ensuring that all members of a community benefit equally from the benefits provided (common good approach)
• Character development which enables both ethical and value based behaviour (virtue approach)

Based on the five ethical approaches, they therefore suggest evaluating a proposed answer against five questions, which are each discussed below in relation to the proposed answer:

What benefits and what harms will each course of action produce, and which alternative will lead to the best overall consequences?

The proposed answer leads to the greater good for both the organisation as well as employees. Benefits to the organisation include not only a reduction to cost, but also increased customer service, improved efficiencies and productivity, current strategy achievement, a positive influence on future strategy, and therefore increased shareholder value. As employees are aligned in terms of organisational values, are competent in their roles, display effort and commitment and operate within the framework of policy it creates a balance between employee competence and the organisations ability to have immediate access to an already developed future fit talent pipeline as the demand arises.

Employees need to have a sense of involvement and influence, the scope to demonstrate competence in an environment where hard work is recognised and rewarded, where roles and responsibilities are clearly defined, and where personal benefit is derived from these development opportunities which increase the likelihood of career paths and promotional aspects.

What rights do the affected parties have, and which course of action best respects those rights?

Both employees and employers have the right to protect themselves against risk and harm, and in order to protect both the employees involved as well as the organisation, process mapping was done throughout the environment to ensure that risks were
managed and mitigated. All employees were trained on the new process, and therefore had a very clear understanding and knowledge upfront in terms of what was required from them, and the process which they needed to follow.

This not only minimised future risk to the organisation in terms of exposure to non-compliance, but also to the people involved, as they were aware of policies and procedures which needed to be followed, and therefore reduced any potential harm from previously grey areas in which they were required to make judgement calls which could have led to negative consequences for themselves, and the organisation.

Further benefits to the employees include the right to work in an environment where behaviours are congruent with a value system and all employees regardless of level, are treated fairly, equitably and consistently, with respect and dignity.

*Which course of action treats everyone the same, except where there is a ethically justifiable reason not to, and does not show favouritism or discrimination?*

The use of a performance plan clearly articulates clarity of outputs and what is required from each individual team member in order to deliver the strategy. Increasing skills, identifying development gaps and coaching, mentoring and training employees to close competence gaps ensures that the levels of stress are managed in the development process and that all parties are moving forward in the right direction.

As everybody learns and adapts to new knowledge at different speeds, care and compassion in the learning process was balanced through the need to ensure people engagement was optimised by doing culture checks within the environment to understand stress points and put action plans in place to mitigate.

Due to targets on the performance plan being modified each year based on previous years achievement, the pressure to stretch the goals and increase performance was driven from the bottom up, as opposed to top down, and was based on the individual wanting to score an above average increase through exceeding their targets.

The goals on the performance plan are both specific and measurable which avoids any favouritism or discrimination, and are mutually agreed between both parties up front. They give clear guidelines as to what the employee needs to achieve to score a below, on, or above target rating, and unless there are circumstances beyond the employees
control which have occurred during the year under review, the actual results and associated ratings, should not need to be debated.

Monthly reviews against the performance plan during the first year, coupled with targeted competency development encourage employee to understand their goals and how to influence them. The employees therefore know at all times where they are tracking, and whether different efforts are required, or if assistance needs to be sought.

The performance rating they receive in the performance plan, as well as their managers’ view of their overall performance at the end of the year will therefore not come as a surprise to them, as they receive constant feedback during the year. This encourages transparency, fairness and reduces any form of discrimination or favouritism.

*Which course of action advances the common good?*

Measuring performance on a holistic level ensures that employees are allocated resources and benefits based on true performance, and not on single competencies, and both the employee and the line manager are therefore aware of individual development needs throughout the process.

Individual and tailored development resulting from the complete measurement system ensures that it is not only the organisation who benefits from increased skills and competence but that all employees benefit equally from a development program which initially focusses on aligning base skills, but then only on those competencies which require development.

Within a culture of high performance a space needs to exist which allows for failure, as not every continuous improvement project will be successful. Any implementation of change to a process or system is linked to an element of risk, and this is balanced through debate with colleagues and line managers on the proposals given, and an understanding of the risks and potential solutions. Once agreed, the individual is given ownership to implement in small steps to allow them a sense of comfortability and the confidence to experiment in a controlled environment, while simultaneously being mentored and monitored by line managers to ensure stability in the system. This reduces the stress and risk to both employee and organisation.
Increasing performance subsequently resulted in employees qualifying for short term incentives which they previously did not receive, and thereby created personal wealth for them through being able to participate in a scheme which the balance of the Supply Chain business units had historically enjoyed sole benefit from.

It also created the benefit of increased confidence in the business unit, and therefore employment and promotional opportunities, as additional activities and opportunities were identified through strategic intents.

Which course of action develops ethical virtues?

In order to build a culture which is mutually acceptable to both management and staff within the framework of the organisational values, employees at all levels need to be encouraged to participate, and a mechanism which facilitates openness, honesty and transparency was created in order to facilitate this.

Employee engagement sessions ensured that all employees were given an opportunity to participate in the building of a new culture by having forums in which they could share experiences which did not resonate with them, as well as being encouraged to notice changes which were positive, and which they wanted to see more of.

Shifts in the culture were carefully monitored in feedback sessions to ensure that a values based environment was being created. Any behaviour which was not aligned to company values was dealt with at both staff and management levels. Both positive, to reinforce behaviour, and negative, to work on changing behaviour, feedback was given to the teams based on these engagement sessions to ensure that there was an awareness of culture movements.

The proposed solution therefore ensures that there is overall benefit to both the organisation and the employee and adequately deals with the ethical framework against which it is measured.

The aim of building a high performance culture where both high performance and adherence to the organisation values are recognised and rewarded, where we develop our people to support delivery of the strategy and grow the next generation of leaders from within and entrench a values based culture, was achieved.
6.7 Conclusion

There are many moving parts both within the definition of what makes a good leader, and it is the opinion of this researcher that it is a balanced individual who can be developed across levels and into a holistic all-rounder, and who has built up the necessary skills to be able to handle complexity, uncertainty and diversity that will be the future leaders, irrespective of the industry in which they find themselves.

The research reveals that the quality of leadership drives both the culture, performance as well as the development of talent within an environment. The leadership style which emergences, means managers lead with heart, through simultaneously holding people accountable, while managing them fairly but firmly, with empathy and caring.

The interventions and mechanisms put in place ensure the effectiveness of a performance plan, and means that employees are developed by measuring them against a full range of competencies in a high performing environment.

This principle is cascaded throughout the levels in order to ensure performance and therefore enables the identification of inherent DNA required for talent succession and development.

Management development is not a linear process, but rather an equifinality one in which the development journey is subject to multiple revisions as new information regarding competency gaps come to light.

The result is an environment where performance is improved, values are aligned, employee development is cascading and self-sustaining, and the talent pipeline which emerges is relevant to creating a future fit workforce, but also a succession and promotion pipeline.
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Appendix A: Employee Lifecycle Management

The human resource department provides management with an employee lifecycle framework which is designed to measure and improve performance, build skill level, ensure talent management and assist line managers to manage employee performance and development during their employment. This is divided into 5 phases, and competencies form the basis of each of these phases:

The 5 Phases of the Employee Lifecycle

The aspects of each of these five phases are discussed below:

A.1 Recruit

Roles are aligned to broad categories of jobs into levels, and each role in the organisation has a job profile which contains details of the purpose, responsibilities, accountabilities (with key measures), as well as competencies which comprise of both leadership and technical elements.
A.2. Train

Once the employee is recruited into the role, they are provided with organisational specific training, which includes team communication methodologies, as well as any training initiatives which are being rolled out throughout the organisation.

Once these two cycles are complete, the employee is effectively on boarded into the organisation, and the three stages which follow (review, develop and progress) are then repeated on an annual basis:

In order to establish a performance driven culture, and set effective performance objectives aligned to operational plans and strategies, the organisation uses an integrated performance management system. This comprises of the Review and Develop phases within the employee lifecycle. Although these are two separate phases, they are intrinsically linked, as the quality of the review rating will influence the development decision.

A.3 Review

Central to the review phase is the framework with which to manage and measure performance, drive value based behaviours and provide guidelines for salary, talent and succession management.

It comprises of four stages, each of which are discussed below, in the order in which they occur.

- Performance and development planning

Performance planning relates to the annual expectation of outputs for an employee, and is in essence a performance contract between the organisation and the employee for the year ahead which translates the organisational strategy into the business unit strategy. This is then cascaded into employee goals, based on their specific roles in order to enable
achievement of the overriding strategy. The goals which are set are specific, realistic, measurable and meaningful, and agreed to by both parties.

- Interim review

Notwithstanding line manager intervention if performance during the year is not on track, the interim review occurs mid-year. The line manager and employee formally assess if the goals and outcomes agreed are in line with expectation. Corrective action is agreed if the performance is not on target. Performance objectives can also be renegotiated, removed or amended during this discussion if there were significant changes due to circumstances beyond the employees’ control.

- Annual review

At the end of the year, the employee and the line manager review the performance and mutually agreed ratings are then assigned to the agreed goals. The employees annual salary increase is based on the overall rating assigned.

There are 4 possible performance rating options which can be assigned to employee performance against the operating plan. They are listed below with the meanings for each rating defined:

- Rating 1 - Performance improvement is required - most of the objectives which were agreed to in the performance planning have not been achieved to the agreed standard. This rating could indicate that the employee is new or the fact that performance management is required. No increases are given to employees who fall into this category.
- Rating 2 - Achieved most of agreed standard – most, but not all, of the objectives have been achieved to the agreed standard. This rating could indicate that it is a new employee who is still settling in, or the fact that performance management is required. Employees in this category get below standard increases.
- Rating 3 - Achieved all objectives – all objectives have been achieved to the agreed standard. Employees get a standard increase as determined by the company.
- Rating 4 - Exceeds expectations – performance has been outstanding and the objective achievement is significantly above those which were agreed. Employees in this category get above standard increases.
The principle within the organisational is that the sum of total employee increases needs to equal the standard increase percent declared. Performance for top achievers is therefore rewarded by allocating them a higher share of the funds, and is, in essence, funded by the employees who get below standard increases.

- Talent framework

Based on the abovementioned scoring allocated in the performance review, and other factors such as employee readiness as determined by the line manager, employees are allocated placement positions in a nine box talent framework, as reflected below.

**Talent Placement Grid**

The performance rating translation into the placement in this grid is as follows: Employees who are rated as 1 and 2 performers in the abovementioned annual review are placed across the ‘below target’ performance horizontal axis, those rated as 3 performers across the ‘on target’ axis and the 4 performer across the ‘above target’ axis. Line management
view of the readiness of the employee to transcend to the next level indicates the vertical placement in this grid.

This succession management identification is therefore where high potential employees are placed for visibility in order to create a selection for a talent aimed at ensuring a supply of future leaders and possible succession candidates. It is in essence our talent pipeline, and these individuals also receive priority in terms of development funding from the organisation.

A.4 Develop

The fourth phase in the Employee Lifecycle management is ‘develop’. Develop involves a formal discussion which occurs annually during the abovementioned performance review stage. The line manager and the employee discuss employee career aspirations.

Employee performance, as well as placement position within the talent grid, determines the relevance of the discussion in terms of development needs based on the career aspirations agreed, and whether it is for succession, promotion to a new level, a sideways move to build skill at a similar level, or additional skill development in a current role

A development plan is then agreed between the line manager and the employee which assists both parties to identify development gaps between the current position and the aspirational one. This includes the identification of both short term goals (0–2 years) in the employees' current role as well as long term goals for future roles (2-5 years). Short term goals can be a combination of improving performance at a current level, or building up skill in preparation for the long term aspiration.
### Appendix B: Research Results – Research Cycle 1

#### B1: Triad Selection for repertory grid interviews

**Possible Triad Selection**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Elements</th>
<th>Skilled</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Unskilled</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
<td>4 5 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1 2 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1 2 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1 2 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1 3 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1 3 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1 3 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>1 4 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>1 5 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>2 3 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>2 3 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>2 3 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>2 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>2 4 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>2 5 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>3 4 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>3 5 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>4 5 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>5 5 5 5 5 5 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Actual Triad Selection**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Elements</th>
<th>Skilled</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Unskilled</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
<td>4 5 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2 3 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1 3 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2 3 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1 3 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2 4 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>1 2 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>1 5 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>5 5 5 5 5 5 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This ensured that each category would be rated 8 times

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Elements</th>
<th>Skilled</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Unskilled</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Count 8 8 8

Comparison of categories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Elements</th>
<th>Skilled vs Average</th>
<th>Skilled vs Unskilled</th>
<th>Skilled vs Average vs Unskilled</th>
<th>Average vs Unskilled</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Count 2 2 4 2
## B2 : Categorisation: Categories and related propositions for level 3 managers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Behaviour</th>
<th>Domain</th>
<th>Literature</th>
<th>Criticality</th>
<th>Categorisation</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Propositions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Emotional intelligence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Interpersonal skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adaptability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Openness to change</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Thinking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Conceptual skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge and Information Management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Information processing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Self-regulation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team Management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Team building</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision Making</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Risk taking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Creativity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Values and Ethics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ethical behavior</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Description of the Propositions:

- **Emotional intelligence**: The ability to identify, understand, and manage one's own emotions, as well as the emotions of others. It includes self-awareness, self-regulation, motivation, empathy, and social skills.

- **Interpersonal skills**: The ability to understand and manage relationships with others. It includes listening, empathy, collaboration, and conflict resolution.

- **Openness to change**: The willingness to consider new ideas and adapt to change. It includes curiosity, flexibility, and a growth mindset.

- **Conceptual skills**: The ability to think abstractly and consider different perspectives. It includes problem solving, strategic thinking, and critical reasoning.

- **Information processing**: The ability to identify, manage, and use information effectively. It includes decision-making, critical thinking, and problem-solving.

- **Self-regulation**: The ability to control one's own behavior, impulses, and emotions. It includes goal-setting, perseverance, and self-control.

- **Team building**: The ability to work effectively in a team. It includes collaboration, communication, and conflict resolution.

- **Risk taking**: The willingness to take calculated risks. It includes decision-making, innovation, and problem-solving.

- **Creativity**: The ability to think outside the box and generate new ideas. It includes divergent thinking, flexibility, and originality.

- **Ethical behavior**: The adherence to moral and ethical principles. It includes honesty, fairness, and integrity.

---

### References:


---

### Additional Notes:

- Emotional intelligence is a key component of leadership and management effectiveness.
- Openness to change is crucial for adaptability and innovation.
- Interpersonal skills are essential for building and maintaining positive relationships.
- Conceptual skills are necessary for strategic thinking and problem-solving.

---

### Acknowledgments:

- This categorisation is based on a comprehensive review of literature and research in the domain of leadership and management.

---

### Contact Information:

- Ingrid Harmse
- May 4, 2017

---

### Further Reading:

B3: Inter relationship Diagraph depicting the development of variables to a higher level of abstraction
B4: Categories subsumed to higher levels of abstraction

Categories in yellow had the highest level of abstraction, and the balance where subsumed into them through inductive reasoning.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Middle Management</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Perception of strength of character created by having a presence</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree of focus and ownership of own development</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consistency of Operational Achievement</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of staff development</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willingness to take risks and challenge the status quo</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness of engagement and integration with stakeholders</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of understanding the impact of decisions outside of own area</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of understanding impact of own behaviour</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to understand data and build a coherent argument</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
B5: Inter relationship Diagraph for reduction sampling

- In 1 Out 3
- Degree of self development
  - Appropriate combination of task and people activities to ensure operational achievement
  - Willingness to challenge the status quo
- In 3 Out 1
- Degree of presence
  - Readiness to explore innovative options (as a form of divergent thinking)
- In 2 Out 2
### Appendix C: Research Results – Research Cycle 2

#### C1: Categorisation: Categories and the relating propositions for level 4 managers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ability to analyse and draw value from information</th>
<th>Ability to consider impacts of decisions on the organisation</th>
<th>Ability to communicate effectively</th>
<th>Degree of Renewable Energy</th>
<th>Level of staff development</th>
<th>Level of operational performance</th>
<th>Effectiveness of engagement with stakeholders</th>
<th>Efficiency of engagement with stakeholders or</th>
<th>Effectiveness of engagement with stakeholders</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To process data swiftly and analyse it</td>
<td>To encourage others to see the need for change</td>
<td>To play on / ask questions</td>
<td>To develop strategies</td>
<td>To keep others focused</td>
<td>To lead by example</td>
<td>To ensure subordinates receive feedback</td>
<td>To encourage subordinates to take risks</td>
<td>To ensure subordinates take risks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Logical / logical thinking</td>
<td>To encourage others to see the need for change</td>
<td>To play on / ask questions</td>
<td>To develop strategies</td>
<td>To keep others focused</td>
<td>To lead by example</td>
<td>To ensure subordinates receive feedback</td>
<td>To encourage subordinates to take risks</td>
<td>To ensure subordinates take risks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Logical / logical thinking</td>
<td>To encourage others to see the need for change</td>
<td>To play on / ask questions</td>
<td>To develop strategies</td>
<td>To keep others focused</td>
<td>To lead by example</td>
<td>To ensure subordinates receive feedback</td>
<td>To encourage subordinates to take risks</td>
<td>To ensure subordinates take risks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Logical / logical thinking</td>
<td>To encourage others to see the need for change</td>
<td>To play on / ask questions</td>
<td>To develop strategies</td>
<td>To keep others focused</td>
<td>To lead by example</td>
<td>To ensure subordinates receive feedback</td>
<td>To encourage subordinates to take risks</td>
<td>To ensure subordinates take risks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Logical / logical thinking</td>
<td>To encourage others to see the need for change</td>
<td>To play on / ask questions</td>
<td>To develop strategies</td>
<td>To keep others focused</td>
<td>To lead by example</td>
<td>To ensure subordinates receive feedback</td>
<td>To encourage subordinates to take risks</td>
<td>To ensure subordinates take risks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Logical / logical thinking</td>
<td>To encourage others to see the need for change</td>
<td>To play on / ask questions</td>
<td>To develop strategies</td>
<td>To keep others focused</td>
<td>To lead by example</td>
<td>To ensure subordinates receive feedback</td>
<td>To encourage subordinates to take risks</td>
<td>To ensure subordinates take risks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Logical / logical thinking</td>
<td>To encourage others to see the need for change</td>
<td>To play on / ask questions</td>
<td>To develop strategies</td>
<td>To keep others focused</td>
<td>To lead by example</td>
<td>To ensure subordinates receive feedback</td>
<td>To encourage subordinates to take risks</td>
<td>To ensure subordinates take risks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Logical / logical thinking</td>
<td>To encourage others to see the need for change</td>
<td>To play on / ask questions</td>
<td>To develop strategies</td>
<td>To keep others focused</td>
<td>To lead by example</td>
<td>To ensure subordinates receive feedback</td>
<td>To encourage subordinates to take risks</td>
<td>To ensure subordinates take risks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Logical / logical thinking</td>
<td>To encourage others to see the need for change</td>
<td>To play on / ask questions</td>
<td>To develop strategies</td>
<td>To keep others focused</td>
<td>To lead by example</td>
<td>To ensure subordinates receive feedback</td>
<td>To encourage subordinates to take risks</td>
<td>To ensure subordinates take risks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Logical / logical thinking</td>
<td>To encourage others to see the need for change</td>
<td>To play on / ask questions</td>
<td>To develop strategies</td>
<td>To keep others focused</td>
<td>To lead by example</td>
<td>To ensure subordinates receive feedback</td>
<td>To encourage subordinates to take risks</td>
<td>To ensure subordinates take risks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Logical / logical thinking</td>
<td>To encourage others to see the need for change</td>
<td>To play on / ask questions</td>
<td>To develop strategies</td>
<td>To keep others focused</td>
<td>To lead by example</td>
<td>To ensure subordinates receive feedback</td>
<td>To encourage subordinates to take risks</td>
<td>To ensure subordinates take risks</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### May 4, 2017

Ingrid Harmse – May 4, 2017
C2: Inter relationship Diagraph depicting the development of variables to a higher level of abstraction
C3: Categories subsumed to higher levels of abstraction

Categories in yellow had the highest level of abstraction, and the balance where subsumed into them through inductive reasoning.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Senior management</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level of personal attributes required at Senior Management level</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Ability to communicate effectively</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of operational achievement</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Level of staff development</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Level of effective delegation</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree of Renewable Energy</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to consider impacts of decisions on the organisation</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Effectiveness of engagement with stakeholders</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to analyse and get value from information</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Willingness to take risks and take responsibility for them</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
C4: Inter relationship Diagraph for reduction sampling

- Effectiveness of communication
- Effectiveness of delegation to enable operational achievement
- Level of synthesis (as a form of convergent thinking)
- Degree of Passion for work
- Degree of business acumen
### C5: Differences between Level 3 and Level 4 competencies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level 3 Categories</th>
<th>Importance based on % Constructs</th>
<th>Level 4 Categories</th>
<th>Importance based on % Constructs</th>
<th>Differences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Degree of presence (Created through the combination of Perceptions of strength of character created by having a presence and the Degree of Renewable Energy)</td>
<td>3.56%</td>
<td>Degree of passion for work</td>
<td>10.26%</td>
<td>While passion, internal drive and motivation are listed by both L4 and L5 as important, L4 combines this category with the intangible factors which lead individuals to experience a sense of strength and passion for work. This particular aspect was important enough to be rated as a separate category by L5. L5 rated energy alone at 6.9% more highly than the L4 did by combining strength of character and energy together. Combining the L5 Degree of Renewable Energy and Level of personal attributes would have rated this category at 34.62% - a massive 31.32% higher than at L4 level.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree of self development</td>
<td>7.69%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Not mentioned by L5 at all - is this an indicator that once someone is at L4 that they are considered sufficiently developed? This could be a cause for concern.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriate combination of task and people activities to ensure operational achievement (Created through the combination of Consistency of Operational Achievement and the Level of staff development)</td>
<td>36.29%</td>
<td>Effectiveness of delegation to enable operational achievement (Created through the combination of the Level of operational achievement, the Level of staff development and the Level of effective delegation)</td>
<td>23.08%</td>
<td>Rated 13.26% more important by L4 than L5. Whilst operational achievement and staff development are important for both groups, the focus at L4 is about the doing activities whilst at L5 effective delegation became more of a focus area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willingness to challenge the status quo</td>
<td>8.79%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>For L4 the risks and challenging status quo and having a continuous improvement mindset support the achievement of operational excellence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Readiness to explore innovative options (as a form of divergent thinking) (Created through the combination of Effectiveness of engagement and integration with stakeholders and Level of understanding the impact of decisions outside of own area and Level of understanding impact of own behaviour and the Ability to understand data and build a coherent argument)</td>
<td>43.99%</td>
<td>Level of synthesis (as a form of convergent thinking) (Created through the combination of the Ability to analyze and get value from information and the Willingness to take risks and take responsibility for them)</td>
<td>19.23%</td>
<td>Rated 24.73% higher by L4. Again influencing stakeholders becomes key to supporting operational excellence and the focus is more on using the data to support your argument to achieve this. At L5 the meaning is different as it is more about using the data to make business decisions. It is less about understanding the detail behind the data and more about a higher level viewpoint.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree of business acumen (Created through the combination of the Ability to consider impacts of decisions on the organisation and the Effectiveness of engagement with stakeholders)</td>
<td>23.08%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Whilst L4 focused on stakeholder integration in order to support operational achievement at L5 it focuses more around Commercial understanding - for the greater good of the organization as opposed to the department.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness of communication (Created through the combination of the Level of personal attributes required at L4 and the Ability to communicate effectively)</td>
<td>24.30%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Although present at L4 (but combined with energy) - it is far more defined and measured by L5 where role model behaviour is viewed as 24.36% importance towards leadership effectiveness.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix D: Research Results – Research Cycle 3

### D1: Categorisation: Categories and the relating propositions for operational behaviours

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Creating clarity of purpose</th>
<th>Co-ordination of diverse and meaningful thinking</th>
<th>Achievement of operational indicators</th>
<th>Effectiveness of resource utilisation</th>
<th>Ability to use data to drive performance</th>
<th>Level of risk management</th>
<th>Effectiveness of strategy evaluation</th>
<th>Level of competence in problem resolution</th>
<th>Effectiveness of stakeholder engagement and integration</th>
<th>Degree of protection of own area of responsibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ability to get people aligned and moving in the right direction</td>
<td>Clear logical thought process</td>
<td>Action plans in place to ensure operational deliverability</td>
<td>Allocation of resources to enhance problem solving</td>
<td>Analysis of critical success factors and stakeholders</td>
<td>Carefully maintain data and ongoing change</td>
<td>Able to provide a new analysis to establish parameter consistency</td>
<td>Translate understanding in advance to facilitate change</td>
<td>Full understanding of problems and the causes</td>
<td>Listen to others, understand points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear understanding given to everyone so they know what to do</td>
<td>Ability to grasp abstract concepts</td>
<td>Focus on understanding the issue and does not get lost in the problem</td>
<td>Controlled approach to project management</td>
<td>Does not get too caught up or in detail</td>
<td>Value hand-holding for change and support to long-term operational success</td>
<td>Manage change through smaller goals and expected task to enhance achievement</td>
<td>Program execution limited to current, and not tangential future issues</td>
<td>Well-prepared prior to meeting with stakeholders and participation</td>
<td>Writing to challenge, but ensure that the impact on their own area of responsibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open-mindedness in order to ensure understanding</td>
<td>Divergent thinking</td>
<td>Responds to issues proactively</td>
<td>Cutting costs to deliver value</td>
<td>Understanding better to ensure problem activities and being measured</td>
<td>Manages risk</td>
<td>Ensures existing process to achieve short-term strategy achievement</td>
<td>Focus on problem at hand and finding a solution to it</td>
<td>net sense and acknowledge importance of relationships</td>
<td>Effect solutions particular to own perspectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to explain concepts both new and down the line</td>
<td>Trendy questions and on their feet</td>
<td>Realizes own issues - does not wait for others to react</td>
<td>Investing aspects to deliver value</td>
<td>Understanding change in order to justify answer</td>
<td>Carries consequences only for the current financial year</td>
<td>Issues an own shared achievement and not to organizational strategy</td>
<td>Identify short-term immediate solutions</td>
<td>Table issues (multiple stakeholders perspectives)</td>
<td>Do not afraid to step on toes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear expectations in terms of desired outcomes</td>
<td>Logical thought process</td>
<td>Does not get caught up in operational problems</td>
<td>Synthesis of data</td>
<td>Various immediate issues and resolution of problem without fully understanding long-term risk</td>
<td>Measured everything that impacts a measure before being in place to ensure strategy</td>
<td>Get grid all independent, and focus on bigger picture</td>
<td>Relationship building</td>
<td>Waiting to seek the leads and challenges</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Facilitated behaviour in meetings

- **Multiple Solutions**
  - Put plans in place to ensure long-term solutions
  - Synthesis of facts and electronic making based on information at hand
  - Team player within strategy achievement
  - Innovative problem solving capability

- **Document discussion with accountability and action plans**
  - Innovative thinking
  - Out of the box thinking to enable problem resolution
  - Presents organized and meaningful data to enable decision making
  - Implementations of not achieving strategy are clearly understood
  - Interactions of issues cause of problem

- **Create a sense of inspiration**
  - Synthesis of information
  - Creative thinking to ensure goals achievement
  - Anticipates questions regarding information presented
  - Understands how problem impacts on team short-term and long-term strategy achievement
  - Questioning value add to long-term arrangements

- **Clear direction**
  - Able to handle multiple sources of data and synthesis
  - Recognizing when things need to change
  - Well prepared
  - Link operational performance to strategic plans
  - Able to deal with problem resolution on property - does not pass one problem to someone else

- **Very clear about requirements**
  - Drives ownership achievement
  - Questions every piece of information in order to understand where to drive efficiencies
  - Sense of drive towards not delivery
  - Prioritized positions to using of production times

- **Sense of purpose**
  - Has clear direction and knows what to put in place to ensure it is delivered
  - Understands limitations, problem resolution, and final solutions as mitigates

- **Be clear on order to gain understanding**
  - Integrating systems to drive long-term goal
  - Able to react when unanticipated issues does not hold

- **Sustain change in order to gain understanding**
  - Analyzes strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats (SWOT assessment)
D2: Categories and the relating propositions for strategic behaviours

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effectiveness of decisions on organisational sustainability</th>
<th>Degree of business alignment</th>
<th>Time span of forward thinking cycle</th>
<th>Alignment of resources to ensure sustainable change</th>
<th>Degree of deliberate networking for continuous organisational benefits</th>
<th>Effectiveness of ability to influence and respond to change</th>
<th>Ability to connect the dots through high-level strategic thinking</th>
<th>Degree of boundary blurring</th>
<th>Degree of ability to integrate into organisational activity</th>
<th>Willingness to take risks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Allows negative impact to an environment for greater good of organisation</td>
<td>Ability to spot flaws in high-level strategy</td>
<td>Defines strategic direction and does not leave it to chance</td>
<td>Aligning operational requirements to long-term vision</td>
<td>Build relationships to ensure self-sufficiency</td>
<td>Identification of signs of success</td>
<td>Grassroots and informal communication and collaboration</td>
<td>Willingness to interfere in areas outside own areas of responsibility to ensure value creation</td>
<td>Recognised risk and unspoken values being driven to do the correct thing</td>
<td>Willing to take risks to ensure sustainability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understands systemic implications on business change</td>
<td>Does not get bogged down by operational details at high-level strategic level where there is a problem</td>
<td>Defines strategy for 5 year goal achievement based on financial and organisational resources</td>
<td>Sees value in change</td>
<td>Build relationships to ensure collaboration for future processes</td>
<td>Modifies plans if they are not adding value to strategy at current moment</td>
<td>Grassroots and informal communication and collaboration</td>
<td>Is not based on boundaries</td>
<td>Identifies risk and the need to do things differently in order to ensure environmental sustainability</td>
<td>Taverses considered risk based on potential outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rights for what they believe will negatively impact the business as a whole</td>
<td>Converges thinking</td>
<td>Out of the box thinking for long-term benefits</td>
<td>Sees potential for organisational change and development</td>
<td>Acknowledging risk, creating growth towards strategic impact</td>
<td>Link and used inside information to mitigate potential issues</td>
<td>Constantly pushes the boundaries</td>
<td>Highlights risk to operations, resources, capacity and costs</td>
<td>Ability to recognize that the benefit is sometimes not worth the risk</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seeks opportunities to differentiate its offering</td>
<td>Processed at high-level and acts decisively to ascertain there is a problem</td>
<td>Necessitates need for opportunities to improve its product and service offering</td>
<td>Create transformation by ensuring everyone is in place to enable growth</td>
<td>Has clear outcomes linked to strategic achievement</td>
<td>Creates long-term opportunities at allowing current positions to continue</td>
<td>Does not consider any need to not adding value unambiguously</td>
<td>Understands risk to organisation and achievement of strategy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognising that change needs to happen, or move faster</td>
<td>Able to summarise vast amounts of information and make a decision</td>
<td>Persuades in place to re-consider its decisions</td>
<td>Lays comprehensive plans for future development</td>
<td>Reflects on success or failure in re-considering new direction</td>
<td>Immediately makes connections between stakeholders/relationships and organisational strategic implications</td>
<td>microphone identification of risk in response to future possibilities and engage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Considers ethical implications of decisions</td>
<td>Understands financial implications of changes to development</td>
<td>Create and sustain momentum of systems and resources to ensure alignment to achieving vision</td>
<td>Manage perceptions of stakeholders to ensure long-term sustainability</td>
<td>Knows when to affect change in order to avoid loss of efficiency</td>
<td>Links messages/signs which impact strategic development (leads the connection early enough)</td>
<td>microphone identification of risk in response to future possibilities and engage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Organisational facilitation to ensure responsiveness to change (both systems/organisations) | Meets with stakeholders to prepare and get perspectives | Seeks stakeholders input to prepare and gain perspectives | Data is immediately the shaping process between stakeholders and organisations and when not clear | Understands long-term negative impacts of decisions |
| Uses new business opportunities to correct and deliver past maintaining issues | Ensures stakeholders' resistance and engagement from the beginning | Uses learning from experience to modify plans | Seeks signs of disturbance which would impact balance |
| Every individual is aligned with a strategic goal in mind | Seeks competitive advantage through gaining knowledge of other parties' interest | Seeks competitive advantage through gathering knowledge of other parties' interests | Being present and contain a sense of trust to identify where to influence |
| Clear plan to ensure future growth | Uses every opportunity to network | Uses every opportunity to network | Mens connections to potential consequences |
| Action plan put in place for all strategies | Uses marketing to target key message across that would otherwise get lost in translation | Uses marketing to target key message across that would otherwise get lost in translation | Plays attention to other's insights |
| Applies pressure to force people out of comfort zone | Takes advantage of networking opportunities to influence external | Takes advantage of networking opportunities to influence external | Mindfulness |
D3: Inter relationship Diagraph depicting the development of variables to a higher level of abstraction - operational behavioural categories
D4: Inter relationship Diagraph depicting the development of variables to a higher level of abstraction - strategic behavioural categories
D5: Categories subsumed to higher levels of abstraction

Categories in yellow had the highest level of abstraction, and the balance where subsumed into them through inductive reasoning.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Operational</th>
<th>Strategic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Achievement of operational indicators</td>
<td>Alignment of resources to prepare platform for change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness of strategy execution</td>
<td>Effectiveness of decisions on organisational sustainability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creating clarity of purpose</td>
<td>Degree of deliberate networking for own and organisational benefit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness of resource utilisation</td>
<td>Degree of boundary blur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree of protection of own area of responsibility</td>
<td>Effectiveness of ability to recognise and respond to changes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of competence in problem resolution</td>
<td>Degree of business acumen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to use data to drive performance</td>
<td>Timespan of forward thinking cycle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combination of divergent and convergent thinking</td>
<td>Willingness to take risks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of risk management</td>
<td>Ability to connect the dots through high functioning cognitive ability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness of stakeholder engagement and integration</td>
<td>Degree of ability to identify risks</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
D6: Inter relationship Diagraph for reduction sampling – operational behavioural categories

OUTCOME

Achievement of operational indicators

Effectiveness of strategy execution

Effectiveness of resource utilisation

Level of competence in problem resolution

Degree of protection of own area of responsibility

Driver, 3 OUT, 1 IN

2 OUT, 2 IN

3 OUT, 1 IN, DRIVER

4 IN, 0 OUT

2 OUT, 2 IN.
D7: Inter relationship Diagraph for reduction sampling - strategic behavioural categories.
## Appendix E: Research Results – Research Cycle 4

### E1: Categorisation: Categories and the relating propositions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Importance of selecting right candidate based on identification of antecedents which show potential for development</th>
<th>Effectiveness of live manager for actively engage in development process and provide feedback</th>
<th>Effectiveness of tangible measurement system to drive development and required performance</th>
<th>Importance of understanding principles that you need to help yourself through growing others</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sense of honour</td>
<td>Constant check in</td>
<td>Detailed Operating Plan put into place</td>
<td>Ability to stop micro-managing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sense of responsibility</td>
<td>360 degree feedback</td>
<td>Continuous improvement by staff</td>
<td>Developing managers below</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sense of respect for organization</td>
<td>Visible change</td>
<td>Employee morale increased through quality</td>
<td>Encouraging growth of team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By principle</td>
<td>Empowerment and change feedback</td>
<td>Reward &amp; recognition</td>
<td>Operate at a higher level of abstraction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By principle</td>
<td>Ability to synthesize feedback</td>
<td>Measure on balanced scorecard approach as holistic as a strategy</td>
<td>Delegate, trust and manage exceptions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By principle</td>
<td>Consistent feedback</td>
<td>Goal must be measurable and defined</td>
<td>People engagement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By principle</td>
<td>Stabilize then build it</td>
<td>Meet monthly to review</td>
<td>Lines team engagement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By principle</td>
<td>Manager needs to be connected to development of employee</td>
<td>Weekly monthly to feedback on performance</td>
<td>Encourage team contribution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awareness of implementation of self-change</td>
<td>Immediate feedback on issues</td>
<td>Create direction</td>
<td>Use others and advice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awareness of implementation of self-change</td>
<td>Do something and the feedback report</td>
<td>Define direction</td>
<td>Using and competing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awareness of implementation of self-change</td>
<td>Identify which progress needs to be kept going</td>
<td>Identify which progress needs to be maintained</td>
<td>Add perspectives, but do not shut down</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awareness of implementation of self-change</td>
<td>Look out for opportunity to improve</td>
<td>Look out for opportunity to improve</td>
<td>Needs to be a quantifiable link to improvement (S &amp; L)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awareness of implementation of self-change</td>
<td>See any kind of business as opportunity for improvement</td>
<td>See any kind of business as opportunity for improvement</td>
<td>Realize clients have been heard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awareness of implementation of self-change</td>
<td>Coaching feedback</td>
<td>Clarity of measurement</td>
<td>See things from others versus points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-focus</td>
<td>Line manager feedback</td>
<td>Quick measurement</td>
<td>Learn play</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-focus</td>
<td>Identify points in focus behavior immediately – urgent feedback</td>
<td>Equal weighting for people, process, customer, finance, administration others good ideas</td>
<td>Lean play</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-focus</td>
<td>Acknowledge change – positive feedback</td>
<td>Selected success within each quadrant</td>
<td>Research others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-focus</td>
<td>Lots of learning of leading</td>
<td>Exceptionally detailed (try, learn, test)</td>
<td>Research others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-focus</td>
<td>Withdrawal of focusing off after 1st year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-focus</td>
<td>Recognize movement in terms of development to adjust plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-focus</td>
<td>Verbal / non-verbal communication assessment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-focus</td>
<td>Break dependency in development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-focus</td>
<td>Willingness to work with self and develop individual</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-focus</td>
<td>Identify signs of progress</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-focus</td>
<td>Movement in the right direction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-focus</td>
<td>Identification of temperaments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-focus</td>
<td>Clear and observable signs of movement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-focus</td>
<td>How other people think about them</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-focus</td>
<td>Willingness to be discussed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-focus</td>
<td>Encouragement to want to change</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-focus</td>
<td>Encouragement to want to change</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-focus</td>
<td>Ability to translate concepts into practical implementation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-focus</td>
<td>Ability to meet or match education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-focus</td>
<td>Ability to match or match education was high</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-focus</td>
<td>Takes feedback without defensiveness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-focus</td>
<td>Holds people accountable for full role</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-focus</td>
<td>Understanding of any that are worth development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-focus</td>
<td>Idea that the leader must grow together with him</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-focus</td>
<td>Clarity of expectations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-focus</td>
<td>Recognizing jump in development curve</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-focus</td>
<td>Rerun the process</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-focus</td>
<td>Mentators</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-focus</td>
<td>Identify which progress needs to be stopped (direction in reverse)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-focus</td>
<td>Be aware of giving a guide too much in one direction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-focus</td>
<td>Line management, where external needs required</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Categorisation: Categorie and the relating propositions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trust and confidence building</th>
<th>Degree of leadership ability to execute at the correct level</th>
<th>Repositioning of target of leadership and engagement</th>
<th>Work to develop with different systems (systemic thinking)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty decision making</td>
<td>Differentiator from subordinate (other’s role)</td>
<td>Role models behavior in superior</td>
<td>Understanding detail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty decision making</td>
<td>Confidence to plan by deuce</td>
<td>Timelessness</td>
<td>Innovation and trialability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Done in both black &amp; white decision making</td>
<td>Done in both black &amp; white decision making</td>
<td>Reactiveness</td>
<td>Innovase problem solving ability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Done in both black &amp; white decision making</td>
<td>Ability to deal appropriately what you can do differently</td>
<td>Experience</td>
<td>Recognize problems proactively</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Done in both black &amp; white decision making</td>
<td>Ability to deal appropriately what you can do differently</td>
<td>Experience</td>
<td>Recognize problems proactively</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Done in both black &amp; white decision making</td>
<td>Done in both black &amp; white decision making</td>
<td>Experience</td>
<td>Better manage continuums, and in smaller chunks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Done in both black &amp; white decision making</td>
<td>Experience</td>
<td>Experience</td>
<td>Systematic thinking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Done in both black &amp; white decision making</td>
<td>Experience</td>
<td>Experience</td>
<td>Focus on available tools and signs for signs of disturbance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Done in both black &amp; white decision making</td>
<td>Experience</td>
<td>Experience</td>
<td>Subordinate taking of events</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Done in both black &amp; white decision making</td>
<td>Experience</td>
<td>Experience</td>
<td>Open thinking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Done in both black &amp; white decision making</td>
<td>Experience</td>
<td>Experience</td>
<td>Etc. thinking for clarity (seek understanding)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Done in both black &amp; white decision making</td>
<td>Experience</td>
<td>Experience</td>
<td>Demonstrate ability to see multiple perspectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Done in both black &amp; white decision making</td>
<td>Experience</td>
<td>Experience</td>
<td>Move into each deeper, and then use to manage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Done in both black &amp; white decision making</td>
<td>Experience</td>
<td>Experience</td>
<td>Understandable co-play effect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Done in both black &amp; white decision making</td>
<td>Experience</td>
<td>Experience</td>
<td>Understandable points of intervention</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Consistency of stable and structured environment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership example by senior manager</th>
<th>Level of perception management</th>
<th>Effectiveness of focus on changing verbal and non-verbal language</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leadership example by senior manager</td>
<td>Understanding others perceptions of you</td>
<td>Reassuring to gather thoughts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership example by senior manager</td>
<td>Manage perception of others</td>
<td>Structure communication correctly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership example by senior manager</td>
<td>Correcting others perceptions</td>
<td>Face display and body language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership example by senior manager</td>
<td>Strategy around of changing others opinions</td>
<td>Work on necessary after doing something wrong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership example by senior manager</td>
<td>Dealing directly with effects in influence opinions</td>
<td>If unable to stop – how to recover - epidemiology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership example by senior manager</td>
<td>Notice others reactions to you</td>
<td>Importance of language - yes, but in years, and identification of praising mechanism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership example by senior manager</td>
<td>Judge successes of actions according to people/environmental response</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership example by senior manager</td>
<td>Force others to acknowledge signs of change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership example by senior manager</td>
<td>Seeks feedback from others</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership example by senior manager</td>
<td>Perceptions management</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership example by senior manager</td>
<td>Party politics in meeting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership example by senior manager</td>
<td>Visibility to senior managers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership example by senior manager</td>
<td>Use “group” to ascertain rules to influence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership example by senior manager</td>
<td>Use “group” center to feedback positive managers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
E2: Inter relationship Diagraph depicting the development of variables to a higher level of abstraction
## E3: Categories subsumed to higher levels of abstraction - operational behaviours

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable number</th>
<th>Variable Heading</th>
<th>Number of In's</th>
<th>Move to</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Importance of selecting right candidate based on identification of antecedents which shows potential for development</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Willingness of line manager to actively engage in development process and provide feedback</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Effectiveness of tangible measurement system to drive development and required performance</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Importance of understanding principle that you need to grow yourself through growing others</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Clarity of decision making and willingness to fail forward</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>#4 - Importance of understanding principle that you need to grow yourself through growing others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Degree of leadership positioning by associating at the correct level</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>#9 - Constancy of a stable and structured environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Repositioning framing of own leadership and engagement styles</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>#9 - Constancy of a stable and structured environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Ability to work with different systems (systemic thinking)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>#4 - Importance of understanding principle that you need to grow yourself through growing others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Constancy of a stable and structured environment</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Level of perception management</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>#9 - Constancy of a stable and structured environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Effectiveness of focus on changing verbal and non-verbal language</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>#4 - Importance of understanding principle that you need to grow yourself through growing others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heading</td>
<td>Propositions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Perception of strength of character created by having a presence</strong></td>
<td>Good first impression (confidence/aura/dress) = presence</td>
<td>Has presence - prepared to state case, participate and give viewpoint</td>
<td>Exudes self confidence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presence: stewardship, ambition, vision, order, affirmation and mentorship.</td>
<td>Having presence is being fully present</td>
<td>Presence is one of the most critical powers</td>
<td>Role model - others want to be like them</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Degree of Renewable Energy (Def: an energy source that is replaced rapidly by natural processes)</strong></td>
<td>Passion for company/job</td>
<td>Passion for the brand - Brand ambassador for the company</td>
<td>Energy - life energy/ on the go</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resilience - ability to bounce back quickly</td>
<td>Very fast reaction time when something is requested from them</td>
<td>Takes initiative and is able to identify a problem</td>
<td>Never gives up and looks for alternate solutions if the first one identified does not work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Driven (displays energy/achieves goals)</td>
<td>Shows passion in every way (spark in eye)</td>
<td>Internal drive to succeed</td>
<td>Personal motivation - don't wait for others to raise issue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Takes pride in what he does</td>
<td>Passionate / Ambassador for the company</td>
<td>Dedicated - amount of effort and additional hours put in</td>
<td>High work ethic - focussed on work and takes pride in delivery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passion for own job</td>
<td><strong>Degree of focus and ownership of own development</strong></td>
<td>Creates environment for own development</td>
<td>Is committed to develop themselves</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Takes ownership of learning and commits to it - and succeeds despite any setbacks</td>
<td>Is apply to translate theory learnt into practice to improve their operations</td>
<td>Demonstrates interest in continual learning</td>
<td>Feedback is viewed as an opportunity to improve themselves</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Level of competence in problem resolution</strong></td>
<td>Has full understanding of problems and the causes</td>
<td>Problem resolution limited to current, and not to potential future issues</td>
<td>Focus is on problem at hand and finding a solution to it</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questioning value add from long standing arrangements</td>
<td>Able to get resolution on problems - does not pass the problem to someone else</td>
<td>Prioritised solutions to fixing of problem with timelines</td>
<td>Understands limitations to problem resolution and find solutions to mitigate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovative problem solving capability</td>
<td>Identification of root cause of problem</td>
<td>Ability to problem solve</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Appendix F : Research Results Meta-synthesis**

**F1: Extract of propositions collected**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effectiveness of strategy execution</th>
<th>Designs provisional action plan in advance to achieve strategy</th>
<th>Breaks strategy down into smaller goals and responsibilities to ensure achievement</th>
<th>Ensures basics in place to enable long term strategy achievement</th>
<th>Focus's on own scorecard achievement and not to organisational strategy</th>
<th>Measures everything that is needed to ensure basics are in place to drive strategy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Understanding own area in context of the organisation</td>
<td>Alignment between the goals of individual areas and the overall organisational strategy</td>
<td>Team player within strategy achievement</td>
<td>Implications of not achieving strategy are clearly understood</td>
<td>Analyses strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats (SWOT) of situation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduction and management of change</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness of resource utilisation</td>
<td>Allocation of resources to fixing problem</td>
<td>Controlled approach to project management</td>
<td>Cutting costs to deliver to bottom line</td>
<td>Sweating assets to deliver value</td>
<td>Effective matching of demand and supply</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resources are used and aligned</td>
<td>Resource utilization as a skill</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People management and planning of labour</td>
<td>Manipulation of resources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consistency of Operational Achievement</td>
<td>Unwavering operational business achievement</td>
<td>Get results / goal achievement</td>
<td>Focussed - has eye on the ball - gets job done</td>
<td>Consistently delivers own objectives</td>
<td>Able to work on own and display initiative and implement action plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Put plans in place to ensure long term solutions</td>
<td>Out of the box thinking to enable problem resolution to achieve goals</td>
<td>Creative thinking to ensure goal achievement</td>
<td>Recognising when things need to change</td>
<td>Be process compliant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Be able to make plans when things go wrong</td>
<td>Paying attention to detail</td>
<td>Learns from mistakes</td>
<td>Ability to solve problems</td>
<td>Improving one’s overall work</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On top of things (logical / well planned)</td>
<td>Compliance driven (process)</td>
<td>Always meets / beats deadlines</td>
<td>Goal driven (wants to achieve)</td>
<td>Respects authority levels (boundaries)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Systematic in how they do things</td>
<td>Good planning (sees bigger picture and breaks down into chunks)</td>
<td>Able to multitask and deal with many issues at once</td>
<td>Achievement of goals is a priority</td>
<td>Drives scorecard achievement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action plans in place to ensure operational delivery</td>
<td>Sets high standards - process compliance</td>
<td>Deals with issues effectively</td>
<td>Always meets deadlines</td>
<td>Attention to detail</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capability</td>
<td>Performance Details</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>Responds to issues proactively</td>
<td>Resolves own issues - does not wait for others to resolve</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structured and organised in plans to meet goals</td>
<td>Takes ownership of projects in own areas to ensure project deliverables</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuously reviews KPI's (reflects / analyses and makes relevant changes) in order to meet them</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus’s on solution to resolve issue and does not get lost in the problem</td>
<td>Ability to work on their own</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deliver through teams - keeps following up to ensure delivery of results</td>
<td>Able to multi skill and maintain balance between activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Able to create link between activity and strategic intent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process competence and process improvement, Establishment of goals, identification of the problem, the constraints and alternatives to the problem.</td>
<td>Appropriate combination of task and people orientation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meet commitments i.e. scorecard</td>
<td>Facilitating work of others</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leans quickly regarding new operational requirements</td>
<td>Execution of strategy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Takes responsibility for the work delegated</td>
<td>Planning for achievement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management effectiveness in terms of achieving KPI's</td>
<td>Expertise in performance outputs required</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project management when new operational requirements are needed</td>
<td>Has diagnostic skills when operation goes wrong</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Skills to perform role</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to maintain goal pressure</td>
<td>Plans and implements change effectively to meet indicators</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental management</td>
<td>Concentrates on improving work performance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speed up operational processes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operations management specifically time management, and planning</td>
<td>Does not get caught up in operational problems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proactively manages problems as they arise</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear logical thought process</td>
<td>Ability to grasp abstract concepts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thinks quickly and on their feet</td>
<td>Able to come up with multiple solutions for problems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skills in synthesis of information</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Out of the box thinking</td>
<td>Divergent thinking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Logical thought process</td>
<td>Innovative thinking wrt solutions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Able to handle multiple sources of data and synthesise</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovation in finding solutions</td>
<td>Add value through appropriate and innovative solutions to challenges</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problem resolution enablement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combination of divergent and convergent thinking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis of data to establish pattern or trends</td>
<td>Does not get too caught up in detail</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding detail to ensure correct activities are being measured</td>
<td>Understanding of detail in order to justify answer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Synthesis of data</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anticipates questions regarding information presented</td>
<td>Well prepared when presenting data</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questions every piece of information in order to understand where to drive efficiencies</td>
<td>Presents organised and meaningful data to enable decision making</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Synthesis of facts and decision making based on information at hand</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willingness to take risks and take responsibility for them</td>
<td>Willing to take calculated risk</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has courage to take calculated risk</td>
<td>Good judgement calls around decisions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Takes responsibility for decisions</td>
<td>Decisiveness - no delay in making decisions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to analyse and get value from information</td>
<td>Takes hard decision if status quo will lead to long term operational failure for short term gain</td>
<td>Manages risk</td>
<td>Willing to take risks to ensure sustainability</td>
<td>Takes calculated risk based on potential threat</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carefully weighs risks and benefits of change</td>
<td>Ability to recognise that the benefit is sometimes not worth the risk</td>
<td>Considers consequences only for the current financial year</td>
<td>Risk management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wants immediate action and resolution of problem without fully understanding long term risk</td>
<td>Makes sense when speaking and presents a coherent argument</td>
<td>Willingness to be questioned on decisions</td>
<td>Communicates the appropriate amount of information to ensure understanding</td>
<td>Creates balance between data analysis and gaining understanding</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compelling rationale behind argument</td>
<td>Focusses at correct level of detail</td>
<td>Picks out relevant information and discards irrelevant stuff</td>
<td>Business acumen is demonstrated by data synthesis and meaning extracted</td>
<td>Able to analyse and get value from information</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understands financial management information</td>
<td>Personal competence in communication, conflict resolution and facilitating decisions around data presented</td>
<td>Clarity of communication around information</td>
<td>Control of details in order not to overwhelm audience</td>
<td>Logical clear thinker - ability to process data and get meaning from it</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision making enabled through clarity of argument</td>
<td>Communication skills enable message delivery</td>
<td></td>
<td>Negotiating skills are enabled through data analysis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to prepare data and do analysis</td>
<td>Ability to argue and support opinion</td>
<td>Presents argument in a way that covers most potential questions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Able to prepare data and do analysis</td>
<td>Listens and pays attention so that they can understand detail</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>Willingness to interfere in areas outside own areas of responsibility to ensure value creation</td>
<td>Is not boxed in by boundaries</td>
<td>Constantly pushes the boundaries</td>
<td>Does not consider any area that is not adding value untouchable</td>
<td>Not afraid to challenge other managers if they do not agree with decisions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree of boundary blur</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fights for own area but listens to all sides of the argument</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>Degree of protection of own area of responsibility</td>
<td>Willing to challenge other people if there is a negative impact on their own area</td>
<td>Protection of territory</td>
<td>Offers solutions particular to own perspectives</td>
<td>Is not afraid to step on toes</td>
<td>Willing to rock the boat and challenge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness of decisions on organisational sustainability</td>
<td>Effectiveness of engagement with stakeholders</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>Allows negative impact to an area/division for greater good of organisation</td>
<td>Proactively networks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understands holistic implications on business of changes</td>
<td>Good specialist industry knowledge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understands the need to compromise own position if benefit is greater for another department and as a result, the overall organisation</td>
<td>Keeps others informed and in the loop</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seeks opportunities to differentiate offering for the greater business</td>
<td>Gains understanding of situation before criticizing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognises that change needs to happen in other areas to move forward</td>
<td>Conflict resolution - amicable result</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fights for what they believe will negatively impact the business as a whole</td>
<td>Understands clients needs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does things for the greater good</td>
<td>Ability to foster strong relationship with clients and understand their needs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understands end to end process (bigger picture)</td>
<td>Will consider and take into account others opinions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understands impact on organisation</td>
<td>Good relationship with colleagues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will balance focus on business delivery outside of own area</td>
<td>Collaborates with others</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Works together with stakeholders and considers impacts</td>
<td>Persuasion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrates with stakeholders and understands their constraints</td>
<td>Collaboration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conceptual skills when looking at bigger picture</td>
<td>Looking after your customers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mindful (ability to consider impact of decision on more than 1 stakeholder)</td>
<td>Behaviours need to be inclined towards cooperation and integration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic thinking skills</td>
<td>Dealing with conflict effectively</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial understanding - greater good of organisation</td>
<td>Ability to identify future threats and opportunities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Make decisions in best interests of organisation</td>
<td>Considers ethical implications of decisions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open to new ideas (embraces change)</td>
<td>Confidence with context, personal needs with the greater good</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willing to assist in areas outside of own</td>
<td>Ethical decision making</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Take all factors into account before making decision</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to identify future threats and opportunities</td>
<td>Skilled negotiator (gets what they want)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Influencing and reducing resistance to change</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Persuasiveness (in order to build stakeholder relationships)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ensure relationship commitment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Creates networks and integrates with others</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Knowledge of other areas of business</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ability to maintain relationships</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Table issues (multiple stakeholder perspectives)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Relationship building effectiveness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Set scene and acknowledge importance of relationship</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Knowledge of other areas of business</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Listen to all departure points</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Customer centric mind-set</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Engagement with stakeholders to increase satisfaction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Working with others for a common goal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Well prepared prior to meeting w.r.t stakeholder perspectives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Meets with stakeholders to prepare and get perspectives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Uses every opportunity to network</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Build relationships to ensure collaboration for future projects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Build relationships to ensure self protection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ability to get stakeholder buy in</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Importance of selecting right candidate based on identification of antecedents which shows potential for development</td>
<td>Anticipates stakeholder resistance and engages them prior to meeting</td>
<td>Networking is “effective in communicating complex information, sensing subtle signals and transferring knowledge”</td>
<td>Has Informal meeting designed to impart knowledge in a way that it appears to be sharing of confidence, however is aimed at softening future actions</td>
<td>Ability to influence at all levels</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proactively creates networks</td>
<td>Understands what the other person is saying and what his needs are - and working together to meet them</td>
<td>Patience w.r.t creating understanding amongst stakeholders</td>
<td>Ability to work as part of a team</td>
<td>Care for customer - balancing interests and going the extra mile</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seeks competitive advantage through gaining knowledge of other parties/rivals</td>
<td>Takes advantage of networking opportunities to influence outcome</td>
<td>Collaborative action</td>
<td>Networking for future opportunities</td>
<td>Ability to influence stakeholders</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manage perceptions of stakeholders to ensure long term sustainability</td>
<td>Ability to engage with people at higher levels in the organisation</td>
<td>Use empathy listening and genuine connections to build relationships</td>
<td>Networking for reciprocity</td>
<td>Collaboration with colleagues - works together to better understand something</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal skills contribute to creating relationships</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sense of respect for line</th>
<th>Needs a sense of humour</th>
<th>Sense of respect for organisation</th>
<th>Needs to be fully present</th>
<th>Follows policy and procedure at all times</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Able to accept feedback</td>
<td>Follows rules &amp; regulations</td>
<td>Ability to be mindful</td>
<td>Strong sense of responsibility</td>
<td>Willingness to do something different</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willingness to be disturbed</td>
<td>Respects boundaries</td>
<td>Willingness to fail forward</td>
<td>Displays energy wrt improving themselves</td>
<td>Submission to development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Takes responsibility for actions</td>
<td>Demonstrates that they are self assured</td>
<td>Results driven</td>
<td>Speed of response is appropriate</td>
<td>Willing to go extra mile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Openness to want to change</td>
<td>Very quick to identify opportunities to operationalise learnings</td>
<td>Uses feedback to affect change</td>
<td>Ability to engage others in the learning process</td>
<td>Needs to display a degree of creativity towards self improvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eagerness to experiment</td>
<td>Respects authority</td>
<td>Displays sense of urgency</td>
<td>Cares about what people think about them</td>
<td>Conscientiousness to maintain ethical behaviour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awareness of implementation of self change</td>
<td>High reflection ability</td>
<td>Expresses a commitment to change</td>
<td>Willing to be disturbed</td>
<td>Strong sense of curiosity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exploring and being open to change</td>
<td>Ability to select and match information in order to implement personal changes</td>
<td>Must be willing to increase relevant knowledge, skills, abilities and other personality characteristics</td>
<td>Tolerance towards themselves and others</td>
<td>Flexibility to learn and adapt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Openness to feedback and change</td>
<td>High degree of openness</td>
<td>Intellect wrt outputs required for role</td>
<td>Extroversion (willingness to put themselves out there)</td>
<td>Self-management of the development process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to translate concept into practical implementation</td>
<td>Takes feedback without defensiveness</td>
<td>Needs to focus on correct development for gaps</td>
<td>Collaboration in order to move forward</td>
<td>Displays sense of agreeableness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment to the process and practical application of learning</td>
<td>Appropriate level of respect shown to seniors and authority levels</td>
<td>Displays care and capability towards others</td>
<td>Wisdom, gained from self-reflection of experiences</td>
<td>Ability to be willing to learn from their own experiences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willingness to succumb to the circumstances for development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Willingness to constantly check in on employee</th>
<th>Ability to take note of visible change</th>
<th>Ability to synthesise feedback</th>
<th>Line Manager begins the process slowly then builds up</th>
<th>Gives immediate feedback on issues - does not wait</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Willing to do 360 degree feedback</td>
<td>Ability to give encouragement wrt change (feedback)</td>
<td>Willingness to give consistent feedback</td>
<td>Manager needs to be committed to development of employee</td>
<td>Look out for opportunity to improve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coaching feedback to employee</td>
<td>Acknowledge changes - positive feedback</td>
<td>Recognise movement in terms of development to adjust plan</td>
<td>Understand shortcomings of employee</td>
<td>Clear and observable signs of movement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line manager feeds back continuously</td>
<td>Allows employee to do lots of bouncing off in beginning</td>
<td>Manager needs to allow challenge to grow candidates thinking</td>
<td>Structured development plan subject to multiple revisions as issues emerge</td>
<td>Agreement regarding how often employee should check in</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Willingness of line manager to actively engage in development process and provide feedback**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Identify which progress needs to be maintained</th>
<th>Encourages employee to do try something and then report back</th>
<th>Movement in the right direction</th>
<th>Line Manager needs to break dependency in development as appropriate</th>
<th>Both parties need to continuously remember the purpose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>See any kind of stickness as opportunity for improvement</td>
<td>Identify which progress needs to be kept going</td>
<td>Identification of competencies</td>
<td>Willingness to work with and develop individual</td>
<td>Line needs to manage performance during development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line Manager needs to identify signs of progress</td>
<td>Draw employees attention to verbal/non verbal communication messages</td>
<td>Line ability to be able to recognise jump in development curve</td>
<td>Verbalisation of why they are worth development</td>
<td>Agreement around how often to check in to monitor progress with line</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agreement of silent signals (to correct behaviour immediately) - instant feedback</td>
<td>Line Manager needs to withdraw bouncing off after 1st year to encourage growth</td>
<td>Line Manager needs to hold people accountable for full role</td>
<td>Understand the parts to be able to influence the whole</td>
<td>Identification of particular behaviours which need to change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management development must become a corporate competence</td>
<td>Development requires a tailored approach</td>
<td>Talent development requires discipline, decisiveness by the line manager</td>
<td>Senior management involvement in leadership development</td>
<td>Identify which progress needs to be stopped (direction is wrong)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Management development must become a corporate competence**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Learning opportunities need to be defined and redefined</th>
<th>Training and development is greatly facilitated if the person being developed identifies with the one doing the influencing</th>
<th>Employers take responsibility for management development within an established framework</th>
<th>Line manager involvement in development</th>
<th>Be aware of swinging scale too much in one direction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not everyone in the talent pool should be treated in the same way</td>
<td>Support with access to knowledge and relationship networks</td>
<td>Use of senior leaders in the design of development programs</td>
<td>Line managers need to take responsibility for employee development</td>
<td>Line manager honesty in where external help is required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creating vision towards end goal of development</td>
<td>Senior managers serve as role models to the individuals being developed</td>
<td>Create clarity and meaning</td>
<td>Understanding of what needs to happen to optimize learning</td>
<td>Clarity of expectation with employee being developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detailed Operating Plan put in place</td>
<td>Measure and drive employee morale through operating plan</td>
<td>Measure on balanced scorecard approach (holistic as opposed to operational only)</td>
<td>Drive change through goals</td>
<td>Meet monthly to review goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KPI's encourage continuous improvement by staff</td>
<td>Use operating plan to enable Reward &amp; recognition</td>
<td>Equal weighting for people, process, customer, finance</td>
<td>Goals must be measurable and defined</td>
<td>Meet monthly to feedback on performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Needs to have a quantitative link to improvement (data to support)</td>
<td>Use measurement to address gaps</td>
<td>Clarity of measurement</td>
<td>Weighed scores within each quadrant</td>
<td>Management to formally evaluate progress after a period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of performance measurement systems to influence the behaviour and decisions of managers.</td>
<td>Evaluation and understanding of the individuals skill set with short term development plans</td>
<td>Operating plan needs to be exceptionally detailed in the 1st year, less so 2nd</td>
<td>Plans are amended as new direction emerges</td>
<td>Management to mentor, review progress and set new plans every quarter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competencies need to be continuously reviewed</td>
<td>2nd year no monthly review - expectations have been built and set in 1st year</td>
<td>Create direction through operating plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to get people activated and moving in the right direction</td>
<td>Gain clarity on statements in order to ensure understanding</td>
<td>Clear expectations in terms of desired outcome</td>
<td>Documents discussion with accountabilities and action plans</td>
<td>Very clear about requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear understanding given to everyone so they can know what to do</td>
<td>Ability to explain concepts both up and down stream</td>
<td>Facilitates behaviour in meetings</td>
<td>Creates a sense of expectation</td>
<td>Sense of purpose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explains changes and the impact to get buy in</td>
<td>Information management (communication)</td>
<td>Seek clarity in order to gain understanding</td>
<td>Gives clear direction</td>
<td>Team creativity enabled through the combination of a common understanding of the problem to be resolved and the sharing of a desired outcome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of personal attributes required at Management level</td>
<td>Effective communication to teams</td>
<td>Giving direction</td>
<td>Deal with facts</td>
<td>Consistency of behaviour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to communicate effectively</td>
<td>Ability to get meaning across in communication</td>
<td>Confident communication - how you present yourself</td>
<td>Subordinates have clear understanding of requirements</td>
<td>Displays honesty and transparency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Articulation (clear communication)</td>
<td>Ability to communicate at all levels (up and down)</td>
<td>Uses personal contact to influence others</td>
<td>Displays emotional stability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ability to separate emotional aspect from unpleasant task which needs to be performed</td>
<td>Does not allow themselves to get drawn into politics or emotional responses</td>
<td>Remains positive in the face of adversity even if not felt internally</td>
<td>Displays emotional stability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Does not display temper outbursts</td>
<td>Emotionally even tempered</td>
<td>Consistent emotional behaviour</td>
<td>Assertive but caring behavioural style</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Displays emotional stability</td>
<td>Assertive but caring behavioural style</td>
<td>Actions aligned to goal achievement</td>
<td>Ability to trust and be trusted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of understanding cognisance of own behaviour</td>
<td>Open to others opinions</td>
<td>Will deal with issue where they don't agree in a constructive manner</td>
<td>Stable (no mood swings) consistent moods</td>
<td>Open to feedback / new ideas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Takes cognisance of impact on others (emotional - not transactional)</td>
<td>Appropriate level of maturity</td>
<td>High levels of honesty with line manager</td>
<td>Ability to communicate effectively</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Supports colleagues and will present a united front even if not in 100% agreement</td>
<td>Consistent in what they say and do (aligned)</td>
<td>Shows support for their senior manager</td>
<td>Consistency of the way communication is done is key to being effective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Manage and stand ground in conflict</td>
<td>EQ level matches IQ level</td>
<td>People view them as approachable</td>
<td>Effective communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Role model behaviour</td>
<td>Leads by example</td>
<td>Holistic good all rounder</td>
<td>Displays understanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Displays understanding</td>
<td>Being passionate</td>
<td>Is respected by his own team</td>
<td>Assertiveness (is taken seriously)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Commitment to role</td>
<td>Harmonious passion</td>
<td>Acceptance of feedback</td>
<td>Courage and persistence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Displays maturity (appropriate seriousness/humour)</td>
<td>Ability to lead change</td>
<td>Non defensive and open to feedback</td>
<td>Personal integrity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Is able to trust and be trusted</td>
<td>Open to feedback / new ideas</td>
<td>Critical thinking skills</td>
<td>Emotional intelligence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High integrity (do what I say I will do)</td>
<td>Experience in their specific role (years of experience)</td>
<td>Displays tenacity in adverse circumstances</td>
<td>Emotional regulation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Self confidence</td>
<td>Self confidence, self-monitoring, and empathy</td>
<td>Increased understanding of themselves, their roles, the environment and the organisation</td>
<td>Accepts diversity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Approachable</td>
<td>Emotional intelligence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness of focus on changing verbal and non verbal language</td>
<td>Pausing to gather thoughts</td>
<td>Facial displays and body language</td>
<td>If unable to stop - how to recover - apologise</td>
<td>Identification of pausing mechanism to stop blurtling out things</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work on recovery after doing something wrong</td>
<td>Importance of language - yes, but vs yes, and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clarity of decision making and willingness to fail forward</th>
<th>No blame approach to dealing with issues</th>
<th>In grey areas needs to learn to question</th>
<th>Preventing issues from re-occurring</th>
<th>Continuous improvement dependant of willingness to fail</th>
<th>Discernment vs black &amp; white decision making</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Update ideas of failure</td>
<td>Build mind-set of problem solving and improvement</td>
<td>Willing to change unwillingness to fail</td>
<td>Dealing with uncertainty</td>
<td>Ability to decide quickly what you can do differently</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cannot experiment if you are scared of failure</td>
<td>Importance of asking good questions</td>
<td>Seek first to understand</td>
<td>Confidence to stand by decision</td>
<td>Spot tactical opportunities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust own decision making</td>
<td>Decisiveness about picking and selecting growth tools</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effectiveness of listening to multiple perspectives</th>
<th>Needs to respond to people without shutting them down</th>
<th>Allow people to see soft side without compromising</th>
<th>Ability to pay attention to response</th>
<th>Balance between toughness and softness</th>
<th>Routine vs non routine authority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ability to stop micro managing</td>
<td>Ability to regulate anger/emotions</td>
<td>Focus on correct level when managing down</td>
<td>Middle ground - firm but fair</td>
<td>Authority over routine activities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operate at a higher level of abstraction</td>
<td>Add perspective, but do not shut down</td>
<td>Ownership of area</td>
<td>Self regulation</td>
<td>Self management</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focussed on management/leadership growth</td>
<td>Framework redefinition - how to be tough but fair</td>
<td>Discretionary authority</td>
<td>Encourage team contribution</td>
<td>Give others airtime</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delegate, trust and manage exceptions</td>
<td>Grow team engagement</td>
<td>Give others signal that you have heard them</td>
<td>Caring and competent management style</td>
<td>See things from others view points</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Command, control, compliance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recognition and reward</th>
<th>Gives praise to others</th>
<th>Recognise and reward behaviours in teams (acknowledges them)</th>
<th>Recognises staff (training &amp; opportunities)</th>
<th>Recognition for good performance</th>
<th>Reward others</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Share glory</td>
<td>Acknowledge other's good ideas</td>
<td>Recognise others</td>
<td>People engagement is high</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of effective delegation</th>
<th>Delegates effectively and controls tasks delegated</th>
<th>Delegates tasks effectively</th>
<th>Delegates Effectively</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Delegates</td>
<td>Tasks effectively</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of staff development</th>
<th>Develops staff</th>
<th>Team goes out of their way for their manager</th>
<th>Mentors and shares knowledge with own team</th>
<th>Empowering to the point of ownership</th>
<th>Invests in people with generosity of time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Takes pride in department when they achieve something (puffs up)</td>
<td>Delegation of tasks to ensure execution</td>
<td>People rather than task skills are more important</td>
<td>Motivating people</td>
<td>Care displayed towards people</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of discipline</td>
<td>Impact of environmental influence</td>
<td>Degree of leadership positioning by associating at the correct level</td>
<td>Repositioning framing of own leadership and engagement styles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empowers staff by giving them opportunity to learn</td>
<td>Shows interest (caring) for others</td>
<td>Assists people - will give own time to impart knowledge - coaching / mentoring</td>
<td>Ability to recognise good leadership and mimic it</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop managers below</td>
<td>People management - caring / empathy</td>
<td>Encourage growth of team</td>
<td>Redefine framework of own leadership style</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership/motivational skills</td>
<td>Desire to develop others</td>
<td>Empowers others by encouraging them to find solutions to their problems</td>
<td>Absorb others leadership style and adapt to suit you</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Give constructive feedback to others</td>
<td>Actively managing staff performance</td>
<td>Effective feedback to employees about performance</td>
<td>Develop style that mimics others but is a natural fit with you</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coaching and counselling</td>
<td>Providing feedback to staff on performance</td>
<td>Proactively deals with staffing issues</td>
<td>Changing language when engaging at higher levels</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership example by senior manager</td>
<td>Performance Management culture</td>
<td>Right framework is provided to all staff</td>
<td>Developing own style</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High performing culture</td>
<td>Values based leadership</td>
<td>Correct boundaries are in place for employee</td>
<td>Is own definition of leadership congruent with organisation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning about events and consequences in the environment</td>
<td>Development is relevant to the role and the environment</td>
<td>Culture attention, retention, and reproduction</td>
<td>Adjusting behaviours to blend with different levels</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High degree of accountability</td>
<td>Environmental factors influencing behaviour/output</td>
<td>Consistent behaviour from all employees</td>
<td>Realisation that it gets lonely at the top</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop competencies in their contexts</td>
<td></td>
<td>Different environments tend to produce different behaviours in similar people</td>
<td>Relationship differentiation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Differentiate from subordinates (office move)</td>
<td>Associating with correct level of people</td>
<td>Playing politically</td>
<td>Role models behaviour on superior</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship differentiation</td>
<td>Realisation that it gets lonely at the top</td>
<td>Adjusting behaviours to blend with different levels</td>
<td>Develops own style</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mimics behaviour</td>
<td>Update own leadership definition</td>
<td>Leadership style is revised</td>
<td>Leadership is defined by its congruence with organisation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expand understanding of leadership</td>
<td>Ability to recognise good leadership and mimic it</td>
<td>Redefine framework of own leadership style</td>
<td>Align leadership expectations to actions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Principles leadership based on culture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Aligns to agility and learning from environment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Maintains an appropriate distance between themselves and staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Empowers staff by giving them opportunity to learn
- Shows interest (caring) for others
- Assists people - will give own time to impart knowledge - coaching / mentoring
- Team performs because of them
- Willingness to develop people
- Develop managers below
- People management - caring / empathy
- Encourage growth of team
- Team building to build morale
- Motivating, training listening and empathy
- Leadership/motivational skills
- Desire to develop others
- Empowers others by encouraging them to find solutions to their problems
- Excellent interpersonal skills
- Give constructive feedback to others
- Actively managing staff performance
- Effective feedback to employees about performance
- Sets staff objectives and achieves delivery
- Not afraid to have difficult conversations with people
- Coaching and counselling
- Providing feedback to staff on performance
- Proactively deals with staffing issues
- Sets a high standard and holds team accountable
- Leadership example by senior manager
- Performance Management culture
- Right framework is provided to all staff
- Highly emotionally regulated environment
- Social thinking is a critical skill to effect change
- High performing culture
- Values based leadership
- Correct boundaries are in place for employee
- Support Structure to create culture of caring
- Willingness to assess what is required for situational adaptation
- Learning about events and consequences in the environment
- Development is relevant to the role and the environment
- Culture attention, retention, and reproduction
- Culture of, honesty, commitment and trust
- The leader is able to read the relevant environmental cues
- High degree of accountability
- Environmental factors influencing behaviour/output
- Consistent behaviour from all employees
- Different environments tend to produce different behaviours in similar people
- Individuals develop through learning from their surrounding
- Develop competencies in their contexts
- Differentiate from subordinates (office move)
- Associating with correct level of people
- Playing politically
- Choosing allies in line with your role
- Chose your friends wisely
- Relationship differentiation
- Realisation that it gets lonely at the top
- Adjusting behaviours to blend with different levels
- Changing language when engaging at higher levels
- Maintains an appropriate distance between themselves and staff
- Role models behaviour on superior
- Develops own style
- Is own definition of leadership congruent with organisation
- Develop style that mimics others but is a natural fit with you
- Alignment of leadership expectations to actions
- Repositioning framing of own leadership and engagement styles
- Mimics behaviour
- Update own leadership definition
- Leadership style is revised
- Absorb others leadership style and adapt to suit you
- Principled leadership based on culture
- Expand understanding of leadership
- Ability to recognise good leadership and mimic it
- Redefine framework of own leadership style
- Aligns to agility and learning from environment
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of perception management</th>
<th>Understanding others perceptions of you</th>
<th>Correcting others perceptions</th>
<th>Dealing directly with others to influence opinions</th>
<th>Judge successfulness of actions according to people/environmental response</th>
<th>Seeks feedback from others about self</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Manage other’s perceptions</td>
<td>Strategy around influencing others opinions</td>
<td>Notice others reactions to you</td>
<td>Force others to acknowledge signs of change</td>
<td>Perception management</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previous bad behaviours impact people’s opinions</td>
<td>Notices how others react to them</td>
<td>Raise profile in HO meetings</td>
<td>Use &quot;gossip&quot; to ascertain where to influence</td>
<td>Use &quot;gossip&quot; carrier to feedback positive messages</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visibility in senior meetings</td>
<td>Focus on a variable and watch for signs of disturbance</td>
<td>Open thinking to allow opportunities to emerge</td>
<td>Understand points of intervention</td>
<td>Zoom into detail to understand, and then out to manage</td>
<td>Better to manage continuously, and in smaller chunks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subconscious linking of events</td>
<td>Questions for clarity (seeks understanding)</td>
<td>Understand that devil is always in the detail</td>
<td>Understand ripple effects</td>
<td>Systemic thinking</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase problem solving ability</td>
<td>Demonstrate ability to see multiple perspectives</td>
<td>Recognise problems proactively</td>
<td>Increase analytical ability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willingness to create change in the system</td>
<td>Willing to take risks/decisions which will differentiate you</td>
<td>Good judgement calls regarding boundary testing</td>
<td>Proactively goes about finding a solution to a problem</td>
<td>Challenges the historical way of doing things</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuous improvement mind-set</td>
<td>Questions status quo</td>
<td>Out of the box thinking</td>
<td>Know what they want and assertive enough to go after it</td>
<td>Will always try and find better ways of doing things to improve the operation / KPI achievement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generation of varied ideas</td>
<td>Creatively coming up with new ideas, services or concepts</td>
<td>Divergent thinking is an integral process in creativity</td>
<td>Challenge current practices and ask questions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to identifies future risks</td>
<td>Recognises risk and implications if nothing is done to correct</td>
<td>Highlights risk to operation, resources, capacity and costs</td>
<td>Proactive identification of risk in response to future potential events</td>
<td>Identifies risk and the need to do things differently in order to ensure organisational sustainability</td>
<td>Understands risk to organisation and achievement of strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to connect the dots</td>
<td>Grasps and links comments/situations/events to long term implication</td>
<td>Link and uses inside information to mitigate potential issues</td>
<td>Immediately makes connections between statements/solution s and long term strategic implications</td>
<td>Understands long term negative impacts of decisions</td>
<td>Being present and mindful in times of trouble to identify where to influence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grasps concepts quickly</td>
<td>Grasps long term implications of allowing current status quo to continue</td>
<td>Links/messages/signs which impact strategy achievement (makes the connection early enough)</td>
<td>Reacts to signs of disturbance which could impact balance</td>
<td>Makes connections to potential consequences</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pays attention to other’s insights</td>
<td>Making connections between multiple factors</td>
<td>Ability to be mindful and notice movements of patterns</td>
<td>The ability to detect, assess and react to change</td>
<td>Non linear solution thinking</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alignment of resources to prepare platform for change</td>
<td>Continually scan the external environment</td>
<td>Thinking needs more than linear understanding of historical patterns</td>
<td>Ability for opportunity recognition and, pattern recognition</td>
<td>Awareness of potential opportunities and threats which could emerge</td>
<td>Identification of variable change drivers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Making connections between events and for applying meaning to these patterns</td>
<td>Create structural change in order to enable new direction / change</td>
<td>Lays concrete plans for future development</td>
<td>Uses new business opportunities to correct and deliver past outstanding issues</td>
<td>Alignment &amp; integration of human, information and organisation capital</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alignment of resources to prepare platform for change</td>
<td>Aligning operational requirement to long term vision</td>
<td>Create transformation by ensuring structure is in place to enable growth</td>
<td>Create and ensure interconnectedness of systems and resources to ensure alignment to achieving vision</td>
<td>Every interaction is aligned with a strategic goal in mind</td>
<td>Ability to interpret one’s environment and resources subjectively</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action plans put in place for all scenarios</td>
<td>Sees value in change</td>
<td>Encourages organisational flexibility to ensure responsiveness to change (both systems/processes)</td>
<td>Clear plans to ensure future growth</td>
<td>Aligning resources and people to deliver a common goal in relation to the strategy</td>
<td>Assessment of the situation and plan for it</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aligns people to adapt to change</td>
<td>Prepare people to adapt to change</td>
<td>Applies pressure to force people out of comfort zone</td>
<td>Balance achieved between people, physical assets and technology</td>
<td>Alert to shifts and changes alignment between employees and the organisation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action plans put in place for all scenarios</td>
<td>Action plans put in place for all scenarios</td>
<td>Alignment between different functional areas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepares the environment for change</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>Timespan of forward thinking cycle</td>
<td>Defines strategy upfront and does not leave it to chance</td>
<td>Out of the box thinking for long term benefit</td>
<td>Puts plans in place to retain competitive advantage</td>
<td>Thinking ahead and keeping themselves informed</td>
<td>Engage in organisational dialogue - broaden understanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belief or commitment to a vision of the future</td>
<td>Top-down development and a bottom up execution approach</td>
<td>Does not only focus on the ‘here and now’</td>
<td>Define strategy for 5 year goal achievement based on financial as well as other goals (eg BEE scores etc)</td>
<td>Relentlessly seeks opportunities for improvement to profit and growth of organisation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree of business acumen</td>
<td>Ability to spot flaws in high level calculations</td>
<td>Convergent thinking skills</td>
<td>Able to synthesise vast amounts of information and make a decision</td>
<td>Able to build a coherent argument</td>
<td>Intellectual abilities (analysis)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does not get bogged down by detail - looks at high level information and only drills down where there is a problem</td>
<td>Focussed at high level and only drills down into detail when there is a problem</td>
<td>Understands financial impact of changes to environment</td>
<td>Ability to understand complex situation and formulate action plan</td>
<td>Sense making of data and the presentation of it</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to balance intuition with data</td>
<td>Decision making skills - does not avoid making decisions</td>
<td>Makes smart business decisions</td>
<td>Able to create wealth for the organisation through business understanding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identification of signs of success</td>
<td>Acknowledging milestones in achieving growth towards strategic intent</td>
<td>Has clear outcomes linked to strategic achievement</td>
<td>Able to identify the tipping point between when to hold on and when to let go</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modifies plans if they are not adding value to delivery of strategic intent</td>
<td>Knows when to affect change in order to avoid loss of benefit</td>
<td>Reflects on success or failure to determine new direction</td>
<td>Proactively recognize when change is necessary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agility in dealing with change</td>
<td>Understand the change management process</td>
<td></td>
<td>Uses learning from experience to modify plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## F2 : 2nd Level Category categorisation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Sub Categories</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness of decisions made for the greater good of the organisation</td>
<td>Effectiveness of decisions on organisational sustainability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Degree of protection of own area of responsibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Degree of boundary blur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness of engagement and integration with stakeholders</td>
<td>Effectiveness of engagement with stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact of environmental influence</td>
<td>Constancy of a stable and structured environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Degree of leadership positioning by associating at the correct level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Repositioning framing of own leadership and engagement styles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Level of perception management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to build and communicate a credible, compelling and coherent argument</td>
<td>Ability to analyse and get value from information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Willingness to take risks and take responsibility for them</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ability to use data to drive performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Combination of divergent and convergent thinking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to create value for the present</td>
<td>Consistency of Operational Achievement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Effectiveness of resource utilisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Effectiveness of strategy execution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Level of competence in problem resolution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree of Presence</td>
<td>Perception of strength of character created by having a presence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Degree of Renewable Energy (Definition: an energy source that is replaced rapidly by natural processes)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness of a performance plan</td>
<td>Effectiveness of tangible measurement system to drive development and required performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to create value for the future</td>
<td>Effectiveness of ability to recognise and respond to changes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Degree of business acumen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Timespan of forward thinking cycle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alignment of resources to prepare platform for change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willingness of line manager to actively engage in development process</td>
<td>Willingness of line manager to actively engage in development process and provide feedback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstration of presence of inherent leadership DNA</td>
<td>Importance of selecting right candidate based on identification of antecedents which shows potential for development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ownership of own development journey</td>
<td>Degree of focus and ownership of own development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree of leadership competencies</td>
<td>Clarity of decision making and willingness to fall forward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Effectiveness of focus on changing verbal and non-verbal language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ability to communicate effectively</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Level of understanding cognisance of own behaviour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Level of personal attributes required at Management level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Level of staff development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Creating clarity of purpose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Recognition and reward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Level of effective delegation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Level of discipline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Consistency of behaviour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Effectiveness of listening to multiple perspectives</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
F3 : Inter relationship Diagraph depicting the development of variables to a higher level of abstraction
F4: Categories subsumed to higher levels of abstraction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Number of 'in' arrows</th>
<th>Number of 'out' arrows</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Degree of environmental influence on culture creation and leadership framing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact of environmental influence on behaviours</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willingness of line manager to actively engage in development process</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ownership of own development journey</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness of a performance plan to maintain performance and enable development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness of a performance plan</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to create value for the present</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to build and communicate a credible, compelling and coherent argument</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness of engagement and integration with stakeholders</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness of decisions made for the greater good of the organisation</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to create value for the future</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presence of inherent DNA required for successful development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstration of presence of inherent leadership DNA</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visibility of strong leadership with heart</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree of leadership competencies</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree of Presence</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
F5: Inter relationship Digraph for reduction sampling
Appendix G : Memo Notes 1 - 27

Memo Note 1

A single aspect in Interview 1 caused a middle manager, Element 5 to be rated as unskilled, however I noted that he was highly rated in all other constructs. Likewise, Element 1 scored highly on any construct relating to operational achievement but so badly on others that it moved him from a skilled to an average performer.

Interview 2, had the same issue as Interview 1 where the elements final scores did not reflect their overall abilities. Interview 3’s ratings were consistent with the skill placement levels.

Interview 2 realised that his skill placement level was not reflective of the scoring as he was rating the elements against the constructs, as opposed to Interview 1 who did not pick up on this at all.

Interview 2’s own opinion was that transactional, operational and goal achievement attributes had led him to identifying the placement of the skilled elements, but that he realised during the interview that the actual leadership attributes were missing. I suspect his opinion on some of the elements has changed during the interview and has created awareness of actual leadership ability.

In going back to Interview 1 to discuss the data in order to try and establish why skill level placement differed so vastly from the scoring, it was found that a single aspect of performance had created that perception, and when looking at the overall scores, Interview 1 acknowledged that the Element was indeed not as unskilled as initially perceived.

There has to be something more fundamental than co-incidence if 2 out of 3 interviews display the same reasoning processes? Does it have something to do with weighting of leadership attributes, or is it driven by perception? Does a single perception influence skill placement level? If it is a perception, and can it be attributed to a single category?

In order to understand this, once I have done the Stage 2 coding in Grounded Theory, I need to check which constructs moved Elements to different skill levels, and see if these are specific to a category, so that I can try and understand the reasoning behind rating someone as skilled and then scoring them as average or unskilled, or visa versa.
Memo Note 2

It appears that a large part of strategy achievement is influencing others in either a pleasant or unpleasant way to enable change. I have noticed very clear types of behaviour during interactions.

Although both types of behaviour at strategic level appear to use relationships to influence change – one is clearly more destructive than the other. Both expect reciprocal behaviour - so if you respond in the right way to an unpleasant influencing experience, the reward is that you get a reprieve, and your behaviour is therefore reinforced through reward, which teaches you to be compliant.

It was concerning to note that the ‘villain’ behavioural type is about using people ruthlessly to advance themselves – it was less about networking and caring and nurturing relationships but deliberately targeting people to add to their networks and strategically aligned themselves for reciprocity, influence or self-protection. Both the ‘visionary’ behaviour type at strategic level and operational behaviours seem to be more about ensuring collaboration and getting multiple perspectives through stakeholder engagement (as a way of finding solutions and resolving issues) and relationship building for long term benefit.

I’m not always sure that this is a deliberate strategic intent - in a lot of cases it appears simply to be driven by bad behaviour - almost a bully type of behaviour where people comply due to fear of reprisals

A lot of strategy achievement appears more about behaviour and less about planning 5 years ahead

Memo Note 3

My belief when commencing this research was that I would see a big difference between executive management, senior management and operational management in terms of strategic behaviours which would be very clearly defined, and that a causal mechanism could be built of strategic behaviours and a separate one for operational behaviours, and a gap for development identified.
I have however, noticed with interest that the opposite has proved true: A lot of the interactions viewed at executive management level have been more focused on operational behaviour than strategic behaviour, and similarly, senior management and middle interactions are often more strategic than those exhibited by executive management.

A lot of people in strategic positions seem to operate at an operational level, and it is often their subordinates who point out the implications of decisions or situations, and make connections before they do.

In reality there are more operational constructs than strategic one's, which are exhibited by both middle, senior and executive managers.

Is this a case of the failure of the talent pipeline as mentioned in my first research cycle where people are promoted on a perceived skill level and are not able to display the competencies required?

I initially struggled with this concept because I wasn't looking at positions and looking for the differences in behaviours between Executives/ Senior and Middle Managers I was looking for strategic behaviour, which created a blur because in a lot of cases the behaviour of Executives was not aligned in terms of strategy, and future value creation, but more operationally focused.

**Memo note 4**

There is a contraction in Participant 1’s EQ effective level – while he views his relationships as healthy he is distant/aloof with low empathy. This indicates that he is out of touch with the impact of his behaviour on others and probably does not get feedback to the contrary because of his aggressive behaviour). Need to open his thinking and give him feedback on behaviour)

**Memo Note 5**

Small observable signs are giving me the identification of potential to develop Participant 1 into an effective senior manager.

Besides the normal indicators which most people would rate highly, such as being willing to go the extra mile, offering to complete a piece of work for me that others wouldn’t, responding with appropriate sense of urgency with requests and having a sound operational ability, what really piques my interest above all else is that he has exceptionally high reflection skills
He listens to feedback, and I can see sometimes he doesn’t agree with what I am saying. He then disappears and returns to discuss what I have said - this reflective ability to be able to absorb, analyse, synthesise and debate indicates a high learning potential which could indicate a very rewarding developmental opportunity for both Participant 1 and myself.

The benefit is that he is already operationally sound, the question is can the balance of attributes be developed, and will he be willing to be disturbed in order to go on this journey with me and affect change?

The advantage is that I am through previous research, aware of what these attributes should be, and also his shortfalls against the criteria. I make the conscious decision to take the risk to appoint him but understand that development is required.

**Memo Note 6**

Not everyone who expresses an interest in being developed, or is placed in a development pipeline, is capable of actually translating this into reality. What is it about the differences in two candidates that make one successful and the other not? Are there overriding or inherent competencies which will differentiate them so that I can be aware upfront of the likelihood of success in development?

**Memo Note 7**

Questions
1. If I provide a structured, disciplined environment, where rules, regulations and authority are clear, will this change his behaviour and channel him correctly?
2. If he relies so heavily on authority pleasing does this indicate that it is the basis for quality delivery – whatever I asked him to deliver he will, which will translates into operational excellence?
3. Nobody else can see this – why? (Additional Memo note: Nobody has connected his structured background and the need for order to it causing him internal chaos. It is his natural comfort zone, and he keeps trying to get back there.
Memo note 8

I decide to take a chance on Participant 1 and appoint him. I have heavy resistance in certain parts of the business, but I announce that I will take full responsibility for this decision. Some people are very unhappy with my decision, but it is mine to make, and I have a strong intuition about this.

I set up a meeting with Participant 1 to give him interview feedback. I position it with all the negative feedback first – his interview was not great, the assessment feedback indicates that he is not ready, and that he does not appear to be ready to transcend to the next level.

He acknowledges what I am saying, and I can see that he has accepted the fact that I am about to tell him that he was not successful. However, I say to him that despite all these indications that he is not ready, that there is something that I see in him which gives me the indication that he is, with my assistance, able to change, and that with the right guidance I believe he could be brilliant.

I make it very clear to him that I am taking a chance on him, and if he is unable to make the shift, then we would be having a very different conversation within 3 months. He is very surprised, and immediately commits to making the changes required.

Memo Note 9

With Participant 1’s appointment I immediately start restructuring office space to accommodate his new position. I identify two offices in the main building where I sit as an appropriate place for him to be. I advise him of this, and his first reaction is that he wants to stay on the DC warehouse with his management team.

I tell him that this is not a good idea – he needs to move away from them in order to create boundaries and to be seen as different (i.e. not on the same level as them). It’s a management lesson he has to learn – as you go up the ladder your previous friends now become your subordinates – the relationship has to change, and it gets lonelier and lonelier at the top, with less people you can confide it. It can be quite an isolated place to be, but unless you have this differentiation you can never be fully effective. I notice with interest that he chooses the office furthest away from mine. Still hiding from me?
A lesson for him will be that as he rises up the corporate ladder that he will have to consider who he can identify as the people he might need to become closer to because they would be
the correct people to help him on his journey vs the person who is naïve and maintains the same relationships.

**Memo Note 10**

I take note of Participant 1’s body language and facial expressions in meetings. If someone says something that he does not agree with it is immediately transparent – his body language closes and he displays a ‘scowl’ expression on his face. It's quite disconcerting to watch, and I can well imagine that lower levels of staff becoming quite intimidated with this. The impression is immediate – you are talking nonsense and I’m not going to agree.

I am not sure if he is aware of this, and give him feedback on this issue. He is very unaware of it, and we agree in future meetings that if I see him to this that I will give him a pre-agreed sign. This works well, and he corrects himself immediately once I do the sign.

Over time there is a marked difference in him. I acknowledge with respect that it must be exceptionally difficult to change this subconscious involuntary reflex, but to his credit he does.

**Memo Note 11**

It took Participant 1 quite a while to get to grips with the understanding changes needed to happen to move forward when I suggested changing the Inbound, Inventory, Outbound, FLM to include Picking as a larger focus area, which I had to explain to Participant 1 was the largest operational activity and therefore deserving of their own manager.

He battled initially with the concept, however soon got to grips with it as he began to see the value in his own mind. Goes back to his profile where he needs to see tangible evidence, and perhaps battles with the abstract thinking

He needs to learn to trust me, and once he has seen that changes can work, and work effectively then perhaps he will be more willing to explore change as an effective management tool.
Memo note 12

Throughout the 2 year period, I constantly ask probing questions about Participant 1 behaviour to stakeholders and staff without being direct. 360 degree feedback is that change is visible – that is a good sign.

I also give Participant 1 this feedback as a form of encouragement that he is moving in the right direction, and that people are starting to notice.

It is also a way for me to start changing perceptions about him – encourage people to verbalise and see the change – if they can see it, feel it, and speak it – then they will believe it. It’s a perception management tool.

Memo note 13

It is becoming more apparent that Participant 1 thrives on feedback. In fact he seeks it out, this is a good sign – a sign that he is constantly checking in to see if he is on the right path, if my expectations of him are aligned to his actions, if he has behaved appropriately in situations, if he has responded adequately to issues.

It indicates a real commitment to change, and a willingness to be open to, and apply action to areas in which he still needs to work on.

If he does a job well and receives praise the pride in him is visible (eyes light up, chest puffs up, stature straightens). If you give him feedback on an area which he could have done differently, he looks confused and put out. To his credit, I notice that he takes the feedback, asks questions for clarity and then goes off to think about it. He returns the next day and has a discussion in terms of learnings. This is a marvellous skill, and one that I have told him that this is the best management tool he could use, and he needs to keep on doing it – reflection

Memo note 14

Gave Participant 1 feedback on the perception of him in the business. He is very surprised as he did not realise that people had such a negative view of him.

Despite his exterior persona, he’s very sensitive about what other people think about him.
He realises that in order to develop he needs to change this perception. I run a session with the management team and play a video called “The danger of a single story” (Chimamanda Ngozi Adichie: The danger of a single story on TED.com) and have a discussion with the management team around how people often get labelled and become known by that label e.g. “He is a trouble stirrer”, and it defines them despite them having many other facets to their personality. I ask them to look beyond the label and see the whole person, and also to specifically look for signs that these people are changing.

I ask Participant 1 how he will know if what he is doing is changing people’s perceptions of him. We agree that the best method is to ask them directly for feedback – it will force them to look for signs and acknowledge them. From a head office perspective specifically, the plan it is to include him in meetings and projects where he can start making positive contributions, and become noticed.

I explain to Participant 1 that you can do two years of good work, but that a single incident can become a defining moment. His behaviour therefore needs to be consistent and focussed.

Memo note 15

Participant 1 came to check why I hadn’t checked up on him – is this a coping mechanism to stay out of trouble Authority for him equalled respect, it equalled having “authority’s back”, and every action was designed to please authority(?)

(Additional Memo note: this manifested itself later when he was confused about me inviting him and allowing him to challenge me on decisions he potentially had another opinion on, and to have a debate around it. Previously even though he principally disagreed with management, he would verbalise it aggressively, but ultimately follow the instruction even though he thought it was wrong as debate was not encouraged, and his opinion never fully considered)

Memo Note 16

Have been playing with the idea for a while that Participant 1 could benefit from some business coaching. I have previously referred people to a specific coach, and the results have been well worth the investment. She is focussed on moving people from periods of being stuck and assists them to navigate through mind fields of thoughts into a focussed solution based state.

I mention it to Participant 1 during one of our meetings. I can see that it is not something that he is completely comfortable with. I try and reassure him that he is not there to pour his heart
out, but must consider it a developmental tool on the journey. He agrees to do it because he trusts me, and because he is so keen to grow.

**Memo Note 17**

Set an Operating Plan for the year with some uncomfortable targets for Participant 1 to achieve. It is quite different from what he is used to. His previous operating plans were vague and largely focussed on operational indicators. I apply a balanced scorecard principle broken down into People, Process, Customer and Finance. The goals are very clear and measurable. It details for him my full expectation and what he needs to do to achieve a score of 3 (you are doing what I expect you to do) and a 4 (you have gone above and beyond what I expect you to do).

He is looking a bit overwhelmed by this. I commit to meeting him every month to review his progress against the operating plan and to feedback to him on his performance.

**Memo note 18**

Sat in a meeting with Participant 1 and his managers, and it was immediately visible that he did not consider any of their input. Although he started the meeting off well, as soon as they tried to give input he shut them down immediately, both verbally and with body language – it is clear to me that this is a normal, as opposed to an isolated, incident.

Is it because what they are saying is really without validation, in which case he needs to acknowledge their input and explain to them why it is not a good idea or is it because he believes he is right and shut out to other opinions, or simply because he is so desperate to shine that he wants to own the idea and the solution and the credit that goes with it?

This is not conducive to continuous improvement or team engagement. I allow the meeting to run its course and give Participant 1 feedback afterwards. He is quite surprised as he had not recognised this in himself. I asked him to put himself into another’s shoes and see how he would feel if every time he came to me I shut him down in a dismissive way.

In order to drive this, I add to his Operating Plan the target that he needs to deliver a number of continuous improvement projects that come from staff.
I also add a target for Reward & Recognition to force him to look for, and acknowledge, good performance, ideas and innovation.

As he is target driven, this will force him into the space of having to consciously be on the lookout, and open to, these new ideas and interventions

When he started doing this, it was a big shift in his behaviour for me, and the team atmosphere changed immediately

**Memo Note 19**

July IPM – it’s probably been the best IPM he had ever had because I acknowledged what he did, and it is very important for him to get my approval. He was very taken aback with the feedback, as well as the acknowledgement of movement in the right direction – the increase in confidence was immediately visible, and I could see he was very touched by the feedback after having had very negative reviews in the past.

**Memo Note 20**

I begin to realise that Participant 1 mimics behaviour. Under previous management, although placed in an unsuitable environment which exasperated the situation, he adopted the leadership style of the previous GM.

I make a statement about something, and then a while later, hear Participant 1 repeating it almost verbatim to someone else as if it was his own thought.

This is very interesting; because it indicates he looks to leadership to set the example, and then perhaps believes by following it, he is aligning to them. His first leadership style experienced was very militaristic – which defined his framework, and the subconscious belief that you have to follow the style of the leader to stay out of trouble. I’m not aware of what other leadership styles (except for the previous GM) that he has experienced, however this framework needs to be worked on.

If he can be given the right coaching, mentoring and exposure to a different management style, I hope that he can redefine his framework, and have the confidence to develop his own style by picking out the pieces of excellence that work for him, and developing his own style with good, and carefully selected, modifications.
Memo Note 21

As Participant 1 starts settling into his role, I notice that he has not yet developed the confidence that he is making a right decision, or that he can in fact make a decision on his own. Part of this is the fact that he has never been in this position before (of being a decision maker) and part is also his confidence in his own decision making ability and the unwillingness to fail, all of which he needs to learn.

I allow him to continue to bounce things off me for a couple of months, and then start gently making the concept clear that he is responsible for the entire site, and needs to run it, and be held accountable for it, in its entirety. The messages start off quite subtly in the beginning, and then become more direct as I need to push him off the edge of comfortability and into the unknown.

It is a new concept for him – total ownership. It’s a big jump on his development curve. He starts off slowly testing the waters, and as he gets more comfortable makes big leaps. Had a quiet chuckle to myself a while back when I heard someone ask him if he needed to bounce something off me, and he responded firmly that it was his decision to make.

He is very proud of the fact that I trust him to make a decision and this has reinforced his confidence in his growth and management practice.

Memo Note 22

An essential part of management is not only understanding why you have failed, but also why you have succeeded, so that it can be repeated.

Participant 1 does not like being taken by surprise, and not have the answer to something when I question with facts, he looks surprised and wants to know how I knew that.

I teach him that the devil is always in the detail – seek first to understand before you can be understood.

He grasps this concept extremely quickly, and begins to increase both his analytical and problem solving ability by getting to grips with the detail.
It amazes me how quickly he grasps this and puts it into action

In the process he also learns that it is better to manage something continuously, and in smaller chunks, than to wait for the end of the week for the scorecard to be published, and to be surprised when you have failed. He develops a sense of continuous monitoring and appropriate action driven solution to correct timeously.

A causal effect is emerging – focus on a variable, and watch for signs of disturbance. If you are present and in the moment, it will quickly alert you to the fact that something is going on. A good first start to a systemic thinking ability.

**Memo Note 23**

Participant 1 still appears to be trying to micro manage everything. The site is doing well, and I have explained the concept to him that although it is always important to understand the detail, as you climb the corporate ladder you need to operate at a higher level of abstraction.

He needs to start having the same level of influence over his managers that I have had with him. He needs to set clear expectations from them in terms of what it is that he wants them to do, but he no longer has to DO it for them.

As I have done with him, he needs to allow them the opportunity to grow, and fully develop, which will not happen if you keep them under a microscope and make all their decisions for them.

The key is to allow them to fail forward, but maintain a constant eye on them so that you can correct quickly before it deteriorates.

I explained to him that the definition of a good leader wasn’t that they were so irreplaceable that things fell apart in their absence but that they carried on. This was an indication that you have developed your people sufficiently so that they can manage when you are not there

**Memo note 24**

Subsequent to discussions around people engagement and making sure staff are happy and engaged, Participant 1 seems to have shifted from being an extreme disciplinarian, to perhaps displaying too much empathy.
He was very proud of himself that he backed off doing a full chastising discussion with a female manager, and presented this as evidence of how he is starting to treat people differently. When asked why – he said he didn’t want her to cry.

He was quite surprised that I disagreed with this, and I explained that crying was a female defence mechanism. He has to find the balance – treat her with empathy, and give her tissues if required, but don’t let it stop you from taking her to task, as long as it is done in an appropriate manner.

I’m guessing that he has swung the pendulum too far in order to appear approachable, sympathetic and understanding. He needs to explore the framework of this to find the balance in the middle.

He absorbs the lesson and finds the middle ground – firm but fair.

**Memo note 25**

In early 2014 I made a point to keep an eye on Participant 1’s behaviour as he was experiencing extreme versions of trauma – his son was diagnosed with leukaemia and was in hospital and simultaneously his Father in law passed away. It would be the perfect opportunity for him to revert to previous behaviours.

I can see that he is distracted at stages, and appears aloof – but there is no variation in terms of volatility or unreasonable behaviour.

I have a discussion with him to tell him that I will support him in whatever way he needs, and that he can self-manage his time if he needs to go to the hospital, but that I am not going to be soft on his service delivery. I recognise that the work environment will be critical to keeping him focussed forward – he will receive empathy but not sympathy.

He is exceptionally grateful that I am flexible in accommodating his situation, and also expresses that he needs to be at work to avoid having too much time to think – this is something I intuitively knew. A way to help him cope is to force him to be focussed at work.

I sense that he has a large degree of emotional trauma which he does not want to share with me, as he feels that I will think less of him if he cannot cope. That is not true, but I respect it, so
simultaneously I organise him counselling sessions with someone who can balance his emotional needs and help him on this difficult journey.

**Memo note 26**

In the 2nd year, the same principles of deliberate goal sets were established, however I no longer do a review with him monthly, as I believe the principles are in place, and Participant 1 needs to get rid of his dependency to have me oversee everything, and continue to grow and own his space.

It’s quite interesting that he has noticed this as I never verbalised it. He came to me and said ‘What’s the matter?’, and I said, ‘What do you mean?’ He said ‘you don’t come and sit with me so much anymore, you don’t ask me details, and you just leave me’

I explained to him it was because he was now doing what he is supposed to be doing, and that I trusted him to do it. He did a check in with me and asked ‘So it’s a complement?’ I confirmed it was and he was happy again.

There was a sense of that a degree of vulnerability and sensitivity was emerging, and that he was questioning the fact that perhaps that I was ignoring him because he was doing something wrong. Although it is a good sign that he came to clarify this with me, because it is about perception management, it does however surprise me because I believed that his framework is now there – he understands the boundaries in which he needs to operate

**Memo note 27**

Participant 1 has really come on in leaps and bounds – he is delivering superb service, and has undertaken what must have been an extremely challenging journey at stages, although he has done it with apparent ease.

He has been developed in so many areas and now in order to fully transition, needs to depth of systemic thinking and I have plans which I have agreed with him to do a formal qualification in year 3 & 4. I am able, though Participant 1’s performance, to motivate and receive authorisation to enrol him into the GSB for a Post Graduate Diploma in Management Practice. I commit to him that I will mentor and coach him during this process.
Appendix H : Evidence of Improvement

H1: Customer Feedback

What are the improvements which you have noted in the C&GM DC Ops area?

- Communication channels have improved dramatically, the overall mind-set of the team is very positive with a pro-active, solution focussed approach to their daily activities and outputs.
- Customer centric focus, optimisation of processes, understanding of broader C&GM issues
- The warehouse team show a lot more focus on key operational tasks and have helped us enable projects like the in house processing.
- Team empowerment
- Responsiveness to business requirements
- Positive approach and solution focussed
- Excellent management of packing list prior to container receiving.
- Better productivity and service level
- Clear accountability and role clarity
- The experience in dealing with the DC was awesome over the last year
- Thank all of you for your great support and the way you have responded to previous performance, by continuously raising your game to meet our requirements.
- There has been a consistent improvement over the last 2 years.
- I have been in the business since 1998 and have worked extensively with the DC’s across import, exports and foods and this is the best team and service I’ve experienced at DC’s.
- I am in a position to compare your service with that of other countries and I can say without a doubt that right now in my opinion you are in the lead.
- Communication has been great
- Consistency over all areas.
- Turn around times with regards to promotions
- Improvement in the ways of working
- Better understanding of C&GM business and priorities
- Better collaboration and a focus on enabling retail versus KPI’s
- There is now effective team integration with increased flexibility and much improved processes and controls
• Handling of high volumes in peak periods that could potentially have caused bottle necks but did not.
• The handling of the additional demands placed for new product handling & launches was dealt with professionally & with great excitement to contribute to the growth of our business.

Is there anything you would particularly like to highlight as having been outstanding?
• There have been huge strides in the ways-of-working, the environment is structured and controlled and the “people” component has evolved into a unified, efficient operations team.
• The above has been executed within a framework of flexibility to accommodate the business needs.
• Stakeholder integration has improved dramatically
• Great improvement in the picking accuracy, volumes picked which shows in the scorecard.
• Demurrage and storage cost savings have been achieved
• Dwell time improvement
• The “CAN DO” attitude is noticed and appreciated.
• Speed to Market and the flexibility of the Ops team in prioritising intake and accommodating unplanned containers at very short notice to avoid costs
• Improved reporting, productivity and team work
• Good peak management, best Chinese New Year
• Inventory management improving as evidenced by stock take results
• Reduction to Inventory Accuracy compared to previous year;
• Focus on continuous improvement which was previously non-existent
• Reducing lead time, improved du fill, improved productivity.
• The inventory accuracy, reduced scratches, improved lead time, on the ball with taking in our containers, even when we had 18 on 1 vessel
• Thank you for a year of excellent service which has assisted us in improving availability to our stores with great sales results